

## NUMBER 16 / PART III

## FINE ARTS

1. ART DURING THE TRANSITION PERIOD BETWEEN  
PALEOLITHIC AND NEOLITHIC ON THE TERRITORY OF  
ROMANIAIoana-Iulia Olaru<sup>127</sup>

**Abstract:** *This material refers to one of the many transition periods from the History of Art on the territory of Romania – that is the period which separates Paleolithic from Neolithic: Epi-Paleolithic, with its end called (and accepted, first of all!) by some researchers: Mesolithic. As we will see, we will refer to the art of this moment of great complexity and diversity. From an artistic point of view, Epi-Paleolithic already has tools which can be placed in the category of technical beauty, as far as form is concerned, precision becomes more and more important, and also the skillfulness of their production and the delicate, refined finishing; also connected to the artistic side of the period, the interest for beauty for creating geometrical-abstract decorations increases, obviously becoming a coherent ornamental motif. In the final phase of Epi-Paleolithic, the Mesolithic period comes with an art which is different from the one of the culture Schela Cladovei, characterized by ornaments with simple geometrical motifs, linear incisions, oblique or in a network, this geometry leading to the main compositional textures of decoration of the oldest phase of the future Neolithic culture Criș.*

**Key words:** *à coche, à dos arquée, esquillées, encoche, à bord abattu*

## 1. CHARACTERISTICS OF PREHISTORIC PERIOD ON THE ROMANIAN TERRITORY

Chronologically speaking, what we call in general “Prehistory” refers to the period having an uncertain beginning, starting around 2 000 000 years ago (ever since the first traces of conscious activity of hominids have appeared – especially the creation of the first tools); recording a slow progress, the ancient epoch ends at the beginning of the second period of Iron Age, Latène (on the territory of Romania: once the Dacian-Getae appeared). Difficult research and archeological discoveries count the most in the process of understanding, re-enactment and discovery of the universe of our ancestors.

In general, regarding periodization, the primitive period is divided in: Stone Age, composed of Paleolithic (when the forming of Gentile society takes place) and Neolithic (during which the Gentile society blossoms), and also Metal Age, with Bronze Age and Iron Age (when the Gentile society disappears – in Bronze Age and the first period of Iron Age). Geographically speaking, on the territory of our country, we refer to the Carpathian-Danubian-Pontic unity of space – limited by Middle Danube and by Tisa in the west and by Nister River in the east – having the corresponding series of civilisations spread along the

<sup>127</sup> Associate Professor Ph.D., “George Enescu” National University of Arts from Iași, Romania, email: olaru.ioana.iulia@gmail.com

Carpathian hydrographic basin. There have been periods of calm and other of instability caused by the coming of pastoral populations. Migrations and invasions have always existed: at the beginning of Neolithic, at the beginning and end of Bronze Age, in the first Iron Age.

**Stone Age** is called like this because it represents the period when humans used stones, in general, for creating tools. Classified in Paleolithic (The Period of Unpolished Stone, The Old Epoch of Stone); Epipaleolithic+Mesolithic (The Middle Stone Age) and Neolithic (The Period of Polished Stone, The New Stone Epoch), it has known development over a large period of time from the history of human kind, with important changes that have influenced the evolution of people.

## 2. ART BETWEEN PALEOLITHIC AND NEOLITHIC

The period of transition from Paleolithic to Neolithic is of great complexity and diversity. In Epipaleolithic and in Mesolithic – when different aspects coexist in parallel, for a while, at least, before the Mesolithic ones will – the recoil of ice has led to a tender climate, becoming similar to what we have nowadays and recording changes in all fields (hydrological basins, for example, have also been transformed), thus leading to changes in the environment of human communities. In this situation, human groups went from open, plain areas to colder, forest areas from the Carpathian area, chasing the game which simply draws back, determining the mixing with the indigenous population<sup>128</sup>.

Regarding space, in the transition period from Paleolithic to Neolithic, there are a series of inhabited nuclei in some areas<sup>129</sup>. Regarding tools, there is a tendency of microlitization given the improvement and perfection of technique; the tools are composed of carved silex combined with other materials: bone, wood, teracota<sup>130</sup>. Regarding art, now we can talk for sure about artistic manifestations, having purely aesthetic purposes.

