

PARTICIPATION OF THE HOUSEHOLD IN THE EVOLUTION OF THE PIETROASA COMMUNE'S CULTURAL LANDSCAPE. TRANSDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH APPROACHES

Doctoral Thesis – Summary

to be awarded the academic degree of PhD at the

Politehnica University of Timisoara

Doctoral Field: Architecture

Author Eng. Alexandru Ciobotă

Scientific coordinator **Univ.-Prof. Arch. Smaranda Maria Bica PhD**

February 2021

1. THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH OF THE RESEARCH

There is a strong interest within my thesis in the connections between *household* and *cultural landscape*. Therefore, it analyzes the way *household* is inserted and develops in the *landscape*. *Landscape* is considered a testimony of the life and work of successive generations¹, character of which reproduces traces of past practices.

Importance of the Research

Its importance consists of the fact that analyzing the *household* captures the changes occurred in a *cultural landscape*. *Landscape* therefore becomes the result of a dynamic, continuous process, generated by the *smallest social unit of the village*². The *social unit of the household* is used as a means to study the connection in time amongst the habitant and the environment they live in.

As the villages in this study, mostly have a Romanian ethnic structure over the years³, aspect which has not been studied in detail in Banat, this thesis is significant for the researches on Banat's multiculturalism, which makes it worth it.

The study actuality consists of the fact that it analyzes the two vectors that influence the evolution of the *household* and determines changes in the *landscape* of villages: *social economic policies (ideologies, reforms, rules)* and the *cultural specificity (practices, knowledge, beliefs)*.

Study Objectives

- To outline the main political systems and ideologies which influenced the historical evolution of the *rural household* in Banat;
- The way the members of the group of inhabitants understand and relate to *household* and *landscape*. Relations among successive generations and within larger forms of social organization (neighborhood, village, region), the extent such relations contribute to the local character of the *landscape*;

¹ Tim Ingold, *The temporality of landscape* în *World Archaeology*, vol. 25, nr. 2, Routledge, 1993, p. 152;

² Răzvan Dumitru, *Gospodăria între vecinătate și rudenie* în *Sociologie Românească*, vol. 9, no. 1-4, 2001, p. 250- 266;

³ Varga E. Arpad, *Statistică recensăminte după limba maternă*, respectiv naționalitate, județul Timiș 1882- 2002, <http://www.kia.hu/konyvtar/erdely/erd2002/tmetn02.pdf> (08.01.2021);

- The way the *household* is built, operates and evolves as related to the *landscape*: technological flows within the household and beyond, various construction-related systems, present and past, the relation between household and the anthropic landscape;
- The importance of local agricultural techniques, of crafts and use of local materials in defining the household character and evolution in the *cultural landscape*. The extent local practices still exist in the household, the distribution of tasks for the members of the group, the specialization degree of each and every member, the relation between practices and the natural environment.

Studied Concepts. General Considerations

Household is used in this study as referred to the smallest social and economic unit of the village, domestic group of which keeps the previous generations in its collective memory, collaborates within larger forms of society (village, region), knows and adapts the policies of each and every historical stage, by using its own practices in interacting with the natural environment. Therefore, *household* has generated a specificity of the *cultural landscape*.

There is an interest within this thesis on the *cultural landscape*, as a dynamic process of successive generations. The text uses the term *landscape*, by considering it the result of a human intervention process which develops in a certain natural framework. *Landscape* is also interpreted from a physical perspective, of the traces left by local practices and by the way nature changed (deforestations, agriculture etc.). All such practices, processes and meanings are placed in this study within households, the two concepts being in a direct report (landscape-household).

Research Methods

By using the historical method and out of archaeological data, the notion of *household* in Banat has been put into an evolutive context.

The field research within my doctoral study employs the *data production interview*, used in *culturalist* studies, in the scope of sociology and anthropology⁴. *The semi-structured interview* was the work instrument⁵. The field study also involved the method of participatory observation⁶ and analyzed the productive, constructive practices as well as their temporal relation. Furthermore, *photography and field sketches and drawings* completed the data information which were impossible to be included in the wording.

Consulting maps and documents in the archives was also part of the research methods.

Dictionary of Local Language Elements. Units of Measurement Used in the Text

The local language elements in this study represent an important part of the cultural landscape which assists in local identity. To this effect, such information was structured based on the two themes of this thesis: *agricultural practices and construction-related practices* which have been described at large.

Place Object to the Research. Geography- and History-Related Classification of Villages

Research for the case studies was performed in the villages *Pietroasa*, *Crivina de Sus*, *Poieni* and *Fărășești* from Timis County. The area studied is placed in the north-east of Banat, Făget Area (*Țara Făgetului*), at the foot of Poiana Ruscă Mountains.

