

**MINISTRY OF NATIONAL EDUCATION  
„1 DECEMBRIE 1918” UNIVERSITY OF ALBA IULIA  
FACULTY OF HISTORY AND FILOLOGY  
DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF HISTORY**

**NEOLITHIC AND ENEOLITHIC ANTHROPOMORPHIC AND  
ZOOMORPHIC CLAY FIGURINES FROM TRANSYLVANIA**

**PhD ABSTRACT**

**Phd Coordinator**

Prof. univ. dr. hab. Mihai Gligor

**Phd Candidate:**

Ancuța Ioana Ileş (Bobîna)

**Alba Iulia**

**2018**

KEYWORDS: anthropomorphic figurines, zoomorphic figurines, anthropo-zoomorphic figurines, Neolithic, Eneolithic, Transylvania, macroscopic analysis, radiography, 3D scanning, graphic tablet, database, *le chaîne opératoire*

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **I. METHODOLOGICAL AND TERMINOLOGICAL ASPECTS REGARDING ANTHROPOMORPHIC AND ZOOMORPHIC CLAY FIGURINES RESEARCH**

I.1. Methodology and terminology

I.2. Main typological aspects used in scientific literature

#### **II. THE HISTORY OF RESEARCH AND CURRENT STATE OF RESEARCH REGARDING NEOLITHIC AND ENEOLITHIC ANTHROPOMORPHIC AND ZOOMORPHIC CLAY FIGURINES FROM TRANSYLVANIA**

#### **III. THE REPERTOIRE OF THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES WITH DISCOVERIES OF ANTHROPOMORPHIC AND ZOOMORPHIC CLAY FIGURINES FROM TRANSYLVANIA**

III.1. The repertoire of the archaeological sites

III.2. Analysis and interpretation of the results

#### **IV. CASE STUDY: PRIMARY ANALYSIS MADE ON A SAMPLE OF ANTHROPOMORPHIC AND ZOOMORPHIC CLAY FIGURINES**

IV.1. The category of anthropomorphic figurines

IV.2. The category of zoomorphic figurines

IV.3. Analysis and interpretation of the results

#### **V. MODERN TECHNIQUES APPLIED IN RESEARCHING THE ANTHROPOMORPHIC AND ZOOMORPHIC CLAY FIGURINES**

V.1. The use of radiological science and results

V.2. 3D scanning technique

#### **VI. INTERPRETATIONS CONCERNING THE ANTHROPOMORPHIC AND ZOOMORPHIC NEOLITHIC AND ENEOLITHIC CLAY FIGURINES**

VI.1. Main directions and interpretation regarding the anthropomorphic and zoomorphic figurines

VI.2. The category of anthropomorphic figurines

VI.3. The category of zoomorphic figurines

VI.3.1 Symbolistic interpretation of the faunistic representations

VI.4. *Le chaîne opératoire*

VI.4.1. Manufacturing and firing

VI.4.2. Ornamentation

VI.4.3. Fragmentation

## **FINAL CONSIDERATIONS**

List of figures

Bibliographical Abbreviations

Bibliography

Appendix

## INTRODUCTION

The vast research field concerning the Neolithic and Eneolithic clay figurines has produced in the last decades a consistent specialised literature that has gathered numerous discussions and divergent opinions. The investigations techniques, methods of approaching, analysing and presenting the results obtained are concentrated into different aspects involving this particular field.

The necessity of a precise repertoire to encompass these special artefacts was mandatory. In the current state of research, there is a limited number of exhaustive publications or studies that managed to collect information over these types of artefacts. Therefore, I considered that a repertoire of discoveries that will include all the anthropomorphic, zoomorphic and hybrid artefacts must be ascertained.

The repertoire was realised by using a personalised database completed in Microsoft Access (2007) by using statistical query entries. The accessibility of the software is the fact that it can be easily transformed to contain more artefacts and even to enlarge the geographical territory that will be subjected to research.

The research area that I concentrated upon corresponds to the geographical limits of Transylvania<sup>1</sup>, excluding the Banat region and it covers the chronological timeframe of Early Neolithic reaching Final Eneolithic<sup>2</sup>.

By using modern research techniques (statistical software, X-rays and 3D scanning), we can depict better inferences over these findings. The interpretations involving these artefacts are varied and by reviewing the literature we can observe different connotations given to these finds, such as gods and goddesses represented in various manners, amulets, deceased individuals from the community or ludic objects made by or for children. Some of these ideas are given through ethnographic perspectives. A series of studies, that carefully analyse the archaeological context of the discoveries and are analysing the artefacts through modern methods of investigation are trying to explore the place of origin and the meaning of these objects for the community.

