



THE ROMANIAN ACADEMY
SCHOOL OF ADVANCED STUDIES OF THE ROMANIAN
ACADEMY
DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY
THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE “VASILE PÂRVAN”

SUMMARY OF THE DOCTORAL THESIS

HABITAT OF THE GETIC POPULATION OF CENTRAL-EASTERN
MUNTENIA DURING THE SECOND IRON AGE
(4th - 1st CENTURIES BC)

DOCTORAL SUPERVISOR,
DR. VALERIU SÎRBU, C.S. I

DOCTORAL STUDENT,
ANIȘOARA (STOIAN) TOPÂRCEANU

- 2024 -

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abbreviations.....	3
INTRODUCTION. Motivation for choosing the theme. Stage of knowledge – Historiography of the problem. What we aim for.....	5
I. GEOGRAPHICAL FRAMEWORK AND THE NATURAL RESOURCES OF MUNTENIA	9
I.1 Geographical framework (relief, flowing waters, lakes, communication paths, etc.)..	9
I.2 Natural resources of soil and subsoil.....	10
II. THE WRITTEN SOURCES REGARDING MUNTENIA (POPULATION, RELIEF, CLIMATE, RICHES).....	13
III. REPERTOIRE OF THE GETIC DISCOVERIES IN CENTRAL-EASTERN MUNTENIA IN THE 4TH TO 1ST CENTURIES BC.....	24
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE FINDINGS	203
IV. A. Settlements	203
IV. A.1 Fortified settlements	203
IV. A.2 Unfortified settlements	210
IV. B. Housing structures	214
IV. B.1 Bordeia.....	214
IV. B.2 Semibordeia/deepened dwellings	220
IV. B.3 Surface dwellings	222
IV. C. Cult structures: sacred areas, temples, decorated altars (eschara).....	227
IV. D. Household facilities	235
IV.D.1 Pits	235
IV.D.2 Outdoor oven.....	241
IV. D.3 Outdoor hearths	243
IV. D.4 Material agglomerations	245
IV.D.5 Platforms without elevation (?)	246
IV.E. Internal organization of the settlements (grouping, association of housing structures and household facilities)	247
V. CONCLUSIONS.....	250
VI. VARIOUS	261
VI. 1. Bibliography	261
VI. 2. <i>Appendix 1.</i> List of Getic Settlements of Central-Eastern Muntenia of the 4 th to 1 st centuries BC.....	279
VI. 3. <i>Appendix 2.</i> List of the necropolises, isolated funerary discoveries, treasures and important isolated discoveries of Central-Eastern Muntenia of the 4 th to 1 st centuries BC ..	337
VII. ILLUSTRATIONS (Appendix list, Appendix 3, Maps, Tables).....	347-457

INTRODUCTION

Introduction. Motivation for choosing the theme. Stage of knowledge – Historiography of the problem. What we aim for.

The Wallachian Plain has provided living conditions throughout the period of time that we refer to, due to geographical conditions and favorable climate.

The archaeological investigations carried out until 1979 in Muntenia gave us the possibility to know the Geto-Dacian culture, with 213 settlements being listed at that time. For most of the settlements in the Danube Plain the habitation ceases towards the end of the 1st century BC, with few of the archaeologically researched settlements that evolved chronologically during and after the 1st century AD.

The theme I chose to research complements what I was concerned about and studied during college, as the topic of my bachelor's work was: *Getic settlements on the lower sector of the Lower Danube in the second Iron Age* (held at Ovidius University, Constanța, 1999), coordinated by the late professor Mihai Irimia.

The absence of an extensive current work, which would provide information about the Getae settlements in Muntenia, chronologically framed in the period of the 4th to 1st centuries BC gave us the opportunity to analyze and present through our project a clearer, up-to-date situation on the archaeological discoveries, the typology of the settlements, the history and the way the research has evolved over time.

Our project, *Habitat of the Getic population of Central-Eastern Muntenia during The Second Iron Age (4th to 1st centuries BC)*, focuses mainly on the analysis of archaeological findings which reflect the habitat of the local population in Muntenia.

Through this project we intend to summarize the habitat elements of the Getic population of Central-Eastern Muntenia (4th to 1st centuries BC) and to bring up to date the repertoire of settlements in this area. The systematic research, preventive research and surveys have highlighted 364 points in which were discovered vestiges of habitation which belonged to the Getic population, whether we refer to settlements with housing structures and household facilities (dwellings, pits, hearths, ovens, etc.) or the discovery of ceramic fragments.