4 François de Singly et. al., *Ancheta și metodele ei: chestionarul, interviul de producere a datelor, interviul comprehensiv*, Ed. Polirom, București, 1998, p. 129;

5 Ibidem, p. 153;

6 Dorina Onica, *Peisajul cultural rural dintre Prut și Nistru. Aspecte etnogeografice*, Ed. Etnologică, București, 2017, p. 45

The villages being studied were first documented around 1514- 1516 (Pietroasa, Poieni and Fărășești) and 1501 (Crivina de Sus).

2. THE EVOLUTION OF THE HOUSEHOLD IN BANAT LANDSCAPE. ADMINISTRATIVE, URBAN AND LAND AND AGIRCULTURAL CONSIDERATIONS. BRIEF HISTORY

In order to better understand the evolution of the *household* and of the elements which had their role, with time, in defining such comprehensive concept, this chapter will deal with a historical and evolutive route, calling upon researches deployed on the territory of Banat.

Seeing that the periods still visible up to nowadays are those following the 18th century, this chapter mainly focuses on the interval between the modern period and present times.

Modern Period (1716- 1918)

Administrative and Social Considerations

Once the Austrian Administration set up in Banat (1716), the social and territory related policies have experienced radical changes which would generate variations to the *household* structure. The new policies applied will have an impact as well on the villages which are object of this study.

Organization and Evolution of Villages in Banat. Architecture of the Household

January 11, 1772 is the day the executive document “*Impopulationis Haupt- Instruction*”⁷ was first enforced. It was about laying out systematized principles for the development of new villages and for intervening in the existing villages.

On June 11, 1784, the Imperial Council by Resolution⁸ orders the compaction of settlements which developed, up to such times, organically⁹. The compaction process mostly applied to the lowlands but also had an impact on mountain areas, and particularly to the villages included in this case studies.

Sizing Principles of Households and Defining Their Heritage

A full household will be of 37 iugerum, but not all households can be equal, depending on the territory reservation. In certain cases, there will be halves and quarters of households. Therefore, it is about 3 types of households according to their size, all related to a full standard household (37 iugerum).

Considerations on the Household. Construction-Related Principles

The habitation of colonists will have two rooms and one kitchen and will be made of wood or mud, will be adapted according to the circumstances and materials available and to the size and shape of the other habitations in the area¹⁰. Certain construction techniques are recommended, so that the houses are built rapidly and with minimum costs involved. Such construction systems are still encountered in the area studied by this thesis. Starting with the 19th century, by using new construction materials (burnt bricks, tiles etc.), there is a lower risk of fire, seeing that house extension is a natural process during such period.

Land Related and Agricultural Considerations

Joseph the 2nd implemented, during his ruling in Banat, measures like the estimate of the complete size of population, the first military topographic survey (1769-1772) and the

⁷ *Impopulations- Haupt- Instruction für das Banat*, apud Anton Tafferner, *Quellenbuch zur Donauschwäbischen geschichte*, Stuttgart, Verlag Buch und Kunst Kepplerhaus, 1982, p. 251;

⁸ Ioan Munteanu, *op. cit.*, p. 103-104;

⁹ I. Boros, *Regularea comunelor în județul Caraș- Severin. 1784-1790*, Analele Banatului, 1930. ”spread, with no order or rule and settled at a distance of 3000 steps one from the other, and the largest part of the pastures extends in the empty territory between the houses, and therefore, even before getting to mow the grass, in fact, even before it gets to grow, the grass ends up under the wheels of carriages”;

¹⁰ *Impopulations- Haupt- Instruction für das Banat*, *op. cit.*, p. 255;

enforcement of the *Urbarium* (1780). *Urbarium* meant for Banat the clarification between nobles and peasants and the redefining of the land heritage of *households*.

*The Imperial Patent from 1853 with the decision of the Emperor to amend Law IV, on April 11, 1848*¹¹ meant the beginning of the taking into possession in Banat. The year 1870 have established, onto the whole territory of Banat, the land registries and recorder offices, which still have a role in real estate property records.

The Law for the Agrarian Reform in Transylvania, Banat, Crișana and Maramureș from 1921

Although there were larger numbers of the Romanians, out of the analysis of the distribution of rural-urban properties, they held a lower weight of real estate properties (24% urban and 59.5% rural), while the remaining land was owned by minorities. Such land situation is valid up to 1918¹². A greater weight is noticed for the households of 0-5 iugerum, not enough for assuring a decent living for the family.

The main purpose of the law is to create households with an average size (10 ha), the grounds for such law being *public utility*.

As an application mechanism, the land reform was subject of 2 steps, the State being an important part, as it was the provisory owner of all lands (*expropriation*) in order to subsequently *give possessions* to the peasants.

The Communism (1944-1989)

After the end of the Second World War, following the occupation of Romania by Soviet Troops and the pressures arisen with such fact, the government of the Romanian Labor Party was set up.

Such period witnessed a series of radical transformations which left their marks both on the way of production and on rural collectivization. For the studied area, the effects of such transformations entered by the communist state were not so dramatic like in other areas, as the reform measures only applied for a brief period of time or at all.