---

<sup>1</sup> For the geographical area see Pop 2003, 11. The database is comprised from entries created on artefact discoveries from Transylvania (jud. Cluj, Sălaj, Bistrița-Năsăud, Alba, Mureș, Harghita, Hunedoara, Sibiu, Brașov și Covasna), from North West and West area (jud. Satu Mare, Bihor și Arad).

<sup>2</sup> Cultures and cultural groups: Starčevo-Criș, Herpály, Pișcolt, Lumea Nouă, Ceramica Liniară, Vinča, Turdaș, Suplac, Iclod, Tisa, Foeni, Petrești, Precucuteni, Ariușd, Tiszapolgár, Bodrogkeresztúr/ pill handles horizon. For discussion about the final period of the Eneolithic period see Diaconescu 2009, 25-26; Diaconescu 2015; Schier 2014.

# **I. METHODOLOGICAL AND TERMINOLOGICAL ASPECTS REGARDING ANTROPOMORPHIC AND ZOOMORPHIC CLAY FIGURINES RESEARCH**

## **I.1. Methodology and terminology**

The categories of anthropomorphic and zoomorphic clay figurines are encompassing various types of artefacts, including the rare anthropo-zoomorphic artefacts.

The repertoire that contains all the discoveries of this type were made by using GIS technology on geographical maps as I considered that my research required creating it. The modelling encompasses the cultural timeframe, spatial distribution and also it displays the typological aspects of each artefact. It can be visualised in Appendix 1. Each category has registered a series of deviations as follows: the anthropomorphic figurines category is comprised of anthropomorphic, anthropomorphic females, anthropomorphic males, anthropomorphic androgynes figures, pottery vessels, applications and representations on vessels, handles and protomes, lids, miniature altars and all the artefacts that present anthropomorphic features; the zoomorphic category is comprised of: figurines, pottery vessels, applications and representations on vessels, handles and protomes, zoomorphic altars and bucrania. To these mentioned categories I incorporated as well the group of the anthropo-zoomorphic representations.

The catalogue was realised by using the archaeological technique of drawing the artefacts, followed by using the graphic tablet in combination with Photoshop CS6 software. The artefacts were macroscopically analysed by following the traits with reference to the type of clay, firing process, colour and manufacturing techniques. They were weighed and measured and some were subjected to X-ray investigations and 3D scanning.

The terminology used in the visual description of these archaeological finds are various and in some cases, slightly extravagant<sup>3</sup>. Usually, they are described throughout with the following terms, idols<sup>4</sup>, statuettes<sup>5</sup>, representations<sup>6</sup> or figurines<sup>7</sup>.

## **I.2. Main typological aspects used in scientific literature**

The miniatures discovered were divided into two main categories – anthropomorphic and zoomorphic which, in turn, were divided by manufacturing and creating techniques,

---

<sup>3</sup> Apud Gligor 2013, 70.

<sup>4</sup> DA 1995, 226; MDA 2010, vol. I, 1105.

<sup>5</sup> MDA 2010, vol. II, 974; DA 1998, 135.

<sup>6</sup> DEX 2012, 945.

<sup>7</sup> DA 1995, 181-182.

ornamentation or species (in case of zoomorphic/anthropo-zoomorphic ones). As an example, the anthropomorphic figurines from Precucuteni culture were classified by their body's position, each having distinctive ways of depiction<sup>8</sup>. The figurines attributed chronologically to Starčevo-Criș and Vinča cultural horizons, from Banat region, were studied by Gh. Lazarovici. The author is differing these artefacts by shape<sup>9</sup>, adding as well a category of miscellaneous objects<sup>10</sup>. E. Comșa chooses to present the artefacts by the typological aspects offered by the literature for each chronological timeframe<sup>11</sup>, adjoining as well a series of distinctive finds<sup>12</sup>.

Classification and chronological framing are notable in monographies or studies that have dealt with significant samples of these special artefacts<sup>13</sup>. There are mentionable as well the examinations made by D. Monah<sup>14</sup>, R. R. Andreescu<sup>15</sup> and S. Hansen<sup>16</sup>.

Concerning the zoomorphic figurines, these were not subjected to elaborate enquiries but are mentioned in the reminded studies. Nevertheless, over the last years, their study has amplified to such an extensive way that they are studied in connection with faunistic remains<sup>17</sup>. This particular category is also extremely diverse and among the researchers that displayed classification and typological aspects for these artefacts, we mention the studies of A. Nițu<sup>18</sup>, Gh. Lazarovici<sup>19</sup>, C.-Magda Mantu<sup>20</sup>, V. Chirică și M. C. Văleanu<sup>21</sup>. Valentina Balabina conducts one of the most extensive works on the zoomorphic figurines<sup>22</sup>, casting precious connexions with zoological features.

