List of Figures

Figure 1.1: Map of Cucuteni-Trypillia distribution (by M. Nebbia) — **2**
Figure 1.2: Timeline of Cucuteni-Trypillia group — **3**
Figure 1.3: Cucuteni A pottery, Drăguşeni (by B. Gaydarska, based upon Crîşmaru 1977, Fig. 20) — **3**
Figure 1.4: Trypillia BII – CI pottery, Bug-Dnieper Interfluve (by L. Woodard, based upon Ryzhov 2012, Figs. 6.4–6.5) — **4**
Figure 1.5: Cucuteni-Trypillia figurines (by Y. Beadnell, based upon Monah D. 1997) — **6**
Figure 1.6: Settlement model for Central and Eastern Europe: key – darker shades show higher densities of a site type, lighter shades lower densities (by C. Unwin) — **7**
Figure 1.7: Early remote sensing of Yatranivka: (a) plot of air photograph; (b) geophysical plot (by L. Woodard, based upon Videiko 2013) — **10**
Figure 1.8: Geophysical plan of the 2009 season overlain on satellite image of Nebelivka (by M. Nebbia, based on Hale et al. 2010) — **11**
Figure 1.9: Two experimental 'Trypillia' houses in the process of construction (by S. Johnston) — **14**
Figure 2.1: The 'Maximalist' model (by C. Unwin) — **33**
Figure 2.2: The Trypillia 'Big Other' (by C. Unwin) — **38**
Figure 2.3: Realistic and stylised figurines (by B. Gaydarska) — **43**
Figure 2.4: The Scânteia vessel with multiple symmetries (source: Monah D & M 1997, Fig. 46) — **45**
Figure 3.1: Coverage of CORONA imagery for the study area (by M. Nebbia; copyright: The Project) — **63**
Figure 3.2: Coverage of the acquired WorldView-2 satellite images (8-band multispectral 1.85 m and panchromatic 0.46 m) for the Nebelivka micro-region (5 km radius) and panchromatic (0.46 m) satellite image for the Nebelivka macro-region (25 km radius) (by M. Nebbia; copyright: The Project) — **64**
Figure 3.3: Distribution of anomalies mapped on the WorldView-2 satellite image, Nebelivka micro-region (by M. Nebbia; copyright: The Project) — **66**
Figure 3.4: Distribution of anomalies interpreted as traces of a palaeo-channel network, the Nebelivka micro-region (by M. Nebbia; copyright: The Project) — **67**
Figure 3.5: Anomalies mapped on the WorldView-2 pansharpened multispectral 8-band (0.46 m) satellite image, which have been interpreted as having anthropic origins (by M. Nebbia; copyright: The Project) — **68**
Figure 3.6: Shallow depth of the top of the anthropogenic deposit on the North-Eastern part of Nebelivka, allowing a better visibility of the anomalies compared to the rest of the site (by M. Nebbia) — **70**
Figure 3.7: Two views of the Trypillia site of Perehonivka (BII): clearly visible in crop-free field conditions (upper) and totally invisible when the field is cultivated (lower): WorldView-2 panchromatic images (0.46m resolution), acquired on April 2008 (upper) and September 2011 (lower) — **71**
Figure 3.8: Comparison between two extreme examples of barrows as they appear on the WorldView-2 satellite image and on the ground (by M. Nebbia; copyright: The Project) — **72**
Figure 3.9: Distribution of all the anomalies that can be interpreted as burial mounds mapped within the Nebelivka macro-region, with Trypillia sites by Phase (copyright: The Project) — **74**
Figure 3.10: Upper: Interpretation of the geomagnetic survey, South-East corner of Nebelivka. Visible are parts of the two concentric circuits of houses (by J. Roe); Lower: sherd densities across the surveyed land units (by M. Nebbia) — **78**
Figure 3.11: Interpolated contour plot of daub (upper) and pottery (lower) densities by number of fragments (by J. Roe) — **79**