## 3. ART IN EPIPALEOLITHIC (AROUND 13 300<sup>131</sup> – 10 000<sup>132</sup>/9 000/8 000<sup>133</sup> B.C.)

Epipaleolithic is placed in the post-glacial period, at the beginning of the second phase of Quaternary: Holocene. It is a period characterized by a fundamental change of climate and environment, after the recoil of the ice cap. The groups of hunters chase big animals, in their retreat heading north, other

---

<sup>128</sup> Ion Miclea, Radu Florescu, *Preistoria Daciei*, București, Ed. Meridiane, 1980, p.16

<sup>129</sup> *Ibidem*

<sup>130</sup> *Ibidem*

<sup>131</sup> A. Păunescu, Cap. I *Paleoliticul și mezoliticul pe teritoriul României*, in M. Petrescu-Dâmbovița, N. Palincaș, *Partea I Preistoria. Izvoare arheologice*, in Mircea Petrescu-Dâmbovița, Alexandru Vulpe (coord.), *Istoria românilor*, vol.I, *Moștenirea timpurilor îndepărtate*, București, Academia Română, Ed. Enciclopedică, 2010, p.89

<sup>132</sup> Dinu C. Giurescu, *Istoria ilustrată a românilor*, București, Ed. Sport-Turism, 1981, p.14; L. R., in Radu Florescu, Hadrian Daicoviciu, Lucian Roșu (coord.), *Dicționar enciclopedic de artă veche a României*, București, Ed. Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1980, p.260, s.v. *paleolitic*

<sup>133</sup> Dinu C. Giurescu, *op. cit.*, p.14; A. Păunescu, Cap. I *Paleoliticul și mezoliticul pe teritoriul României*, in M. Petrescu-Dâmbovița, N. Palincaș, *Partea I Preistoria. Izvoare arheologice*, in Mircea Petrescu-Dâmbovița, Alexandru Vulpe (coord.), *op. cit.*, p.92

communities adapting to the new conditions, migrations and mixes of populations giving birth to a granulation of cultural areas. It is an epoch situated between Palaeolithic and Neolithic, in which, under the influences of climate change, caused by the end of quaternary glaciations, cultural-material and spiritual-material mutations produce, which marks the transition to Neolithic. Inventions succeed quicker than in Palaeolithic. All these features will generalize in the next period, “The New Epoch of the Rock”.

The oldest sanctuary on the territory of Romania comes from this period. It is about the sanctuary of hunters from Buda – Ceahlău: a simple landscape, with discoveries of bone remains grouped meaningfully<sup>134</sup>. This is the period about which, artistically speaking, it is considered that many of the microlithic tools can be placed in the category of technical beauty, by the precision of shape, in the search of maximal functional efficiency, by the craftsmanship they are made and also by its distinct finish, ornamental elements being more and more frequent<sup>135</sup>.

Late **epigravettian** settlements<sup>136</sup> of hunter groups are repoted on the territory of Romania in the south of Moldova (Mălușteni, Berești – Dealul Taberei), in Dobrogea Centrală (Gherghina, Castelu), on the high peaks of Ceahlău and Hășmaș mountains (Poiana Scaune – Ceahlău, Curmătura Bardosului, Bicăjelu)<sup>137</sup>. Around Porțile de Fier area, groups of final epigravettian hunters-fishers-savengers<sup>138</sup> were accomodating about the same time, but also mediteranean tardigravettians.

Epipaleolithic is the creation of the current human being, *Homo sapiens recens*, the first modern humans being “oriental Cro-magnon” type<sup>139</sup>. The tools with pedunculate tip were discovered in the settlement from Poiana – Scaune. The starting of **tardigravettian** is reported in the Clisura Dunării area, inside Climente I and II caves (Duvova, Mehedinți country)<sup>140</sup>. The second step of tardigravettian from the area of Cazanele Dunării is suggested by the discoveries from the known covert in Cuina Turcului (Dubova), situated in the same millestone mountain, Ciucaru Mare, where we can also find Climente I-II caves<sup>141</sup>. Belonging to those two layers of habitation, bone and tusk tools and weapons, jewellery<sup>142</sup>, all these are decorated with incised geometric motifs. The

<sup>134</sup> R. F., in Radu Florescu et al, *op. cit.*, p.296, s.v. *sacru,(-ă)*; H. D., R. F., in Radu Florescu et al, *op. cit.*, p.297-298, s.v. *sanctuar*

<sup>135</sup> L. R., in Radu Florescu et al, *op. cit.*, p.260, s.v. *paleolithic*