By correlating older data related to the Getic settlements in Central-Eastern Muntenia (4th to 1st centuries BC) with the most recent, we have tried to achieve a clearer situation of the existence, number and typology of these discoveries. In addition to the analysis of the habitat elements of the Getic population in Central-Eastern Muntenia, our project also aims to update the situation regarding necropolises, isolated funeral discoveries, treasures and important isolated discoveries.

In Appendix 2 we have included necropolises, isolated funeral finds, treasures and important isolated discoveries, both to complete the information on the presence of the Getae in the area, as well as to highlight their traffic and trade routes from the 4th to 1st centuries BC.

I. GEOGRAPHICAL FRAMEWORK AND THE NATURAL RESOURCES OF MUNTENIA

I.1 Geographical framework (relief, flowing waters, lakes, communication paths, etc.)

The Wallachian Plain is part of the Romanian Plain and stretches along the left shore of Danube, between the waters of Olt and Buzau, being bordered in the North by the Getic

Piedmont and the Southern Subcarpathian Mountains. The conventional northern border passes through the following localities: Slatina, Pitești, Găiești, Dragomirești, Târgoviște, Băicoi, Urlați, Buzău and Brăila. The particular character of the relief of this region lies in the fact that it can be defined by three distinct aspects: plains, terraces and meadows.

The areas of Muntenia that we will refer to are: Burnaz Plain (the Giurgiu area), Bucharest Plain, between the Argeș and Prahova rivers and Dâmbovița (the Argeș, Dâmbovița, Ialomița, Prahova and Buzău area) and Bărăgan Plain (Călărași, Ialomița and Brăila area).

I.2 Natural resources of soil and subsoil

The dominant soils in the Wallachian Plain have always been steppe or forest-steppe soils or chernozem. Natural resources were very important for the existence and development of human communities. The geo-morphological and climatic factors of this area have led to the possibility of the Getic population to practice agriculture. The following were cultivated in the eastern part of the Romanian Plain: wheat, barley, two-rowed barley, broad bean, peas, lentils, mustard, poppy, chickpeas and textile plants (flax, hemp). The evidence regarding the cultivation of plants was discovered in the Getic settlements from: Barboși, Grădiștea, Crăsanii de Jos-*Piscul Crăsani* and Popești.

Domestic animal bones have been found in all the Getic sites in Muntenia, for which expert analyses were carried out as follows: Pietroasa Mică-*Gruia Dării*, Vlădiceasca, Bordușani-*Popină*, Cățunu, Valea Argovei, Conțești, Brănești, Chirnoși-*Rudărie*, Militari-*Câmpul Boja*, Radovanu, Mironcești-*Conacul lui Palade* and Mironcești-*Coastă*.

In the Getic settlements of the Romanian Crăsanii de Jos-*Piscul Crăsani*, Popești, Radovanu, Vlădiceasca, Cârломănești, Grădiștea, Căsciorele, Greaca, Prundu and Cetățeni have been identified, based on archaeological analysis, the following wild mammals: *Castor fiber* (Eurasian beaver), *Lepus europaeus* (brown hare), *Canis lupus* (wolf), *Vulpes vulpes* (vulpe), *Ursus arctos* (bear), *Putorius putorius* (European polecat), *Meles meles* (European badger), *Felis silvestris* (wild cat), *Cervus elaphus* (deer), *Capreolus capreolus* (roe deer), *Bos primigenius* (aurochs) and *Sus scrofa ferus* (wild boar).

II. THE WRITTEN SOURCES REGARDING MUNTENIA (POPULATION, RELIEF, CLIMATE, RICHES)

Little is known about the history of the lands inhabited by Getae in the 4th to 3rd centuries BC. The information regarding the existence of the Getic population in this area originates from ancient literature, historical and epigraphic written sources. The first extensive information about the Getae comes from the Greek historian Herodotus (IV, 93-96), who defines them as: „the bravest and fairest of the Thracians”. However, the one who makes a written mention of the Getae of the Wallachian Plain for the first time is Arrian (*Anabasis* I, 3, 4).

Other written sources regarding Muntenia are the cartographic sources. Information on the hydrography of Muntenia during the 7th century is included in the Stolnic Cantacuzino's *Harta Țării Românești*, in which the hydrography is widely illustrated based on the Dâmbovița, Argeș, Ialomița, Călmățui (the old course of Buzău) rivers and Snagov, Căldărușani, Mostiștea lakes. Furthermore, the name of some localities are also mentioned, some of which being: „Poppești, Greaca, Prundul, Radonani (Radovanu), Stenica (Stelnica) și Grădiștea” (<https://ro.wikipedia.org/wiki/>).