Figure 3.12: Fields surveyed with a non-site sampling strategy in 2009, 2012 and 2013, Nebelivka hinterland, to assess the definition of 'sites' from surface scatters (by M. Nebbia) — **82**
Figure 3.13: Areas covered by the field survey in the 2012–2014 seasons (by M. Nebbia) — **84**
Figure 3.14: Distribution map of all sites recovered during the 2012–2014 field survey seasons, including the locations of known Trypillia sites in the Nebelivka macro-region (by M. Nebbia) — **85**
Figure 3.15: Surface material counts by site sampling transects at the newly discovered Trypillia settlement of Kutsa (20 km North-East of Nebelivka) (by M. Nebbia) — **87**
Figure 3.16: Sampling transects on the Trypillia site of Volodymyrivka. The colours indicate the quantity of both pottery and burnt daub collected at each sample. The red line shows the actual limit of the built-up area (by M. Nebbia) — **89**
Figure 3.17: Material counts of the 6 transects walked on the BII megasite of Volodymyrivka (by M. Nebbia) — **89**
Figure 3.18: Upper: Boxplot of site areas reported in the Encyclopaedia by phase, showing the megasites sizes as outliers; Lower left: plot of GINI coefficients of Trypillia site sizes by phase; Lower right: plot of Trypillia megasites vs. smaller sites by phase (by M. Nebbia) — **91**
Figure 3.19: Distribution of the 499 Trypillia sites used in the study, derived from the Encyclopaedia (Videiko 2004) (by M. Nebbia) — **98**
Figure 3.20: Distribution map of known Trypillia settlements, highlighting the location of megasites in the Southern Bug-Dnieper interfluve (by M. Nebbia) — **100**
Figure 3.21: Histograms displaying Trypillia site sizes by phase. Phase A (N=33 sites); Phase BI (N=46); Phase BII (N=176); Phase CI (N=234); Phase CII (N=85) (by M. Nebbia) — **102**
Figure 3.22: Spatial distribution of Trypillia settlements by Phase: upper left – Phase A; upper right – Phase BI; middle left – Phase BII; middle right – Phase CI; lower left – Phase CII (by M. Nebbia) — **104**
Figure 3.23: 5-km hinterlands of megasites in the Southern Bug-Dnieper interfluve (by M. Nebbia) — **108**
Figure 4.1: Pollen diagram, Nebelivka P1 core (by B. Albert) — **113**
Figure 4.2: Human impact proxies, Nebelivka P1 core: pollen zone, pollen zone depth and human impact depth columns show darker shades with increased depth (by C. Unwin) — **116**
Figure 4.3: Geophysical plan of Nebelivka showing magnetic gradient data (by J. Watson) — **124**
Figure 4.4: Interpretative geophysical plan of Nebelivka (by J. Watson) — **125**
Figure 4.5: Interpretative geophysical plan of Nebelivka, showing boundaries of Quarters (by Y. Beadnell on the basis of D. Hale's geophysical plan) — **126**
Figure 4.6: Tightly-spaced and loosely-spaced houses, Nebelivka (by J. Watson) — **131**
Figure 4.7: Upper & middle: gaps and kinks in house circuits; lower: converging inner radial streets, Nebelivka (by J. Watson) — **132**
Figure 4.8: Assembly Houses 1–11, Nebelivka (by J. Watson) — **134**
Figure 4.9: Assembly Houses 12–23, Nebelivka (by J. Watson) — **135**
Figure 4.10: Squares and short inner radial streets, Nebelivka (by J. Watson) — **140**
Figure 4.11: Upper: megasite entrances and the main palaeo-channel; lower: short inner radial streets and blocking structures, Nebelivka (by J. Watson) — **141**
Figure 4.12: Upper: blocking streets; lower: poorly burnt dwelling houses and pits, Nebelivka (by J. Watson) — **143**
Figure 4.13: Upper: linear pits and short inner radial streets; lower: strong anomalies possibly representing 'kilns', Nebelivka (by J. Watson) — **144**
Figure 4.14: Upper: anomalies outside the Northern end of the megasite; lower: main palaeo-channel with kinks in house circuits, Nebelivka: numbers refer to Assembly Houses (by J. Watson) — **147**