<sup>136</sup> The epigravettian term should be used for culture evolved on an older, gravettian background in the eastern, western and south-eastern areas of Romania. Cf. A. Păunescu, Cap. I *Paleoliticul și mezoliticul pe teritoriul României*, in M. Petrescu-Dâmbovița, N. Palincaș, Partea I *Preistoria. Izvoare arheologice*, in Mircea Petrescu-Dâmbovița, Alexandru Vulpe (coord.), *op. cit.*, p.90

<sup>137</sup> *Ibidem*, p.88

<sup>138</sup> *Ibidem*, p.89

<sup>139</sup> Mihai Bărbulescu, Dennis Deletant, Keith Hitchins, Șerban Papacostea, Pompiliu Teodor, *Istoria României*, București, Ed. Corint, 2007, p.16

<sup>140</sup> A. Păunescu, Cap. I *Paleoliticul și mezoliticul pe teritoriul României*, in M. Petrescu-Dâmbovița, N. Palincaș, Partea I *Preistoria. Izvoare arheologice*, in Mircea Petrescu-Dâmbovița, Alexandru Vulpe (coord.), *op. cit.*, p.90

<sup>141</sup> *Ibidem*

<sup>142</sup> Drilled teeth, bone pendants, perforated shells.

lithic material (silex and, rarely, obsidian) is also represented by a series of tools<sup>143</sup>.

The third and the last stage of tardigravettian habitation from Porțile de Fier area is the one suggested by the discoveries found in the settlements from Veterani – Terasă, Ogradena – Icoana, Ogradena – Răzvrata, situated in Cazanele Dunării area. Here were found microlittes, but also objects of bone and horn, decorated with incised motifs<sup>144</sup> following the pattern of the objects from Cuina Turcului<sup>145</sup>. Analogies of tardigravettian industries from Porțile de Fier area can be made with the microlithic industries of the final epigravettian from Italic Peninsula, the final epigravettian from the settlements in open space from the high Adriatic area<sup>146</sup>, as well as the industries discovered in the covert of Crvena Stijena (Muntenegru), but also with the settlements situated in the iugoslavian shore of Porțile de Fier (Padina, Vlasac)<sup>147</sup>.

Artistically speaking, we need to mention the interest of beauty in the composition of the abstract-geometric decoration of some of these objects. The oldest objects found at Cuina Turcului, of bone and tusk, have a jagged decoration: slightly irregular incised cross-lines, groups of parallel lines, vertically aligned along the side of a perforated object, or groups of two-three parallel lines, engraved on the edge of another object, all these representing a big step to realising a decorative motif. This will truly be accomplished: at the meandric motif on an object from the same settlement, where we find a genuine abstract-geometric view<sup>148</sup>.

The first stone or bone idols belong to the Epipaleolithic (stone heads rough modeled found at Cuina Turcului, Lepenski Vir type)<sup>149</sup>. Representative is the so-called idol (feminine?<sup>150</sup> – the resemblance with a human figure being bigger from its side face<sup>151</sup>) from Cuina Turcului<sup>152</sup>, a whole bone pice: a wild horse falanga (falanga I, with proximal edges, distal from plantar side and polished distal tubers)<sup>153</sup>, ornamented by grinding and incision all over with a genuine composition represented on one side of two concentric diamonds, the inner one being filled with parallel horizontal lines; at the ends of the diamond is continued with the top of the angle edges, also concentric, engraved with emphasized lines. On the other side, the superior part is covered with nine lines,

---

<sup>143</sup> "Gratoare", lace à coche, lame à dos (some with sharp tip, similar to microgravettes), tips à dos arquée, piercings, burinas, geometric pieces, esquillées pieces, microburinas. *Ibidem*

<sup>144</sup> Fragments of daggers, spatulas, votive objects. *Ibidem*, p.91

<sup>145</sup> *Ibidem*

<sup>146</sup> *Ibidem*

<sup>147</sup> *Ibidem*, p.92

<sup>148</sup> Vladimir Dumitrescu, *Arta preistorică în România*, București, Ed. Meridiane, 1974, p.11

<sup>149</sup> L. R., in Radu Florescu et al, *op. cit.*, p.125, s.v. *Cuina Turcului*

<sup>150</sup> Not all researchers agree on the sculptural stylization of a human form of this piece. Cf. Vladimir Dumitrescu, *op. cit.*, p.11