On Austrian military maps of the 19th century, on the territory of Wallachia, some of the settlements in which traces of Getic habitation were subsequently reported, appear as follows: “Zimnitza, Adunatzi Copăceni, Mogoșești, Popești, Mihailești (Argeș); Radovan, Prundu, Greaka, Pietroiu (Călărași); Stelnika, Bordușani - Movila Popina, Krăsani de Jos - Movila Kopuzului (Ialomița), Baraboș (Galați); Grădiște de Jos, Grădiște de Sus (Brăila), Petroasa de Jos, Petroasa de Sus (Buzău) și Cetatzenii de la Negru Vodă (Argeș)” (<https://mapire.eu8>).

III. REPERTOIRE OF THE GETIC DISCOVERIES IN CENTRAL-EASTERN MUNTENIA IN THE 4TH TO 1ST CENTURIES BC

In this chapter we set out to analyze the 364 Getic settlements using a paper in which the following are mentioned: the siruta code; the locality; the toponym; the RAN code: and/or the LMI; location of the point and the relief form; type of research; type of complexes and their general characterization; chronology and bibliography.

Ex: 67611 ADÂNCATA, GURA OCNIȚEI COMMUNE, DÎMBOVIȚA COUNTY

Pod Pâscov (Ghimpuri); cod RAN: 67611.01; cod LMI: DB-I-m-B-16956.02

The site is located at the southern end of the commune, to the left of the Pâscov River (Pl. 1; 2/1; 7/1).

Field research: C. Preda 1954.

Ceramic fragments and a treasure composed of 46 Vârteju-București coins, 6 Thasian tetradrachms issued in 148 BC.

2nd to 1st centuries BC

Bibliography: Preda 1957, 380-389; Poenaru-Bordea, Condrea 1972, 109-131; Mitrea, Brob 1981, 349-351; Olteanu 2002, 142; <http://ran.cimec.ro/sel.asp?descript=adanca-gura-ocnitei-dambovita-situl-arheologic-de-la-adanca-pod-pascov-cod-sit-ran-67611.01> (accessed: 7.12. 2022).

IV. ANALYSIS OF THE FINDINGS

In the chapter **Analysis of the findings** we proposed a classification of the types of settlements (fortified, unfortified), a broad and topical analysis of the dwelling structures (bordeia, semi-bordeia/deepened dwellings, surface dwellings), cult structures (sacred areas, temples, decorated altars) and household facilities (pits, outdoor ovens, outdoor hearths, clumps of materials).

IV. A. Settlements

Regarding the settlements, we find that the Getae from Muntenia did not have a preference for a certain form of relief, instead they settled wherever they found favorable living conditions and, most importantly, a water source. This explains the fact that all settlements are located on the banks of rivers or near lakes or natural springs. Most of the settlements of this period are not fortified.

Getic settlements of the 4th to 1st centuries BC were classified on the basis of several main criteria, namely considering the place chosen for the settlement, its size (implicitly the importance from an economic, political and military point of view) and the spread of dwellings within it.

IV. A.1 Fortified settlements

Fortified settlements are less common in the Wallachian Plain. The fortification elements of the settlements were represented by the trench (simple, double, triple), trench

with earthen rampart; rampart with stone or vitrified core and wall made of wood and earth, mud or stone.

The most numerous fortified settlements in the Central-Eastern Muntenia region are located in hilly areas, thus in the Prahova county at: Albesti Paleologu-*La Pod*, Coada Izvorului-*La Grădiște*, in the county of Prahova, Drajna de Sus-*La Cetățuie*, Fagetu-Varfu Prisacu, Homoraciu-*La Cetățuie*, Mirloguea-*Piscul cu cioburi*, Piscul-*La Cetate*, Podgoria-*Piscul cu cioburi* etc.

Other fortified settlements were discovered in Dâmbovița county at Aninoasa-*Râpa Târgului*, Dragodănești-*Podul Dâmboviței*, Iedera de Jos-*Dealul Cetățuia*; in Buzău county at Căndești, Cărlomănești, Pietroasa Mică-*Gruiu Dării* and Târcov-*Piatra cu Lilieci*, Călărași (Căscioarele-*D'aia parte*, Radovanu-*Gorgana I, Gorgana a II a*), Buzău (Căndești, Cărlomănești, Pietroasa Mică-*Gruiu Dării*), Giurgiu (Popești-*Nucet*), Ialomița (Crăsanii de Jos-*Piscul Crăsani*).

IV. A.2 Unfortified settlements

The unfortified settlements, otherwise the most numerous in the plain area, were preferred by the Getae. In this category were included both the large settlements which occupied dominant positions, with the role of political, religious and economic cores for the surrounding settlements, such as: Bordușani-Popină, Chirnoși-*Rudărie*, Grădiștea, Căscioarele și Vlădiceasca- *Ghergălăul Mare*, as well as others of smaller extent.

