

HOUSE IN CARPATHIANS¹

JIŘÍ LANGER AND HELENA BOČKOVÁ

ROŽNOV POD RADHOŠTĚM and BRNO, CZECH REPUBLIC

INTRODUCTION

The problem of the folk culture has always been a great topic for the ethnographers. Since the last century an attention of many explorers from many countries has focused on it. A common interest in finding the answers to the questions of the causes of the specifications of their cultural manifestation in the Carpathians connected them. They seemed to be different from firmly rooted ideas about the typical features of individual nations. Anachronisms provoke everybody who was looking for the originalities of their own national or Slavonic culture. They served to the creating of romantic fantasies about the culture in the mountains surviving into the period in which European nations formed. From the point of view of a historian this culture is considered to be very young, having been created before our eyes. Our generation could still study it by the very watching. We know it from autopsy. It differed from neighbouring lower situated areas with the early evolution forms, transferring of their phenomena for long distances, strong penetration and cooperation with neighbouring social environments and ethnic heterogeneity. This all enabled people in the mountains to survive even in the worst climatic and social conditions.

The principles of the folk culture being thought to be specific for the whole Carpathians touching vast areas of Europe connected fairly different forms of the way of the life from the Balkan to White Russia and from the river Morava (CZ) as far as the coast of the Black Sea. These principles consist in the specifications of economical

¹ This article is a reprint of the summary of the synthesis model: J. Langer and H. Bočková. 1999. *Dům v Karpatech a přilehlých oblastech balkánských* (House in Carpathians and Neighbouring Balkan Regions). Rožnov: Valašské Muzeum v Přírodě v Rožnově pod Radhoštěm (Wallachian Open Air Museum), 97–141. The publication of Langer and Bočková was supported by the Grant Agency of Czech Republic (No. A0930801). Editorial Office of *Ethnologia Polona* obtained copyrights and publishing permissions from the Authors and the Publisher. Editors retained the original content, form and style of the language of the publication, only minor fixes and shortcuts. This model was successfully approved by the Subcommittee for Folk Architecture of the International Committee for Carpathian Folk Culture, and its authors created the general synthesis *Obydlí v Karpatech a přilehlých oblastech balkánských* (Building in Carpathians and the Neighbouring Balkan Regions) published in 2010 (Ostrava: Publ. Šmíra-Print. pp. 932).

and settlement organization, utilisation of the furthest mountainous areas that were uncovered by the rural colonisation of surrounding nations until 14th century. It was getting forward from the lowlands and partly adapted under unfavourable conditions. The process can be seen as a product of macrostructure social differentiation in south eastern part of Central Europe. Their sociably homogenous layer with a similar source of livelihood integrated, though different as to the ethnic aspects. From the point of cultural development of each nation the Carpathians specifications differed. Usually like a marginal and not important aspect that gradually took over elements of economically decisive social areas. However of course, from the point of view of unifying cultural performance in the Carpathians, this aspect obtained completely different significance. It was also anticipated differently by various fields of the research, which usually did not come to the common simple scheme. So a huge complex of problems became a clash of interests of various explorers. They had a different orientation, starting with historians via law, economy, social process historians, historical archaeologists, historical demographers, linguists, settlement and social geographers, and literary historians up to the folklorists and ethnographers. The topic Carpathians has been connecting scientists of many countries in polemics, inspiring their methodical development and terrain research. They were realising mutual necessity of interdisciplinary and international communication and at the last they formed a team that considered speciality of working methods of the ethnographers.

Owing to the desire of my colleagues for broader a more complex research the International Committee for Carpathian Folk Culture Studies was founded in 1959 and later "The Balkan" was supplemented into its name. In 1976 the activities of this committee (further only MKKKB) came to the programme of individual spheres of the folk culture synthesis in the Carpathians as a whole. The synthesis of the folk architecture, residential areas and housing was in 1978 programmed into three stages. The first of them comprised *a house*, the second was *outbuildings, technical and social buildings*, and the third focused on *the sacral ones*. According to the Professor Václav Frolec, the work on the synthesis of the house was divided into nine chapters: 1. The character of geographical, economical, historical, social and cultural conditions, sources and an opinion development on their interpretation; 2. Settlement types, farm-courtyard types and their genesis; 3. The floor plan of the house and its vertical analysis; 4. Construction material, construction, heating and lighting facilities; 5. Artistic details of the gable entrance facades and house interior; 6. The way of living and household; 7. Conclusions: folk architecture and its significance in the Carpathians and its position within Europe; 8. The system of the care of the folk architecture in the Carpathians, a network of the open-air museums in Europe; 9. Representative bibliography (in 1981 its publishing opened the general work in this field), drawings and photographs.

Individual national sections (Czech and Slovak, Polish, Ukraine, Hungarian, Bulgarian, Yugoslavian) worked out national synthesis. They mutually acted in the oppo-

sition. A total material has been concentrated covering approximately 2000 pages of the text in six languages. Even during the opposing of the national synthesis Professor Václav Frolec and Professor Ján Botík, were appointed to create final synthesis form of the Carpathians as a whole. By 1991 Ján Botík had written the text of the chapter 6, and Václav Frolec had finished manuscript sketch about the layout from the chapter 3. His premature death in 1992 has broken so promising beginnings of the work for longer time. The original Czechoslovak section finished its activities in 1994. The Ethnologic Institute in Bratislava has not classified the synthesis of a Carpathian house into its research programme.

The activities of MKKKB have been renewed in 1993 thanks to the president of the Ethnography Institute at The Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Lvov, Professor Stepan Pavluk. The Committee asked Ph.D. Jiří Langer, to finish the work on the synthesis. He agreed with it owing to his retirement in 1996. His project on the finishing of the synthesis was approved for the realisation during the years 1998–2000 by the Grant Agency of The Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic. The vernacular architecture of the Balkan adjacent regions are covered up by the participation of the collaborator Ph.D. Helena Bočková, as a specialist in this field. Although the authors of the national synthesis were getting forward according an unified thematic structure and methodology, yet the national synthesis are as to the contents rather uneven. That is why some passages were being completed on the basis of mutual consultations, working out of the Romanian synthesis included. The necessity of their mutual genetic relations has come out from a comparison of characteristic features of individual countries. The national synthesis, of course, did not solve this problem and their historical data were not sufficient. That is why the work on it has to be necessarily completed. There are big gaps in documentary materials. Only some drawings of a very different quality level have been found, and looking for photographs has not been successful. This is the reason of my presenting 80% drawings of those that have been found so far, and adding mainly my own photo documentation [...].

The marked synthesis structure has a character of a traditional description of found facts on certain territories. Historical attitude and the owing up with the results of other fields having been done until now. They shifted positivist dispositions in the source interpretation towards the expressing economical, ethnical and social circumstances. Yet we feel nowadays that the too long laps of time since the firms conclusions were formulated can call out apprehensions about the quality of the work. In the past mainly common signs and the internal differentiation within the Carpathians and The Balkan have mainly been focused on, not the position of The Carpathians phenomena in building traditions of Europe. In Europe such an extensive synthesis has not been worked out yet. That is the reason why there was no opportunity to profit from similar activities. At the same time methodological requirements on any synthesis have increased because at that time new ethnographic atlases and encyclopaedias came into

existence. Coming out from the above mentioned facts, I am coming to the conclusion that provided preserving the phenomenistic richness of individual parts of the work on this problem will be solved by creating of final conclusions. Every work of science is only a sort of stepping stone to the solution of a certain problem to another position. You can lean on the results of the research of your predecessors being grateful for their contribution and understanding their failures. These can be usually seen only in retrospect. Even our work is trying not only to enlarge geographical view but also an attempt to understand appurtenance of bearers of civilisation values in building culture, not only in the west-east but also in the north-south and south-north relations. Many cultural activities of the western civilisation are being lost at the Carpathian cross-roads because their bearers did not understand complications in the cultural adaptation of multilateral development dimensions. The Roman civilisation heritage infiltrated there directly, and until these days the contributions of the Ancient civilisations have not been evaluated yet. The advanced forms of building cultures from both sides surround the Carpathians, and it is not quite clear which of them was on the higher level. I think the answer at least to some questions could be found in the architectonic documents of such unusually large parts of Europe.

The research synthesis of a folk building in the Carpathians will become a testimony of a generation that probably as the last worked with direct ethnographic sources in a terrain, with preserved buildings that were still functioning in accordance with their original mission. This also happened in the connection with their social and historical environment. Perhaps the greatest changes of dwellings in history and a process of the extinction of the phenomena handing down for more than one thousand years have been watched during our lives. We are aware of the fact that our researches will never be able to be repeated. At the same time it will not be possible to use our ethnographic methods. The traditional way of life has been considered as an appearance of the present. But for our followers this research will only be a sort of historical ethnography that does not do the research in the open, but in the museums, documentation collections, and such sources that we considered being subsidiary ones. Usually we had to hurry during our research work not to miss at least the facts that we had taken down during the reconstruction of villages, and we could not fully take advantage of all the sources. Another generation of colleagues will reproach us with all what we had missed and had not managed to elaborate. They will find new fact in the archives, in the conclusions of later research of historians and archaeologists and people from various other fields of study, in dendro-chronological dating and in a detailed technical analysis of the objects kept in the open air museums and preserved areas. They are certain to make more accurate or even alter the interpretation of some of our conclusions. Without them it would not be possible to keep on searching true answers to all given questions about a cultural development in Europe.

1. RESEARCH AND OPINION DEVELOPMENT

Ethnographers in all Carpathian countries nearly agreed on the division of the development of the field of study. The oldest period is considered to be that one not functioning as an object of systematic process of understanding, but its manifestation has been recorded for easier orientation in economic or political effects on the population. The folk architecture with its surroundings also woke artists' interest. Since the beginnings of tourism it has been perceived as a part of recreational country elements mainly in mountainous areas. It has become a subject of admiration that was even sometimes imitated.

The beginnings of the ethnographical research itself focusing on the folk architecture, settlements and the way of living itself were followed and sometimes even provoked by contemporaneous results of historical and archaeological research. In the second half of the 19th century even an ideological legend did not miss. The research result served as an argument of an autochthonic culture for all emancipation movements. The social environment was mostly hit by searching for the elements of the national originality. It had to defend from the influence of ethnic theories on spreading the civilisation principles by so called culturally more developed nations from The west of Europe to the east of the continent. Since the beginning of the ethnographical research in the Carpathian countries sort of national barriers limiting the research only on local territories, whereas in a German environment the research get out of Austrian shell and focused on the comparison of particular phenomena in broader European dimensions. That is why these individual elements of architecture (e.g. three-unit layout of a house and its gabled orientation, types of yards with rectangular link of agricultural buildings to a house) existed not only in Germany but also in other parts of Europe. The house in the Carpathians with Slavs as well as the Romance was considered to be the result of a *cultural wave* having been spread from the Upper Germany and creating a special *cultural area* in a cultural – geographical sense of word. These problems a bit less concerned ethnographic studies on the folk architecture in the Polish, Ukrainian and Romanian regions, that from the start were focusing on regionally particularistic studies and ethnographic groups (Goral, Lach, Lemko, Bojko, Huculetc.). However the authors even there in the archaisms of Carpathian dwelling could see the original principles of the national culture and border contact links to the cultural background of the national territory centre.

Austrian and German environment influenced principally the methods of ethnographic research in the Carpathian countries by its morphological-ethnic conception in the artefact research. Semantic comparison studies, concentrated in the periodicals *Wörter und Sachen* (Heidelberg 1909–1937), came out from the presumption that the language origin of the name corresponding to the ethnic origin of the phenomenon that is marked.

They enriched the way of thinking of those days not only with the material and its comparison within broad European range but also with the knowledge of functioning relations and their geographical variability and their places from evolution point of view. They also set the basis of the cultural methodology method, and incited depth thematic research, for example the forms of fireboxes and its development, and other elements of the buildings. The idea of linking the artefact with a certain ethnic group as given statistics was developed in an art-historical idea. According to this idea only artistic stylish values existed out of which people only reproduced the simplest principles and arrive at the decaying degradation (Eduard Hoffmann-Krayer in 1903 said: "The Folk does not produce, only reproduce").

Given opinion streams concerned ethnographic way of thinking in the period between the wars, whether they were partly accepted or argued. But it has been always followed by new terrain research, increasing standard of documentation and also by the standard of argumentation. Formal phenomenon analysis might have taken roots in Czech, Slovak and Hungarian ethnography. Nevertheless individual Carpathian regions were mainly the subjects of the research, because factual documentation unsubstantiated relations geographical and historical more and more inspire no confidence, because even then in many Central European centres positivism found its legs.

At the time of fulfilling the aims of many emancipation movements after the World War I and foundation of new national states the research on the folk architecture and the way of living became on object of pioneers and founders of ethnographic centres and schools. The searching the methods of those days and their deepening from today's point of view looks like a number of experiments, whose results became authoritative classicism of several few front representatives of the field. Their wide cultural-historical education and a rich experience with traditional manifestation in the terrain enabled them to find global circumstances. However such an amount of the folk architecture in the Carpathian villages only led the authors towards the choice of source documents functioning as the only illustrations of their deductions. Sometimes they wrongly considered the simple form to be a historical archaism and until the much younger analysis proved their origin in a modern process of social differentiation. The typology of the house forms and its constructional parts and their evaluation of the evolution was a result of the application of a cultural morphology method. That created a very long idea of the only one and non-alternative way in the development of the house in various areas (e.g. genesis of a three-unit floor plan with gradual attachment of premises).

The tradition of national monographs was coming to a higher quality of depth analysis concerning the way of the life in one community. A systematic research of individual phenomena was just begun to make including the dwellings. In addition to earlier typological tendencies two or more stratified stages of development changes started to be differentiated, which came to the conception of evolution-stadium with

the regions of retreat theory, in which the earlier stage forms were living out. This conception was very close to the Naumann's theory concerning decaying values from the sphere of certain architectonic styles and creating folk architecture. The reaction to that was the defence of the originality of folk culture as the forms determined by its function and natural conditions. The first synthesis then started to separate the statistical point of view (phenomena typical for regions or ethnographical communities) from evolutionary one as well as to follow both views. Cultural morphology brought valuable works in all Carpathian countries.

The book by Bruno Schier *Hauslandschaften und Kulturbewegungen im östlichen Mitteleuropa* (1932) started the biggest theoretical polemics between the wars. It was a unique attempt to synthesise problems of the folk architecture. This work exceeded the geographical point of view of the published works that were usual by then. However rich in new stimuli it was, it was far from total completing all the problems comprised in the title of the work. Only the problems considered by the author to be the most substantial were chosen. Those problems concerned the incorporation of the Carpathians into the cultural area created by the upper German wave. Those were illustrated by the representative documents taken from the Northern Carpathian regions, predominantly from Slovakia. His work is considered to be the peak of the ethnic theory. However the most substantial was its contribution to the literature presented by the subject of new disputes – *a cowshed type of a three-unit house*. Apart from other elements (rafter truss, gable orientation of the building dominant, closed quadrangle yard being at its climax, stove and a kitchen) it was thought to be a substantial sign representing German culture. The house with its living room and a shed accessible from the entrance room situated between them should have been the original Central German type, and its appearance in the Sudeten and in the Carpathians served as the evidence of German colonisation tribute. A lot of ethnographers of the period accepted Schier's theory. As late as the war ended Vilém Pražák published his criticisms. He connected a chamber-house with Slavs and admitted extension of a cowshed-house above all with German. Though he found a reason for that argument in speculative economic causes (agriculture: cattle breeding) and in colonisation epochs, that were characterised by the floor plan and later by the fireplace typology. Later research both in Germany and the Carpathians proved the connection of a cowshed-house with modern pauperisation of inhabitants and their social stratification.

Apart from starting economical aspect application in a study of causes in formation of the folk architecture very rarely an approach distinguishing social effects appeared, however only black-and-white contrasts between the dwelling of a farmer and that of the poor in the country. The influence of urban architecture on the village was perceived not only as the innovation element, but also as cultural degradation. Mostly only marginal notes appeared, because an interest in typical phenomena in their Sunday best form representing individual regions prevailed.