Land Reform

This step is actually a preamble of the radical agricultural reforming process in Romania, as it set it grounds on the eradication of individual property for the land during the collectivization process.

The enforcement of Law no. 187/ 1945 will *expropriate* a series of properties based on various criteria, most of them political¹³. The expropriation process in 1946 is declared almost ended¹⁴ and as a follow-up the peasants from poor households who own land with a total surface less than 5 ha can begin *taking possession*¹⁵. In the studied area as well, the fortunes of the *Grafs* were expropriated, parts of such fortunes being allocated in property of the locals (*P. household in Poieni*).

Land Collectivization

As related to the process of land collectivization, it completed the process of the private property disappearance of the *individual household* by forced association *into large agricultural cooperatives*, with significant social effects. And so, the unit once represented by

¹¹ Ioan Munteanu, *Banatul istoric 1867-1918. Ocupații. Economia*, Vol. II, Timișoara, Ed. Excelsior Art, p.182

¹² Mircea Georgescu, *Reforme agrare. Principii și metode în legiurile române și străine*, Ed. "Bucovina" I. E. Torouțiu, București, 1943, p.37;

¹³ M.Of. nr. 68/23 mar. 1945, *LEGE nr.187 din 23 martie 1945 pentru înfăptuirea reformei agrare*, Cap. 2 Exproprierea, art. 3;

¹⁴ *Ministerul Agriculturii și Domeniilor, Direcția Proprietăți și Bunurilor Statului, Nr. 165236/ 18.04.1946* în Arhivele Naționale ale României, Serviciul Județean Timiș, Comisia județeană pentru reforma agrară Timiș-Torontal, Fond 574, cota 1 (1945-1947), Fila 245;

¹⁵ M.Of. nr. 68/23 mar. 1945, *op. cit.*, Cap. 4 Procedura expropriării și împrumutării, art. 9;

household disappears.

In Pietroasa 1959 *Întovărășirea Agricolă „Drum Nou”* was established and it was active up to 1962 when it bankrupted. The collectivization process was also subject of resistance, as for example, a nucleus of 11 families from Pietroasa managed by “moșu Pițu”, permanently teased and marginalized by the community. Such villages where the collectivization lasted for a short period of time, are locally named “capitalist villages”.

The lack of collectivization in the studied area allowed the perpetuation up to these days of old practices and the partial conservation of the specificity of the *cultural landscape*.

Urban Considerations

After the end of collectivization, political focus switches towards administrative reorganization of territory and systematization of settlements. On December 6, 1967, the National Conference of the Communist Party is the place for the formulation of the “*Basic Principles for the Improvement of the Administrative and Territorial Organization of Romania and Systematization of Rural Settlements*”.

The 10th Congress of the Romanian Communist Party in 1972 enounces new general principles for the systematization of Romania’s territory which shall be the grounds for the law on territory and rural and urban settlements systematization in 1974. The Law launches the concept of villages and communes with “a potential for social-economic development”.

As related to the studied villages, Pietroasa and Poieni are considered as having a “development potential”, in return Crivina de Sus is classified as “disadvantaged” and Fărășești “justifies its existence by architecture”, as it is not a village with development possibilities in terms of systemization policies¹⁶.

The wording of the law provides for the establishment in each and every commune of a civic center which will encompass administrative, social and cultural, educational and health functionalities grouped altogether in one single building or in an assembly of buildings with several levels and having a “representative aspect” for the socialist ideology. *The Systematization Layout of Pietroasa Commune* (1971) provides for the arrangement of the civic center by building within a small center for service supplies, the school boarding house, a bathroom, and a bakery. As well, it proposed the extension of the locative space by 70 apartments (for the following 5 to 15 years), and planned, on short term, the construction of a block of flats with ground floor and one floor, built later.

The Contemporary Period

After 1989, the retrocession process of the properties is difficult and incomplete. Therefore, the *households* included in the collectivization process receive 0.5 ha in use (1989), and subsequently, according to the land law, the households can take possession on the land owned, but up to the limit of 10 ha (1991) following for the law to be completed by the possibility of land retrocession up to the limit of 50 ha for agricultural land and 10 ha forest (2000).

Urbanistically speaking, the act of abrogating the law of settlements systematization (1989) is natural. Next, a period of more or less ten years without specific urbanism regulations. In 2001, the state started regulating the enactment method of city planning documentations, that is the responsibilities of institutions in such matter by *Law 350/ 2001 on territory arrangement and city planning*.

In 1991 they elaborated the law in the field of constructions which allows an “emancipation” and individualization process of the houses, the gradual disappearance of architectural and urbanistic coherence of the villages and the appearance of the phenomenon

¹⁶ Fond Primăria Comunei Pietroasa, Dosar nr. 623/ 1971, Consiliul Popular al Județului Timiș, Direcția de Sistemizare Arhitectură și Proiectarea Construcțiilor Timișoara, *Schiță de sistematizare a Comunei Pietroasa*, Proiect nr. 14746, Vol. I, 1971, p. 103- 106;

“pompous” houses which refutes the local past and character. As the villages above are relatively isolated, such phenomenon comes out later, once the population migrates for work in European countries and starts interpreting domestic models.