Of the unfortified settlements category were those located near various water courses, on terraces or plateaus, such as those at: Mironiști-*Coastă*, Milcovăț-*La Dig*, Letea Nouă-*La Grădină*, Letea Veche-*La pădure*, Cămineasca-*Măgura*, Bălănoaia, Stoieniști, Mogoșești (jud. Giurgiu), Grădiștea Călărași, Grădiștea Coslogeni-*Măgura lui Negoită*, Unirea-*Rău*, Găldău-*Centru și Cheson*, Pietroiu- *Centru*, Andolina, Chirnoși (Călărași county), Cetățeni-*Poiana Târgului și Monumente* (Argeș county).

Unfortified settlements were also discovered on the terrace of rivers such as: Mozacu, in Argeș county - Bughea, Campulug Muscel, Teiu din Deal; along Ialomita in the counties of Dambovita and Ialomita - Crivatu, Bujoreanca, Bujoreanca, Baleni Sarbi, Catunu, Bucu, Copuzu; along Neajlov - Corbii Mari, Puntea de Greci and along Colentina - Decindeea, Urziceanca; along Râmnicul Sărat, in Buzău county - Băbeni-*Muchia Pușcașului*, along Buzău - Berca, Sibiciul de Sus, Valea Lupului; along Călmățui - Gherăseni-*Grindul Cremenea*, Pietrosu-*La Arman*, Spătaru; along Cricovul Sărat in Prahova county - Albești Paleologu, Cioranii de Jos, Jercălăi; along Teleajen - Belciug, Făgetu, Gura Vitioarei; along Clănița și Teleorman in Teleorman county - Băbăița, Merișani and Lăceni.

In Ilfov County were identified fortified settlements on terraces, near bodies of water also, as follows: along Dâmbovița - Bălăceanca, Ciurel, Dudești, Tânganu; along Colentina - Cățelu Nou, Tei; along Cernica - Căldăraru; along Sabar - Bragadiru-*La Moară*, Cărămidărie, Afumați-*La Moară*; and in București along the lakes of Băneasa, Grivița, Pantelimon and Tei.

IV. B. Housing structures

Getic housing, for the entirety of their history, could be divided into three fundamental types: bordeia, semi-bordeia /deepened dwellings and surface dwellings.

IV. B.1 Bordeia

The bordeia were generally few, and typically found in plain areas, being classified by the form of pits: irregular rhombic-shaped bordeia, oval or rectangular, round-shaped bordeia and bordeia with quadrilateral contour and rounded corners.

IV. B.2 Semibordeia/deepened dwellings

The semi-bordeia/deepened dwellings are staples of Getic settlements in the plains and hilly areas of Muntenia. Depending on their plan, they can be grouped into three main types: quasi-round or oval, quadrilateral or irregular polygonal and quadrilateral.

This type of housing was found in settlements such as: Bărcănești, Belciug, Căldăraru, Crăsanii de Jos-*Piscul Crăsanii*, Sărulești, Sibiciul-*Dealul Burdușoia*, Târcov-*Piatra cu liliaci*, Cățunu-*Viișoara*, Petrișoru-*Ulmii lui Țârlea*, Popești și Vlădiceasca-*Ghergălăul Mare*.

IV. B.3 Surface dwellings

The surface dwellings were the most abundant type of dwelling structures found at the Getae settlements in Wallachian Plain, being discovered at: Bălăceanca-*La malul trăznit*, Bărcănești, Bila-*La Fântână*, Pietroiu-*Centru*, Bragadiru-*La Moară*, Cățelul Nou, Budești-*Ciocârla*, Cățunu-*Viișoara*, Cărlomănești, Coslogeni-*Măgura lui Negoită*, Crăsanii de Jos-*Piscul Crăsanii* și Târcov-*Piatra cu liliaci*.

The dwellings were built in two ways: with walls made of wooden beams or with walls of beaten clay reinforced with stakes embedded in the ground. The roof of either type was made of straw, reed and cattail.

IV. C. Cult structures: sacred areas, temples, decorated altars (eschara)

The sacred areas of the settlements and temples were placed in the fortified, central and dominant part, in spaces to ensure their visibility (Popești, Crăsanii de Jos-*Piscul Crăsanii*, Căscioarele-*D'aia parte*); outside the settlements at Conțești-*Lacul lui Bircă*, Ciolăneștii din Deal, Bănești-*Dealul Domnii*; an enclosure, used only as a sacred place, at Pietroasa Mică-*Gruuu Dării*.