The World War II and the construction of destroyed villages caused another heavy loss in the field of a folk architecture. The war hit mainly the Carpathians in Poland and the Ukraine. Post-industrial building up then affected western countries (CZ, SK). The will to record and interpret a function of the folk architecture within individual nations strengthened and a number of specialised work places together with experts educated in this field increased. Their work was not so exclusive as it used to be in the past and material contributions started preponderate in their proportions over speculative theorising. The development of social science also made ethnography to see studied works of art in a broad context. However this was only done in a limited degree and in geographically closed areas. The research of some border contact zones exclusively in the Carpathians presented half-hearted attempts to cross the national culture borders by the end of 1960s. The absence of European ethnography in majority of post-communist countries in Eastern Europe obstructed not only comparative studies but also a contact with methodical development in the west. The scientific information exchange with the west that was broken had a negative impact even in a marginal creation of an idea that the Carpathian areas and contiguous areas of the Balkan Peninsula do not belong to the cultural area of Central Europe but to the eastern territory. The view of the area was traditionally led from the Western-European side and the relations to the culture of both southern and eastern parts of Europe were coming about in the west-east cultural polarisation. In a material culture the differences between north-south direction are rather outstanding and the differences of the economic development in lowlands and mountains link a mankind mainly according to river basins. So there are more differentiating aspects to be followed. In earlier studies an opposite view of the east was missing. More and more a shortage of more complex interdisciplinary approach that would accept all done depth monothematic studies, and at the same time would not cross its interpretation abilities within the marked out conception (even in its title).

In majority of Carpathian countries however positivistic material analysis and morphological classification coming out of the terrain research prevailed. The region signs were formulated however as a sort of function development result. Historical principles and dealing with a documentation of specific constructions as well as with the source were gradually becoming self-evident attribute of studies. Thematic analysis using historical methods both morphological and functional comparative methods (social determination of dwellings emphasising a family pattern, seasonal and permanent dwellings, urban influence, archaeological, historical and iconographical source utilisation, construction signs of 17th and 18th centuries, inter-ethnic relations, customs, function and artistic aspects etc.) led towards a complex view. That all also even required system approach.

The object research determination resulted from an outline of an opinion development of ethnographers involved in the Carpathian problems. A house, that is a per-

manent dwelling or long-time temporary (a few years), represents the object on the contrary from a seasonal dwelling. The residence as a component in an economically utilised country is at issue. Following the spirit of the beginnings of a research tradition a method of observation became quite common, thus a research of traditional material sources. These however give evidence of building culture from various periods of an origin and adaptation of individual buildings, which was not recorded in earlier studies. As soon as we find a form contingent on economic and social functions with the help of historical science sources, mostly from archives, then historically defined types of houses will become evident as representatives of local, period and social forms. From the opposite point of view we will learn whether all social groups creating different functional structures of households have their representatives in the preserved materials. These are often fragments and blanks in them cannot even be completed by the idea.

The other heuristic aspect is a traditional element of the vernacular architecture that is called folk or traditional to be accurate. Innovation cultural process and the process of social adaptation cause changes, deviations from a simple inheriting. However they usually do not cross the frame of the heart of the body in house architecture. The development of an innovation influence leads from professional dwelling division (a nobleman, burgher, mayor, subject-farmer, land-less people) to a regional and local differentiation of house forms. A social differentiation has an integral influence (the dwellings for the lowest strata are the same nearly everywhere) and the innovation of industrial period, gradually regulating and setting the norm for both project conditions and building production, then disclaims all traditional elements. The folk architecture tradition is dying out, and the same happens to the object of our interest. The strongest regulation intervenes were taking place in the countries of the former Austrian monarchy and the weakest ones were recorded in Romanian areas. Mutual growing of traditions and innovation processes through a village, provincial town and big towns caused a different comprehension of the object of study in individual countries. The character of recent sources required that. For example contrast two-rail development of material culture in towns and villages in Bohemia led ethnographers to the research of mainly houses belonging to farms in the country. In Bulgaria even provincial towns are included within the term of folk architecture. That is the reason for our attempt in this synthesis to get over all restrictions done until now and to present as broad view of the problem as the material comprised in national synthesis and procurable literature enables. One of the authors explained some innovations of the building culture as a Turkish oriental influence. More detailed view can differentiate domestic, Mediterranean and Muslim contributions. But a new Balkan-style created by specific process: the Muslim life style ideas were realised by domestic builder masters using domestic traditional building methods.

In the Carpathian countries and adjacent Balkan areas you can follow the time of the origin of preserved material sources in the field of the 19th century folk architecture

and from the beginning of 20th century. Fewer objects date back to the first half of 19th century. Those from earlier stages are very rare. These exceptions are uncommonly outstanding as comparative material for the creation of hypothetical idea at least concerning earlier situation at the places, from which similar documents miss but where you can lean on fragment indirect information from iconographical or literal or other sources. Building traditions did not take place in all Carpathian countries with the same dynamism. Economical mainly market centres as an innovation source supported the development, and in many places functioned as a uniting element. Apparently that is the reason why the constructions that are the least hit by the innovation process can be found in some regions of North-West Carpathians, and then in north-west part of the mountains, and in some regions of Southern Carpathians (Oltenie and Hateg, RO).

Though geographical determination of the object of our interest relates to mountainous area of the Carpathians, observed phenomena even occur outside the area. Some researchers proved not only a cultural differentiation but also direct genetically relations among the inhabitants in the mountains and lowlands. Hypothesis about the originality of mountainous cultures has not been proved so far. That is the inevitable reason for a division and grading of the observed areas:

1. The area of the mountains themselves and small hollows inside of them, where Carpathian cultural specification will be researched.
2. The area of uplands and the areas under the mountains (including Transylvania basin) with characteristic features of specific cultures.
3. Adjacent area that influenced genetically the first two cultures (lowlands Carpathian Basin include).

In the last case the traditions of building culture of the lowlands under the mountains on the one hand, and the culture of Balkan areas on the other hand (predominantly in Bulgaria and Serbia – YU) will be considered. These areas were in the past for the Carpathians the same transient zones of the main cultural continental streams as the western part of Central Europe. The name of the area that is the Balkan is used in literature as a term with a very broad application from Bulgarian mountains (Stara Planina) up to the whole peninsula. In our synthesis we prefer more frequent term adjacent Balkan areas in the sense of the peninsula, and that rather presents specific regions situated southward from the Danube (RO, BG, YU) and the Sava (YU, HR, BH).

2. HUMANISATION OF THE LANDSCAPE

The Carpathians differ from all main mountain ranges of Europe by the largest afforestation and at the same time by the largest plane utilisation for farming. In the Alps, the Pyrenees or mountains in Scandinavia a considerable part of the surface is not utilised for farming purposes. The Balkan and the Dinar mountains contrast with

a strong deforestation that existing in all mountainous areas around the Mediterranean sea that is strongly marked by grazing management of antique cultures. The Carpathians are approximately as large as the Alps (about 220 000 km²) and are situated in a very much like southeast location. Only its extension towards the east caused their distance further from the Atlantic humidity and closer to the dry atmosphere of steppes in Eastern Europe. Permanent dwellings following farming activities got into the Carpathians. It had even been happened from the medieval colonisation. In the Alps the number of population increased in adequate locations of mountainous pastureslands in connection with tourism of an industrial period. From a certain distance a link-up of both mountain ranges can be observed.

a) Climatic conditions

The Carpathians are usually divided into western up to the bed of the rivers Topľa (SK) and Wisłoka (PL), the central in a river basin of the upper Tisa up to Jablonický pass located between its sources and sources of the Prut (U), the eastern up to the pass of Predeal, eastward from M. Bucegi (RO), and the southern as far as a breakthrough of the Danube in the Kučaj mountains (YU).

Climatic influences of the Atlantic affect the Western Carpathians, and they weaken towards the area of the Tatras. Other parts of the mountains have a continental climate. This climate influences the whole eastern curve, starting at the Central Carpathians in the north, going to the Southern Carpathians, expanding to Transylvania and reaching as far as the Great Hungarian Lowlands (Nagy Alföld), more from the side of dry plains of northern area of the Black Sea. The Balkan Peninsula, situated between the continental Black Sea coast and the area of Mediterranean, has a special position that is complicated by its predominant mountain surface.

The south-north direction of the most compact valleys of the Vardar (GR-MK) and the Morava (YU) and the nearness of the Adriatic coast enable penetration of the Mediterranean climate in to the lowlands of the Central Danube basin (Vojvodina, Bácska, Banát, YU, H, RO), and sometimes to the valley of the Mureş up to the centre of Transylvania (RO). The south-north flow from the Tisa basin and north south from the Wisłabasin influence positively the lowest (500–800 m high and long approx. 120 km) and the narrowest (approx. Only 10km) the Carpathian area between the sources of the Topľa, Ondava, Laborec (SK) and Wisłoka (PL) in the mountain range Beskid Niski. The Carpathian Basin is then situated on the borderland of all three main climatic areas of Europe.

The upper forest border rises from the west (1400–1600 m) towards the east (1700 m) and the south (1900 m). Not only accessibility of various climatic influences, but also simple 600 km distance in the north-south direction causes considerable temperature differences. Comprehensibly southern slopes close to adjacent lowlands are the warmest and the most convenient for agricultural settlement. However even

northern slopes situated in lower locations and opened to the influence coming from the Baltic area show better conditions than small afforested Carpathian Basin (e.g. Liptov, Turiec, Zvolen, SK). The coldest and the most humid areas in the Carpathians are north-west (Beskidy – CZ, PL, Kysuce, Orava, Spiš – SK, PL), and a mountain joint on the border of the Maramureş, Bukovina, Transylvania and Moldavia (from the Černá Gora mountains – U, to the areas of Dornele and Cimpulung – RO).

The original forest stand in the mountainous areas of the Carpathians consisted of beeches and firs. The spruce only prevailed in colder and humid areas of the north-west and in Romanian-Ukraine mountainous joint. Other areas where the spruce predominated were the highest range locations near the upper tree line. Beyond the line only the mountain pine grows. A large stand of the sycamore maple, rowan, larch and yew appeared on lower mountain ridges in a thin virgin forest biotope. There used to be seen the Scotch Elm, lime-tree, ash, hazel. In southern locations even the black pine grew. Oak woods were in the lowlands and they reached as far as to the slopes around the estuary of mountainous valleys starting in the area of Satu Mare (RO, H), via the marginal area of the Tisa basin towards the south, in the centre of Oltenia, Western Muntenia and Moldavia. The locust trees, hornbeams, elms, lime-trees and willows were growing. The remnants of original oak groves in lowlands of the lower Danube gradually transfer into fields and forest steppes of plains. The latter are marked by broad floodplains in riverbeds. There the stand of various types of woody plants among the pastures is preserved. The driest steppe areas have been created owing to the climatic conditions as well as to gradual landscape deforestation by a man in the three areas: Puszta at the Central Tisa in Hajduság and Nyírség provinces (H), in Muntenia of the lower Danube basin in regions of Vlaşca and Bărăgan and in North-East Moldavia in the area of Jijia – Botoşani region (RO). Also Dobrodgea (RO, BG), immensely deforested perhaps in the period of antiquity, shared the climatic conditions more with the Balkan than with the Carpathians.

The original plant stands were also changing thanks to the progressive settlement and later owing to forestry. The man caused not only deforestation but also soil cultivation and a change of its structure. Tree species typical for the lowlands (e.g. oak trees) were getting into the mountains together with a man. Approximately the end of 18th century, intentional forest cultivation started by its protection against an enlargement of mountainous living places, usually connected with pasturing. At the turn of 18th and 19th centuries on some estates an intentional planting of the spruce started, because its physical qualities for the industry were the best. That is why in the mountains a spruce monoculture began to spread with a disproportionate densely afforestation that was usual in the original woods. This process hit mostly the western part of the Carpathians. Although, in the second half of 19th century, Bukovina (U, RO) and the areas around industrial centres and big forest estates with advanced economical system had been influenced, too.

b) Conditions of historical settlement development

Human activities in the Carpathians have been proved by archaeological finds dating back to the period of the Stone Age, but their connections with the mountain region were created not before the construction of settlements linked with farming activities around the area. These non-systematic activities can be watched at various places and various periods in all Carpathian countries from the later part of the Stone Age. More evidence comes from the period of the Bronze Age, and enables to map out the first Trans-Carpathian trading paths. New settlements of more permanent character were arising along them, because agricultural settlement was rather movable. After depletion of fertility inhabitants of the village moved somewhere else. Mountain paths led through riverbeds. The mountain passes became important joints. The distance communication between The Baltic, Black Sea areas and Southern Europe led from the north to the south.

South-Eastern Europe (besides Northern) was one of the few continental places with the oldest settlement culture (since 13th B.C. existed), whose tradition had been continual till the recent times. Herodotus, 5th B.C., described Greeks, Thracians, Illyrians and Scythians. They inhabited the whole Balkan Peninsula, Southern and Eastern Carpathians, and in the north of the Black Sea area. Their economical background was presented by farming. They mainly focused on extensive agriculture – grazing cattle, sheep and goats. The building of permanent centralised settlements was begun by the people of Greek Classical period, presented by the conception of *the polis*, city states (800–500 B.C.) They were spreading predominantly along the coast, later along the trading paths, then in the mountains. Within the place the gardens, orchards, vineyards and fields were founded. Sheep were grazing in the mountains in summer time and in winter they were punched to lowlands near the coast. This population showed how they founded their permanent settlements more than one thousand years before the Middle Ages, unlike the other European nations founded after the migration of peoples, between 9th and 12th centuries. Partial Greek colonisation on the Italian territory (750–550 B.C.) prepared the background for a rather later settlement culture of the Roman Empire (148–476 B.C.), and – through the mediation of it – for the whole Southern Europe. Since the separation of East-Roman Empire (325–395 B.C.) and its transformation into the Byzantine Empire in 527 the building-up of the western and eastern society started to get estranged from one another. They had a substantial influence on an ownership approach and on a structure of a family life too, as well as on a creation of settlements and on a method of utilising the natural landscape. The house – a permanent dwelling – has become primary in this process.

The Roman law created a conception of private ownership. In written form it was fully formulated (especially on the basis of *Institutiones* by Gaius in 2nd century) in 529–534 in Justinian Codex (since 16th century called *Corpus Iuris Civilis*). In accordance with this work the ownership related only to a man being at the head of the family. So

it was patriarchal, paternal and everything that the family had subordinated to him. The only exception was his son's property gained from a military service. Out of this one can understand Romans' interest in the expansion into other provinces. Justinian's conception was damaged by the Byzantine Codex written by Syrian Leon III, called *Eclogue* valid between the years 726–875, and the agricultural codex – *Nomos georgikos* – published around 720. Both of them declared a Greek conception of common ownership and collective estate and tax responsibility. The application of Roman conception was spreading from Western Europe, and the Greek one was influencing eastern parts of the Continent. The influence was apparent in succession states of both empires in the sphere of administration and church that was also divided (temporarily until 484, 867, and permanently till 1054). The western principles led to the society feudalisation with individual responsibility for a farm and authority marking out of territories for individual villages. The eastern principles then led to the common autonomous settlement organisation with common utilising of relative landscape territory. The norms had a different impact on each area of the customary law.

According to the comparison of agricultural structure of the most advanced cultures in Europe, a few centuries B.C., the Celts excelled in technique (considerable pig-breeding, cattle winter stall-feeding), and Thracians (nowadays the territory of Bulgaria and Romania, iron rakes for harrowing, significant sheep-breeding) with autochthonous development similar to Roman, as well as Illyrians were good at fruit-growing and sheep-breeding for cheese and wool. Scythians were famous for growing wheat. Germans did not have vineyards and orchards and cattle breeding (with the stabling although even a winter grazing) prevailed over grain growing. At Slavs in the Dniester Basin the true millet and rye growing preponderated and beef cattle breeding without winter stall-feeding. The Carpathian countries were inhabited by Dacians – one of the groups who lived the furthest in the north, and who became the basis of Romanian ethnic genesis. Antique sources from 82–44 B.C. mention the Burebista Geto-Dacian empire. In the contemporary literature there are several ethnical groups distinguished within Thracians (subjected romanisation in the years 106–271). In the north they were called Daco-Romanians, south of the Danube – Megleno-Romanians, in the west – Istro-Romanians, and in the south, on the later Macedonian-Greek border – Aromanians. In the Middle Ages surrounding ethnical groups called them Wallachians (*Valachi, Vlachi*) in the signification of latinized ethnical group, settled farming inhabitants, Christians, on the contrary from the Moslems, but not only shepherds (this meaning was used in connection with later colonisation waves in the Central and Western Carpathians). The name Wallachia – Valachia also occurred with attributes giving names to various territories. For example in an eleven-century sources: White- between the Danube and The Balkan Mountains (BG), Black- in the west of the peninsula (YU), Little- or Upper- in Macedonia, Great-Wallachia in Thessaly (GR).