---

<sup>8</sup> Marinescu-Bîlcu 1974, 89-90.

<sup>9</sup> Lazarovici 1979, 32-35, 88-90.

<sup>10</sup> Lazarovici 1979, 54, 104-105.

<sup>11</sup> Comșa 1995.

<sup>12</sup> Comșa 1995, 45-49.

<sup>13</sup> see Nițu 1970; Nițu 1971; Paul 1992; Lazarovici, Maxim 1995; Ignat 1998; Ciută 2005; Gligor 2009; Gligor 2013; Suci 2009; Sztáncsu 2009; Sztáncsu 2015; Ciută, Florescu 2010; Băcueț Crișan 2013; Băcueț Crișan, Virag 2006; Virag 2015; Luca 2015; Luca 2016; Luca *et al.* 2017; Ștefan 2014; Ștefan 2016; Ștefan *et al.* 2013; Bobîna 2017 etc.

<sup>14</sup> Monah 1997; Monah 2012.

<sup>15</sup> Andreescu 2002, 19, 77-90.

<sup>16</sup> Hansen 2007.

<sup>17</sup> See Furnică 2014a, 515.

<sup>18</sup> Nițu 1972, 14-15.

<sup>19</sup> Lazarovici 1979, 100-103.

<sup>20</sup> Mantu 1994, 161.

<sup>21</sup> Chirică, Văleanu 2008, 118-119.

<sup>22</sup> Balabina 1998, 5.

## II. THE HISTORY OF RESEARCH AND CURRENT STATE OF RESEARCH REGARDING NEOLITHIC AND ENEOLITHIC ANTHROPOMORPHIC AND ZOOMORPHIC CLAY FIGURINES FROM TRANSYLVANIA

This chapter represents an overview of the scientific literature that has treated over the years the subject of Neolithic and Eneolithic figurines. The interest vis-à-vis these artefacts is known to have risen by the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century<sup>23</sup>. These primary incursions are followed by studies over large samples of artefacts<sup>24</sup>, discussions over the prehistoric art<sup>25</sup> and accounts over the spectacular Cucuteni figurines<sup>26</sup>.

Gh. Lazarovici<sup>27</sup>, E. Comşa<sup>28</sup> or D. Monah<sup>29</sup>, R. R. Andreescu<sup>30</sup> or S. Hansen<sup>31</sup> are among the archaeologists that draw towards different methods of approaching these types of discoveries.

Typological aspects and interpretations are offered as well by researchers that study various samples from the archaeological sites through the published monographic series<sup>32</sup> or through the different articles that are concerned with these artefacts<sup>33</sup>. Adding up to the aforementioned list of studies the field is enriched with exhibition catalogues<sup>34</sup>, studies about Neolithic art<sup>35</sup> and spirituality of the mentioned period<sup>36</sup>.

---

<sup>23</sup> Roska 1941.

<sup>24</sup> Dumitrescu 1968; Höckmann 1968.

<sup>25</sup> Dumitrescu 1974.

<sup>26</sup> Dumitrescu 1979.

<sup>27</sup> Lazarovici 1979.

<sup>28</sup> Comşa 1995.

<sup>29</sup> Monah 1997.

<sup>30</sup> Andreescu 2002.

<sup>31</sup> Hansen 2007.

<sup>32</sup> Paul 1992; Lazarovici, Maxim 1995; Luca 1997; Ignat 1998; Ciută 2005; Gligor 2009; Suciu 2009; Bărbat 2013; Virag 2015; Bem 2015; Sztáncsuj 2015; Luca 2015; Luca 2016; Luca *et al.* 2017 etc.

<sup>33</sup> Bader 1968; Pădureanu 1973; Vlăsa 1976; Lakó 1977; Lakó 1978; Zrínyi 1981-1982; Lazarovici 1980; Lazarovici 1985; Lazarovici 1991; Lazarovici, Lakó 1981; Lazarovici, Pădureanu 1981; Lazarovici, Dumitrescu 1985-1986; Lazarovici, Kalmar 1987; Lazarovici, Maxim 1989-1993; Lazarovici, Kalmar-Maxim 1990; Lazarovici *et al.* 2002; Lazarovici *et al.* 2011; Luca 1994; Luca 2014; Luca 2001; Luca, Iercoşan 1998; Luca, Luca 2015; Ursuţiu 2000; Rustoiu 2001; Ignat 2001; Ignat 2006; Gligor 2003; Gligor 2013; Gligor 2017a; Gligor 2017b; Sztáncsuj 2007; Tincu, Marc 2008; Maxim *et al.* 2009; Ciută, Florescu 2010; Popa, Fazecaş 2012; Băcuet Crişan 2013; Băcuet Crişan, Virag 2006; Ştefan 2014; Ştefan 2016; Ştefan, Petcu 2015; Ştefan *et al.* 2013; Ştefan *et al.* 2015; Buzea, Kovács 2015; Némethi, Hágó 2015; Sava 2015; Dimache *et al.* 2017; Bobîna 2017 etc.