Decorated hearths (eschara) or altars have been discovered in numerous Getic settlements, such as the ones at Băbăița, București-*Mihai Vodă*, Cotofenii din Dos, Cărlomănești, Iedera de Jos-*Dealul Cetățuia*, Popești Leordeni, Crăsanii de Jos-*Piscul Crăsanii*, Radovanu, Târcov and Vlădiceasca.

IV. D. Household facilities

IV.D.1 Pits

In the area of the settlements of the Wallachian Plain, the most frequent household facilities were represented by pits, dug for keeping supplies, extracting clay and soldering soil from the lower layers of the soil, and, almost all turned to places of storage of household waste eventually.

The pits, whether for the purpose of storing supplies or discarding household waste, were spread over the entire surface of the settlements unevenly depending on the settlement.

Regarding the shape of the pits, they could be cylindrical at Grădiștea, Căscioarele, Unirea-*Rău* (Gr.2), Crăsnii de Jos-*Piscul Crăsanii*, Însurăței, Bălăceanca-*La malul trăznit* and Cărlomănești; conical or "bell-shaped" at Căscioarele (50 pits), Grădiștea, Crăsanii de Jos-*Piscul Crăsanii*, Bordușani, Radovanu, Bucu-*Pochină*, Bălăceanca-*La malul trăznit* and Sărulești; oval at Grădiștea, Căscioarele, Malu Roșu, Chirnogi and Cărlomănești; irregular at Căscioarele (two pits) and Grădiștea.

In the Getic settlements of the Wallachian Plain another type of pit encountered was the ritual or cult type. Three ritual pits were discovered at the Grădiștea (Gr.124, Gr.126, Gr.127), which through form, ordering, filling and archaeological inventory within reflect certain magical-religious beliefs, Spiru Haret which have a deer skeleton at their bottom, and the one from Coslogeni.

Ritual pits were also discovered at: Bucureștii Noi, București-*Fundeni* in which whole dogs were deposited, Vadu Săpat-*La Siliște* and Spiru Haret- *Movila Cornu Malului*.

IV.D.2 Outdoor oven

Craftsmen and household-use ovens were discovered in Chirnogi, Unirea-*Rău*, Radovanu, Bucu-*Pochină*, Sibiciu de Sus-*Dealul Burdușoia*, Bălăceanca-*La malul trăznit*, Bălteni, Belciug, Cățelul Nou și Cărlomănești and Pietroasa Mică-*Gruuu Dării*.

IV. D.3 Outdoor hearths

The hearths belong, along with the ovens, in the category of heating facilities, and their presence in various places of the settlements may indicate their shared use by several households. The shape of the hearths was usually round or oval at Grădișteea, while at Căscioarele (*Șuvița Hotarului, Coinea I, Suharna and La Slom*) they had a round, less often oval, shape.

Outdoor hearths were also discovered in the settlements of Schitu-Gura Despei, Popești, Crășanii de Jos-Piscu Crășani, Ocnița-Hoaga, Târcov-Piatra cu liliaci, Căscioarele-D'aia parte and Vadu Săpat.

IV. D.4 Material agglomerations

Agglomerations of materials were discovered at Cascioarele, at the points of *Șuvița Hotarului, Suharna, La Stână* and the *Greaca-Prundu* area. These material agglomerations were circular or oval areas, with irregular edges and of different sizes, between 0.80 x 2.00 m, consisting of burns, vessel fragments, animal bones, stones, pieces of burnt house walls. Perhaps these agglomerations represented areas for depositing household waste. In Târcov-Piatra cu liliaci five material agglomerations were found in the archaeological campaign of 2019.

Material agglomerations were discovered at: Budești-Bivolul, Căscioarele-D'aia parte and Suharna, Radovanu-Gorgana a II a (Călărași county), Crășanii de Jos-Piscul Crășani, Vlădeni (Ialomița county), Grădișteea-Movila Crestată (Brăila county), Greaca, Popești, Prundu, Schitu-Gura Despei (Giurgiu county), Moara Vlăsiei, Sintești (Ilfov county), Gura Vitioarei, Vadu Săpat (Prahova county), Zimnicea (Teleorman county) and Stoenești/Cetățeni (Argeș county).

IV.D.5 Platforms without elevation (?)

Platforms were types of complexes whose use we cannot be certain of and whose name is improper. These were areas with a more or less regular contour, where stones were found, usually broken and with traces of burning, animal bones, fragments of vessels and of burnt housing walls.

Platforms were found at Grădișteea, Schitu-Gura Despei of oval shape and dimensions of 1.50x0.95 m, consisting of a cluster of river stones whose use is difficult to identify, Crasani de Jos-Piscul Crășani and Cârломănești.