<sup>151</sup> Vasile Boroneanț, *Noi date despre cele mai vechi manifestări de artă plastică de pe teritoriul României*, in *Studii și cercetări de istoria artei*, tomul 19, 1, București, 1972, p.110

<sup>152</sup> Vasile Drăguț, *Arta românească*, vol. I, *Preistorie, Antichitate, Ev Mediu, Renaștere, Baroc*, București, Ed. Meridiane, 1982, p.16

<sup>153</sup> A. Păunescu, *Cap. I Paleoliticul și mezoliticul pe teritoriul României*, in M. Petrescu-Dâmbovița, N. Palincaș, *Partea I Preistoria. Izvoare arheologice*, in Mircea Petrescu-Dâmbovița, Alexandru Vulpe (coord.), *op. cit.*, p.90

all deeply engraved, horizontally parallel, and the inferior part – with two intermittent engraved lines, continued on one of the sides. To the base, in the middle, were drawn several concentric angles. The rest of the surface of the falanga has its decoration made of many groups of parallel lines, two by two, engraved at irregular distance, on the upper part of one of the side edges of the falanga being engraved new parallel horizontal notches, at equal distance. It is a unique artefact, unitarily designed, a unique of the Epipaleolithic epoch in Europe, through its shape and decoration<sup>154</sup>. Hypothetically, its decoration might suggest an item of clothing.

#### **4. THE ART OF MESOLITHIC (10 000<sup>155</sup>/9 000/8 000<sup>156</sup> – 7 500/7 000/6 500<sup>157</sup>/5 500<sup>158</sup> B.C.)**

Considered to be the final phase of an Epipaleolithic that is in course of Neolithization<sup>159</sup>, the Mesolithic is illustrated through two cultures: the tardenoisian and the culture of Schela Cladovei. Maybe the economic and cultural diversification of this period entitle the assumption over the social diversification, to which we add the increase in importance to the purpose of the man in certain fields of society and culture. The result is the transition from the matrilineal genealogy to the patriarchal genealogy type<sup>160</sup>. Also, now appear the premises of the first major social division of labour: the groups that transition from the predatory economy to the producing one, gradually detach: the culture of plants and, less on the territory of Romania, animal husbandry (which was never a dominant feature of the community of these lands)<sup>161</sup>.

##### **Tardenoisian (circa 9000 – 7500/7000 B.C.)**

Tardenoisian is wide-spread in many regions of the country, outside the area of Porțile de Fier (where the culture of Schela Cladovei developed) and Câmpia Dunării<sup>162</sup>: the territory between Prut and Siret, like also the one of Dobrogea and the east-north-eastern Muntenia. The tardenoisian hunter-gatherers belong to the great cultural complex of north-westic Pontic tardenoisian. The habitation – particularly on high grounds – is way harder than in Paleolithic, speaking about stability and fitting<sup>163</sup>. Settlements can be spotted at Călinești – Oaș (Maramureș)<sup>164</sup>, Ripiceni – Izvor, Icușeni, Erbiceni, Băneasa,

<sup>154</sup> Vladimir Dumitrescu, *op. cit.*, p.13

<sup>155</sup> Dinu C. Giurescu, *op. cit.*, p.14; L. R., in Radu Florescu et al, *op. cit.*, p.260, s.v. *paleolithic*

<sup>156</sup> Dinu C. Giurescu, *op. cit.*, p.14; A. Păunescu, Cap. I *Paleoliticul și mezoliticul pe teritoriul României*, in M. Petrescu-Dâmbovița, N. Palincaș, *Partea I Preistoria. Izvoare arheologice*, in Mircea Petrescu-Dâmbovița, Alexandru Vulpe (coord.), *op. cit.*, p.92

<sup>157</sup> *Ibidem*

<sup>158</sup> Dinu C. Giurescu, *op. cit.*, p.14

<sup>159</sup> Mircea Petrescu-Dâmbovița, Alexandru Vulpe (coord.), *op. cit.*, p.92

<sup>160</sup> Ion Miclea, Radu Florescu, *op. cit.*, p.17

<sup>161</sup> *Ibidem*, p.16

<sup>162</sup> Mircea Petrescu-Dâmbovița, Alexandru Vulpe (coord.), *op. cit.*, p.92

<sup>163</sup> Ion Miclea, Radu Florescu, *op. cit.*, p.54

<sup>164</sup> R. F., in Radu Florescu et al, *op. cit.*, p.125, s.v. *Maramureș*

Berești (Moldova), Cuza Vodă, Medgidia, Straja (Dobrogea), Lapoș, LARGU (East-North-East of Muntenia)<sup>165</sup>.