Figure 4.15: (1) bivariate plot of house sizes; (2) histogram of all house sizes; (3) house sizes by Outer Zone, Nebelivka (by J. Chapman) —— **150**
Figure 4.16: (1) house sizes outside the Outer Circuit; (2) house sizes in cross streets; (3) house sizes in Squares, Nebelivka (by J. Chapman) —— **152**
Figure 4.17: Maximum class sizes by Quarter; (1) Class 3 equal to, or fewer than, other size Classes; (2) Class 3 dominant, with Class 4 but no Class 5; (3) Class 3 dominant, with Classes 4 and 5, Nebelivka (by J. Chapman) —— **156**
Figure 4.18: (1) mean breadth of all house size classes; (2) spread of house size classes; (3) No. of houses vs. GINI House Size Co-efficient plot by Quarters, Nebelivka ((1) & (2) by J. Chapman; (3) by M. Nebbia) —— **157**
Figure 4.19:Visibility Graph Analysis of Quarter L: (1) Connectivity; (2) Point First Moment; (3) Point Second Moment; (4) Visual Entropy; (5) Visual Integration: HH; (6) Visual Integration: P-value; (7) Visual Integration: TEK; (8) Visual Mean Depth; (9) Visual Node Count; (10) Visual Relativised Entropy (by B. Buchanan). For explanation of these models, see Table 4.5 —— **167**
Figure 4.20: Connectivity analysis of all 10 Quarters: (1) B; (2) C; (3) D; (4) G; (5) H; (6) I; (7) L; (8) F; (9) N; (10) M (by B. Buchanan) —— **168**
Figure 4.21: (1) Average measurements of VGA analysis of entirety of structural evidence; (2) Average VGA measurements of Model A; (3) Average VGA measurements of Model B (by B. Buchanan) —— **169**
Figure 4.22: VGA Mean Depth analyses of all Stages of both Models, Quarter F, Nebelivka: (1) Distributed Governance Model (A), Stage 1; (2) Model A, Stage 2; (3) Model A, Stage 3; (4) Assembly Model (B), Stage 1; (5) Model B, Stage 2; (6) Model B, Stage 3 (see Table 4.9) (by B. Buchanan) —— **176**
Figure 4.23: VGA Integration-TEK analyses of all Stages of both Models, Quarter F, Nebelivka: (1) Distributed Governance Model (A), Stage 1; (2) Model A, Stage 2; (3) Model A, Stage 3; (4) Assembly Model (B), Stage 1; (5) Model B, Stage 2; (6) Model B, Stage 3 (see Table 4.10) (by B. Buchanan) —— **178**
Figure 4.24: VGA Mean Depth analyses of all Stages of both Models, Quarter L, Nebelivka: (1) Distributed Governance Model (A), Stage 1; (2) Model A, Stage 2; (3) Model A, Stage 3; (4) Assembly Model (B), Stage 1; (5) Model B, Stage 2; (6) Model B, Stage 3 (see Table 4.11) (by B. Buchanan) —— **179**
Figure 4.25: VGA Integration-TEK analyses of all Stages of both Models, Quarter L, Nebelivka: (1) Model (A), Stage 1; (2) Model A, Stage 2; (3) Model A, Stage 3; (4) Assembly Model (B), Stage 1; (5) Model B, Stage 2; (6) Model B, Stage 3 (see Table 4.12) (by B. Buchanan) —— **180**
Figure 4.26: Upper: Burnt house remains (*ploshchadka*), Mega-structure Context 55; lower: bone and ceramic scatter, Pit near House B17, Nebelivka (upper by J. Chapman; lower by M. Videiko) —— **183**
Figure 4.27: Upper: platform, Durham Experiment; lower: withy impressions, Nebelivka Experimental Burnt House Excavation (by S. Johnston) —— **185**
Figure 4.28: House collapse scenario 1 (1-storey houses) (by L. Woodard) —— **187**
Figure 4.29: House collapse scenario 2 (2-storey houses) (by L. Woodard) —— **188**
Figure 4.30: Upper: house panels falling inwards, Nebelivka House Burning Experiment; lower: house panel fallen outwards, Nebelivka Experimental Burnt House Excavation Contexts 425 & 426 (upper by M. Nebbia; lower by J. Chapman) —— **189**
Figure 4.31: Kite photo of Mega-structure, Nebelivka: North to Right side; burnt area 36m East-West (by M. Houshold) —— **196**
Figure 4.32: Digitised remains, Nebelivka Mega-structure; Phase 3 Lower (by M. Nebbia) —— **197**
Figure 4.33: Digitised remains, Nebelivka Mega-structure; Phase 3 Upper (by M. Nebbia) —— **198**
Figure 4.34: Digitised remains, Nebelivka Mega-structure; Phases 2 and 3 Lower & Upper (by M. Nebbia) —— **200**