IV.E. Internal organization of the settlements (grouping, association of housing structures and household facilities)

The research, carried on small areas and having the role of preserving some sites in the area of Căscioarele - Greaca - Prundu did not lead to the notification of any intention to order housing complexes or pits. These complexes appeared in all areas of the settlement, in different densities. At Căscioarele-Coinea II it can be said that there was a special area designated for pits, a hypothesis which results from the large number of pits (10) compared to that of housing complexes (2). A special case was the settlement of Bordușani, where the surface dwellings were arranged after a well-defined street plan and on two levels of habitation.

In the Getic settlement of Grădișteea several archaeological complexes were observed in the southeast, southwest and on the northeastern side of the mound. The stratigraphic observations here suggested a "rotation" of the households in certain areas of the mound rather than a horizontal shift, in a particular direction of the community, while the pits accumulated on the edges of the settlement, where the housing complexes were located, but one can not talk about areas intended only for them.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Muntenia represented the cradle of the thriving Getic civilization, especially for the period between the 2nd and 1st centuries BC, when we can talk about a real demographic explosion, confirmed by the abundance of archaeological discoveries and research in this space. A large number of Getic settlements were reported both in the plain area (Călărași, Giurgiu, Ilfov, București) and in the hill area (Prahova, Buzău, Dâmbovița).

Thanks to systematic excavations and surface research undertaken by specialists, a series of settlements, necropolises and monetary discoveries, in treasures or isolated, are known for the territory of Muntenia. Research so far has shown that of a massive Getic habitation of Muntenia can be spoken about only in the 2nd and 1st centuries BC, a period in which we are witnessing a real demographic explosion. In addition to the fortified and unfortified settlements, 10 fortresses were also discovered in Central-Eastern Muntenia. These were reported, in particular, in the hill/mountain area in the counties: Pisculești, Drajna de Sus, Homorâciu, Mârlogea, Tisa), Buzău (Pietroasa Mică-*Gruiu Dării*, Târcov-*Piatra cu Lilieci*), Teleorman (Orbeasca de Sus), Giurgiu (Popești) and Argeș (Stoenești/Cetățeni).

As a result of some field research, a number of the points reported we could not include in a certain category, therefore we referred to them as "unspecified", because only ceramic fragments were discovered here, which could not be framed chronologically and typologically, reason for which we were not able to specify the typology of these settlements. In *Appendix 1* we presented information on the 550 points with Getic discoveries, structured as follows: type of research, type of settlement (unfortified, fortified, fortress, unspecified), housing complexes, household facilities, chronology and illustration. The unequal distribution of the Getic settlements discovered in Central-Eastern Muntenia is probably due to the insufficient surface and systematic research in certain areas (Argeș, Brăila, Ialomița, Teleorman) rather than their lack.

On the grounds of Getic settlements in Muntenia were discovered necropolises from the period between the 4th to 3rd centuries BC at Brăila-*Brăilița*, Grădiștea-Coslogeni, Costeștii din Vale, Galbinași, Moșoaia, Stelnică, Vadu Săpat, Zimnicea, and for the period of maximum development of the Getae (2nd to 1st centuries AD) no important necropolis of the common population was discovered, but only some groups of funerary graves (e.g., Popești). This phenomenon is difficult to explain because we are talking about a period of maximum density and expansion of settlements and intense archaeological research.

In the area we have taken care of there have also been discovered, especially fortuitously, over time numerous monetary treasures, such as: Macedonia Prima and Thasos tetradrachms at Suseni and Bogați; Vârteju-București coins at Vrănești and Valea Danului (Argeș county), Căscioarele-*Ostrovel* (Călărași county), Adâncata (Dâmbovița county); Thasos tetradrachms at Chiselet, Belciugatele, Tămădăul Mare, Valea Presnei, Ulmu and Boșneagu (Călărași county), Brâncoveanu (Dâmbovița county). In *Appendix 2* we have updated the information on necropolises, isolated funeral finds, treasures and important isolated discoveries.

Through our project we have updated the information about the Getic settlements in Central-Eastern Muntenia, both by significantly increasing the number of known ones, as well as completing the data on others, we proposed a new typological classification and, in some cases, we detailed their chronology. We have made 13 geographic maps with the spread of the Getic discoveries (settlements, necropolises, isolated funeral discoveries, treasures, important isolated discoveries) from Central-Eastern Muntenia, both throughout the area (Pl. 1, Pl. 2), as well as by counties (Pl. 3-13).