3. THE HOUSEHOLD IN THE LANDSCAPE. LOCAL PRACTICES – RELATIONS

Household in the Community Mentality

In order to understand the work concept, this subchapter makes a (re)construction of the *household* through the lens of the local communities this thesis studies.

Temporal Representation. Next of Kin and Co-participation

This thesis identified a way of *temporal representation*, in regard of kin as related to kinship, and various other larger social forms (neighborhood, village etc.), by which the subjects narrate the evolution of the *household* from the past to the present.

As related to *kinship*, the case studies have identified various branches which led to the construction of the *household*: inheritance, displacement, new edifications.

Two cases have been analyzed:

- First of all, a *household* can consist of several fortunes come from the inheritance from relatives without descendants, that is marriages (*household B. I. from Fărășești*);
- The second case represents the edification of the *household* by successive displacements and the application of rigors of the law which conditioned its evolution and the variations occurred in time on the position of the household in the network (*household P. from Fărășești*).

As regards *co-participation*, the study lays out as well connections within larger social forms like the neighborhood, the village and sometimes even related to several villages in the studied area. The study has identified ways of *co-participation* in *construction practices* and in *agricultural activities*.

Concerning *co-participation* in *construction practices*, this thesis has identified practices by which the whole community of the village participates, by way of working, to the edification of houses in the village boundaries or to obtaining the needed construction materials. The household organization stylistic and similitudes are also aware replicas amongst the neighbors, as the field research revealed similarities in the way the households within the village boundaries were organized, or architectural similarities. This tendency to copy the situation in the neighborhood also reflects in the use of new construction materials, sometimes inadequate for the construction system of houses.

Co-participation in *agricultural practices* is performed among entities according to very strict arrangements, approved by several generations. It has very old forms, currently extinct, like common agricultural works, which assume complex machines like the thresher and the grain selector (*țălindăru*), which was available for use to all the households in the village. A different example of *agricultural co-participation* is still a current practice and regards the pasturing of the flock of sheep. Two organizing systems have been identified in this matter: a type of associative pasturing, vagrant amongst the dwelling places of the associated members and locally curling which includes a larger group of households.

This chapter has also noticed the maintenance of interhuman relationships, a certain relation to property, a certain mimicry related to the architecture of houses and households, which has reflected up to now, *ancestral practices*.

Spatial Representation. Maps and Mental Maps

The case studies have identified two ways of spatial representation of the household.

- a concrete representation, on physical *maps* (cadaster, topographic, GPS) accompanied by ownership documents, which the subjects use in their formal relations to the state.

- a personal and subjective representation, as *mental maps* by which the subjects imagine the *landscape* and the way the *household* is inserted and evolves in relation to it.

In order to represent the current situation of lands in possession, the interlocutor uses printed GPS maps to delimit the areas of agricultural land belonging to his or her household. During the interviews, the interlocutors never hesitate to use as well narrative representation forms, by building *mental maps* to transpose the *household*, spatially and over generations. Spatial marks of the properties are therefore set by relating to natural elements like valleys, water springs or outstanding vegetal elements. As well, the interlocutors evoke old agreements on real estate properties, which have no legal ground, it is about informal acts which take precedence over formal legal documents (Land Book registration).

As well, the interlocutors rebuild the past situation of places with altered landscape (*the place from Druja- Fărășești*, former meadow, presently forest of pines) or enunciates spatial marks of the old boundaries of the villages they live in (*Trifești*- the old village boundaries of Fărășești village, *Valea Bisericii* to the old village boundaries of Poieni village).

Two ways of mental (re)construction and relatedness to the landscape are emphasized, by actual and daily living, decoding landscape elements (natural limits, milestones, practices) but also by factual states or narrations passed down through generations up to now. By its transgenerational connection, the *household* is an essential component with multiple significances for the domestic group that has been living it, a component which builds and permanently amends the local *cultural landscape*.

Household Construction in the Landscape. Functional Analysis

This subchapter has studied the economic structure of the village and of the *household* nucleus as a basic element of it and identified various functional relationships.

The nucleus of the village boundaries consists of a house and outbuildings, in a courtyard, and includes, most times, the *grădjina de bucacie* (vegetable garden for the use of family members). The remaining components (grasslands, hayfields, *meadows*, *fields* etc.) are outside the village (*în hotar – into the boundary*) and are named *place(s)*, with a role in supporting the economic functionality of the *household*.

Hereinafter, an analysis of the evolution of the *household* into the *landscape* as result of the action of two forces: *centrifugal*, for functional extension to the outside and *centripetal*¹⁷ for inclusion, and noticed the dynamics determined in time by them.