Figure 4.35: Upper: digitised remains, Phase 2. Key to Context Numbers: Fired Clay Bin – 80; Platforms – 6, 46, 58, 89, 176 & 272; Podium – 29; Threshold – 120; Platform 257 was excavated on the last day of Week 7 and therefore not digitised; it is found in Grid Square C21–22; lower: fired clay slot, Nebelivka Mega-structure (upper by M. Nebbia; lower by J. Chapman) — **201**
Figure 4.36: Burnt timber remains, Nebelivka Experimental Burnt House Excavation: upper: burnt timber fallen obliquely, Context 419; lower: timber void, Context 226 (by J. Chapman) — **202**
Figure 4.37: Upper: long North-South section (the width of both walls reflects daub tumble out from the walls); lower: three sections across podium, Nebelivka Mega-structure (by C. Unwin) — **203**
Figure 4.38: (1) Durham reconstruction; (2)–(5) Bayesian plots of AMS dates, Nebelivka Mega-structure (1 by C. Unwin; 2–5 by A. Millard) — **204**
Figure 4.39: Upper: general view from East; lower: Stage 4 placement of vessel from North; Fired Clay Bin, Nebelivka Mega-structure (by J. Chapman) — **206**
Figure 4.40: Platform 46 from East, Nebelivka Mega-structure (by J. Chapman) — **207**
Figure 4.41: Plot of daub firing temperatures and vitrified daub, Nebelivka Mega-structure (by M. Nebbia based upon information from N. Shevchenko); Colour Key for daub firing temperatures: blue: 200–400°C; yellow: 400–900°C; orange: >900°C — **210**
Figure 4.42: General view of Nebelivka barrow from South-West (by J. Chapman) — **213**
Figure 4.43: Distribution of all excavated areas, Nebelivka (by M. Nebbia) — **215**
Figure 4.44: Distribution of burnt houses, unburnt houses and Assembly Houses (by M. Nebbia) — **216**
Figure 4.45: Typical Test Pit stratigraphy, Test Pit 26/6, Nebelivka (by C. Unwin) — **218**
Figure 4.46: Sections across (1) Fired Clay Bin; (2) Contexts 215 & 310; (3) Platform 46; and (4) Contexts 210 and 310 (by C. Unwin) — **219**
Figure 4.47: Depth of burnt houses in excavation units and Test Pits (by C. Unwin) — **220**
Figure 4.48: Upper: section of thick pile of destruction daub, Test Pit 13/3; (a) South-facing; (b) East-facing; lower: sections of platform below destruction daub, Test Pit 15/2; (a) East-facing; (b) South-facing (by L. Woodard). Numbers in Figs. 4.48–4.50 refer to general pit stratigraphic sequence in Fig. 4.45 — **222**
Figure 4.49: Upper: sections of two well-defined layers of destruction daub, Test Pit 33/1; (a) SSE-facing; (b) WSW-facing; lower: sections of two-storey house with platform above destruction daub, Test Pit 26/5: (a) West-facing; (b) North-facing (by L. Woodard) — **223**
Figure 4.50: (1): West-facing section of unburnt house, Test Pit 1/4; (2): North-facing section of burnt house with platform daub with pit under floor, Test Pit 17/1; (3) SW-facing section of platform in Assembly House, Test Pit 27/3; (4) section of mound of burnt house debris, Test Pit 24/4; (a) ESE-facing; (b) NNE-facing (by L. Woodard) — **224**
Figure 4.51: Distribution of Test Pits with *in-situ* vs. dispersed platform daub (by M. Nebbia) — **225**
Figure 4.52: Distribution of number of layers of Destruction Daub by Test Pit (by M. Nebbia) — **227**
Figure 4.53: Sections of Pit, Sondazh 1: (1) East-facing; (2) West-facing; (3) East-facing; (4) South-facing; (5) West-facing (by C. Unwin) — **229**
Figure 4.54: Upper: plan of base of pit; Pit, Sondazh 1 (by L. Woodard); lower: proportion of burnt and 'unburnt' houses by Neighbourhood and Quarter (by J. Chapman) — **232**
Figure 4.55: Upper: North Ditch profile from South-East; lower: Triple Ditch profiles 1–3 from East (by L. Woodard) — **235**
Figure 4.56: Plan of House A9, Nebelivka (by L. Woodard) — **237**
Figure 4.57: Upper: sections of House A9: B–B1 – South-facing; C–C1 – North-facing; A–A1 – East-facing (by L. Woodard) — **238**
Figure 4.58: General view of Industrial feature, Nebelivka (by M. Videiko) — **242**