Before the basic ethnogenesis had been finished, South-Eastern Europe went through the period of migration of nations (1–6 centuries), and the period of raids and a permanent settlement of the last ethnic groups (7–14 centuries). Except the influence of Roman province from 4th century several ethnical groups were moving towards the south across the Carpathians and the Balkan Peninsula. The Slavs who had been coming from the second half of 5th century presented the most outstanding group. The wave was coming on the one hand from the north to the Western and Central Carpathians and further to Slovakia and Bohemia, and on the other hand to the area of the Eastern Carpathian curve from the northern coast of the Black Sea. They settled in Bulgaria, Serbia and Macedonia and influenced even Romanian inhabitants very much. From the area of the lower Dniester Basin in 896 under the pressure of Pecheneg (Pečeněh) ethnic group, the Hungarians started to move, and in 972 they founded their own independent state on the territory of present-day Hungary. Related population of Sicula accompanied them across the Carpathians. They settled in Eastern Transylvania (RO). At first the expansion of Stephen I captured eastern part of Great Moravian Empire (Slovakia) in 1025–1039, then the upper Tisa Basin (U). Their perpetual effort to master the whole Transylvania (Terra Blachorum with Romanian population) ended up successfully not before 1211 under the rule of Andrew II. The expansion to the south in the end of 13th century touched the borderland of Oltenia. They conflicted with the dynasty of Bessarabians who were founding their principality there at that time.

Pechenegs moved to Transylvania after 1036. In 1242, after the first Tartar invasion, Bela IV moved on the western border expanding from the Drava (HR, H) up to the confluence of the Moravia and the Danube (A, SK). In 10th century Tuvinec ethnic group from Kievan Rus appeared in the upper Tisa Basin (U), Moldavia and North-Eastern Muntenia (RO). In the half of 11th century Cumans got through the lower part of the Don Basin into the Dobrodgea and Muntenia (RO). They originated a ruling class in the territory of the lower Danube Basin and temporarily subjugated even Northern Hungarian regions. Bela IV challenged them to inhabit the steppes between the Danube and Tisa (H).

The line between the western and eastern conception of residence and farming was determined by ideological influence of the Byzantine Empire. The German law controlled the colonisation of Hungarian Carpathian too. In 12th century Hungarian nobility who was authorised to protect the eastern border, mastered Transylvanian Siculs and the Trans-Carpathian Ruthenians. Residence system of Hungarian Romanians apparently had not been feudalized at that time. A new settlement only drove them out from the territory into the mountains. The Order of German Knights was called by Andrew II to protect the country against Cumans. The members of the Order were building up many castles and later fortified churches in Southern Transylvania since the period 1211–1225. Their activities went together with urban colonisation of so called Saxons given by royal privileges.

The interpretation of settlement culture genesis in the Carpathians was influenced by the controversy over the ethnogenesis of Romanians. Earlier historians' studies could only be based on written Byzantine or Hungarian sources (Rössler from 1866). They usually issued from ethnic theory of the Austrian School that gathered protagonists of the immigration theory. From the contents of known documents they deduced the fact that the Wallachian existence (later Romanians) is proved only in the Byzantine Balkan (Greek Thessaly, Macedonian-Albanian Epiros, Northern Bulgarian Moesia etc.), north of the Danube as late as the beginning of 13th century, and in Transylvania not before the arrival of Germans and Hungarians who were the only settlers creating colonisation agenda. They became the only nations as an estate group in the country. The given sources mentioned only Wallachians in connection with their convenient utilising for crusades. On the base of this fact they were mistakenly considered to be moving ethnical group whose livelihood is based on pasturing. According to R. Rössler, the period of The Roman province in Dacia was during a short period closed, because of spreading of Goths and other migrating ethnic groups. His speculative interpretation was generally accepted then, although he had the opponents to his theory as well (Austria, Transylvania, Bohemia, Romania). The authority of the autochthonous conception predominated as a result of declassified number of archive materials and mainly thanks to rich results of archaeological excavations in 20th century. This documentation became the basis of modern scientific interpretation of Romanian history. Literature created on the basis of wrong understanding of Wallachians as migrating shepherds dealt with Wallachian colonisation in the Central and Western Carpathians. The created idea of sheep dairy-farming as an independent phenomena of compact (originally from the ethnical, later social and professional point of view) groups of the inhabitants that was separated from agriculture and genetically linked with the Balkan pasturing tradition heritage of the Antique world, that had been spread from the Carpathians from Greek and Albanian borderland.

Donations of Hungarian king Ludwig I of Anjou were the first stimulus for the Wallachian colonisation. He granted prince (voivode) Sass and his sons (Drag, Balk, Loan). Polish literature follows the whole dynasty of Sass as a landlords, who took the greatest credit for the colonisation of both sides of the Central Carpathians, especially Sambor Area (U) and Sanok (PL). Some authors supposed that this economic and cultural movement took longer. The Wallachian attempts to get to the north and the west within the Carpathians had been preceded by a migration of the population from the south as far as Macedonia, Albania and the Aegean Sea. The wrong interpretation of Wallachians proved in the sources of the Central Carpathians and they testify Wallachian interest to settle down and to stop further extensive sheep rearing in the mountains. They became predominantly farmers, and extensive pasturing was gradually weakening till the complete downfall. Pasturing way of life was preserving within the environment of social provisional arrangement or within the groups of inhabitants

that had not obtained any land. That was the reason for their further moving into other mountainous areas with even worse climatic conditions. The name Wallachian still meant Romanian and this name comprised its ethnical character on the contrary from the Ukraine inhabitants founding farming villages on the slopes of the mountains westward, as far as the Poprad Basin (The area of Lemko ethnographic group) from 13th century. Spring and autumn pasturing in the lowland fields enabled new contacts of mountainous Wallachians with local people. The inhabitants sometimes withdrew to the mountains to take advantages given for those founding new villages. Ethnical and professional assimilation happening from the end of 16th century was gradually changing the meaning of the expression Wallachian into a professional denomination. The name meant a shepherd at chalet. However shepherd's terminology linked with pasturing way of life has its origin in Romanian background.

The *customary law* created land ownership of commons (*obcina*) based on kinship groups. Non-regulated biological and settlement development of the population divided this type of the ownership between the families in villages gathering about 30 farms (*vatra, prisjolak*). This common ownership was autonomous towards the individual ownership of nobility. An elected representative of the common (*knyaz, kňjaz, kiniz, krajnik*) saw to economical needs, organised farming activities including defensive ones. The head of the church community was subordinate to him (*popă, pop*). *Knyaz* was submitting to a provincial administrator or a monarch but not to the nobility. The common from a geographical point of view covered a mountain valley that was approximately 30–50 km long. It was segmented into several zones: gardens, vineyards, fields lying fallow cultivated in a two-field system, fields that were worked every third (or more) year, meadows and pasturelands located from mountain clearings to area above the tree line. New settlements cultivated another soil because the density of population with regard to the landscape area was in the period of the existence of commons very low. Common family ownership encouraged farming of more relative families in one household, but their dwellings could have been separated.

German law (especially that of Magdeburg) was creating individual form of the ownership within the feudal system. The official appointed by a monarch divided the demarcated land to individual peasants (various social grades) and they utilised it for in accordance with a generation succession determined by specific inheritance rights (coming out from Roman Law, actually *Institutiones* by Gaius, 2nd century). This influenced a residential form of an individual (nuclear) and enlarged families, the institution of the dwelling of a retired peasant, a community of non-relative members of a household etc. The subordination comprised not only dividing up of the power but also a relation of the cultural emancipation between a monarch or provincial administrator (*Kníže, voda, voivode, starosta*) and a lord, baron (train, dignitaries, feudal tenant: *boier, bojar, gráf* etc.) – knight, (*zeman* – minor land owners, freeholders: *boiernaç*) – burgher (royal or tributary towns) – priest (*farář, pop, mnich*) – an official

appointed for the land division (lineal, elected), *rychtář* (magistrate, half privileged person who guaranteed tax delivery based on feudal duties with the right of double soil allotment, construction and running a mill, saw and a pub: *fojt, vojť, soltuz, scultetus, šoltýs, kneaz, kiniz, kňjaz*) – serfs (*sedlák, sedliak, chlop, kmit*) – landless person.

Gradual restriction of the customary law through a state regulation was a part of feudalisation, promoting dependence on the landlord in accordance with the German Law. The first stage of the enclosure and common land division resulted in the commons disintegration into villages and individual homesteads within them. The pasturelands remained to be the only common ownership. In the Western Carpathians this process had been finished until 13th century. In the eastern and southern part of the Carpathians it was not before 15th century. However, there very often other deserted land was left after a previous division. A previous member of the common could have obtained this land preferentially (in the case of a forest cultivated) for his kin. New separated villages (called *rezeş*) were responsible only to the monarch for their taxes.

After the marking off of their register, they soon changed themselves into a territorial neighbouring commonwealth, and they gradually demarcated individual utilised parts from the utilised land. At the system of fallows, and under the complicated family links of connected households, there were still relative lines between the both ownership forms. Besides them, there were classical subject villages with serfs (*serbi*) depended on barons (bojars) (Panaitescu 1990). The second feudalization stage in the Southern and Eastern Carpathians proceeded in from 16th century and meant other restrictions for traditions of commons. The ban of weapons among the inhabitants resulted in their dependence on the protection of barons (bojar, bojernas) and monasteries. The only exception was the border villages in the Northern Transylvania. There was still the land duty to protect the frontier. The most consistent usage of the German Law was applied in Transylvanian autonomous regions and in the farms of Hungarian nobility, where the feudalisation was finished in the most consistent form. Uneven development caused frequent survival of earlier elements in local economic isolation. For example, in a description of Moldavia from the second half of 18th century the existence of the commons Vrancea, Cîmpulung and Tigeci (RO) was mentioned. These were independent on the ownership of barons (bojar). The reason of longer commons surviving in Moldavia was the knights' protection, because they found their necessary political support against the increasing power of barons (bojar) there. The consequence of the tradition was a weaker power of the common tenure or village representatives and bigger autonomy of freeholders in Moldavia than in other countries.

There were a lot of compromises between the customary law and the German law. The *Wallachian Law* is one of them, created with the aim of colonising still uninhabited mountainous areas in the Central and Western Carpathians. It was codified at several places (SK, PL, U) in 15th century and its varieties consist in the following principles: 1. Taxes were only on the sheep (2–5%, from 16th century up to 20%). 2. Wallachians

had the right of unlimited moving with their cattle out of the frontiers of the country. They could be armed (usually this right was linked with guarding duty on the land border). 3. The commons of individual dominations had their own autonomy – a sort of self-government. The voivode was at the elected head. The common representatives (kñjaz) at an assembly that had also judicial power elected him. 4. The voivode obtained the Wallachian Law from the monarch that is the reason why the authority respected it. 5. The common representatives had the same privileges as the founders within the German Law. However, their right of the corn-mill, saw-mill, fulling-mill and pub possession was understood to be the right of the common – not of the representative. 6. The right of the kñjaz to take 1/3 of taxes and penalties, to control farming system in the common resulted in making Wallachians depended on the land, which was in accordance with his interests. His function was gradually merging with that one of an elected magistrate (some of the landless people had their own subjects because they came to the fore thanks to their outstanding activities and were raised to the nobility for their political merits). 7. Annually the voivode organised within several mountain valleys and ranges a division of mountain pastures among individual sheepfolds. In the period of increasing economic interests of the nobility in utilising mountain forests the voivode was their partner in defining competencies. However, gradually (18th century) the mayors became wood-reeves. The strongest colonisation according to the Wallachian Law proceeded in the Central and Western Carpathians in 16th century, and it related to the exodus of Moldavians as a result of the strongest feudalisation wave of commons. They strengthened the usage of the customary law with certain common elements in the northern part of the Carpathians. The collective usage of the pastures was kept for the longest time.

The Russian Law was applied as a modification of the common law in the areas with the Ukraine settlement in the Central and North-Eastern Carpathians and adjacent lowlands. The occurrence of the communities applying the Wallachian Law and having their own representatives weakened to westward. During 16th and 17th centuries the influence from the west on the restriction of Wallachian specialities strengthened. Later the landlords began to levy feudal tax and demanded corvée as it had used to be applied in non-Wallachian villages. The weakening of the position of a monarch in the period of anti-Habsburg uprisings and Turkish wars enabled landlords to become sovereign rulers over their manor.

Turkish expansion (from 1354, 1402 up to the Danube, 1481 up to the Southern Carpathians, 1512 Moldavia seized, in 1541 Transylvania, in 1561 Hungary the upper Tisa Basin and the south of Slovakia) and their raids were devastating, especially near the military line and around their military camps. A large number of people were kidnapped. This fact strongly influenced the settlement of the area. Hungary was hit by this events most of all. The inhabitants of villages from South and East Balkan regions hid for the shelter in the mountains, from West Balkan regions to the north.

This process also provoked rather blind colonisation wave. The occupation régime of the Osman Empire in Balkan abolished a domestic nobility. Peasants were subjugated as a bondmen and their resistance occasioned a strong slaughter and exodus. A difficult ethnic mosaic in South-East European regions is the result of this processes. Most of the Carpathians were saved from the raids of the Osman empire. The political and economic vassal system preserved the voivode autonomy (the position of the administrators in the country) and bojars. The feudalisation of the commons and further colonising process were still the part of their competency. After 1711 in Moldavia and in 1716 in Oltenia and Muntenia (RO) the Osman authorities, so called Phanariots (mostly Greeks), cleverly gained the power and got into the local ruling structures of the principalities. After the Osman army withdrawal from Central Europe (1683–1699 to so called military border in the Southern and Eastern Carpathians and further not before 1878) there were spontaneous as well as a regulated transfer of population from the mountains into deserted areas in lowlands. Predominantly low social classes participated in this colonisation and they founded centralised and organised settlements.

c) The forms of settlement

In literature the colonisation period producing a certain type of dwelling according to the environment of the landscape is put into the causal nexus. The natural environment was the place where a man had shifted his existential interests. All the authors agree on the existence of water source as a necessary settlement condition. The object of the research in a present-day village is the position of the estates along the road and what is their relation towards the flow and to the division of fields. Only such standpoints are not sufficient for the research in the area of the Carpathians. Regarding a long surviving of the customary law and the system of commons a settlement type cannot be considered only from the point of view of a present-day administration unit. It is necessary to have account of a settlement development of wider village complex that are lying in the river basin and had created an economical unit in the past. Decoding of the origin of development of settlements in the mountains is difficult to do. It was usually retarded by a higher participation of extensive sheep breeding in the valleys owned by the commons and this process was different at the places where the German Law had been applied. It created a village centralised around a village green, (*a green-village type of settlement* according to an urban model), or they were founded by a division of tracts of land with manors along ways, on individual tracts of land marked upright towards a valley way. This process created another type of a *chain settlement*. The density of the last type of the settlement was increasing on the one hand by its dividing, and on the other hand by increasing of the population surplus of lower social classes.

In the countries of the Austrian monarchy the construction was regulated through the definition of the built-up area of the village within Theresian register in 1767. For

every at least a little centralised settlement the area for building of a court was demarcated including a garden with a barn. The original courtyards were corresponding to tax units and were defined even if more houses surrounded them, and more households were farming together there. Somewhere the courtyards were held for surface measure that was nearly an equivalent of register unit called *jitra*: 0,575 ha (PL, U). Until these days the names of their original colonisers are preserved in their names (e.g. *Bobrova rala, porta, kmetskoe mesto, hold*, etc.). The density of built-up area was increasing by the constructions on gradually halved on the allotments of courtyards into concentrated *road, street* and *row* forms including *the street enlarged into oblong* or lentil-like village green similar to the municipal urbanism. However transit roads until 18th century usually led through dry gravel beds of rivers and creeks so it is logic that for founding of new settlements the importance of present-day road had a creek or river. On their banks the roads leading to the entrance of the courtyard of individual settlements were later created. That is the reason why such villages are named *creek streets*.