To the specific tools of the final of epigravettian new shapes are added<sup>166</sup>. In the three residential complexes from the settlement in Erbiceni, multiple scraps were found<sup>167</sup>. Similarities of the lithic industry from Moldova and Dobrogea can be spotted in the Mezolithic resort from the east of Prut (Frumușica, Ghirjevo, Grebeniki, Poznanka, Kazanka)<sup>168</sup>. For the lithic industries from the tardenoisian settlements in the south-eastern Transilvania (Cremenea – Sita Buzăului, Merilor – Gâlma – Valea Brădetului, Costanda – Lădăuți), situated in the mountain area, as well as in the north-western of Transilvania (the settlement from Ciumești – Pășune from Câmpia Carei), similarities can be found with the industry of settlements at Baraca I, Seredi I (Slovakia)<sup>169</sup>.

**The culture of Schela Cladovei**, actually Schela Cladovei-Lepénski Vir (8600 – 7600)<sup>170</sup> (Mehedinți country) (firstly appeared on the territory of Romania at Schela Cladovei – Drobeta Turnu Severin, then at Ostrovul Banului, at Răzvrata and Icoana, at Veterani – Terasă, and at last in Alibeg<sup>171</sup>) is considered to have its outset after the completion of the final stage of tardigravettian<sup>172</sup> (from Epipaleolithic epoch) of Porțile de Fier area, actually from the entire valley of inferior Danube<sup>173</sup> (and it doesn't belong neither to the tardenonasian<sup>174</sup>), and its end takes place before the arrival of the first carriers of the Neolithic culture Starčevo-Criș at Porțile de Fier<sup>175</sup>. It is considered by some reserchers to be some type of culture of transition from Epipaleolithic to Neolithic<sup>176</sup>. It is an example of culture belonging to the transition to the the manufacturing economy. Within it, even elements of preceramic Neolithic, protoneolic elements appear: the culture of domestic plants (at Schela Cladovei, Icoana, Ostrovu Banului)<sup>177</sup>. By some researchers, the Schela Cladovei's culture can't actually be attributed with certainty to a Mezolithic in course of

---

<sup>165</sup> A. Păunescu, Cap. I *Paleoliticul și mezoliticul pe teritoriul României*, in M. Petrescu-Dâmbovița, N. Palincaș, *Partea I Preistoria. Izvoare arheologice*, in Mircea Petrescu-Dâmbovița, Alexandru Vulpe (coord.), *op. cit.*, p.92

<sup>166</sup> "Gratoare", burinas, lamella à bord abattú, lamele à coche. *Ibidem*, p.93

<sup>167</sup> Lithic objects, bone fragments, snail shells, shells. *Ibidem*

<sup>168</sup> *Ibidem*

<sup>169</sup> *Ibidem*, p.94

<sup>170</sup> *Ibidem*, p.92

<sup>171</sup> V. Boroneanț, *Probleme ale culturii Schela Cladovei – Lepénski Vir în lumina noilor cercetări*, in Drobeta, IV, Drobeta-Turnu Severin, 1988, p.27

<sup>172</sup> It is considered not to have its origins in the Mediterranean Tardigravettian. Cf. A. Păunescu, Cap. I *Paleoliticul și mezoliticul pe teritoriul României*, in M. Petrescu-Dâmbovița, N. Palincaș, *Partea I Preistoria. Izvoare arheologice*, in Mircea Petrescu-Dâmbovița, Alexandru Vulpe (coord.), *op. cit.*, p.96

<sup>173</sup> Ion Miclea, Radu Florescu, *op. cit.*, p.55

<sup>174</sup> V. Boroneanț, *Probleme ale culturii...*, p.39

<sup>175</sup> Although it could have been, at least to its end, contemporary with the first Neolithic communities that have entered the area. Cf. A. Păunescu, Cap. I *Paleoliticul și mezoliticul pe teritoriul României*, in M. Petrescu-Dâmbovița, N. Palincaș, *Partea I Preistoria. Izvoare arheologice*, in Mircea Petrescu-Dâmbovița, Alexandru Vulpe (coord.), *op. cit.*, p.96

<sup>176</sup> *Ibidem*

<sup>177</sup> Ion Miclea, Radu Florescu, *op. cit.*, p.16

neolotization, and even less to a genuine aceramic Neolithic<sup>178</sup>, having features that distinguish it from all of its latter cultures, being a normal evolution of an epoch, as a consequence of climate warming and changing environmental conditions.