<sup>34</sup> Ex. Scânteia 1999; Draşovean, Ciubotaru 2001; Catalogue SM, 2007; Lazarovici *et al.* 2009 etc.

<sup>35</sup> Draşovean, Popovici 2008.

<sup>36</sup> Istoria Românilor 2001, 124-196.

### **III. THE REPERTOIRE OF THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES WITH DISCOVERIES OF ANTHROPOMORPHIC AND ZOOMORPHIC CLAY FIGURINES FROM TRANSYLVANIA**

Studies associating Neolithic and Eneolithic clay figurines have been published over the years in dedicated scientific literature. In the current state of research, the number of these artefacts it is unknown. Therefore, I considered useful creating a detailed repertoire of each discovery that could encompass the figurine itself, classifications and degree of preservation. It contains published discoveries but as well unpublished material.

#### **III.1. The repertoire of the archaeological sites**

The repertoire has been built by following an alphabetical order and each point taken is geographically localised. As I stated above, it contains data about the categories of the clay figurines, chronological timeframe as well as the references that I used.

#### **III.2. Analysis and interpretation of the results**

Due to the repertoire management, I identified a number of 1453 clay figurines- complete ones but also fragmentary. Within these, the category of anthropomorphic figurines was represented by 928 artefacts, zoomorphic ones by 519, and a number of 5 is denoted as anthropo-zoomorphic ones, as one artefact remains unidentified. This number of artefacts is the result of the research over the years into 112 archaeological sites.

Given the queries from the database, I managed to make some interrogations based on a certain series of aspects. The data package is presented as statistical graphics and contains groups distribution, fragmentation degree, variety among the categories, spatial distribution during research, etc.

### **IV. CASE STUDY: PRIMARY ANALYSIS MADE ON A SAMPLE OF ANTHROPOMORPHIC AND ZOOMORPHIC CLAY FIGURINES**

The access that I gained during my research years to both of the main categories of clay figurines has given me the possibility to implement a research method dedicated to these artefacts. My study concentrated on the item itself. The primary analysis<sup>37</sup> has looked into the

---

<sup>37</sup> See Andreescu în 2002.



type of clay used, firing, manufacturing and modelling and as well looked into describing the ornamentation if the artefact had it. The figurines were each weighted and measured. After the primary drawing, made in a regular way on millimetre paper, I scanned and digitalised the figurines<sup>38</sup>; the results can be consulted in the catalogue.

Most of these artefacts were published in the scientific literature and they are discoveries made during field research such as systematic investigations or rescue ones: Alba Iulia – *Lumea Nouă*; Petrești – *Groapa Galbenă*; Tărtăria – *Gura Luncii*; Tibru, Orăștie – *Dealul Pemilor Punctul X<sub>2</sub>*; Deva – *Cimitirul Reformat/ Camera Mortuară*; Șoimuș – *La Avicola*; Turdaș; Brănișca – *Pe Hotar*; Homorodu de Sus – *Ograda Borzului*; Tășnad – *Sere*; Pișcolt – *Lutărie*; Carei – *Cozard*; Halmeu – *Vamă*; Călinești-Oaș – *Dâmbul Sfintei Mării*; Suplacu de Barcău – *Corău și – Dealul Roșu*.

**IV.1. The category of anthropomorphic figurines** is comprised of 188 artefacts complete or fragmentary that were macroscopically analysed, weighed and redrawn.

**IV.2. The category of zoomorphic figurines** is comprised of 23 artefacts that were subjected to analysis and described.

**IV.3. Analysis and interpretation of the results** are presenting different observed aspects in terms of the clay preparation techniques for each artefact, as well as details about firing, ornamentation and data about the degree of fragmentation. By using the database queries entries, I did a series of statistical graphics. The conclusions that I got to after these inquiries are that there are differences in the perspective of chronological timeframe for each artefact and that they were modelled and used during different events. Most of them are made in a schematic technique. The realistic ones are characterized by a reduced number and both of them (realist and schematic) are encountered in different quantities among the studied prehistorical period.

## **V. MODERN TECHNIQUES APPLIED IN RESEARCHING THE ANTHROPOMORPHIC AND ZOOMORPHIC CLAY FIGURINES**

This chapter presents a series of information regarding non-destructive analysis made on clay figurines.

### **V.1. The use of radiological science and results**

---

<sup>38</sup> See Bobîna 2015, 9 and forthcoming.