There is a distinction of two major functional zonings, the household into the *village* and the household on the hill/ „*pă djal*” (built landscape / cultivated landscape), results of long-term historical and cultural processes¹⁸. Using methods like *retrogressive analysis*, collecting data by *simplified superimposition of historical maps and direct observation*, the following subchapters make a detailed description of the way *households* appear, develop and organize in communities, in the case studies.

The households studied functionally integrate such functional areas, determining various seasonal living and working. Each and every member of the domestic group has clear tasks within specific activities depending on skills. The specialized work of the domestic group members is structured according to the role of the members according to generations, or genre criteria.

Toponyms in Describing the Cultural Landscape

This subchapter treats the theme of toponyms, an important resource in researching

¹⁷ François Ruegg, *La maison paysanne, histoire d'un mythe*, Collection Archigraphy, Ed. Infolio, Elveția, 2011, pp. 138- 139;

¹⁸ Chiva Isac, *Pour une grammaire du paysage agraire* în *Études rurales*, nr. 121-124, 1991. De l'agricole au paysage, p. 25;

cultural layers of the landscape, being an archive that *keep the memory of events, occurrences and data that happened along time*¹⁹.

The interpretation of the toponyms identified in the case studies reveals a series of relationships to the *cultural landscape*, relevant for this study. Most of them describe physical and geographical particularities (oronyms), or natural details of the landscape, and shows true actual characters. Generally speaking, there is predominance of the topographic elements (*Cioaca, Praveț, Corholu, Crivina etc.*), or special vegetal ones (*Ulmet, Curpenu etc.*) or hydronyms (*Lunca Largă, Între păraie etc.*).

Others render the character of the landscape in the studied area from previous steps, like gradually passing from the forest landscape to the agricultural landscape by deforestation (*lăzuire*) or clearing (*poienire*) (*Dealul Negru, Dealul Corbu, Lazu Ienii or Poieni*).

Some toponyms indicate old settlements of places of worship, presently disappeared or replaced by the walled church (*Dealul Bisericii* in Fărășești) or indicate the old boundaries of the village prior to its migration from the hill to the valley and indicates the placement of the old church (*Valea Bisericii* in Poieni).

And related to extinct practices, there are the toponymic references, like the toponym *Cârnitura* which comes from the practice of *cârnit*, presently abandoned (cutting tendrils / branches from trees in order to make stocks of leaves for forages, locally named *stoguri* (*heaps of leaves*)). We also note the phenomenon of toponym circulation from one village to another (*În groape, Zbeg*).

4. THE LANDSCAPE – A RESOURCE

This chapter puts landscape in a clear identity, with diverse ecological and cultural values which come from certain practices, by the *human- environment* report. It has been considered that *agricultural and construction practices* are the key elements which define the landscape in the studied area, and therefore this research is limited to studying them.

The Landscape, an Agricultural Resource

At the beginning of the 18th century, agricultural land is around the boundaries of the studied villages, in an organic structure where the houses and their courtyard (*ocol*) are grouped into a tissue of “gardens”, interconnected by spontaneously developed circulation.

The evolutive analysis of the agricultural landscape identifies three historical periods for the transformation of the landscape by deforestation:

- *Proximity deforestation* (the 18th century) which enlarges the agricultural territory of the villages, in particular *pe lunși*;
- Massive deforestation (*collective deforestation*)²⁰ with a large extension of the lands into the *țarină* and of the grass fields and *hayfields* on the *hill*, transition to rational agriculture;
- Deforestations in *poieni* or *lazuri*, cutouts in the forest which become settled, and receive in the first part of the 20th century the functionality of temporary residence (*căsoanie*).

As far as the *agricultural function and practices are concerned*:

- *grădjina* is one of the oldest structures of agricultural landscape of the household;
- I have identified a typology of *orchard* like collection of species and sorts, in the gardens in the village boundaries or in the household on the hill, and the *livada din țarină* (*orchard*

¹⁹ Vasile Ioniță, *Nume de locuri din Banat*, Ed. Facla, Timișoara, 1982, p. 19;

²⁰ André Burguière, *Paysages et paysans. Les campagnes européennes de Xe au XXe siècle*, Ed. Nathan, Paris, 1991, p. 34;

in the field), little diverse, destined mainly to the product of plums for *răchie* (*brandy*); For species breeding, they used the technique of *ultonire în despicătură* by using a billhook penknife with protection of the ulonium with soil and breeding by planting *săzi*.

- *Fâneța* (*meadow*) is organized on the parcel of the extensively exploited orchards or on separate lots.

Mowing is most of the times mechanized or manual in case of traditional agricultural practices for high natural value grasslands (HNV), important for the fauna.

The members of the domestic group divide their harvesting of the hay as follows:

- Mowing is the activity men usually do;
- Women and children are in charge with turning and gathering the hay in haystacks.

In February and March, molehills are cleaned and levelled and in order to stop the extension of the fern, the plants are successively mowed five or six times a year up to their depletion.