At a spontaneous colonisation, in accordance with the customary law in the commons environment, there were an orientation of the entrance wall of eaves towards the sun and an effort to have more intensively reclaimed land at the courtyard. Then division of the field was applied according to landscape relief and location of courtyards along the permanent routes with enough space for founding family settlements. Another standpoint was family's relation to the water flow, and then at last to the road connecting settlements and neighbouring settlement areas. Common ownership required transverse division into farming areas along the whole valley. If the settlements with a reclaimed soil (in a three-field or two-field systems) in the lower part and in basins at the creek confluence, temporary fields and meadows were situated higher in gradually deforested parts and pastures on the ranges. After the chain settlement of the whole valley all the three given areas shifted into higher positions, and the distance between pastures and maternal settlements was several dozen kilometres. There, where the valley began to narrow and the terraces of bank rivers and slopes were not spacious enough for the courtyard requirements, new settlements were rising along the range paths (usually below them with a southward orientation not towards the road).

After the common disintegration into villages and after the population surplus more and more dense courtyard chains were arising from individual settlements. The original lengthwise macrostructure division in valleys into the field areas, meadows and pastures was changed into a diagonal one, in fact into stretches of land and in narrow valleys small terraced fields were founded. Then, from the river terrace in the valley, behind the courtyard in a long stretch vegetable gardens, were located first and then intensively cultivated fields at the foot of the slopes. Then, there were located fields reclaimed every third year, and meadows followed, and above them forests and pastures on the ranges belonging to individual settlements. These collective pastures either for cattle or for sheep were on the same place as the commons had decided. If the

settlement kept the family allotment undivided, the houses and outbuildings were built around one courtyard. It looked like *a nest* (*kuča*). However, after the disintegration of the undivided land of a kin, as a result of following the legacy of inheritance, the lots were divided lengthwise, and later diagonally (on the steep slopes terraced fields were formed). More quickly new settlements arose in the lower parts of a valley, at its mouth, where the villages were expanding into more parallel streets that were vertically interconnected. Where the terrain was diverse *street*, and *cumulative settlement* were built up. The regulation of settlements in the adjacent lowlands was functioning earlier, and that is why the importance of the transit roads organisation and local streets with houses situated in rows were much more important than in mountain valleys. For the pre-industrial period another type of settlement was characteristic: *scattered* and *clearing* development in the most faraway areas in the Carpathians. They were developing either spontaneously or owing to landlords' effort to utilise still unproductive soil. In the case of the first mentioned situation a population surplus from valleys built their settlements on the slopes around the original one, or they built only houses and sheds on the original pastures (or they decided to live permanently in their seasonal buildings). Both of them were situated on cultivated allotments in an inconsistently deforested area of mountain ranges or on clearing slopes. Scattered settlement area very often had more inhabitants than its maternal village. Somewhere (especially in Hucul area, U) new villages developed from scattered and lately separated parts. In the case of the other mentioned variety the subjects could let a surveyed part of the forest to cultivate the soil and to work there. This form prevailed in the Western Carpathians and was applied from the end of 17th to the beginning of 19th century.

As it has been suggested all given settlement types were changing and diffusing in the course of history. Nowadays only seldom a development with the signs of individual settlement type can be found. The awareness of genetic coherence is very important because the same type does not always have to be a result of the same social processes. For example a cumulative settlement in the Carpathians usually means a final stage of a long and changeable development. But at the Balkan and in the whole Mediterranean area of Europe it is much older and can nearly mean the starting point of settlement culture. At the present mostly *a combined settlement types* are possible to differentiate by comparison with earlier forms. This can be however done on the basis of historical not formal analysis, because the simpler forms are typical mainly for mountain colonisation done by the lowest social strata. However, coming out from all the available material the chain settlement can be considered to be the form that is characteristic for long mountain valleys of Moldavia and Northern Transylvania (RO), Bojko (U) and Lemko (SK, PL, U) areas in the Central and Western Carpathians. The disperse settlements are characteristic for Hucul Verchovina (U), the area of Dornele (RO) and the borderland of Zvolen and Hontregions (SK), Goral areas (ethnography group created by the assimilation of all ethnic groups) from Orava up to Těšín regions

(SK, PL, CZ), in border mountains of the Beskidy and Javorníky mountains and in some parts of the Biele Karpaty mountains (SK, CZ).

If we had to seek the border between roughly original existence of completely centralised and organised settlement types and those ones that cannot be considered the most characteristic in the Carpathians (chain and disperse) we would have to come back to historical roots of the settlement. At that point the building culture tradition that is the object of the research started to develop. They differed in individual parts of the Carpathians. In the western part of the mountains (CZ, SK, PL) the period of the second half of 17th and 18th centuries was important. In the Lemko area (SK, PL) it was the turn of 15th and 16th centuries, and for Bojko area in the Ukraine it was the period from the end of 14th till 16th centuries. In the areas of scattered settlements in the Central and Eastern Carpathians it was as early as the end of 13th century and then in 14th century. Most of villages situated on southern slopes are in the form of collective settlements. Historical evaluation of the settlement typology from a functional point of view suggests that during its development also a process of extensive sheep breeding separation from peasants' farming proceeded. The more intensive the plant production was the more sheep breeding was reduced. The latter required rather extensive style of life and this meant the shortage of man's labour in the fields, because mainly men were involved in sheep breeding. Some families living in the areas where sheep breeding had survived later specialised in sheep-dairy farming.

There is a geographical line limiting medieval settlement by natural conditions in all big mountain massifs of Europe. The differences were apparent in the way of livelihood of people who were permanently crossing the line. Mostly miners and craftsmen seeking raw materials and water power or shepherds with their cattle during the season (the Pyrenees, Alps, Scandinavia). Their lives depended on a large market background in the integrated feudal society that lived below the mountain productivity line. This imaginary line was weakened by higher extensiveness of farming. Working in the field was linked there with sheep-dairy farming, which required cyclic moving of herds for long distances. Some families moved their residential focus outside the village above the productivity line. This farming system with an internal common system and specific Customary Law in the Eastern and Southern Carpathians was resisting the feudalisation process for a very long time and its characteristic features after its inconsistent close. The disintegration of the system resulted in a separation of some families from the land. They together with a population surplus, landless people and refugees expelled because of wars and repression had the only chance to survival to renew their knowledge of sheep-dairy farming above the production line in the mountains. While they were looking for an unsettled land, they got into the areas with worse climatic conditions in the north and mainly in the west of the Carpathians. With their farming system and in their geographical isolation they could not utilise the market and they completely lost their social base that shepherds in other mountains had.

Social conditions made them to social adaptation being surrounded by consistently feudalised market society. From a cultural standpoint generations of these ethnically varied groups assimilated on the basis of their common lots and created from a cultural standpoint non-definitely formed population in contact zones. Subjective provisional arrangement of these people's lives became final.

3. DWELLINGS

All national synthesis proved that the courtyard, ground plan forms and a construction of the house built in the Carpathians come out from the traditions developed in farmers' environment. It is possible to see the roots of their architecture in an agricultural culture of lowlands, and a social adaptation of dwellings for mountain conditions. Even though identical basic elements can be found on the whole territory, for example a three-unit ground plan of the house, still there is a number of peculiarities that are bringing to our attention cultural relations to other parts of Europe surrounding the Carpathians, as well as common features that are characteristic just for the mountain area.

a) Courtyard

Marking of the courtyard, living house location on its area and setting of outbuildings shows in the Carpathians the same forms that are known from other parts of Europe. In the areas where the settlement was sparse with scattered settlements or a free chain of nest-like settlement, the courtyard is not exactly delimited. The stronger is the link between the house and a road, and neighbouring houses, the more delimited and closer courtyard creates a settlement. Let us imagine the large scale of courtyard typology and we will see its link-up to municipal urbanism. The courtyard lots are completely built up only in bigger provincial towns. They have a covered-in, narrow gateway at the back and entrance walls with an eaves orientation covering the total width. This is a *three-side courtyard* type with a hook-shaped ground plan of the house in the L-shape. The same form, even though only ground floor one, can be found in neighbouring villages. Urban architecture marked village organisation most of all in the Morava Basin (CZ, SK, A) as a result of a new construction development after a thirty-year war in 17th century. Later this process influenced mainly town suburbs and provincial towns and villages surrounding them in Hungary, South-Western Slovakia, Transylvania and Banat (RO), Vojvodina (YU), Slovenia (HR). It follows up with the village urbanism in Northern Burgenland (A) and Low Austria that had similar building traditions as Moravia (CZ) and Western Slovakia. The further we move a head from the Central Danube Basin north-eastward and eastward the wider and less built-up courtyards can be found. In villages situated in valleys of the Western Carpathians (SK), in the centre

of Transylvania (RO), in South Slovakia and in Dunátúl area (H) the houses are constructed with their gables orientated towards the road that was going through the whole settlement. Such settlements had narrow, long courtyards situated along residential and outbuildings with sheds, at the back the courtyards are closed with barns. Such courtyards can be wider; they can also have outbuildings along the opposite side of the house and a granary at the entrance to the courtyard that can be closed with a gate.

The nearer the Carpathian curve was, the further the courtyard was from the road. And the position of the house from the courtyard edge. There are more house with an eaves entrance side facing the road. The reason cannot be seen only in geographical conditions but also in a state and landlord regulation. It was enforced after a steep population increases in 18th century. Since the peak of the Middle Ages till this period the country was being depopulated and devastated by troops as well as by the landlords levying money and payments in kind from their subjects for their war crusades and construction of new fortifications against the Turkish threat. The result was neglected fields, poverty, hunger and pest, and cholera epidemic. So the consolidation in the sphere of livelihood in villages and general economic situation in countries of Central Europe urgently called for centralised control. Modest beginnings concerned fire regulations predominantly in Austrian monarchy. Their inconsistent application depended on the authority endeavour and interpretation. Adaptations of courtyards presented lime and willows planting outside houses [...]. The fire regulations determined safety distance between buildings – that was 18 feet (5.69 m). Another patent – Theresian land-register from 1767 – in contradiction with the last mentioned regulation demarcated the area for building in a village. It was impossible to build outside the area. This resulted in permanent generation division of courtyard lots lengthways until the courtyards was divided into such narrow belts that a cart could hardly go past the house and so other generations were building their small dwellings behind their parents' standing in front at the road. A density of the building in strongly grew up. The enforcement of safety distance was successful in Halič (Galicia) and Bukovina and in the upper Tisa Basin.

Besides the settlements focused with *hook-shaped courtyards* and other combinations of *three-side* up to completely closed *four-side courtyards*, the settlements that were located more freely, created a development of their courtyards in a pavilion form. For individual residential and outbuilding functions two independent buildings were constructed in *a row position* along the longer side in one line one after another, in *a parallel position*-facing each other, or creating a *three-parts* or *four-parts courtyards* with more buildings along yard sides. Pair houses, mainly in the Eastern Carpathians, have eaves in the position facing the road, and in some areas their out buildings are located nearer to the road, and the residential buildings are situated further. The courtyard area rectified rectangular location of buildings and it was larger than the oldest known courtyard assessments of centralised villages. However because of irregularly shaped slope terrain, the size was adapted to actual conditions and so *a cumulative courtyard*

developed. Nest – like kinship clusters with built-in houses and sheds, stages formed by several generations. It was mostly applied in a scattered mountain settlement of the Western Carpathians in Valašsko (CZ) and Kysuce (SK).

For the eastern, southern, partly for central and for the whole area of the foothills large courtyards are typical. The entrance is always situated at the main road but the dominant house wall orientation does not respect this direction. The dominant is opened southward. That is the reason why in some valleys the houses are built with the eaves entrance side facing the road and somewhere the shorter side faces it. On the northern side of the Central and at many places the Western Carpathians (U, PL) the road often leads along the back side of the courtyard and a dominant wall (very often a gable one, esp. PL) is averted to face southward. Innovation processes from the half of 19th century influenced the house and courtyard orientation towards the road and it also caused its closing in denser development. The dominants were a street facade of the house, fencing of the courtyard and the gate and decoration expressing the social prestige which was put on them.

On the greater part of the Carpathians the courtyard was thought to be a sort of enclosure for cattle and a residential building. In a following stage an operational part of the courtyard was detached and it was linked with the entrance to the road. This division is typical for Moldavia, in Transylvania in Hateg region (RO) and other mountain areas. The back that occupied a courtyard part was usually utilised as a vegetable garden, an orchard and for cattle stalls. A small shed was usually built in the basic courtyard part and a hayloft under the roof, shed, pig shed, henhouse, straw pile and usually there was a basket with maize as well. In winter sheep – the most important animals – were put in the courtyard (in a barn on a threshing-floor or in a shed) or in the mountains. Majority of courtyards had also a summer kitchen with a bake-oven utilised for fruit drying too (this building was often used for retired people). The barn is usually missing in southern areas. There is only a place used for threshing.

The differentiation of functional courtyard parts gradually resulted in the formation of representative part between the road and the house entrance. Flower gardens, trees (especially lime-trees) and cult objects (for example crosses next to the entrance gate) were added. As the most advanced apportionment of the courtyard a Bulgarian one can be mentioned. In lowland villages as well as in the mountains the courtyard is provided with two entrances from two different streets, a representative one and operational one. The other parts of the courtyard are segmented from the same point of view.

A four-side courtyard in Europe is thought to be the peak of civilisation development (the origin is probably in the Upper Austria in 17th century) and its occurrence in the areas with the latest settlement connected with a construction of seasonal buildings by Carpathian shepherds provoked polemics concerning its origin. The majority of authors saw the reasons for the fortified settlement in climatic, defensive, social and ethnic conditions. It occurs in the Spiš areas (SK, PL), Hucul area (U) and in the

Southern Carpathians (Birsei, Hateg, RO). The base is created with a house and an adjacent courtyard that is surrounded from three parts by sheds, sheep-pens and huts so as the roofs would be linked. Also less perfect variations are known as a connecting of the enclosure part to the house through the framework, from the inner part roofed all over the area of sheds. Sheep and cattle were put in sheds during wintertime and when the weather was better they were in pens that was linked to the courtyard from the outside where heaps of hay and straw were situated. In the similar areas such a type as a seasonal form can be found with polygonal pen enclosure linked to the shepherd chalet. Polygonal courtyard and building forms are characteristic for grazing management cultures in the whole Mediterranean area, including the south-western part of Europe and they are frequently seen in other parts of the Balkan as well.

The forms of compact construction, whole linking up of all buildings, and having the unroofed area in the middle, defy from the conception of a pavilion courtyard that was typical in farming environment in the whole south-eastern part of Central Europe. They occur in the highest zone with a permanent population of the Carpathians, together with seasonal constructions and the settlement form originating from them, that were projected in a one-wing block. Various forms of shepherd log-cabin huts and their linkage with a pen or timbered shed belong to seasonal constructions. Sometimes the shepherd hut is substituted with timber chalet with a room and simple fireplace, that is separated from the cattles stable by an entrance room, used for keeping various tools, sheepfold, everything situated under one roof. The roof is very often extended to have other penthouses around the whole object. Such seasonal constructions with a free construction of unattached timber chalets and built-in walls gradually changed into permanent residences. Their future adaptation depended on the social conditions of their inhabitants. The living part was created after the separation of the hall from a central shed, that was after pasture cultivation and crop production, used for threshing, and shed entrance was constructed on the side facing the courtyard. The type of a courtyard was sometimes formed by marked-off area outside the eaves entrance wall, and it was called *an integrated courtyard*. Bloc building in the integrated courtyard can be found within the disperse settlement of the Carpathians from the west to the east, as well as in chain settlements in Lemko area (SK, PL), and along range paths on Slovak-Polish border in the Western Carpathians (PL, SK). The linkage of open and light walls of closed penthouses is characteristic there. As a result of the innovation influence of neighbouring areas with more advanced farming tradition, these construction wholes were separated to form a separate residence.

b) Floor plan

The floor plan of the house was always taken to be a characteristic feature of a culture of people of certain area. In ethnographical literature the floor plan became a point of reasoning in all theories ranging from an ethnic to functional and social one.