Figure 4.59: Hungarian Mediaeval brick kilns as analogies for Nebelivka 'industrial' feature; (1) Békéscsaba–Mezőmegyer; (2) Debrecen–Józsa Pláza (by B. Gaydarska, based upon Jakab 2011) —— **244**
Figure 4.60: Corn-drying ovens, Keston Roman villa (internal width of South Oven – 4.15m) (by B. Gaydarska, adapted from Philp et al. 1991, Fig. 22) —— **245**
Figure 4.61: Site plan showing Test Pits with(out) AMS dates, Nebelivka (by M. Nebbia) —— **249**
Figure 4.62: Bayesian plots of AMS dates, Nebelivka: (1) all AMS dates plotted on calibration curve; (2) start and end dates for occupation at Nebelivka; (3) duration of occupation at Nebelivka (by A. Millard) —— **251**
Figure 4.63: Bayesian plots of AMS dates, Nebelivka: (1) start and end dates for circuits and streets modelled independently; (2) start and end dates for Quarters; (3) AMS dates from the Pit, Sondazh 1; (4) start and end dates for three megasites (by A. Millard) —— **254**
Figure 4.64: Building materials analysis: (1) finger action; (2) squared timber-impression; (3) withy-impression; (4) finger-impression; (5) vitrified daub; (6) thermal plot, daub, Context 117; (7) cross-section of daub showing clay layers, Nebelivka (by N. Shevchenko) —— **259**
Figure 5.1: Pottery types used in the Ovchinnikov ceramic system (by Ovchinnikov 2014, 80; see our Table 5.1) —— **269**
Figure 5.2: Taphonomy: (1) burnt sherd, Test Pit 20/1; (2) burnt sherd, Test Pit 33/1; (3) sherd with heavy wear, Test Pit 21/2; (4) sherd with heavy deposition, Test Pit 22/4; (5) sherd with moderate deposit, Test Pit 26/5; (6) vitrified sherd, Test Pit 24/3; (7) vitrified sherd, Mega-structure Context 208; (8) wear on base of sherd, Test Pit 1/3 (by K. Harding) —— **272**
Figure 5.3: Pottery production: (1) handle pushed in, interior, Test Pit 24/3; (2) handle pushed in, exterior, with potting lines, Test Pit 24/3; (3) sherd with grit temper, Mega-structure Context 35; (4) sherd with possible wheel-marks, Mega-structure, TsT 8958, Context 3; (5) sherd with grooved decoration, House A9; (6) base with mat impression, Mega-structure TsT 1905, Context 151; (7) sherd with shell temper, Mega-structure Context 143; (8) sherd with interior potting lines, barrow (by K. Harding) —— **275**
Figure 5.4: Sherd re-fits: (1) Type 1 re-fit, Test Pit 1/3; (2) Type 2 re-fit, Mega-structure Context 232; (3) Type 1 and 2 re-fits, Mega-structure Contexts 157 and 180; (4) Type 2 re-fit, Test Pit 1/3; (5) Type 3 re-fit, Mega-structure Contexts 157 and 4 (by K. Harding) —— **278**
Figure 5.5: (1) number, (2) weight (kg) and (3) mean sherd weight (g) of pottery groups by Excavation Unit (by J. Chapman) —— **281**
Figure 5.6: Density of pottery samples by weight (g), Test Pits (by M. Nebbia) —— **283**
Figure 5.7: Density of pottery samples from Test Pits placed in the centre of burnt houses (Zone 9) (by M. Nebbia) —— **284**
Figure 5.8: Fabric colours: (1) Fabric C; (2) Fabric A; (3) Fabric B; (4) Fabrics I–J; (5) Fabrics E–F; (6) Fabrics G–H; (7) Fabric D; (8) Fabrics O–P; (9) Fabrics K–L; (10) Fabrics M–N; (11) Fabrics Q–R (by K. Harding) —— **286**
Figure 5.9: Fabric distribution for (1) House A9; (2) Mega-structure; (3) Test Pits; and (4) Pit, Sondazh 1; Fabric by sherd number for (5) Quarter G; (6) Test Pit 24/3; (7) Test Pit 25/1; and (8) Test Pit 25/2 (by J. Chapman) —— **289**
Figure 5.10: Surface colour vs. vessel form for (1) bowls; (2) carinated vessels; (3) plates; and (4) dishes, House A9; distribution of rim types without Bases for (5) Pit, Sondazh 1; (6) Test Pits; (7) Mega-structure; (8) House A9 (by J. Chapman) —— **290**
Figure 5.11: (1) distribution of shape types, all Units; distribution of open & closed categories without Bases: (2) all Units; (3) Pit, Sondazh 1; (4) Test Pits; (5) Mega-structure; (6) House A9; (7) Pit, Sondazh 1 SU2; and (8) Pit, Sondazh 1 SU4 (by J. Chapman) —— **291**
Figure 5.12: (1) Minimum Number of Vessel estimates for Episodes and deposits outside Episodes, Pit, Sondazh 1; (2) Vessel sizes by excavation unit (by J. Chapman) —— **294**