The area of culture extends beyond Romania (probably contained a large part of Balkan Peninsula): the Yugoslavian shore of Porțile de Fier (Vlasac, Padinaresorts), Montenegro (Crvena Stijena – level IV b/1)<sup>179</sup>. Nine settlements were discovered near the Danube: Alibeg – Pescari (level I), Veterani – Terasă (level II), Ogradena – Icoana (level II), Ogradena – Răzvrata (level II), Schela Cladovei – Turnu Severin (level II), Ostrovul Corbului – Botul Cliuciului (level I-II), Ostrovul Mare – Gagoșu<sup>180</sup>. They are located on low terraces near water, or on islands. The dwellings are irregularly shaped huts, grouped in small and rare clusters<sup>181</sup>. The culture also knows the first funerals inside the settlements: whole or partial skeletons, deposited in pits, sometimes sitting on their backs, sometimes in fetal position, with their hands on the abdomen, with offerings<sup>182</sup>. The Schela Cladovean type man, descendant of the Oriental version of the Cro-Magnon man, shows here particularities that suggest a beginning of gracility<sup>183</sup>.

The tools and weapons are also made of stone<sup>184</sup> – tools of microlithic silex, but also of bone (abundant) and tusk<sup>185</sup> – hoes of tusk. Ceramics is not yet known<sup>186</sup>. Man begins now to polish stone<sup>187</sup>. The silex inventory is gradually replaced by the one specific to this culture, where quartz processing is predominant, of quartic or quartifer rocks. It is invented the hoe with gloving hole and then the antler couler<sup>188</sup>. It did not yet use carving, but rather breakage, resulting in splinters or cracks without striking intention and percussion bulb, by hitting stones against other stones. Some of the splinters or cracks have been processed by retouching<sup>189</sup>.

The artistic view of some of these pieces is revealed by the ornaments with simple geometric motifs, linear incisions, oblique or in grid, on the main part of the hoes or on one of the sides of the arrowhead but also by the bone and

---

<sup>178</sup> A. Păunescu, Cap. I *Paleoliticul și mezoliticul pe teritoriul României*, in M. Petrescu-Dâmbovița, N. Palincaș, *Partea I Preistoria. Izvoare arheologice*, in Mircea Petrescu-Dâmbovița, Alexandru Vulpe (coord.), *op. cit.*, p.96

<sup>179</sup> *Ibidem*

<sup>180</sup> *Ibidem*, p.94

<sup>181</sup> Ion Miclea, Radu Florescu, *op. cit.*, p.55

<sup>182</sup> *Ibidem*, p.56

<sup>183</sup> V. Boroneanț, *Probleme ale culturii...*, p.35

<sup>184</sup> The lithic objects were quaint pieces of quartz or quartic rocks and siliceous hones; fewer types (scrappers and encoche parts) made in a rudimentary carving technique, the rocks not being of good quality, and the silex pieces are rare. There are also tools and weapons from bone and antler (from antler: "scormonitoare", hoes with gloving holes, planters, furrowers of bone: piercings, spear tips and spears, from the wild boar tusk: scrappers, piercings). Cf. A. Păunescu, Cap. I *Paleoliticul și mezoliticul pe teritoriul României*, in M. Petrescu-Dâmbovița, N. Palincaș, *Partea I Preistoria. Izvoare arheologice*, in Mircea Petrescu-Dâmbovița, Alexandru Vulpe (coord.), *op. cit.*, p.95

<sup>185</sup> With dimensions measuring 4-40 cm in length, these are: "scormonitoare", simple hoes, hoes with gloving holes, "plantatoare", furrows. The bone tools are: "scormonitoare", tips used as arrows and spears, and smaller tools made of wild boar tusk used as scrappers, "scormonitoare".