As soon as some of ethnographers tried to compare a floor plan in diverse areas, they had to face very complicated interconnection of many aspects. On the one side there were the reasons of floor formation that were simple civilisation development and its economic, social and natural conditions. On the other hand there was morphology of independently developing elements: interior zoning and its functional utilisation, heating system, solving of the inner house communicate system and other less substantial elements. Their mutual influencing resulted in local and period forms in countless variations. The problem of choosing substantial items and a necessary generalisation was a needful simplification to get an analysis outcome. However, besides the method of approach, it depended mainly on the number and choice of materials and their heuristic analysis. Majority of experiments to get more wide-ranging synthesis ended up in a rather narrow generalisation. Sometimes materials used as an illustration of the conception created according other sources was used as well.

Václav Frolec started to draft the chapter about a Carpathian house floor plan by comparing all given forms. The method he used was formal classification. Until the present such an amount of elements in a complicated structure has not been accepted. However the experiment that was prepared for a discussion has not been finished because of his death. The formal geographical typology of V. Frolec comprises 106 floor plan forms that issued from analysis of their occurrence and particular development relations in different countries. Although giving the attributes of representation of specific cultural areas to specific floor plan forms is controversial. However, a numeral comparison is rather interesting and it was a starting point for Frolec's conclusions.

Irrespective of reservations the table shows the fewest forms that occur in areas that are common for more, lowland farming societies in individual countries partly situated in the Carpathians and linked with the Carpathians and Danube. This feat indicates that from the abundance of forms in individual countries only a small part was shared by all of them. In all countries a three-unit floor plan with a main living room, entrance room and a chamber was reached. The development of the entire fireplace forms (under the chimney walled of bricks) finished in an entrance room or passage.

Grain-growing areas of the Morava Basin (CZ) after a Thirty Years' War, as well as a rich area of the Central Danube Basin (H, YU) after the Turkish withdrawal, were modernised their development through an evolutionary jump towards the most advanced forms. They were spreading owing to the innovative process through valleys towards the mountains. The end of the process in the settlement areas with a disperse development located very high in the mountains used elementary forms that were also typical for lower classes in nearly all the countries for a very long time. Correctly V. Frolec brought to the attention utilising of some innovative patterns of Carpathians and Balkan countries, because they were more advanced than the result of longer cultural development.

V. Frolec referred to the genetic coherence between the Carpathian chalet with asymmetric floor plan design. This is often linked with a narrow frontage type that

can be entered under the gable directly from the street. Polish researchers have been watching its development from the archaeological findings of the early Middle Ages. Then, a smaller part in the back of a rectangle room was separated by a screen, or a new room curtain, with the help of a light construction, was built to add the entrance part. Undoubtedly the principle of the gable entrance has its model in urban constructions. The occurrence of asymmetric form besides Galicia area can be noticed as far as the north of Mazurian area and its narrow frontage shape also reaches the area of Pomerania and other western parts of the country (PL). Kazimierz Moszyński considers this form characteristic for Poland and mentions its occurrence as far as Berlin in Brandenburg. He puts the question whether the form has survived since the earliest times, or was accepted in historical period. From the standpoint of the Carpathians we are interested in the origin of the process development not in the problem of cultural affect. In Bojko (U) areas, as well as in the area of Slovak-Polish borderland in the Western Carpathians, the asymmetric development starts with building a chamber in addition to the opposite side of the entrance room, beside the living room, not with the isolation of the living space. The chamber had a separate entrance from outside, not from the room. The house is not linked with outbuildings and its entrance room and chamber are rather narrow. Then they differ from the earliest building tradition connected with pasturing and living in disperse settlements, as well as from East European tradition with a symmetrical floor plan, large hall and chamber. In the form of Bojko (U) area you can see the connection rather with the tradition of the Southern Carpathians (roofed foundations walkway and the entrance into the two rooms from outside).

The north-south line of the building tradition force in the Carpathians has proved, besides others, the conception of closed and opened house space. For the inhabitants of Central Europe a house space is understood to be closed.

For example a roofed walkway is not taken as a part of the house construction, even though it serves for various working activities, as well as for relaxation (but never for sleeping). It is understood to be a part of the courtyard, as a pavement leading from the road to the door of the house. This space becomes a part of the house if it is separated from the courtyard by the fence, or at least by slight elevation – terrace pedestal, or by an almost closed corridor along the entrance side (e.g. arcade enclosure in the lowlands of the Danube Basin). Even in such cases an open entrance space in the Carpathian Basin is not understood to be an integral part of the house, as it is in the Balkan, Southern and Eastern Carpathians where it is generally spread. In higher areas of the north, in higher zones of the mountains it only occurs in Bojko and Hucul areas (U) and in Bukovina and Maramureş region (RO). In all Danube lowlands embanked foundations of a walkway are an important part of the construction. However it is elevated only a few centimetres above the surrounding courtyard terrain on the area that is limited by the roof eaves. Roofing is then a determination element of an open walkway entrance space. In the upper part of the Tisa Basin (U, RO) and in

Bojko and Hucul area (U), as well as in Oltenia (RO), the walkway along the front of the house is limited by the basis beams with posts or even wooden arcades. This is all richly decorated with carving in oak and ash wood. Roofed and enclosed walkway bank along the front of the house are utilised having rest (sleeping include) in summer time, dining and working activities.

Elementary forms, that were the origin of the floor plan development, created multi-functional space as the centre, out of which a three-unit house developed. In traditions of the farthest east part of the Central Europe it was presented by a living room with a bake-oven and fireplace, and in the Balkan (including Carpathian, the Danube Basin areas) it had entrance room with a fireplace. The development of the floor out of this central part resulted in separation of other rooms for specific functions: sleeping, food preparation, dining, other house working activities, keeping tools, storing agricultural products, temporary shedding of young cattle. Simultaneously with one-roomed and two-roomed houses in all Carpathian countries a three-unit floor plan developed in the Middle Ages. This one became a basic unit in the areas with earlier colonisation. In Balkan countries this unit was presented by a two-unit floor plan, although the third part was unroofed and opened entrance space before a doorway, and the starting point for the development of the upper floor. In the Danube Basin an independent entrance into each room from the roofed walkway was typical for this original form. In Central Europe a bake-oven with its mouth facing the gable wall, in Eastern Europe facing the entrance (opposite eaves wall). In Eastern Europe a large multifunctional entrance room was cold and it cannot be compared with genetically and functionally different entrance space of an asymmetric plan conception.

c) Vertical development

Sand river terraces provided suitable environment for an easy formation of earthen dwelling. Half-earthen dwellings and earthen dwellings were usually used in proto-historical period and as a temporary residence even later, in the Middle Ages, for example, at the time of town and village constructions or as a result of other reasons. In accordance with other views the half-earthen dwellings with an entrance neck are thought to be the origin of the construction of both medieval gateway house and granaries with a few floors being a component of a country tree-roomed house. In the lowlands of the lower and Central Danube Basin convenient climatic, soil and production conditions enabled the formation of a permanent earthen-dwelling tradition for country farmers and fishermen. All of them have common attributes: entrance space has got a function of a cellar neck, followed by a central room with a fire-place, out of which the wings comprising living rooms lead (usually with a stove) with chambers at the end.

The cellar concealed into the slope and also functioning as a pedestal for a timbered houses reminding of a tectonic function of a vaulted cellar ceiling in a municipal resi-

dence. Above the vaulting a kitchen with a heavy stone bake-oven was built. Country houses owned by farmers and built on a high pedestal in the mountains are usually of an earlier origin and they are considered as a product of modern innovation. Actual houses with an upstairs predominantly occur in the Western Carpathians and this is mainly residences of freeholders: nobility, the church authorities, miners, village magistrates. More often houses with a half-upstairs were seen especially in provincial towns. Their genesis originates from the connection of high room with a fireplace and a bake-oven (3–4 m) with a chamber upstairs (there was a large entrance room between them) and its upper part had a wall with a window facing the courtyard (somewhere with a gallery) uncovered by a pitch breaching. The same construction principal was applied in an exceptional architecture of eaves orientated house with an asymmetric floor plan that had originated in Orava (SK, PL) at the end of 17th century and spread among the farmers who got rich on a linen drapers boom. There was an elevated pitch of hipped roof onto the gallery over the whole eaves wall. The entrance onto the gallery from the space above the room led along the upper part of the room into the upstairs entrance to a two-storey chamber. However it existed till 19th century the archaic kind of a living room with an oven without smoke escaping, situated in the centre of the house. The principle of the connection of a living room, entrance room and a granary generally spread all over the southern at the foot of the Carpathians (CZ, SK), at marginal fertile lowland areas in the period of economic consolidation and agricultural intensification in 18th century. Later, when the height was not important any more, half-storey with a storing function enlarged above the whole floor plan of the house, and enriched a facade architecture at the places where the eaves orientation towards the house became quite common.

The form of a bloc two-unit house of the lower nobility, with its architecture reminds of the tower houses in the Western Carpathians, abandoned from the beginning of 18th century. In the period of Turkish wars they were built in the Carpathian Basin, the most popular are in the Balkan (*kula, cula*) where they had been preserved till the Middle Ages. Their fortification function ensured protection for the country nobility against the army raids (from Albania via Asia Minor up to the Caucasus). At the turn of 17th and 18th centuries these constructions developed into a bloc-storey palace with an entrance tower at its side, so the floor plan formed an L-shape (as late as in 19th century the tower was moved into the centre). The highest floor under the roof had an open terrace (a watchtower) called *cerdak*. They were spread mainly in Romania and became a feature of the architectonic style, named after Earl Constantine Brîncovaenu (1688–1714). The arcades presented a typical feature of baroque ornamentation with a rich relief. They belonged to the symbols of revival national movement and became an innovative source for an architecture of country houses. Commonly constructed houses in the Southern Carpathians with two rooms (living room with a fire-place and living chamber without it) and roofed foundations of a walkway were

started to be built on a log-cabin chamber situated under the whole floor plan. The peak of the tradition was the form with an enlarged half of the lower floor plan in front of the chamber or cellar. An open terrace (*foișor*) before an entrance room was formed above it. This terrace had a separate roof vertically linked to the main roof. The floor plan of the whole construction in an L-shape spread along the southern slope of the Carpathians from the Gorje area eastward to Buzău and Vrancea. At the same time the enlargement of the terrace was moving to the centre of a three-unit floor plan with an entrance room in the centre. In other areas of Moldavia northward the ground floor transformed into the shape of a built-in cellar. A low gallery formed the entrance portico in the middle. A Mediterranean house with upstairs and a roofed terrace was generally spread in the Balkan areas south of the Northern Kosovo border (YU) up to the area around Sofia and to the east off the river Iskar (BG). The innovation coming from the south did not influence the neighbouring Morava Basin (YU) and North-Western Bulgaria at all. They were the poorest areas of the whole South-Eastern Europe in 19th century.

d) Building material and construction

The reason that natural conditions provide the building material usage, is logic and unequivocal, but it is not completely correct. Nearly in all Carpathian countries the farmers could choose clay, wicker, stakes, stones or trunks of the trees in that area. It depended on traditions that were considered by certain society the most convenient. Only among the representatives of the society who were not so dependent on their neighbours, were increasing their requirements as for durability of the material and demanding certain time for its preparation. Their requirements also concerned construction complexity at using more tools not only axes. Different demands caused a division of large European areas according to the used material in a country building from the half of 18th to the half of 20th centuries. In the mountain area of the Carpathians wood was used, mainly softwood that could be easily worked. Although hardwood prevailed in forests. Such type of wood was utilised in lower southern areas. Even in areas of neighbouring lowlands where only clay and brick architecture was known, in the peak period of the Middle Ages timber architecture existed, (e.g. Haná and Slovácko, CZ). This type of architecture substituted even earlier light pale construction with wicker and clay at the time of territorial stabilisation of villages, which is connected with an introduction of three-field system. Application of various materials and constructions was also limited by social possibilities so it often happened that several types were applied. Some of them survived as a sort of existential anchor for the poorest people and some them can be evaluated as a modern innovative craze of the most powerful families showing their prestige to their neighbour.

The tradition significance was apparent in areas where the structure wood species has changed during past 200 years, for instance, using a fir which corresponded to the

original forest growth. In the second half of 19th century the houses were built exclusively of a spruce. Constructional elements characteristic for fir timber were further applied at the work with spruce wood. The oak decline from the mountains into lower locations in North-Western Romania. This meant that the spruce wood was the main material of 19th century used for building, in spite of prevailing beech woods. [...] An oak tree was generally spread on a larger area than in the second half of 19th century.

The demand of a high quality of house **foundations** is less relevant in areas with the latest settlement. Commonly we come across a simple putting of a flat stone under each house corner and somewhere the slope terrain was not even levelled. The reason for the terrain adaptation under the construction could have been humidity mainly in frequently flooded lowlands. In the Carpathian Basin and in the lower Danube Basin the foundations bank is piled up so as the house would be situated above the surrounding terrain.

If the house architecture in the Western Carpathians and in the Carpathian Basin presents the construction whose walls support the roof and everything that is joined is linked with the roof itself, then in the Southern and Eastern (with all adjacent lowland areas – RO, YU, H) and partly in the Central Carpathians it is different. There the roof is supported by three, two or sometimes only one house wall and posts under the eaves. The roof here means mainly the construction of a rafter. Its bearing foundation is formed with the wall plates. Such houses are low; an inner height of a room is only 200–240 cm. The marks of the tradition presented by high rooms without smoke escaping off have not been revealed. The constructional system however indicates the genesis linked with *the post or forked post of clevis construction with wicker-work and clay plastered walls*. In the lowlands forked post construction has been preserved. Its main forked posts support the ridge plate (ridge purlin) and the pitches are suspended on them. In houses where clay walls completely substituted older wooden (timbered) and wicker walls, pillars situated at the wall were constructed to support the wall plates and all roof frame. This was provisional comeback of old technique and the reason was the frequent occurrence of floods. Owing to constructional joining of wall posts with horizontal sill beams and wall plates, a frame system filling with wicker and clay originated. After the suppression of the clay-frame techniques which predominated and were strengthened, frame-work technique originated. They occurred on foothill plateaux of Muntenia, Moldavia, and Central Transylvania, and on the left bank of the Tisa Basin (RO). An apparent linkage of frame-work is to the southern areas of the Balkan (BG, YU, MK), where it was generally used as a traditionally original construction.

The timbered **construction** in Central and South-Eastern Europe is thought to be an asset of ethnic groups coming in the first half of the first millennium from North-Eastern Europe, predominantly Slavs. The construction originating from the combination of sticks, branches and clay was in developed in proto-historical period in European and Asian part of the Mediterranean region with pasturing cultures,

including those who got into the centre of Europe. Modern Antique development in this area supported usage of the stone as a building material. The stone together with the pole frame became a part of a frame-work construction. With **clay constructions** we consider the mud-wall technique to be a basic one provided wood shortage. The clay was mixed with a bigger amount of cut straw or some other natural material, and layer after layer the material was with pitch work put down on the prepared ground and was trodden. Sometimes *the moulded roller shape drying bricks* were made from this material and put into rows, and sometimes also in an ear-like pattern known from the antiquity (*opus spicatum*). The technique of rammed earth into the shifting coffer and unbaked brick-work (bricks dried in the sun) is of rather later origin.

The **log-cabin construction** was widely spread in the Carpathians and also reached areas in the north inhabited by Slavs and further Scandinavian Peninsula and Alpine areas with predominance of German speaking inhabitants. Even though the log-cabin technique provided less constructional options for joining walls, solving the openings etc. And although its material was more vulnerable than non-combustible clay and stone yet it was preserved in the area where still the forests existed. All this was done in spite of state regulations of majority of countries. The researchers saw only a development difference in gradual floor plan segmentation among simple one room log-cabin and complicated systems of mutual log-work. In the Carpathians, however, you can notice the fact that some constructions with more complicated floor plan are a complex of log-cabins bearing one common roof and walls among them situated into pillars. Such a *free construction* is a sort of puzzle that requires not too perfect projection thinking, because every part is timbered from the same elements and independently. A different technique must be applied with a *joined construction*. The carpenter must think over the solution of the joints of all walls in the whole floor plan and specify preparation of many different elements in advance. The occurrence of a free construction in the living house construction is supposed to originate in the period of formation of a three-unit floor plan that was developed owing to the connection of a living room and a chamber via a hall. In recent materials you can find this type usually in the most distant mountain areas with the shortest building tradition. There the process of projection development had to start from basic elements. This can be found predominantly in the Western Carpathians and in the areas where seasonal and temporary settlements turned into permanent ones but it was not before 19th century.