Figure 5.13: Upper: distribution of decorated vs. undecorated sherds; lower: distribution of rims by weight, Mega-structure (by M. Nebbia) — **296**
Figure 5.14: Distribution of (1) impressed sherds by weight; (2) plates, dishes and necked dishes; (3) bowls by weight; (4) pottery found on Living Floor (Phase 2) by weight, Mega-structure (by M. Nebbia) — **298**
Figure 5.15: Coarse ware decorative motifs. Numbers (e.g., 3.1) refer to Motif Numbers. Key: T – Test Pits; M – Mega-structure; P – Pit, Sondazh 1; A – House A9 (by L. Woodard) — **300**
Figure 5.16: Fine ware exterior painted motifs (by L. Woodard) — **301**
Figure 5.17: Fine ware interior painted motifs (by L. Woodard) — **302**
Figure 5.18: Fine ware exterior (rows 1–4) and interior (rows 5–6) painted motifs (by L. Woodard) — **303**
Figure 5.19: Motif linkage plans for four most common motifs, megasite (by M. Nebbia) — **307**
Figure 5.20: Motif linkage plan, Quarter B, megasite (by M. Nebbia) — **309**
Figure 5.21: (1) Composition of burnt house assemblages by vessel shape; (2) ratio of open: closed vessels; Taljanki (T) and Majdanetske (M); (3) regression analysis of painted signs vs. sample size, Bug-Dnieper Interfluve sites, based upon Tkachuk 2005 (by J. Chapman) — **318**
Figure 5.22: Distribution of (upper) fine wares; (lower) painted wares, House A9 (by M. Nebbia) — **320**
Figure 5.23: Distribution of (upper) coarse wares; (lower) sherds with impressed decoration, House A9 (by M. Nebbia) — **321**
Figure 5.24: Distribution of (upper) bowls; (lower) dishes, House A9 (by M. Nebbia) — **322**
Figure 5.25: Distribution of (upper) plates; (lower) summary diagram, House A9 (by M. Nebbia) — **323**
Figure 5.26: (1) distribution of painted signs shared between houses, Majdanetske; (2) comparison of Nebelivka painted motifs with painted signs on other Trypillia sites; (3) comparison of painted signs on Bug-Dnieper Interfluve sites (by J. Chapman, based upon information in T. Tkachuk 2005) — **325**
Figure 5.27: Alternative pathways to making Trypillia figurines (by L. Woodard) — **328**
Figure 5.28: Decorated anthropomorphic figurines from Pit, Sondazh 1: (1) SF 23 and (2) SF 28 + 43: (a) back, (b) front, Nebelivka (by K. Harding) — **329**
Figure 5.29: Anthropomorphic figurines: (1) male, SF 3230; (2) non-gendered, Grid F12; Mega-structure, Nebelivka (by V. Pankowski) — **330**
Figure 5.30: Figurine body parts by excavation unit: (1) House A9; (2) Mega-structure; (3) Pit, Sondazh 1; and (4) Test Pits; Key to figurine parts: H – head; HT – head-torso; HB – head-buttock; HL – head-leg; T – torso; TL – torso-leg; TF – torso-foot; B – buttock; BL – buttock-leg; L – leg; LF – leg-foot; F – foot; TZOO – torso of zoomorph. (5) gender characteristics of figurines; (6) condition of figurines by excavation unit (by J. Chapman) — **332**
Figure 5.31: Upper: zoomomorphic figurine, Test Pit 16/1; lower: types of fired clay tokens (upper by K. Harding; lower by L. Woodard) — **334**
Figure 5.32: Map of Ukrainian para-Neolithic sites with graphite-tempered pottery: Symbols: I – present-day industrial source of graphite; II – para-Neolithic site; III – LBK site of Kamiane-Zavallia; IV – Trypillia culture site of Nebelivka; **Buh-Dnister culture:** 1–Tătărăuca Nouă XV, 2–Soroka I (level 1a), 3–Soroka V, 4–Pechera I, 5–Samchyntsi I, 6–Samchyntsi II, 7–Shymanovske II, 8–Bazkiv Ostriv, 9–Shumyliv-Cherniatka, 10–Hayvoron-Polizhok, 11–Zavallia, 12–Zhakchyk, 13–Melnychna Krucha, 14–Dobrianka 3, 15–Mykolyna Broiaka, 16–Kompaniiska Skelia, 17–Hrushivskyi Ostriv, 18–Semenivka, 19–Ustia Korabelnoi, 20–Puhach 1, 21–Puhach 2, 22–Klepana Balka, 23–Tashlyk 2, 24–Tashlyk 3, 25–Gard, 26–Gard 3, 27–Gard 4, 28–Lidyna Balka, 29–Novorozanivka; **Kyiv-Cherkasy culture:** 30–Buzky I, 31–Lysychyi Horb, 32–Uspenka 2; **Surskyi culture:** 33–Strilcha Skelia, 34–Kizlevyi V, 35–Vovchok; **Azov-Dnipro culture:** 36–Mykilske 2; **Surskyi or Azov-Dnipro culture:** 37–Kamiana Mohyla 1 (by D. Gaskevych) — **339**