- The old practice of *stocks* of leaves as food for goats, replacing the hay during the cold season, a way to exploit forest resources;

- *Pasturing*:

- of cattle is organized *la fir* (*electric wire*) or individually, each and every household daily supervises its own cattle. Pasturing of harvested fields starting with October is an old practice, the has remained since the times of join property (*devălmășie*);
- the sheep pasture the land during spring, up to May 1st, when the flock moves to the grassland
- sheep pasturing on the grassland is somehow a *local swinging* or *associative and itinerant local swinging* amongst the settlements of the owners;
- the old practice of flock grazing into the woods;
- *în lunși* (*in the meadow*) the lots have surfaces of up to 40 acres and have diverse crops (orchard, *grădjina de bucate* (vegetable garden for the use of family members), growing corn or legume-based forage, therefore generating a diverse and very dense agricultural mosaic.

The household also holds surfaces (*holdjie*) in the *țarină* for cereals.

- *Beekeeping*

- The old practice of looking for colonies in the woods (*recoltarea boancei*), still a reality in the studied villages;
- Beekeeping in *boancă*, *coșniță* or hive;

The Landscape, a Resource in Building the Household

This subchapter considers that the natural resource available and the character of the area, from the perspective of nature elements, where a certain architecture gets inserted, influences, up to late, the construction techniques and systems of such area.

The members of the domestic groups know the trade, make or repair *minor* constructions (*poieți* - barns, *căsoanie*), in exchange *major* constructions (the house, *poiețile din vatră* - the old barns) are built with the participation of craftsmen.

Relevant for the studied microregion is the weight of the *stone architecture* in relation to *wood architecture*, the case studies identifying typological zonings tightly connected to the proximity of materials:

- An area with stone and wood actively exploited (*Fărășești Village* and the settlements in the *locul Curpuenu, Poieni*);
- The remaining territory which exploits wood and, to a smaller extent, stone

(foundations);

Below, two techniques of *stone masonry*:

- Two faces masonry is practiced for surrounding walls or for the walls of houses and barns. The two-facets masonry technique is more complicated as two “beautiful” faces need to be obtained;
- One face-masonry, which is mostly practiced in case of inside masonry of the water wells and walls for stabilizing slopes, is simpler as one needs to get one single “beautiful” face.

The stone needs to be chosen carefully, an essential work during the process being the gradual *wedging* of the masonry in order to prevent caving-in.

Stonemasons who built in the area: Drăgoi, Cioană, David (*Fărășești*), Daniel (*Fărășești*), Hobeau (*Poieni*).

Even if not similar in quality to stonemasons, the technique of stone building is also used by the members of the studied households within their own households.

Wood architecture developed in a mainly forestry landscape context, as shown in the previous chapter as well.

Two wood construction techniques are used in the studied area:

- *în cățâi*;
- *în cheutoare*, a less liked style as it is difficult to plaster and the corners are not esthetic, as they are visible from the plaster;

The processing and time resistance of the material depend on the moment wood is chosen and its quality, the *craftsman* being the one *indicating the wood to be cut*.

Type of wood used in the studied area:

- as *pine* wood is difficult to find, it was rarely used for rafters or planks;
- most of the times, constructions are made of *oak* wood, quite frequent in the study area;
- *Poplar* is used for planks, which used to be manually made;
- *Other local types* depending on the availability of the material.

Carpenters who built in the area: Romulus (*Fărășești*), Pătru Drăgostin (*Fărășești*), Trandafir (Toader?) (*Fărășești*), Daniel (*Fărășești*);

Even if this research takes into account an area with construction materials that nature makes available (stone, wood, soil), a specific local cultural element, which shows the *sustainability of archaic practices*, is the reuse of the materials from old constructions.

Pursuing such dynamic of the constructions, we consider as justified the hypothesis when the household members hold elementary craftsmanship knowledge, precisely in order to succeed in adapting, shortest time possible and with minimum costs, the of the household to the needs and flows of interior technological flows, undergoing continuous change.

Shingle is made of beech, split by an axe at 60- 90 cm length (*Avram, Poieni*);

A different local material is *soil* for constructions. Every village has its places with good soil, for *plastering* or for *making stoves*. *Red soil* is better for *plastering*, in return, *yellow soil* is more suitable for *making stoves* as it hardens faster. Soil for plastering is used in a mixture with sand.

Stove fitter who builds in the area: Dan a lu’ Partănie (*Poieni*).

Also, we have identified in the studied village the places where gypsies used to extract soil for *burnt brick*, the transformations occurred to such place being visible in the local landscape.

There are no brick craftsman in the studied villages: Bocoș (*Făget*), „*ăla o făcut pe-aiși pe la tăți cășâlie*”.

A practice nowadays extinct is that of *burning limestone*, which used to be a participative process (co-participation) of the whole village. The burnt limestone is subsequently transported to the household in the village, each household having a lime slake kiln.