The research conclusions of medieval archaeology in Czech prove the fact that two log-cabin united with a roof over the hall differed a lot. The living room with a smoking fireplace was very high and provided a horizontal location of basic roof-beams on the walls, the height of the back log-cabin wall had to have the same height. This part however had below a half-excavated space with a narrow entrance and a chamber with upstairs with a function of a granary. This paradigm, in Bohemia and Moravia known since 13th century, was handing down till 17th century and developed into larger scale in

accordance with requirements of the common life of a number of members in a farming household. The second chamber was built in addition (beside a big living room for pensioners as a habitation), and the firs at the back were used for storing food, and upstairs chambers had a function of bedrooms. The elimination of the dirty smoke effect in the living room and a social decline since the second half of 17th century caused handing down of all the same construction, but its content was different. It gradually adapted to new conditions: the archaic room with an opened fire turned into a living room without fire, the entrance room or passage area lessened, and its back part turned into a kitchen, chamber part was divided into a storing chamber and living one, and a chamber in the upstairs was still surviving. The existence of this type was occurring in some mountain areas of the Western Carpathians (CZ, PL, SK).

Emphasising of special importance of the archaic room with a bake-oven and a fireplace in the area with a spread of a free construction was apparent even at one-storey three-unit houses. Their three-metre height was reduced to a sort of norm – 240 cm and narrowed before the construction started to be joined. In areas where the tradition of a bound construction was older (e.g. Liptov area, SK), the house doorway was located in the middle of a courtyard wall of the entrance room. This was common for constructions walled of stone or brick. In the Southern, Eastern, and partly also in Central Carpathians the height of all house units is the equal. The size of rooms does not differ very much (only in Northern Moldavia – RO and Bukovina area – RO, U, a living room is larger than anywhere else), but in average it is much smaller than in the Western Carpathians. The main living room seems not to be there as a controlling principle in the house construction with a determined roof and other parts construction. The covering construction with a built-in living space seems to be primary.

The roof type in a mountain and predominantly foothill zone of the Carpathians is the most unified. In the studied material only a hipped roof occurs. If gabled roof with a small gable or a half-hipped one occurs, it means that such types originated from a hipped roof by putting the architectonic vista point onto the gable wall (The Western Carpathians, PL, SK, CZ, H), or was influenced by a generally spread gabled roof (Hucul area, U). In adjacent lowlands in the Carpathian Basin (H, SK, U, RO, YU) and the lower Danube Basin (RO) a gabled roof type prevails. South off the Danube (YU, BG) only a hipped roof is known although very low and with a different roof construction. The reasons of this differentiation have not been revealed yet. Archaeological sources in all areas prove king-post roof that somewhere survived in a more accomplished form with both gabled and hipped roofs. However it is more functional with the posts constructions with light walls in contradistinction to heavy log-work that could support chevron rafter construction. According to the development analysis of a hipped-roof type towards a gabled one, the changes were caused by a gradual downfall of the disperse settlement of free courtyards with an eaves orientation of the main wall to the south and by focusing of a younger denser development into regular

courtyards to the valley road, and their gable wall was orientated towards it. This was going on Slovak-Polish borderland in the Western Carpathians in 19th century. Also a location of a pair of windows of the main living room moved from an eaves side to the gable one. A similar process apparently took part in surrounding town areas and in every place where the street development, for example around the centre of Transylvania (RO) and in marginal areas of the Tisa lowland (RO, H, YU). In areas enclosing Transylvanian Basin from the west the roofs were extremely high in compare with a house wall – 3:1, with a straw thatching piled up freely (*on the heap*) on lathing and branch rafts into a thick layer. In majority of all Carpathian mountain areas the wall and roof height proportion is 3:2, and towards the lowlands the hipped ridge is decreased to proportion 1:2 in the lower Danube Basin, Dobrodgea and Southern Moldavia. In the mountain joint of the Eastern and Central Carpathians (U) the proportion ranges between a high and middle roof types.

The houses, that had an roofed foundations of a walkway as an open living space, had the entrance side (sometimes even a lateral wall) with a roof basic frame leaning not against the wall, but against heads of cross walls plates, far led outside the level of the entrance wall. Under their ends on pillars another bearer, called *fruntar* (RO), was put parallel with wall plate. It is considered the most important constructional element of architectonic vista point (eaves courtyard facades). It is extremely strong and decoration is focused on it. Together with posts they sometimes form arcades. Even in lowland areas with clay architecture, where all wooden elements are weak and less valuable. The bearer – *fruntar* is always emphasised.

The introduction of non-combustible tiling led to the requirement of strengthening and lowering the roof, which was done the same way as in majority of Balkan territories, where the system of half king posts with a ridge purlin were extended. The biggest abundance of the forms is presented in wooden roofing. Originally it was used only in a mountain zone and it excluded, however the straw piled up into heaps and thatch far into lowlands, where local better reed thatching was constructed. Wooden roofing occurs in the form of chopped wooden plates and shingles with a blade and a gain. The wooden plates in the Eastern, Southern and partly in Central Carpathians seem to have been an original roofing to 18th century when they have been substituted by a shingle, that was spread in towns all around Europe in the Middle Ages. Long planks (80–100 cm) were used especially in Mărginimea Sibiului, Alba, Hateg and Maramureş regions (RO), even on extremely high roofs instead of straw or combined with it.

This way of construction that was known from Northern Carpathian slopes (PL), where the straw thatching had got far into the mountains. A shingle, generally spread in the Western Carpathians, forced out straw and wooden plates roofing in the Central Carpathians and Transylvania. Many workshops were producing them in the area of Argeş and Birsei (RO), and decorative shaping was typical for them. Straw thatching survived in the Central Carpathians as the longest (SK, PL, U) until 20th century.

Maybe the least the shingle was spread in Bojko area (U). Roof tiles in the 18th century forced out the shingles off the roofs in centres of towns. They were one of innovative elements of the industrial period and in 19th century peasants could buy them only in richer lowland areas of the Central Danube Basin (H, SK, YU, RO), later in the centre of Transylvania (around the towns Sighișoara, Brașov) and in Muntenia (RO).

Many authors were interested in **heating furnishings** in the Carpathians. The base of it was an oven for baking bread and a hearth situated outside its mouth, where the food was prepared. The bake-oven with a hearth, according archaeological findings and archive evidence, was originally situated in an archaic room. However, as a result of spatial differentiation of functions in a house and its cultivation, this system was gradually substituted by more perfect ways of food preparation and heating the house. On the contrary from a mountainous zone in the Carpathians in the lowlands, the bake-oven was separated from a hearth as soon as in 15th century. At first its body in the living room was turned with its mouth and hearth to the entrance room (stove-oven). It was gradually changed into a sort of blind stove. In some regions a bake-oven was moved to a position beside the house into the back garret, but with its mouth still situated in the entrance room (H, YU). In the lowland Danube Basin (SK, H, YU, RO, BG) the bake-oven was built in the courtyard as soon as in 18th century, and in 19th century it became a part of a summer kitchen that was utilised for fruit drying.

The separation of the hearth and oven can be discussed from a geographical point of view as the result of climatic conditions. In recent materials an approximate line of its southern boundary of the oven with a hearth and a wooden pipe for a smoke escaping in an archaic room can be led: from the Matra mountain (H) to the area of Felső Tisza (H) through the valley of the River Someș (RO) to the Călimani mountains, and to the sources of the Mureș, and through the upper Oltenia to the border of Birsei area, and to the sources of the river Buzău and, further along the Southern Moldavian border as far as the estuary of the Prut (RO). Southward from the border in the Southern Carpathians (Western Apuseni and Bihor Mountains included) the hearth was preserved till the half of 19th century and then substituted by blind stove. This hearth has on Transylvanian side of the mountains a character of a stove hearth with a prism smoke escaper. This escaper sometimes closes the whole fire space. In Oltenia the hearth usually lies on the ground or on a low pedestal, and light smoke wooden pipe is hanging from the ceiling. The southern form usually relates to an entrance room functioning as a kitchen [...].

The oldest type of clay and arched oven used to be improved with bowl-like tiles and later with stonewalling. The changeover from baking to the only heating caused a change of shape. It was a vertically cylindrical and later prism shape. Conic arched ovens are typical for the Carpathian Basin (H) as early as from 16th century. The innovative process spread them far into the mountains of Central Slovakia as far as Liptov area and adjacent Orava region (SK) or through the valley of Mureș up to the edge of

the centre of Transylvania (RO). A prism shape of stone oven prevails in a mountain zone of the Western, Central, Eastern Carpathians and Northern Transylvania (RO). On the southern slopes of the lower Danube Basin in the second half of 19th century majority of ovens was built outside a house and a clay bell was used for baking bread. In lowlands during the pre-recent house development, all the processes linked with heating and smoke-escaper were put into the entrance part of the house. Regarding a necessary fireplace isolation, the entrance space of the house front part, that was improved and walled, were widened, later changed into the broad chimney, vaulted over the whole back part of the entrance room, with a function of a kitchen. Three walls and a strong oak beam running through the centre of the room supported the chimney. Out of this beam a later barrier was developed with a big barrel-vault opening (from the lower Morava Basin – CZ, SK- via the Central Danube Basin – SK, H, YU, RO – and the lower Danube Basin, including Dobrodgea – RO). There sometimes (especially Bărăgan, RO) the walled space is under the chimney restricted into the corner of a big penthouse in which very dusty fuel was stored. This fuel comprised dry manure or plant tops. It was used for heating blind stove in adjacent rooms. The origin of the last mentioned forms is sometimes linked with the oriental influence on the coast of the Black Sea.

The bake-oven without a smoke escaping is thought to be a cultural and historical relic typical for the Carpathians that influenced a building construction. Still in the half of 20th century in western (Těšín – CZ, PL, the Central Váh Basin, SK) and central parts (Lemko and Bojko area – SK, PL, U) of the mountains the archaic rooms with a fireplace occurred. These rooms disappeared in other areas as early as at the turn of the late Middle Ages and early modern period. The downfall of the fuming activities is marked by the turn of the mouth into the entrance part of the house (with a separated so-called black kitchen within it) so that the living room (now a clean living room) comprised only an oven body functioning as a stove. In the mountain zone of the Western Carpathians (CZ, SK, PL) they came to a compromise by using a smoke pipe fixed over the hearth in front of the original mouth of the oven in the archaic room and escaping smoke off over the ceiling into the under roof space. Smoke-pipes were also a part of black kitchen cultivation. Their construction in some regions turned into a wooden chimney (framework with wickerwork and lined with clay) and escaping smoke over the roof and finished with a sort of shelter.

From Lemko area (SK, PL) towards the east the smoke pipe functioned in the archaic room as a concentrator out of which the smoke was escaped via a prism fume pipe into the entrance space, where it got under the open basket-shaped chimney escaped out over the roof. Both the ways of the smoke carrying out from the room hearth are known from the Eastern Carpathians, from the Hucul area (U) and Maramureş region up to the Vrancea (RO) in the south, from both sides of the mountains.

Location of a prism oven in the archaic room with its mouth facing the gable wall of the house is a part of spatial regularities that had a great importance in the system

of immaterial culture. This orientation is logic in houses with the vista point situated in the gable wall. It occurs even in such places where a courtyard eaves wall with all room windows in it dominated. Only the Bojko part of the Carpathians (U) is touched by the way of an oven with the mouth facing the eaves wall under the windows. It is a characteristic feature of building traditions in Northern Europe and eastern areas inhabited by Slavs.

Heating system is the most changeable element of the dwelling. Its form adaptation responded to changing economic, social conditions and to changes in a family structure faster than other parts of the house. We find again that the simplest relics were surviving in the North-Western Carpathians. The points at issue show the most substantial differences in a north-south polarity. The changes of the fireplace are sharply expressed by the innovative tendencies supported by a state fire regulations in 18th century that tended towards to centralising, of activities linked with fire and to vertical escaping of a smoke out of rooms with a stone or brick chimney. This resulted in having a clean living room with a blind stove. It is easy to see the development models in towns where the idea of the central house part as a kitchen with a chimney was formed. That is reason the design with an open fireplace in the archaic room was considered provisional. You can see that people in the Western, Central and partly also Eastern Carpathians developed this sort of heating system during a long and difficult cultural processes in the own way. But all Mediterranean population (Balkan one including) used this solution at the times where a permanent settlement of the Carpathians had just started.

4. The way of living and a household

The answer to problems connected with the forms of the way of living is in studies of many authors discussed only as to the description of interior furnishing and its function in an everyday life and a man's artistic feeling. Our synthesis contributes to the explanation of larger complex of complicated relations that influenced the changes in utilising of functions and form adaptation. Model situations differ from the reality according to the position of an individual among the others who lived under one roof. The basis of a residential unit is a family. The insight in the family life is necessary for understanding the importance of human dwelling. The expressions that are connected or divided by the way of dwelling usage according to its filing into a certain family and residential group must be differentiated: family and its form (family unit), household (producing and consuming unit), farm seat (unit of property rights and economical unit), dwelling (a residential unit). The change in social conditions also modified man's chances and led to the adaptation of traditional behaviour. In pre-industrial and industrial periods the process accelerated. At the turn of 19th and 20th centuries one family created one household based on the ownership of one seat and living in one house. Relics with more related families within one farm-yard or in one dwelling were somewhere preserved longer and in a more complete form (e.g. in the Balkan

areas) and in other places they succumbed to economical feudalisation, capitalising of the society long before this and the rights of succession (especially in the Western Carpathians and in the Carpathian Basin).

a) Household and family

The synthesis of Chapter VI that was written by Ján Botík is a detailed summary of information about a model development in a family structure and its relation to the settlement and a household, about the ways of living in different house forms. The author wrote his text before the collections of the Cambridge group got into our countries. They explained until then not studied views of a family and its functional links. They focused on European division according to fundamentally different cultural spheres: a) eastern and southern one with an extended family pattern, b) western and northern one with a nuclear family pattern. The border was accurately led from the middle of French coast to the Northern Italian border as far as Trieste, and from there the approximate line led towards Russian Petersburg.

The law of succession influenced a lot the settlement development and the family structure as well. Byzantine law created a system of real division of property after the death of the settlement representative; Roman then created a patriarchal principle. It created an ideal division of property linked with the institution of a retired people separation. A young generation could inherit during the life of retired farmer. Byzantine system preferred then a free biological family development with a self-subsistent in kind on the contrary from Roman one that preferred production provision for market economy. Both systems mingled on the border although Byzantine one gave way to the Roman one. For a real long-lasting border can the former Austrian-Hungarian border be considered (A: H, CZ: SK, PL: SK, Halič: upper Tisa Basin). The norm introduced in Hungary in 1514 reckoned with a real property division on the contrary from Bohemian kingdom and Galicia where an ideal division of farm property with a dwelling for the retired was pushed forward. The entire application of these norms depended on the conditions in an individual social environment. Given conceptions were rather deformed in the Carpathians. In the period of population decrease in Hungarian kingdom also a big families they disintegrated resulted in settling of empty farms by individual families of separated sons, which laid the tradition for the ownership of individual families. On the Czech side inheritors of mountain settlements were not often able to give the dowry to brothers and so they went on living with them waiting for their part. In a parental house a number of relatives lived according to the western system so the size of a residential group was the same as in eastern big families. Their structure was however substantially different. In the east it was a biological and natural state of things, in the west it was rather an artificial conglomerate of incomplete families and individuals that had the right to live on their father's land.

There was the least information about Romania. Only not long ago A. I. Ciobănel gave the characteristic of a residential unit as the individual family sometimes temporarily enlarged by a young couple until the first child had been born. In accordance with the customs of succession in Romania the youngest son looked after his parents until their death and the house belonged to him. Other sons separated their dwellings and production into their individual households with a courtyard. Until the division of the land by the oldest son after their father's death everything was common.