Figure 5.33: Map of East Balkan graphite painted ware complex: M: Maliq; N: Nebelivka (by B. Gaydarska) —— **342**
Figure 5.34: Graphite painted analogies for the Nebelivka internally thickened rim dish (1): (2) Pietrele (after Hansen et al. 2007); (3) Tangâru (after Voinea 2005); and (4) tell Gumelniţa (after Dumitrescu 1925) (by T. Ignat & C. Lazăr) —— **344**
Figure 5.35: Gas chromatograms of lipid extracts from Nebelivka miniature vessels: (1) Test Pit 2012/3; (2) Mega-structure MP 16; and (3) Mega-structure MP 29 (by O. Craig) —— **348**
Figure 5.36: Types of miniature vessel from outside the Mega-structure cluster: dishes – (1) Test Pit 16/1; (2) Test Pit 31/2 (by K. Harding); flasks – (3) Test Pit 1/4; (4) 33/1; (5) Test Pit 1/4; and (6) 1/1 (by B. Gaydarska) —— **351**
Figure 5.37: Lithics: Mega-structure: 5–7, 9–10, 14–15, 17; Pit, Sondazh 1: 2–4, 12–13; Test Pits: 1, 8, 11, 16 (by M. Gurova) —— **355**
Figure 5.38: Lithics: Pit, Sondazh 1: 1–2, 4–5; Test Pits: 3, 7; Fieldwalking: 6; scale 1:1 (by L. Woodard) —— **356**
Figure 5.39: Lithics: 2014 season: 1–12 (by D. Kiosak); 2009 season: 13–15 (by L. Woodard) —— **357**
Figure 5.40: Lithics: 2014 season: 1–11 (by D. Kiosak); intra-site gridded fieldwalking: 12–16; House A9: 17–18 (by L. Woodard) —— **359**
Figure 5.41: Worked bone tools: (1) tooth bead-pendant, Pit, S. 1 SF 47, with close-ups (b) and (c); (2) tooth bead-pendant, Mega-structure TsT 1461, Context 64; (3) bone imitation of tooth pendant, Mega-structure TsT 1827, Context 142 (by K. Harding based on photographs by Zs. Tóth) —— **371**
Figure 5.42: Worked bone tools: (1) fishbone point, Pit, S. 1, SF 48, with close-ups in (b) and (c); (2) broken bone awl with copper staining, Mega-structure, Grid Square D10 (by K. Harding based on photographs by Zs. Tóth) —— **372**
Figure 5.43: Worked bone tools: (1) ad hoc bone point, Test Pit 19/2, Context 3, SF 6, with close-up in (b); (2) red deer antler hoe model, Pit, S. 1 SF 71; (3) possible bone tool, Mega-structure Grid Square E6 (by K. Harding based on photographs by Zs. Tóth) —— **373**
Figure 5.44: Special Finds: (1) fragment of house model, Pit, Sondazh 1, SF 5727; (2)–(3) two fragments of (?) fired clay gaming board, unstratified; (4) fired clay ring, House A9; and (5) gold hair ornament, SF 1181, Mega-structure (by K. Harding) —— **379**
Figure 5.45: Special Finds distribution, megasite (by M. Nebbia) —— **383**
Figure 5.46: Distribution of figurines, megasite (by M. Nebbia) —— **384**
Figure 5.47: Distribution of lithics, megasite (by M. Nebbia) —— **385**
Figure 5.48: Special Finds distribution: (upper) figurines and tokens; (lower) lithics and Other finds, Mega-structure (by M. Nebbia) —— **386**
Figure 5.49: Upper: overall taxonomic distribution of faunal remains (NISP); lower: distribution of Log Standard Index (LSI) values for measurements on cattle bones (by D. Orton) —— **395**
Figure 5.50: Upper: Trypillia and Cucuteni sites with raw NISP available and used for comparison here. 1. Berezivka, 2. Bilshivtsy, 3. Cucuteni, 4. Draguşeni, 5. Feteşti, 6. Ghelăieşti, 7. Majdanetske, 8. Hoiseşti, 9. Ignatenkova Gora, 10. Konovka, 11. Kosenivka, 12. Liveni, 13. Grebenyukov Yar, 14. Mitoc, 15. Poduri-Dealul Ghindaru, 16. Santana de Mureş B, 17. Sarata-Monteoru, 18. Sverdlikove, 19. Taljanki, 20. Târpeşti, 21. Truşeşti, 22. Valea Lupului, 23. Vasylivka, 24. Velika Slobidka, 25. Vesely Kut, 26. Zhvanets-Shovb, 27. Zhvanets, 28. Nebelivka; lower: main taxa identified at Nebelivka by excavation area (%NISP) (by D. Orton) —— **399**
Figure 5.51: Contributions of wild versus domestic taxa (1, 3 & 5) and breakdown of the main domesticates (2, 4 & 6) for Trypillia and Cucuteni sites in the Early (1–2), Middle (3–4), and Late (5–6) Phases as defined in the text (by D. Orton) —— **400**
Figure 5.52: (1) comparison of frequencies of major taxa between (a) analysts for the Mega-structure, and (b) areas recorded by Sekerskaya (%NISP); (2) comparison of frequencies of major taxa in areas studied by Sekerskaya (%NISP); (3) findspots of bones assigned to different phases