This method allows the examination of the clay figurines through the perspective of the radiological science, which, by contrast, permits discerning the way the artefacts were made. Several figurines benefited from this method and I observed the following: some of them were modelled from multiple parts, others have details like transversal perforations, points or even fissures.

### **V.2. 3D Scanning**

Another used method was 3D scanning with Artec Space Spider, which uses structured light. The artefact subjected to this technique was the clay figurine discovered at Tibru (Alba County). This method allowed observing particular details on the surface of the artefact, and one introduced into the viewing database it can be observed online<sup>39</sup>.

## **VI. INTERPRETATIONS CONCERNING THE ANTHROPOMORPHIC AND ZOOMORPHIC NEOLITHIC AND ENEOLITHIC CLAY FIGURINES**

### **VI.1. Main directions and interpretation regarding the anthropomorphic and zoomorphic figurines**

Studying anthropomorphic and zoomorphic clay figurines plays an important part in understanding prehistoric communities. The main issue encountered, which gave birth to divergent opinions in this field is their primordial meaning, their interpretation.

The artefacts identified in my thesis, although they are a part from the same manifestation, have differences, starting to quantitative ones and followed by manufacturing techniques, all of this generating a visible contrast.

### **VI.2. The category of anthropomorphic figurines**

This group is extremely varied, therefore has received a special attention from the scientific dedicate literature. All the artefacts from this category are modelled from different forms of clay, the firing is not uniform and the colours resulting from this vary from grey to red. Many of them are discovered in a fragmentary state, therefore the number of complete ones is reduced. In some of the cases, we can observe a schematic<sup>40</sup> approach in realising the anatomical details. If ornamentation is present it can be distributed to a certain area of the element or it is

---

<sup>39</sup> See link <https://sketchfab.com/models/28eb511681854c45b6f83aefad40d1a1>.

<sup>40</sup> See Lazăr 1974-1975, 13.

covering the entire figurine. It can be comprised of incisions, lines, dots (with different depths and dimensions) or painting.

### **VI.3. The category of zoomorphic figurines**

So far, archaeological sciences have analysed the fauna only through an economic perspective, the part that the animal itself played within the community being slightly left out<sup>41</sup>. In terms of zoomorphic depictions, there is not a visible difference in manufacturing technique or surface treating (decorations). They respect roughly the same techniques in manufacturing. Some of the interpretation given by the researchers in trying to elaborate different theories regarding this particular group of figurines is that they could be faunal replicas modelled in with a cultic purpose<sup>42</sup>, or totemic animals, psychopomps or sacrificial representations<sup>43</sup>. Other concepts consider that they could be teaching materials or toys, made by or for children, as a way of instruction towards pottery making.

**VI.3.1. Symbolistic interpretation of the faunistic representations** is presenting according to the Dictionary of Symbols<sup>44</sup>, the interpretations regarding the faunal species modelled in clay.

### **VI.4. *Le chaîne opératoire***

#### **VI.4.1. Manufacturing and firing**

The artefacts studied and analysed in my thesis are made from clay. The material allowed by its properties to influence the creation of various archaeological artefacts, ceramics included. The figurines were made from one or two parts and the firing process took place at a low temperature, as the colour displayed on their surface indicated. Some are carefully modelled while others are made in a schematic technique.

#### **VI.4.2. Ornamentation**

Ornamentation is not very frequent in the sample of figurines that I analysed<sup>45</sup>. When present, the surface is covered with decorations such as incised line or dots, sometimes encrusted with different substances or painted. The ornaments are not evenly distributed as it can be present either on the whole surface of the figurine or displayed in certain areas.

---

<sup>41</sup> Vitezović 2015, 7.

<sup>42</sup> Dumitrescu 1968, 52-53; Horváth 1998, 296 și urm.

<sup>43</sup> Dumitrescu 1968, 53; Talalay 1993, 40-51; Lazarovici, Maxim 1995, 147; Schmandt-Besserat 1997, 55-57; Campbell 2005, 68; Becker 2007, 39-40; Meskell *et al.* 2008; Ilie, Dumitru 2014, 38; Furnică 2014a, 89.

<sup>44</sup> Evseev 1994.

<sup>45</sup> Material exposed in my thesis.

### VI.4.3. Fragmentation

Fragmentation in archaeology is a field that encompasses disintegration of these types of artefacts as well and over the year this topic has built an impressive scientifically perspective<sup>46</sup>. Even though connexion has made so far between the main points of this domain – deposition/ context/ fragmentation this habit cannot be fully understood<sup>47</sup>.