Prerequisites for an individual family development can be seen from the period of feudalisation up to the division of the commons, where an individual tax duty was required. In Southern, Eastern and Central Carpathians it was probably from 17th century. In the Western and partly in Central Carpathians as well as in areas with German and Hungarian settlements it had been done earlier. The features of big families were longest preserved in the areas settled by Serbians (YU, South-Western RO, Southern H) and other parts of the Balkan (West BG, MK, AL, BH), where the whole community lived in a dwelling with at least two rooms, and living chambers were added later. The typology of Botik then suggests that the tradition coming out from the Balkan areas prefers a bloc design of the residence of enlarged families. Carpathian traditions then prefer the pavilions coming out from stronger social stratification: associated house forms for living of several relatives and non-relative families with a common courtyard. The bloc form is the nearest to the structure of municipal dwellings and proves the oldest roots within the Mediterranean area.

b) Residential function and house furnishing

National synthesis of the Carpathian dwelling comprises comprehensive description of house furnishing and its functions. The form of fireplace is important for its character. With elementary forms we distinguish the areas with the oven spread (Eastern, North-Eastern and Central Europe), hearth (Southern, Western and North-Western Europe) and a stove (Southern Europe, in the Middle Ages the area northward from the Alps). Innovative processes cultivated these forms with various types of solving the smoke problem, e.g. by making new types of fireplaces. Elementary form of timbered archaic room without a smoke escaping is connected with a carpenter model of fixed furniture: corner benches, plank-beds, cupboard table, timbered base of the oven, shelves joint to door and window lintels, cross-bars and hanging shelves. The oven was heated only if it was baked for bread baking. Then the smoke cumulated in a thick layer under the ceiling (about 1 m) and then it took long to escape it out through the hole or a door into the entrance room and to the under roof. The upper wall parts were covered with tar soot and that is why the cult objects were put on the outer wall. After solving this problem and shifting some functions into other rooms of the house mobile furniture came to the stage.

The Mediterranean tradition spread into the Southern Carpathians the conception of the hearth used for cooking in the entrance room, a low (less than 50 cm) mobile furniture and utilising of an open space of the terrace or gallery for summer sleeping, dining, everyday socialising and working activities. Supposing the usage the oven for baking bread, this was often situated outside the house in the courtyard. The main room of the house was an entrance room-kitchen. The living room with its cult objects was a place of family ceremonies and having rest (low bed was situated permanently there). There usually no fireplace was situated. A stove hearth was characteristic for the momentary form between an archaic smoke-room and a clean room and had a form of a blind stove. This conception weakened most of all a prestige position of the main living room as it was considered from a social and spiritual point of view. It had neither a homogenous system of a cult place nor a table position. The Mediterranean interior conception touched the Carpathians, especially Dobrodgea, (except the village Lipovjans with Russian settlement in the north), Muntenia, Oltenia and Hateg (RO), Serbia (YU), with some elements also further to the north: in the centre of Transylvania (RO) a stove hearth is more important in an entrance room, in the South Moldavia – in a main room, in the Eastern Carpathians – in open-roof terraces.

The spread of Moslem traditions from Asia Minor into the Balkan areas and mingling of Osman empire influence into the environment of nobility and towns resulted in the introduction of fashionable life style represented with low furniture, including sofas, poufs and cushions, wrought mobile heaters, fireplace in a chimney, carpets on the floors and on the walls and other things. In houses with more rooms the parts for guests, men and women were separated. These forms can be found in some areas of Bulgaria, Kosovo, Metohija and provincial towns of Serbia (YU) and Macedonia.

The whole area of the Carpathian Basin is famous for a number of various oven and stove combinations. Early introduction of clean rooms without open fireplace meant also an early development of cultivated mobile high furniture decorated with paintings. The main living room was orientated towards the road. The cult place was moved from the corner opposite the oven to the eaves wall averted of the courtyard. The working activities in the house took part on the foundation walkway and in the kitchen-entrance room, ceremonies in the finery living room. In lowlands a specific life style was formed and it covered the whole area of the Central Danube Basin from the Morava Basin (CZ) via Southern Slovakia, whole territory of Hungary up to the estuary of the Morava (YU). It got through Carpathian valleys into the mountains. The innovation coming from the west of Central Europe (CZ, A, PL) can be defined as the influence of a dense network of economically developed towns concentrated at the foothills of the mountains. The tradition of a three-unit chamber house, whose living room was as early as in 15th and 16th centuries transformed from an archaic smoked room into a clean room, with an entrance room changed partly into a black kitchen with a fireplace and a chimney, was deeply rooted. In adjacent mountains

given changes came later, in more advanced areas in the end of 17th century (e.g. in mining areas of Central Slovakia) and on majority of the area not before 19th century (CZ, SK, PL), however in so called back mountains from the west up to the half of The Central Carpathians (CZ, PL, SK) elementary forms of dwellings with a furnace were preserved until 20th century.

Exceptional importance of the living room was preserved predominantly in the Western, Central Carpathians as far as to Maramureş and Bukovina (RO), from there it weakened southward. Until recently the principle of a cult corner with a table between corner benches, where the cultic statues and pictures were situated, was preserved. During another stage of interior cultivation the table was moved from the corner to the position between the windows of the dominant wall (in centralised settlement it was always a gable wall, in a disperse one it was usually an eaves courtyard wall), and in its centre there was also main cult place of the house. A high bed (about 70 cm) situated in the corner was cultivated into medium high mobile bed (about 50 cm), and very often another bed was put in the opposite corner. Textile stored box in rich areas were transferred into a chest of drawers and wardrobes. The furniture of the house, originally made by a carpenter, became a product of a professional joiners and painters.

Comparing the interior conception of the living room in different parts of the Carpathians we can notice that in the western areas the relics important for immaterial culture were surviving the longest (spatial polarity of the corner with a fireplace and cult corner). In spite of all modernisations in interior furnishing, this relation was most accepted in the furthest western and northern Catholic area (CZ, SK, PL).

Talking about fireplace, we have an oven for baking bread in mind as a symbol of a family society given by their common livelihood. The further south-eastward the more the cult objects and decorating elements laid in the room space. By decreasing of the bake-oven with hearth importance in the living room, the order of individual pieces of furniture was becoming relative. In the Southern Carpathians and in south-western parts of Transylvania (RO) we can even see a spatial separation of a cult space in a finery room from the fireplace for food preparation and centralising the family while dining into the kitchen entrance room.

Genetic origin of the entrance room in its elementary house form was multi-functional space, as well as the archaic room. But in such large entrance room the living functions were linked with economical ones. The house development resulted in a gradual separation of these functions into the entrance room, chamber, barn, sheepfolds and penthouse. The more we go southward where the Mediterranean tradition works, the more similar living and economical symbiosis are unacceptable. The entrance room has bigger importance with the presence of a fireplace and food preparation, including dining and family gatherings. Giving a name to the space is identified with terminology of the whole house and it is a genetic origin of the house development. It has a form of a kitchen-entrance room from the same start, the form

that occurred in northern part of the Carpathians as late as in the final stage. An entrance shared a communicative function with a roofed open space (terrace, gallery or walkway). Even this phenomenon can be compared with a roofed arcade outside the entrance of a municipal dwelling at the square. This form never developed in the houses of farmers in the Western Carpathians.

Historical origin of a multifunctional entrance room in the Middle Ages can be understood as a result of a functional restriction of the archaic room as dark and smoke-polluted, where it was impossible to do more exacting and sophisticated activities. The offer of the requirement increase concerning house functions was provided by municipal architecture. In the Carpathian towns you can find a lot of intermediate stage examples of classical form adaptation. Gateway or the entrance hall of the house, as well as a large country entrance room, provided their inhabitants with a number of activities – entertaining, ceremonial, working. From the end of 16th century the farmers in Bohemia felt ashamed for having an archaic room with an open fireplace. Probably it was used only seldom. The cult corner was not decorated with pictures then, they were situated outside and very often over the doorway. If we go with this comparison even further westward, then these functional relations developed fully in a hall-type house in Western Europe. There even higher integration of economical and living functions were done.

c) Ceremonial functions and decorating

In areas where people gave an exceptional importance to the main living room more ceremonies were held there. In their behaviour they kept more traditional customs. Their feeling to the native house was linked with family and property relations. Their longings, joys and fears come out of the way of livelihood, based on working the land, were the main motif of their behaviour. It depended on the will of the common male ancestor who controlled and ensured the production and its consumption. He was also responsible for the existence of his descendants. The rules for living in a house comprised hierarchy of requirements for individual groups and members of the residential unit. It was the most obviously shown at dining. We can give at least two model extremes:

In the Western and Central Carpathians (CZ, PL, SK, H, U) the most significant sitting-place in the cult corner was protected for the farmer and then on the benches around him set his sons, then daughters and his wife as the last one were sitting. Those who did not have a place at the table had meals standing. There was one chair at the table that was exceptionally for a guest. If the farmer had more sons then only men were sitting at the table and girls with their mother were having meals at the furnace sitting on low stools. Distant relatives were together with women and servants were usually somewhere outside the house or at the pavement in front of the house.

The table was worshipped as a place for putting bread (*Lord's gift*) and other meals. This symbol of protection from evils (*evil ghosts*) was very strong. The hierarchy worked

also with giving the place to sleep. The farmer did not often adapt the chamber for living even though the family enlarged. His only interest was to insure the place for sleeping for closest relatives. He had a bed for himself and his wife, benches for sons and the other children slept on the clay floor, ill and old people slept on the back part of the bake-oven. Single brothers and sisters, uncles and aunts and their children were a burden for his not yet paid dowry and that is why they were moved to provisional habitation.

In the Southern Carpathians dining etiquette did not have such strict rules as in northern and western parts of the mountains. It was given by wider possibilities of place for having meals (kitchen-entrance room, finery room, roofed terrace, courtyard). The people were having meals at a round table, squatting, on their knees, sitting on the carpet or on stools. They slept on several places, a terrace including. In areas, where extensive sheep-dairy farming was spread, majority of men were with their sheep in the mountains or lowlands and other family members left for the mountains in certain period of the year, to distant meadows and to do various farming activities in remote areas belonging to the settlement. The family was not together all the time as it was in the areas with prevailing grain growing and that is why they had different customs and habits linked with the dwelling. The separation of the cult space of the house into the finery room with icons from the place for dining weakened the importance of awareness and using protective magic practice relating to specific place in the house.

The residence model in the Western Carpathians (CZ, PL, SK, partly H) is characterised with an ecological type of socially degraded extensive agriculture with cattle breeding in the worst climatic conditions of the Carpathians with the influence of close market centres. There people could escape seeking their livelihood. The southern model (RO, BG, YU, and partly H) with its multi-production of agriculture, vegetable-growing, fruit growing, vine growing and extensive sheep-dairy farming in very good climatic conditions was the most stable because in the case of bad crop in some branches they could rely on the others.

There is another model – the eastern one – between the two above-mentioned models (U, partly: RO, PL, SK) with more intensive agriculture with prevailing grow graining, that is combined with cattle breeding in quite good climatic conditions. The oven for baking bread is typical for its house interior and the main living room is the most important part of the house with the cult corner in relation to the table there. Very strict etiquette is preserved there and many other customs. Very ceremonial behaviour survives here longer than in other places. Their way of dining reminds of worship in the church. The cult objects in the corner remind you of the altar and the dining table symbolized the sacrificial one. Their dependence on climatic conditions was the strongest in the eastern model with the highest stage of agricultural specialisation in kind. Surviving of various magic practice and customs cohere with it. They should have ensured prosperity and wealth for the people. That is why the cult corner had the biggest importance, and magic function was given to many parts of the house

and to various objects there, that are nowadays taken as decoration only. In places, where the fireplace innovation resulted in separation of the cult objects from dining and food preparation, the importance of the house in immaterial culture weakened.

In the system of handing down traditions the most important role is given to the motif of the sun. Towards the sun all important parts of the house are orientated – entrance side of the house – and the signs of the sun can be seen in all strategic places of the house: entrance portal, the main ceiling beam and the main beam supported the roof over the open entrance space (*fruntar*, RO). The other motif is a Christian cross, and a very interesting is a three-piece-cross symbolising the Holy Trinity. Then among other motives we can mention the tree of the knowledge, Adam and Eve, hearts, ropes (*screw*, *cat-like staircase*), snake (principle of togetherness), wolf teeth, bird etc.

Decorative character with the architecture is applied predominantly on the main wall. The most distinctive place of the house, where the decoration had a protective magic function, was its entrance; but also all the openings, corners, beam heads, eaves binding plates and bearing roof construction, posts, their lintel plates (*fruntar*) and all arcade elements of the arch. At the outskirts of the Western Carpathians (CZ, A, SK) and in the Carpathian Basin (SK, H, RO, YU) in the area of centralised (predominantly street) settlements decorations focused on the gable (the richest areas of Orava and Spiš, SK), windows, pedestal and walls. The influence of various rusticated artistic-style elements from the nearby towns and nobility residence can be seen on the gables of walled buildings (generally classicism, on Moravia side – CZ Art Nouveau, in the north of the Carpathian Basin – H, RO, YU empire-style).

The axe, chisel, knife and carpentry methods were used for wood modelling but also for woodcarving for decoration of made products. Angled edges, channelled line, gain cut were the main means for expressing of more complicated motives or script. The method of taking out the material from the surface was applied (predominantly in the Western and Central Carpathians), also even the method of taking out the surface and leaving the shape in relief (the richest areas Gorj, Satu Mare, Maramureş – RO, Hucuł, Bojko – U, Goral in the Tatras – PL and in the north of Orava – SK, PL). In Maramureş and in adjacent areas (RO) the carvings are done also in oak wood. The lower we get the more the carvings are substituted with colour toning and painting the symbols. This feature is visible in clay and stone architecture (wooden door, paneling of gables), this is mainly done in the area of Ukraine and in the lowlands of the lower and Central Danube Basin (H, SK, RO). On southern slopes of the Central Carpathians prevail brown tones (SK, U), on the northern side and North-Eastern Carpathians (U) blue and grey colours; in Transylvania blue, in the area of Sikuli green tones (RO). In the north of Western and Central Carpathians (U, PL) the rifts were filled with clay and painted with simple lime or with adding of the blue. In marginal area of the mountains around the Carpathian Basin putting the clay and painting the walls was spread. In the west and in the north of the Western Carpathians a custom of

lime-pasting on cut and hewn surface of beams and plates against humidity resulted in the occurrence of spots and patches out of which decorations at the turn of 19th and 20th centuries developed.

Paying attention to the way how decorations were created, we can follow its change from sturdy shapes in the west to contrast filigree detail in the northeast and the south, up to the lacy arcades in the south foothills and in the lower Danube Basin. Decreasing of significant decorative character in the south is accompanied by strengthening variety of colours in the interiors. The north-western part of Carpathians (CZ, SK, and PL) was the poorest as to the decorative character and interior furniture but fabrics used in the interior were predominantly dark. From the Lemko area eastward red colour was stressed and on the North-Eastern Carpathian curves the amount of fabrics with yellow-green-red-black combination increased. Southward off this area (even from Carpathian Basin) decorated bowls and jugs were an enduring part of a room decoration. In the Southern Carpathians more and more red-white-black combination prevailed.

Conscious traditional art production is a part of immaterial culture and is often linked with ethnic phenomena. If they are watched in lowlands they seem to differ in different regions as if a real source of their mountain modifications was their ethnic base. However, there is a material expression of shape changes and the whole form is given with more common attributes than those dissimilar. The changes that can be noticed along the whole Carpathian range occur on both south ethnic slopes at the same time. We are sure to find many regional and local dissimilar features in the interior in the same details although the people who handed them down were people from economically advanced areas having contacts with market centres. These innovations got to border mountains in the Carpathians only provided completely extraordinary conditions.

5. EUROPEAN CONTEXT

By studying individual Carpathian parts from the view of genesis of certain national cultures we came to the ideas of delayed development forms in connection with undeveloped economy in the mountains and their too early social decline. The way of getting their livelihood, as well as the dwelling development, influenced family togetherness and had to ensure all residential and economical functions.

By comparison of the form analysis occurring mainly in the Carpathians and adjacent Balkan areas approximately since half of 19th century we can see building culture development from a different angle. Earlier ideas of a faster cultural development in the western part of the mountains and in backward conditions in the east are proved to be incorrect. Much more substantial polarity occurs in the relation between lowlands and mountains, between the town centre network and entirely agricultural country environment and relations of the whole mountain range to the

earliest innovative source that was presented by the Mediterranean building culture in South-Eastern Europe.