within the Mega-structure. NB. Each dot shows a total station record that can represent a single or multiple bone fragments (by D. Orton) — **403**

Figure 5.53: (1) findspots of burnt bone within the Mega-structure. As above, single dots may represent multiple specimens; (2) spatial distribution of major taxa within the Mega-structure; (3) foetal/neonatal bones recovered from the living floor and destruction phases of the Mega-structure. Diameter of markers is proportional to number of specimens. Length of burnt part of Mega-structure – 36m. (by D. Orton) — **406**

Figure 5.54: Isotopic collagen values, Nebelivka mammals (by A. Millard) — **408**

Figure 6.1: Population estimates for the Majdanetske megasite. Horizontal bars show range of population estimates by author(s) (by J. Chapman) — **433**

Figure 6.2: The Distributed Governance Model (by C. Unwin) — **436**

Figure 6.3: The Assembly Model (by C. Unwin) — **438**

Figure 6.4: The Pilgrimage Model (by C. Unwin) — **440**

Figure 6.5: Distribution maps of (a) Forest Neolithic and Trypillia (b) Phase A; (c) Phase BI; and (d) BII (by M. Nebbia) — **446**

Figure 6.6: Lengyel enclosures and *Rondels*, South-West Hungary (after G. Bertok & Cs. Gáti 2014, Fig. II.89) — **451**

Figure 6.7: Magnetometer plan of Taljanki megasite (by R. Ohlrau in K. Rassmann et al. 2014, Fig. 9a) — **461**

Figure 6.8: Magnetometer plan of Majdanetske megasite with Ohlrau's Quarter boundaries; numbers refer to Ohlrau Quarters; A – inset to be found in Fig. 6.9 (by L. Woodard, based on Müller & Videiko 2016, Fig. 2) — **463**

Figure 6.9: Detail of Northern part of magnetometer plan, Majdanetske megasite (Area A in Fig. 6.8). Key – large numbers refer to Ohlrau's Quarters; small numbers refer to individual paths, house circuits and radial streets (by L. Woodard, based on Ohlrau 2015, Abb. 44A) — **464**

Figure 6.10: Building sequence of Northern part of Majdanetske magnetometer plan (as shown as Box A in Fig. 6.9) (by L. Woodard) — **465**

Figure 6.11: Geophysical plan of Grebeni site. Key: 1: excavated buildings; 2: test pits; 3: geomagnetic anomalies (by B. Gaydarska, based on Koshelev 2004, Ris. 4.14) — **484**

Figure 6.12: Densities of people and structures per ha, urban and non-urban sites of low- and high-density (upper by L. Woodard; lower by J. Chapman) — **504**