We understand *knowledge* as a process which comes from *actual living the landscape* but also as an *inheritance of subsequent generations*. The case studies have identified a series of *agricultural or construction practices which continuously structure and alter the landscape*.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Own Contributions

Hereinafter, my own contributions to this thesis as related to the research of the *rural cultural landscape*:

1. I have shown that the *household* is the depository of local culture, of a certain understanding of the nature-human relation, a social space of the village where knowledge transfer occurs from a generation to the following, and it makes the starting point in studying the rural cultural landscape;
2. in order to better understand the relation between *household* and *cultural landscape*, I used a transdisciplinary approach, and used study methods in the field of social sciences, history, archeology, linguistics and instruments and tools of geographers, landscapers and archeologists;
3. I have adapted certain methods to the study of the *cultural landscape*:
 - the method of *retrogressive analysis* in reconstructing prior steps of the *household* and *landscape* in collective memory,
 - toponym interpretation in reconstructing the *historic landscape*;
 - interpretation of mental maps and analysis of inhabitants relating to the *cultural landscape*;
 - synthetization of useful information by retracing historic maps, only showing interesting elements for this research (*Evolutive Cartography Study of the Village Boundaries, Evolution of Agricultural Surfaces in the Territory*) etc.;
4. as a central element in studying the *household* in relation to the *cultural landscape*, in order to understand reports, practices and nature-human relations, I resorted to the knowledge of the locals also named *local experts*²¹ and to collective memory;
5. I have analyzed the historic evolution of the *household* and the cultural transformations. The two vectors have different weights in the evolution and way of participation of the *household* to the dynamics of the *cultural landscape*.
6. in order to check the work methods and concretize the study guidelines, I have studied in detail some representative households for various typologies;
7. I have analyzed the way craft practices and knowledge have been shared over generations and their connection to the character of the *cultural landscape*.

Comments

There are two main vectors which influence the evolution of the *households* in Pietroasa Commune:

- ideologies and policies which influence along time the evolution of the *household* in Banat.
- The cultural factors specific to the studied area, the social relations within a *household* and outside and the practiced activities. All such elements of *cultural invisibility* have generated in time amendments at the level of the *household* and in parallel with natural

²¹ Cosmin Marius Ivaşcu, *Cunoştinţe ecologice tradiţionale şi adaptări bio culturale în comuna Ieud, o străveche aşezare din Ţara Maramureşului*, teză de doctorat, Cluj Napoca, 2018, p. 11;

phenomena (erosion, dynamic of water courses, afforestation etc.) determine a dynamic at the level of the *cultural landscape* of the area.

The first vector regards the policies and ideologies which influence, with time, the evolution of the *household* in the studied villages, especially the policies in the modern period (1716- 1918). Comparatively to other areas in Banat, the measures applied here during communism and contemporary period influence in a low extent the evolution of the *household*.

The second vector regards the cultural factors that assure continuity for the studied villages:

a. The reporting of the members of the studied communities to their own *household* and *cultural landscape* is made according to the old rules transmitted over generations. They can be understood only in a local, participative key. The processes within the *households* are dynamic and the practices are connected at *transgenerational* level.

b. The reports among successive generations of the domestic group and within larger types of social organization (neighborhood, village, region) are social mechanisms which give a specific character to the *local cultural landscape*. There is a certain relatedness in the studied communities to property, a certain mimicry in the architecture of the houses and households and certain interhuman relations, which reflect up to today, ancestral practices.

c. The relations between *household* and *cultural landscape* permanently change, generating continuous dynamics. Such dynamic is given by the way the *household* is set, functions and evolves at the level of the *landscape*.

d. Noticed, in the studied *households*, a mixture of elements which define the character of the *cultural landscape* (old and contemporary local practices, crafts, way to use local and bought construction materials, specialization degrees of the members of the domestic group related to certain activities etc.). It is outstanding to see the tight connection between the natural environment and the evolution of agricultural and construction practices which adapt continuously, over time.

Guidelines to Follow-up

This study offers guidelines to follow-up through transdisciplinary analysis, with improvement possibility by:

- 1.** Extension of the study on a larger sample of *households*;
- 2.** Extension of the study in other areas of Banat in order to check the methods of the research in a different historic, cultural and geographic context;
- 3.** Extension of the study by using other consecrated research methods of the *cultural landscape* (*European landscape character assessment initiative- ELCAI*²², *Les Atlas de paysages Méthode pour l'identification, la caractérisation et la qualification des paysages*²³);

²² European Commission, CORDIS. EU Research results, *European landscape character assessment initiative- ELCAI*, <https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/EVK2-CT-2002-80021> (12.12.2020);

²³ République Française, Ministère de l'Écologie, du Développement durable et de l'Énergie, *Les Atlas de paysages Méthode pour l'identification, la caractérisation et la qualification des paysages*, <https://www.ecologie.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/Les%20Atlas%20de%20paysages%2C%20M%C3%A9thode%20pour%20l%27identification%2C%20la%20caract%C3%A9risation%20et%20la%20qualification%20des%20paysages.pdf> (12.12.2020);

4. Insertion of the methods used and of the conclusions drawn in the thesis within other local initiatives like making the General Plan of Pietroasa Commune (presently beyond validity term) or within the project *Cultural Landscapes (in Banat): IDENTIFICATION*²⁴.