1. The house forms in the Western Carpathians with the worst, as for the quality, evaluation of functional constructional aspects differ most of all from the continual development in the Southern, Eastern and Central Carpathians. Southern, eastern and partly central part of the area (for Bojko area) accepted comfort and punctual innovations in the Mediterranean areas via Bulgaria, Kosovo and Macedonia. Innovations accepted by a folk building culture from the western marginal part of the mountains were coming in late the period if deep social stratification accompanied with overpopulation and general pauperisation of the highlanders.

2. Cultural attribute of the Mediterranean area generally spread municipal urban conception of settlements and a courtyard, with the house with entrance roofed open living space, a vertical development of the floor, a chimney development of the spatial disposition: more living rooms concentrated around entrance room with a fireplace (kitchen space), spatial separation of food processing and dining from a finery room, and an oven for baking bread separated from the hearth. It created a finery room with an early form of cultivated fireplace (a chimney – fireplace, a stove-oven, blind stove). The Balkan road of the flow was direct and had more elements than the Alpine one. This one provided a country builder in upper Germany only with blind stove and a cultural area of privileged classes utilised it much more than peasants.

3. Changing entrance room function is characteristic for individual Carpathian parts:

- a) In the Western Carpathians an archaic room changed into the clean living room. The entrance room was smaller and its back part was transformed into a kitchen, it is then the place of vertical smoke pipe or a chimney.
- b) In the northern part of the Western and Central Carpathians the asymmetric house has a northern conception of a long house with an entrance room divided into a narrow communicative space and black kitchen with a fireplace.
- c) East-European development reaching eastern and partly central part of the Carpathians preserved its multifunctional entrance room without a fireplace and an archaic room with the oven for baking bread.
- d) In Southern Carpathians the entrance room is thought according to the Mediterranean conception as a room with hearth and food procession place, so the centre of the house on the same level as the finery room or sometimes even more important.

4. In the structure of an agricultural settlement relatively all compounding elements were equal. Sheep-dairy farming with a different residential regime was separated from other parts in the process of feudalisation commons. The most consistent process took part in the Western Carpathians and nearly vanished in the Central Carpathians owing to colonisation of the inhabitants of the Ukraine with a stronger grain-growing

tradition. In Balkan areas extensive sheep-dairy farming survived as a basic in the peasant economy.

5. Common features of traditional Carpathian architecture can be taken as the remnant of the national culture development which utilised earlier development forms in young and sometimes also temporary settlement. It was a heterogeneous unit as for the ethnic standpoint and homogenous as for the social aspect.

6. In the Carpathians a bloc conception mingles with a pavilion conception. Concentrated material proves that basic form development mingling with living and farming functions was cultivated via separation of living space into a special building in all areas. Only seasonal buildings (an archaic room – penthouse – shed) and their social adaptation into stable forms came back to the connection of the house and outbuildings under one roof. In the northern part of the Western and Central Carpathians (PL) North-European tradition of a long house in some regions (Liptov, Spiš, Gemer, SK) supported such tendencies, somewhere it was a concentration in one bloc, that caused a town innovation.

7. Specific point of multi-ethnic unit in a folk architecture of the Carpathians can be compared with other European mountains. The settlement in the Alps got into the highest locations in the Middle Ages and there were no other colonisations on the contrary from the Carpathians. Cultural zones in the Alps with a different folk architecture coincided with the spread of individual ethnic groups: Italian and Rhaeto-Romance people with walled building tradition and vertical conception, Germans with their Alpine forms of log-houses and frame-houses, French with walled or combined walled hall and their vertical conception, the main ethnic line in Swiss centre of the Alps is completely apparent in accordance with the different house form occurrence. In Scandinavia such a line runs along northern edge of Scåne in South Sweden settled and until 1658 controlled by Danes with a frame-work architecture different from Swedish and Norwegian log-cabin architecture. A similar situation can be noticed in the Sudeten Mountain area where the line between log- and frame-work architecture was taken as an ethnic one. The architecture of ethnical enclaves in the south had a completely different position, where it was originated their own specifications according to social adaptation not coming from foreign architectonic base. This happened mainly in economic development and a family and social structure coming out of it (e.g. Germans at the upper flow of the Oder – CZ, Nitra, areas of Spiš – SK, Mărginimea Sibiului and – Birsei – RO etc.).

8. The answer to the often asked question, *how far does the influence of so called European culture reach*, is not easy and cannot be answered on the basis of the folk architecture study. It does not enable to define the unit of so European culture. Only a frame-work construction does not get from the centre of the continent to its eastern margin and prehistoric conception of a hall house (in spite of the occurrence of a frame-work constructions even in the Balkan areas as the original ones).

In accordance with models of walled architecture the frame-work architecture has fulfilled all requirements of a man until now. This cannot be said about log-cabin architecture that was steadier, well heat-insulated, from the northeast covered majority of Europe and created there a three-unit house model that was later applied in all forms. So we should rely in our study of European culture on the problem of the most substantial innovative sources, the ways that they were spread and the reach of their action.

9. At last it is necessary to answer the question why the inhabitant of Central Europe nowadays considers traditional dwellings of the Balkan and Carpathians backward and less influenced by West European urban civilisation? Is it just illusion or it is possible to compare it with the conclusion of our synthesis? Besides Carpathian innovations also strong regressive processes acted. In South-Eastern Europe they had more and deeper reasons in historical development than in Western Europe. Damaging effects of raids and temporary changes during various migrations, wars in the Byzantine Empire (13th–15th centuries), interruption of economic development owing to the Turkish expansion (14th and the turn of 19th–20th centuries). The wars and the commons feudalisation resulted in mass migration from the land and proved as a mass exodus of the inhabitants looking for their lost living conditions in northern and western areas. They could never find them and had to adapt in much worse social environment than the one before. They were pushed to the edges of economic structures.

10. Not regarding given outer historical principles we consider a different formation of social culture, economy and social structures to be the most substantial differences in a cultural development of South-Eastern and Western Europe. In the sphere of the Byzantine influence the common law with a collective responsibility was supported and tolerated. It developed less structured environment with smaller contrasts between a village and a town. That is why everybody accepted the offer of the Mediterranean innovations and got into the mountains. European area with an individual responsibility in the market environment, giving birth to deep social stratification and contrast differences among the privileged and non-privileged enabled to take over and cultivate The Mediterranean innovations only for higher social classes. In the chain of social processes with the longing of the unprivileged to be independent and adapt some features of their models, environment of mountains and eastern distant settlements were not in the centre of the attention.

11. On the contrary from the valley conception in the Carpathian dwellings, the Balkan is characterised with the settlement of fertile and isolated mountain basins. There were created cumulated settlements out of kinship courtyards, both on plateaux and at the foothills or high on their terraces.

12. Some authors explained later cultural innovations through the influence of Turkish authorities and Greek builders. More detailed research however differentiates among development impulses: local, Mediterranean and Moslem (incorrectly called

also oriental). The regime of occupation of the Turkish Empire resulted in liquidation of local elite and slavery of inhabitants. Their resistance resulted in the genocide and exodus, which gradually created complicated ethnic mosaic in the whole Balkan region.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

A – Austria	HR – Croatia
AL – Albania	MK – Macedonia
BG – Bulgaria	PL – Poland
BH – Bosnia and Herzegovina	RO – Romania
CZ – Czech Republic	SK – Slovakia
GR – Greece	U – Ukraine
H – Hungary	YU – Yugoslavia

BIBLIOGRAPHY²

- Bo t í k J. 1974. Veľkorodinné zemnicové obydlie v bulharskej Božurici. *Acta Ethnologica Slovaca* 1, Bratislava, 49–71.
- Bo t í k J. 1998. Geografické, kultúrno-spoločenské a interetnické súvislosti ľudovej architektúry. In *Ľudová architektúra a urbanizmus vidieckych sídiel na Slovensku z pohľadu najnovších poznatkov archeológie a etnografie*. Bratislava, 67–101.
- Bo č k o v á H. 1988. Konstantin Jireček und die Kulturgeschichte der Südslawen. *Ethnologia Slavica* 20, 257–269.
- Bo č k o v á H. 1993. *Ethnische* Gemeinschaft und ethnische Prozesse auf dem Balkan im Werke Konstantin Jireček. *Ethnologia Slovaca et Slavica* 24–25, 225–243.
- C i o b ä n e l A. I. 1995. Reșenița maritală-contexte culturale, economice, juridice. *Anuarul institutului de etnografie și folclor* 6, 37–44.
- C i o b ä n e l A. I. 1996. Tipologia relațiilor de rudenie. *Anuarul institutului de etnografie și folclor* 7, 19–35.
- F r o l e c V. 1963. Sídla v sofijské oblasti v 19. a počátkem 20. století. *Sborník prací filosofické fakulty brněnské university* 12. Řada F uměnovědná 7, 117–137.
- F r o l e c V. 1964. Razvoj narodne arhitekture u jugoiztočnoj Moravskoj. *Narodno stvaralaštvo* 11, 831–835.
- F r o l e c V. 1966a. Příspěvek k moravsko-slovenským vztahům v lidovém stavitelství na území Bílých Karpat. *Slovenský národopis* 14, 293–326.
- F r o l e c V. 1966b. Stavitelství. In *Hornácko. Život a kultura lidu na moravsko-slovenském pomezí v oblasti Bílých Karpat*. Brno, 99–151.
- F r o l e c V. 1968a. Historické pozadí vývoje lidového stavitelství v moravsko-panonské oblasti. *Český lid* 55, 285–307.
- F r o l e c V. 1968b. Kulturní vztahy v lidovém stavitelství v Karpatech. *Slovenský národopis* 16, 169–201.
- F r o l e c V. 1969a. *Národopis Břeclavska*. Brno.

² Bibliography based on: J. Langer and H. Bočková. 1999. Literatura. In J. Langer and H. Bočková. *Dům v Karpatech a přilehlých oblastech balkánských*. Rožnov, 85–94. Editorial Office of Ethnologia Polona posted only those items whose authors have been mentioned in the text “House in Carpathians”.

- Frolec V. 1969b. K otázce vlivu kolonizačních proudů na vývoj lidového domu v Podunají. *Narodno stvaralaštvo* 29–32, 377–384.
- Frolec V. 1970. *Kulturní společenství a interetnické vztahy v lidovém stavitelství v Podunají*. Praha.
- Frolec V. 1970–1971. Směry a metody v evropském bádání o lidovém stavitelství. *Národopisný věstník československý* V–VI (2), 141–173.
- Frolec V. 1972. K problematice karpatsko-balkánských vztahů v lidovém stavitelství. In *Lidová kultura v Karpatoch*. Bratislava, 153–160.
- Frolec V. 1974. *Lidová architektura na Moravě a ve Slezsku*. Brno.
- Frolec V. 1976. Etnická teorie a interetnické vztahy při studiu lidového stavitelství. *Slovenský národopis* 24, 223–321.
- Frolec V. 1979. La maison rurale et la ferme comme unité sociale du parallélisme entre Slaves du sud et Slaves de l'Ouest. In *Etnografski i folkloristični izsledvanija*. Sofija, 85–90.
- Frolec V. 1980. "Kolibarská" sídla ve výhodní části Balkánského poloostrova. *Slovenský národopis* 28, 64–68.
- Frolec V. 1982. K interpretaci geneze trojdílného komorového domu (ve světle archeologických výzkumů na jihozápadní Moravě). *Archeologia historica* 7, 67–77.
- Frolec V. 1989. Zonální formy půdorysu vesnického domu v karpato-balkánské oblasti. *Národopisné aktuality* 26, 1–13.
- Frolec V. 1992. Das rumänische Bauernhaus im Kontext der mitteleuropäischen und südosteuropäischen Entwicklung. *Ethnos* 1. București, 26–34.
- Hoffmann-Krayer E. 1903. Naturgesetz im Volksleben? *Hessische Blätter für Volkskunde* 3, 57–64.
- Langer J. 1965. Lidové stavitelství severní části Oravy. *Zborník Slovenského národného múzea – Etnografika* 6, 23–59.
- Langer J. 1976. Interetnické vztahy lidového domu moravsko-slovensko-polské kontaktné zóny. *Slovenský národopis* 24, 266–278.
- Langer J. 1980. Stavební forma sezónních a stálých sídel v Karpatech z hlediska historického a sociálního. *Slovenský národopis* 28, 51–62.
- Langer J. 1981. K problematice vertikálního vývoje tradičního lidového domu v západních Karpatech. In *Lidová stavební kultura v československých Karpatech a přilehlých územích*. Brno, 131–143.
- Langer J. 1984. Čtyři zastavení nad karpatskou problematikou v práci Václava Mencla. *Národopisné aktuality* 21, 180–182.
- Langer J. 1992. Recentní doklady předrecentních tradic v Karpatech. In *Vesnický dům v 16. a 17. století*. Praha, 179–188.
- Langer J. 1994. Household-Social Environment-Ecotype. *Ethnologia Europae Centralis* 2, 43–55.
- Langer J. 1996. Discussion about the Family-Type between West and East Europe. *Ethnologia Europae Centralis* 3, 31–40.
- Langer J. 1997a. *Co mohou prozradit lidové stavby*. Rožnov pod Radhoštěm.
- Langer J. 1997b. Volná a vázaná konstrukce roubeného domu. In *Evropský kulturní prostor – jednota v rozmanitosti*. Praha, 150–159.
- Langer J. 1999. Úloha síně v polygenezi obydlí ve střední Evropě. *Ethnologia Europae Centralis* 4, 29–38.
- Langer J. and Bočková H. 1999. *Dům v Karpatech a přilehlých oblastech balkánských*. Rožnov pod Radhoštěm.
- Moszyński K. 1929 (1967). *Kultura ludowa Słowian* 1. Warszawa.
- Naumann H. 1921. *Primitive Gemeinschaftskultur*. Jena.
- Panaiteacu P.P. 1990. *Istoria Românilor*. București.
- Pražák V. 1941. Problém vzniku jednoposchodového domu v Čičmanoch. Pomer k domu německému v okolí Kremnice. *Národopisný sborník* 2, 23–71.

- P r a ž á k V. 1943. Príspevky k štúdiu slovenského ľudového domu. *Národopisný sborník* 4, 1–18.
- P r a ž á k V. 1947–1950. Valašský dům pod Makytou. *Národopisný sborník* 8, 189–220; 9, 68–161.
- P r a ž á k V. 1949. Vliv sociálně-hospodářského faktoru na vznik štítu v lidové architektuře. *Národopisný věstník československý* 31, 217–238.
- P r a ž á k V. 1958. K problematice základních půdorysných typů lidových staveb v Československu. *Československá etnografie* 6, 219–236, 331–360.
- P r a ž á k V. 1959. Příspěvky k studiu lidových staveb v bývalé německé jazykové oblasti při Kremnici. *Slovenský národopis* 7, 3–54.
- P r a ž á k V. 1965. K problematice vzniku jizby a síně v čs. obydlí a jejich vztahů k staroslovanskému a franskému domu. *Český lid* 52, 267–275.
- P r a ž á k V. 1966a. Vývojové epochy a stupně topenišť v českém a slovenském lidovém obydlí. *Český lid* 53, 321–348.
- P r a ž á k V. 1966b. Zur Frage der Entstehung der Stube und des Hausflurs im tschechoslowakischen volkstümlichen Haus und ihre Beziehungen zum altslawischen und altfränkischen Haus. *Národopisný věstník československý* 34, 49–63.
- P r a ž á k V. 1967. Vývoj typu lidových topenišť Čičmanech v rámci jejich obecného vývoje v Československu. *Zborník Slovenského národného múzea* 61 – Etnografia 8.), 31–81.
- P r a ž á k V. 1972. Der Einfluss der wallachischen Kolonisation auf einige wichtige ethnographische Erscheinungen in der Wohnweise des östlichen Gebietes der ČSSR. In *Ľudová kultúra v Karpatoch*. Bratislava, 161–166.
- R ö s s l e r R. 1971. *Romanische Studien*. Leipzig.
- S c h i e r B. 1932. *Hauslandschaften und Kulturbewegungen im östlichen Mitteleuropa*. Reichenberg (Liberec).

Authors' addresses:

Helena Bočková, Ph.D.
Brno, CZECH Republic
e-mail: 107057@mail.muni.cz

Jiří Langer, Ph.D.
Rožnov pod Radhoštěm, CZECH Republic
e-mail: juralan@sezam.cz