This chapter presents also some *unknown* relations. Who were the members of the community that modelled these artefacts? Can we discuss about specialised people<sup>48</sup> that made them? Here we can draw a conclusion and point out the fact that not all the figurines are made from the same clay and the firing process is not a constant one. How important was the colour obtained from the firing process? This “equation” has a lot more variables: the clay, temperature and firing atmosphere. What could be the meaning of these figurines, how were they perceived by the people within the community? - all these are questions that in modern themes are not adequate for understanding the mentality of prehistoric groups.

The artefact receives religious valences and is automatically linked to the beliefs in a deity of fertility, fecundity with attributes that are over our modern perceptions. How do we make differences between the figurines that were attributed to spiritual purposes of the ones that were used in designated rituals or ceremonies? What was the nature of these ceremonies and rituals? These are other poignant questions that come across when we try to understand these artefacts. Why most of the figurines are modelled in schematic techniques while others are realistically made? Is it possible that this is only given by the dexterity and knowledge of the person who made them? Idols, characters, deities or toys? This is by far one of the most important aspects that need explaining. Are these figurines perhaps, trying to send a message? The ornaments could be carrying messages, or could be just simple ways of decoration, tattoos, skin painting, scarification or are they revealing adornments and jewellery worn by the members of that community?

If these are the depictions of deities why did the members preferred to dress them, for desacralisation purposes? Could these represent their deceased ones, ancestors?<sup>49</sup> We must not

---

<sup>46</sup> Chapman 2000, 23 și urm.; Porčić 2012, 810 și urm.; see discussion at Bailey 2017, 827 și urm.

<sup>47</sup> Porčić, Blagojević 2014, 91.

<sup>48</sup> Talalay 1993, 32-33.

<sup>49</sup> For example, in Africa, the puppets are rarely without meaning for people. They always represent play partners from children, spiritual agents, fertility symbols for both sexes, amulets given to females, avatars of the deceased (especially twins), that must be fed, washed and treated as they are still alive see Graham 2013, 3.

exclude the theories that these artefacts could be attributed to deities<sup>50</sup>, individuals from within the community<sup>51</sup>, worshipers or simple toys, animals that were going to be sacrificed, amulets for different members or fantastical animals for anthropo-zoomorphic representations.

These theories, exaggerated or not, must be demonstrated through solid scientific evidence, sustained by the context they were discovered in and also by the suitable analysis.

Why is there such a large discrepancy between the main figurine categories? If people have the tendency to represent what they see in their environment and tend to react to what impresses them, we do not have a plausible explanation for the outnumbered zoomorphic figurines.

## CONCLUSION

The discussions that involve theories about this particular type of artistic manifestation in prehistorical times have not come to a conclusion. In the current state of research, we can make an observation concerning categories of representation, typology of the artefacts, state of preservation or ornamentation methods.

Until now, we have a concrete number of archaeological points and locations (112) where 1453 artefacts, most of them published, were discovered.

From the beginning of my research, I realised that the difference between the two main categories is notable. The explanation is that for the zoomorphic representation's perspective the manufacturing technique is much simpler and the number of the discoveries is reduced. Most probably they were made from organic materials that were not subjected to firing. If we assume that they were made by members from within the community that had herds of animals the low number of discoveries might be plausible.

Another aspect that seemed obvious from the beginning was the preservation state of these artefacts, the complete ones being represented by a low number comparing with the fragmentary ones.

The places of the discoveries are varied; we find these representations in all sorts of archaeological contexts such as houses, pits or ritualistic structures. As a final statement

---

<sup>50</sup> We mention the discovery of Parța sanctuary; see Isaiia complex; or the spectacular discoveries from Çatalhöyük; see Kovács 2016a etc.

<sup>51</sup> Crnabrja 2011, 139-140.

regarding this aspect is that most probably these artefacts were used within the community for certain purposes. They could be linked to household activities or spiritual and ritual beliefs and practices.

The manufacturing of the figurines is diverse. Given this, I concluded that they were made in a familiar environment, by different persons used in an intimate space, such a one's household. The realistic ones, that are clearly made by specialised persons within the community, such as the individuals in charge with the pottery manufacturing with precise knowledge and expertise regarding the clay that was about to be transformed through modelling, firing and painting.

The decorations, encountered predominantly in Neolithic and Eneolithic on pottery vessels are present on the figurines as well, or in some cases are used to ornament specific anatomical parts of the representations. The technique of adorning is made through incised lines, points and even painting. Regarding the zoomorphic figurines, the beautification of these particular objects is rare.

The macroscopic analysis's results, the measurements made on a series of fragments and by observing the details concerning the clay used, the firing process and manufacturing technique are presented in a dedicated catalogue. A series of figurines were chosen to be subjected to radiological investigation and 3D scanning.

It can be stated that, in the current state of research, the period of Middle Neolithic and Eneolithic offers the most abundant and diverse variety of representations.