By *its resilience*, the *rural household* is a model to study in order to draft future rural policies (local and regional), its members holding still nature-based solutions, real resources of knowledge in addressing the effects of phenomena like global warming. For the future, public policies need to be based on the interpretation of the *cultural landscape* and involve such real *local experts* who hold the knowledge necessary for future *resilient* societies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Boroș, Ioan, *Regularea comunelor în județul Caraș-Severin. 1784-1790*, în *Analele Banatului*, 1930;
2. Burguière, André, *Paysages et paysans. Les campagnes européennes de Xe au XXe siècle*, Ed. Nathan, Paris, 1991;
3. Chiva, Isac, *Pour une grammaire du paysage agraire* în *Études rurales*, nr. 121-124, 1991;
4. Dumitru, Răzvan, *Gospodăria între vecinătate și rudenie* în *Sociologie Românească*, vol. 9, no. 1-4, 2001;
5. European Commission, CORDIS. EU Research results, *European landscape character assessment initiative- ELCAI*, <https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/EVK2-CT-2002-80021> (12.12.2020);
6. Fond Primăria Comunei Pietroasa, Dosar nr. 623/ 1971, Consiliul Popular al Județului Timiș, Direcția de Sistematizare Arhitectură și Proiectarea Construcțiilor Timișoara, *Schiță de sistematizare a Comunei Pietroasa*, Proiect nr. 14746, Vol. I, 1971;
7. Georgescu, Mircea, *Reforme agrare. Principii și metode în legiurile române și străine*, „Bucovina” I. E. Torouțiu, București, 1943;
8. Ingold, Tim, *The temporality of landscape* în *World Archaeology*, vol. 25, nr. 2, Routledge, 1993;
9. Ioniță, Vasile, *Nume de locuri din Banat*, Ed. Facla, Timișoara, 1982;
10. Ivașcu, Cosmin Marius, *Cunoștințe ecologice tradiționale și adaptări bio culturale în comuna Ieud, o străveche așezare din Țara Maramureșului*, teză de doctorat, Cluj Napoca, 2018;
11. Lotreanu, Ioan, *Monografia Banatului, Situația Geografică. Locuitorii-comunele*, Vol. I, Ed. Institutul de Arte Grafice „Țara” Timișoara, 1935;
12. M. Of. nr. 68/23 mar. 1945, *LEGE nr.187 din 23 martie 1945 pentru înfăptuirea reformei agrare*;
13. Ministerul Agriculturii și Domeniilor, *Direcția Proprietăți și Bunurilor Statului*, Nr. 165236/ 18.04.1946 în Arhivele Naționale ale României, Serviciul Județean Timiș, Comisia județeană pentru reforma agrară Timiș- Torontal, Fond 574, cota 1 (1945-1947), Fila 245;
14. Munteanu, Ioan, *Banatul istoric 1867-1918. Ocupații. Economia*, Vol. II, Timișoara, Ed. Excelsior Art;
15. Onica, Dorina, *Peisajul cultural rural dintre Prut și Nistru (sfârșitul secolului al XIX-lea – începutul secolului al XXI-lea)*, Chișinău, 2016;
16. République Française, Ministère de l'Écologie, du Développement durable et de l'Énergie, *Les Atlas de paysages Méthode pour l'identification, la caractérisation et la qualification des paysages*,

²⁴ Inițiativă de cartare a peisajelor culturale din Banat, G. Pașcu, T.O.Gheorghiu, M.Danciu, A.Negru, R.Rusu, A. Ciobotă, A. Ianaș, D.Belci. (Consultanți) I.Iamandescu (RO), O.Țiganea (IT) și S. Edelblutt (FR);

<https://www.ecologie.gouv.fr/sites/default/files/Les%20Atlas%20de%20paysages%2C%20M%C3%A9thode%20pour%20l%27identification%2C%20la%20caract%C3%A9risation%20et%20la%20qualification%20des%20paysages.pdf> (12.12.2020);

17. Ruegg, François, *La maison paysanne, histoire d'un mythe*, Collection Archigraphy, Ed. Infolio, Elveția, 2011;

18. Singly, François, et. al., *Ancheta și metodele ei: chestionarul, interviul de producere a datelor, interviul comprehensiv*; Ed. Polirom, București, 1998;

19. Taffermer, Anton, *Quellenbuch zur Donauschwäbischen geschichte*, Stuttgart, Verlag Buch und Kunst Kepplerhaus, 1982;

20. Varga E. Arpad, *Statistică recensăminte după limba maternă, respectiv naționalitate, județul Timiș 1882- 2002*, <http://www.kia.hu/konyvtar/erdely/erd2002/tmetn02.pdf> (08.01.2021);