By the placement on the map (Pl. 1) of the settlements (unfortified, fortified, fortresses), necropolises, isolated funeral discoveries and treasures were able to complete the information regarding the presence of the Getae in certain areas (where we do not have habitation), possible traffic and trade routes of local communities with the Greco-Roman world. Of the 364 Getic settlements represented on the map (Pl. 1), 20 are fortified, 9 are fortresses, and most are unfortified and unspecified.

Furthermore, we also tried to present the types of housing structures, household facilities and internal organization within the settlements. We have updated the bibliography on the Getic settlements in Central-Eastern Muntenia and have brought up to date the information related to this area.

We hope that our approach has achieved the proposed objectives regarding the understanding of the habitat of the Getic population in Central-Eastern Muntenia. The information on the Getic civilization in this area can, of course, be supplemented and updated through future systematic, preventive and surface research.

VI. 1. SELECTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY

Babeș 2010 = Mircea Babeș, *Stațiunea geto-dacă de la Cârломănești: dava sau centru religios?*, Mousaios, XV, 2010, p. 123-146.

Bichir 1984 = Gheorghe Bichir, *Geto-dacii din Muntenia în epoca romană: monografie*, Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, București, 1984.

Comșa 1986 = Maria Comșa, *Un cuptor Getic de ars oale de la Radovanu*, CCDJ, II, 1986, p. 143-153.

Conovici 1985 = Niculae Conovici, *Așezări fortificate și centre tribale geto-dacice din Muntenia (sec. IV î.e.n - sec. I e.n.)*, Istros, IV, 1985, p. 71-88.

Crișan 1993 = Ion Horațiu Crișan, *Civilizația geto-dacilor*, vol I-II, Editura Meridiane, București, 1993.

Dupoi, Sîrbu 2001 = Vasile Dupoi, Valeriu Sîrbu, *Incinta dacică fortificată de la Pietroasele - "Gruiu Dării", jud. Buzău*, vol. I, Editura ALPHA, Biblioteca Mousaios, Buzău, 2001.

Frînculeasa et alii 2007-2008 = Alin Frînculeasa, Daniel Garvăn, Mădălina Frînculeasa, Bogdan Voicu, Ion Adamescu, *Descoperiri arheologice în bazinul râului Cricovul Sărat, jud. Prahova*, AMIAP, III-IV, 2007-2008, p. 47-100.

****Geografia României*, vol. V, Editura Academiei Române, București, 2005.

Glodariu 1983 = Ioan Glodariu, *Arhitectura dacilor - civilă și militară (sec. II î. e. n. - I e. n.)*, Editura Dacia, Cluj-Napoca, 1983.

****Istoria Românilor*, vol.I, București, Editura Academiei Române, 2018.

Măndescu 2006 = Dragoș Măndescu, *Cetățeni. Stațiunea geto-dacă de pe valea Dâmboviței Superioare*, Editura Istros, Brăila, 2006.

Nicolăescu 2015 = Monica Nicolăescu, *Abordări interdisciplinare asupra așezărilor și cetăților geto-dacice din Muntenia (sec. II a. Chr. - I p. Chr.)*, Editura Academia Română. Centrul de Studii Transilvane, Cluj Napoca, 2015.

Olteanu 2002 = Gheorghe Olteanu, *Repertoriul arheologic al județului Dâmbovița, I (A-M)*, Editura Cetatea de Scaun, Târgoviște, 2002.

Olteanu et alii 2003 = Gheorghe Olteanu, Ovidiu Cârștina, Denis Căprăroiu, *Repertoriul arheologic al județului Dâmbovița, II*, Editura Cetatea de Scaun, Târgoviște, 2003.

Popescu-Spineni 1978 = Marin Popescu-Spineni, *România în izvoarele geografice și cartografice*, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București, 1978.

Preda 1973 = Constantin Preda, *Monedele geto-dacilor*, Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste Romania, București, 1973.

Preda 1985 = Constantin Preda, *Cu privire la data și cauzele dispariției unor davee geto-dacice sud carpatică*, TD, VI, 1-2, 1985, p. 86-92.