I decided to present both of the categories together. The anthropomorphic ones are more diverse, displaying carefulness in the modelling and manufacturing technique and are outnumbering the zoomorphic ones that are made in a simplistic way. The link between those categories is the fact that they were made within the community area, probably by distinctive members during a common activity and they were used together or separately, therefore these particular types of discoveries must not be treated individually.

Even though I haven't precisely determined the attributes of these artefacts and their meaning for the community, I managed to gather and structure all the discoveries regarding these prehistoric clay figurines in a chronological order; I established a topographical map by combining the discoveries of both anthropomorphic and zoomorphic artefacts. The

methodological aspects that I proposed, the database<sup>52</sup> and the use of modern techniques in researching can be a starting point and can allow us to better understand these particular archaeological finds.

Translated by Ana Fetcu, B Pâclișan

### **Selected bibliography**

- Expo Scânteia 1999      *Expoziția Scânteia. Cercetare arheologică și restaurare*, Helios, Iași, 1999.
- Istoria Românilor 2001      *Istoria Românilor*, vol. I, Ed. Enciclopedică, București, 2001.
- Catalog SM 2007      *Catalogul colecției de arheologie*, Muzeul Județean Satu Mare, L. Marta, P. L. Szöcs coord., Satu Mare, 2007.
- DA 1995      *Dicționar de Artă, Forme, Tehnici, Stiluri Artistice*, A-M, Ed. Meridiane, București, 1995.
- DA 1998      *Dicționar de Artă, Forme, Tehnici, Stiluri Artistice*, N-Z, Editura Meridiane, București, 1998.
- DEX 2012      *Dicționarul Explicativ al Limbii Române*, Academia Română Institutul de Lingvistică „Iorgu Iordan-A. Rosetti”, Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold, București, 2012.
- MDA 2010      *Mic Dicționar Academic*, vol I, II, Academia Română, București, 2010.
- Andreescu 2002      R. R. Andreescu, *Plastica antropomorfă Gumelnițeană, Analiză primară*, Muzeul Național de Istorie a României, București, 2002.
- Bader 1968      T. Bader, *Despre figurinele antropomorfe în cadrul culturii Criș*, în *ActaMN*, V, 1968, 381-388.
- Bailey 2017      D. W. Bailey, *Southeast European Neolithic Figurines. Beyond Context, Interpretation, and Meaning*, în *Oxford Handbook of Prehistoric figurines*, T. Insoll ed., Oxford University Press, 2017, 823-850.

---

<sup>52</sup> This is a database made to preserve and present information about the Neolithic and Eneolithic anthropomorphic and zoomorphic figurines from Transylvania. It can easily be transformed to encompass other regions of Romania and different timeframes.

- Balabina 1998                      Valentina I. Balabina, *Figurki zhivotnyh v plastike Kukuteni-Tripol'ja*, Moskva, 1998.
- Băcueț Crișan 2013                Sanda Băcueț Crișan, *Arta miniaturală din situl de la Porț-Corău: statuetele antropomorfe. Studiu preliminar*, în *Anales Universitatis Apulensis*, Series Historica, 17/II, 2013, 83-99.
- Băcueț Crișan, Virag 2006        Sanda Băcueț Crișan, C. Virag, *Plastica antropomorfa neolitică din nord-vestul României*, în *Fontes Historiae, Studia in honorem Demetrii Protase*, C. Găzdac, C. Gaiu eds., Bistrița-Cluj-Napoca, 2006, 43-59.
- Bărbat 2013                         I. Al. Bărbat, *Complexul cultural Starčevo-Criș în bazinul Mureșului Mijlociu*, (Teză de Doctorat), Alba Iulia, 2013, mss.
- Becker 2007                         Valeska Becker, *Rinder, Schweine, Mischwesen. Zoomorphe Funde der Westlichen Linearbandkeramik*, în *Zwischen Mosel und Morava – neue grabungen und forschungen zur vor- und Frühgeschichte Mitteleuropas*, *Saarbrücker Studien und Materialien*, R. Gleser ed., 11, 2007, 9-95.
- Bem 2015                             C. Bem, *Sistemul de fortificare al stațiunii eneolitice de la Pianu de Jos Podei (Alba, România). Între simbolism și rațiuni defensive*, București, 2015.
- Bobîna 2015                         Ancuța I. Bobîna, *Prelucrarea grafică a figurinelor antropomorfe neolitice. Studiu de caz: grupul cultural Suplac*, în *BCȘS*, 21, 2015, 9-24.
- Bobîna 2017a                        Ancuța I. Bobîna, *Noi descoperiri de plastică aparținând culturii Vinča din situl de la Alba Iulia-Lumea Nouă*, în *BCȘS*, 23, 2017, 19-31.
- Buzea, Kovács 2015                D. L. Buzea, Adela Kovács, *Noi date cu privire la statuetele antropomorfe de dimensiuni mari descoperite la Păuleni – Ciuc „Dâmbul Cetății” (jud. Harghita). Cultura Cucuteni-Ariuşd*, în *Angustia*, 19, 2015, 35-54.
- Campbell 2005                       L. Michelle Campbell, *Antropomorphic and Zoomorphic Figurines of the Eastern Mediterranean*, în *Iris (Journal of the*