<sup>186</sup> Ion Miclea, Radu Florescu, *op. cit.*, p.56

<sup>187</sup> V. Boroneanț, *Probleme ale culturii...*, p.27

<sup>188</sup> *Ibidem*

<sup>189</sup> *Ibidem*, p.30

tusk spear<sup>190</sup>. Several discoveries of this culture, from the settlements from Icoana, Ostrovul Banului and Schela Cladovei, are examples of new pieces with decorations: horn items from Icoana (they had been before decorated with bone parts only), ornamented with notches circularly disposed around the portion from which a branch of horns was cut, or in irregular vertical rows; to these we add irregular incisions, placed disorderly in grids. Along with shaded bands, by the triangle motifs, in-grid shaded angles (diamond mesh), zigzag motifs and circle motifs meet in the last two phases, notches made on the edges of the objects, from the superficial to the deep and wide ones<sup>191</sup>.

Several pieces must be mentioned from Icoana: a bone piercing, decorated with angular bands composed of two parallel line incisions, hatched inside with oblique lines – a motif deriving from the stair one; a dagger, also made out of bone, with the most complex and well-made decoration of the Schela Cladovei's culture, through deep parallel lines, vertically zigzagged, notched by perpendicular lines, vertically separated by two series of grids, and horizontally, by a band consisting of two parallel lines, hatched inside with oblique lines<sup>192</sup>; a wild boar tusk tool, decorated with a schematized bird, a votive antler piece, in shape of sickle, geometrically ornamented<sup>193</sup>.

## 5. Conclusions

The scale-shaped geometry of the engraved bones from Cuina Turcului, on hoes from Schela Cladovei and from the settlement at Icoana, lead to the main compositional frame of the ornamentation, belonging to the earliest phase of Criș Neolithic's culture<sup>194</sup>, some of the elements that make up the ornamental motif of artworks from the Schela Cladovei's culture: simple or shaded band, angled motif, in grids (rhomboid elements), hatched triangle, zigzag and its waved version, circle, but also the way of expression, the concept of rendering motives in records<sup>195</sup> will pass in ceramics (the Neolithic culture of Starčevo-Criș), which encounters a large field of deployment, both incised decoration, and in paintings, the types of antler tools created now will also find functional continuity throughout the Neolithic<sup>196</sup>.

## Bibliography

1. Bărbulescu, Mihai, Deletant, Dennis, Hitchins, Keith, Papacostea, Șerban, Teodor, Pompiliu, (2007), *Istoria României*, Ed. Corint, București

<sup>190</sup> A. Păunescu, Cap. I *Paleoliticul și mezoliticul pe teritoriul României*, in M. Petrescu-Dâmbovița, N. Palincaș, *Partea I Preistoria. Izvoare arheologice*, in Mircea Petrescu-Dâmbovița, Alexandru Vulpe (coord.), *op. cit.*, p.95

<sup>191</sup> Vasile Boroneanț, *Noi date...*, p.111

<sup>192</sup> Vladimir Dumitrescu, *op. cit.*, p.14

<sup>193</sup> V. Boroneanț, *Probleme ale culturii...*, p.39

<sup>194</sup> Ion Miclea, Radu Florescu, *op. cit.*, p.17

<sup>195</sup> Vasile Boroneanț, *Noi date...*, p.115

<sup>196</sup> Idem, *Probleme ale culturii...*, p.39



2. Boroneanț Vasile, (1972), *Noi date despre cele mai vechi manifestări de artă plastică de pe teritoriul României*, în *Studii și cercetări de istoria artei*, tomul 19, 1, București, p.109-116
3. Boroneanț Vasile, (1988), *Probleme ale culturii Schela Cladovei – Lepénski Vir în lumina noilor cercetări*, în Drobeta, IV, Drobeta-Turnu Severin, p.27-42
4. Drăguț, Vasile, *Arta românească*, vol. I, *Preistorie, Antichitate, Ev Mediu, Renaștere, Baroc*, (198), Ed. Meridiane, București
5. Dumitrescu, Vladimir, (1974), *Arta preistorică în România*, Ed. Meridiane, București
6. Florescu, Radu, Daicoviciu, Hadrian, Roșu, Lucian (coord.), (1980), *Dicționar enciclopedic de artă veche a României*, Ed. Științifică și Enciclopedică, București
7. Giurescu, Dinu C., (1981), *Istoria ilustrată a românilor*, Ed. Sport-Turism, București
8. Miclea, Ion, Florescu, Radu, (1980), *Preistoria Daciei*, Ed. Meridiane, București
9. Petrescu-Dîmbovița, Mircea, Vulpe, Alexandru (coord.), (2010), *Istoria românilor*, vol.I, *Moștenirea timpurilor îndepărtate*, Academia Română, Ed. Enciclopedică, București