- Rența 2003-2004** = Elena Rența, *Așezarea Getică de la Bucu-Pochină, județul Ialomița (sec. IV-III a. Chr.). I*, Ialomița, IV, 2003-2004, p. 137-185.
- Roșu 1973** = Alexandru Roșu, *Geografia fizică a României*, Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, București, 1973.
- Schuster, Popa 2008** = Cristian Schuster, Traian Popa, *Mironești, I. Locuri, cercetări arheologice și personaje istorice*, Editura Pelican Publishing House, Giurgiu, 2008.
- Schuster et alii 2012** = Cristian Schuster, Traian Popa, Vasile Barbu, *Cercetări arheologice în bazinul Argeșului*, Bibliotheca Musei Giurgiuvensis, VI, Giurgiu, 2012.
- Sîrbu 1996** = Valeriu Sîrbu, *Dava Getică de la Grădiștea, județul Brăila I*, Editura Istros, Brăila 1996.
- Sîrbu 2006** = Valeriu Sîrbu, *Oameni și zei în lumea geto-dacilor - mărturii arheologice// Man and Gods in the Geto-Dacians World - archaeological testimony -*, Editura C2 Design, Brașov, 2006.
- Sîrbu 2019** = Valeriu Sîrbu, *Structuri de locuire și gospodărești, ateliere și gropi de cult în așezarea geto-dacică (sec. II-I a. Chr.) de la Grădiștea, jud. Brăila*. In: (Eds. A. Zanoci, M. Băț, A. Țârlea, S-C. Ailincăi) *Archeological structures from the Iron Age settlements in the Tisza-Dniester region*, Proceedings of the Saharna Summer Colloquium July 12th-15 h, 2018, Editura Mega, Cluj-Napoca, 2019, p. 105-136.
- Sîrbu, Florea 1997** = Valeriu Sîrbu, Gelu Florea, *Imaginar și imagine în Dacia preromană*, Editura Istros, Brăila, 1997.
- Sîrbu, Damian 2017** = Valeriu Sîrbu, Paul Damian, *Căscioarele-D'aia parte - un centre résidentiel gétique au Bas Danube (IV^e-III^e s. av. J.-C.* In: (Eds.: Aurel Zanoci, Valeriu Sîrbu, Mihail Băț), *Fortificațiile din epoca fierului în spațiul tiso-nistean - Materialele colloquium-ului de vară de la Saharna, 14-17 iulie 2016// Proceedings of Saharna Summer Colloquium Iron Age fortifications on the Tisa-Dniester space*, July 14th - 17th, 2016, Editura Istros a Muzeului Brăilei "Carol I", Chișinău - Brăila, 2017, p. 149-186.
- Sîrbu et alii 1996** = Valeriu Sîrbu, Paul Damian, Alexandrescu Emilian, Elvira Safta, Oana Damian, Stănică Pandrea, Alexandru Niculescu, *Așezări din zona Căscioarele - Greaca - Prundu. Mileniile I î.Hr.-I d.Hr.*, Editura Istros, Brăila, 1996.
- Sîrbu et alii 1997b** = Valeriu Sîrbu, Cristian Schuster, Traian Popa, *Noi descoperiri Getice din județul Giurgiu*, Istros, VIII, 1997, p. 237-257.
- Sîrbu et alii 2020** = Valeriu Sîrbu, Nicolae Conovici, Ioan Cernău, *Sacred area in the Dacian dava from Crăsanii de Jos-Piscul Crăsani (Ialomița County)*. In: (Eds. V. Sîrbu, A. Pețan) *Temples and Cult Places from the Second Iron Age in Europe*, Proceedings of The 2nd International Colloquium "Iron Age Sanctuaries and Cult Places at the Thracians and their Neighbors", Alun (jud. Hunedoara), 7th-9th May 2019 (Alun: Editura Dacica 2020), p. 179-207.
- Trohani 1986** = George Trohani, *Noi cercetări arheologice de suprafață pe valea Mostiștei*, CCDJ, 2, 1986, p. 15-37.
- Trohani 1992-1994** = George Trohani, *Așezări geto-dacice apărute natural și fortificate din Muntenia*, Sargeția, XXV, 1992-1994, p. 65-75.
- Trohani 2006** = George Trohani, *Locuirea Getică din partea de nord a Popinei Bordușani (com. Bordușani, jud Ialomița)*, vol I, Editura Cetatea de Scaun, Tîrgoviște, 2006.
- Trohani 2006a** = George Trohani, *Locuirea Getică din partea de nord a Popinei Bordușani comuna Bordușani județul Ialomița*, vol II, Editura Cetatea de Scaun, Tîrgoviște, 2006.
- Turcu 1979** = Mioara Turcu, *Geto-dacii din Câmpia Munteniei*, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București, 1979.
- Udrescu 1989** = Ștefan Mircea Udrescu, *Vînătoarea la geto-dacii din sud-estul României; date zooarheologice*, TD, X, 1989, p. 197-202.
- Vulpe 1966** = Radu Vulpe, *Așezări Getice din Muntenia*, Editura Meridiane, București, 1966.
- <https://mapire.eu/en/map/secondsurvey-wallachia/8> (accessed: 21.04.2020).
- https://ro.wikipedia.org/wiki/Harta_-_Constantin.png (accessed: 21.04.2020).