- Classical Association of Victoria*), 18, 2005, 65-72.
- Chapman 2000 J. Chapman, *Fragmentation in Archaeology: People, Places and Broken Objects in the Prehistory of South Eastern Europe*, London, 2000.
- Chirică, Văleanu 2008 V. Chirică, M. C. Văleanu, *Umanizarea taurului celest. Mărturii ale spiritualității comunităților cucuteniene de la Ruginoasa-Iași*, Casa Editorială Demiurg, Iași, 2008.
- Ciută 2005 M. M. Ciută, *Începuturile neoliticului timpuriu în spațiul intracarpatic Transilvănean*, Ed. Aeternitas, Alba Iulia, 2005.
- Ciută, Florescu 2010 M. M. Ciută, C. T. Florescu, *Preliminary Considerations Regarding Vinča Anthropomorphic Figurines Discovered in Archaeological Site Limba-Oarda de Jos, Sectors: Bordane, Șesu' Orzii and Vărăria (Alba county)*, în *ActaTS*, IX, 2010, 85-114.
- Comșa 1995 E. Comșa, *Figurinele antropomorfe din epoca neolitică de pe teritoriul României*, Ed. Academiei Române, București, 1995.
- Crnobrnja 2011 A. Crnobrnja, *Arrangement of Vinča Culture Figurines: a Study of Social Structure and Organisation*, în *DP*, XXXVIII, 2011, 131-147.
- Diaconescu 2009 D. Diaconescu, *Cultura Tiszapolgár în România*, *Bibliotheca Brukenthal*, XLI, Sibiu, 2009.
- Diaconescu 2015 D. Diaconescu, *O abordare bayesiană a datelor AMS aparținând epocii cuprului din Câmpia Panonică*, în *AB*, S.N., *Arheologie-Istorie*, XXIII, 2015, 101-118.
- Dimache et al. 2017 Mădălina Dimache, C. E. Ștefan, R. Petcu, *Loom Weight from Șoimuș-Ferma La Avicola 2, Hunedoara County*, în *Revista de Cercetări Arheologice și Numismatice*, 3, 2017, 13-30.
- Drașovean, Ciubotaru 2001 F. Drașovean, D. L. Ciubotaru, *Neolithic Art in Banat, Catalogue of the Exhibition*, Solness, 2001.
- Drașovean, Popovici 2008 F. Drașovean, D. N. Popovici, *L'art Néolithique in Roumanie*, *Arte'm*, Milano/Napoli, 2008.
- Dumitrescu 1968 Vl. Dumitrescu, *Arta neolitică din România*, Ed. Meridiane,

- București, 1968.
- Dumitrescu 1974 Vl. Dumitrescu, *Arta preistorică în România*, Ed. Meridiane, București, 1974.
- Evseev 1994 I. Evseev, *Dicționar de simboluri și arhetipuri culturale*, Ed. Amarcord, Timișoara, 1994.
- Furnică 2014a R. G. Furnică, *Plastica zoomorfă*, în *Comunități cucuteniene din zona Târgu-Frumos*, D. Boghian *et al.*, Ed. Universității „Al. I. Cuza”, Iași, 2014, 86-89.
- Furnică 2014b R. G. Furnică, *Reprezentări zoomorfe din neoliticul și eneoliticul României de la est de Carpați*, (Teză de Doctorat), Iași, 2014, *mss.*
- Gligor 2003 M. Gligor, *O figurină antropomorfă aparținând culturii Petrești de la Alba Iulia – Lumea Nouă*, în *Sargetia*, 31, 51-60.
- Gligor 2009 M. Gligor, *Așezarea neolitică și eneolitică de la Alba Iulia – Lumea Nouă*, Ed. Mega, Cluj-Napoca, 2009.
- Gligor 2013 M. Gligor, *Plastica antropomorfă neolitică din Transilvania. Tradiție și inovație*, în *Anales Universitatis Apulensis, Series Historica*, 17/II, 2013, 69-82.
- Gligor 2017a M. Gligor, *A Clay Figurine With Representation of Pregnancy in Early Eneolithic Transylvania (Romania)*, în *Proceedings of 9<sup>th</sup> European Symposium on Religious Art, Restoration and Conservation*, Kermes Books, Torino, 2017, 143-146.
- Gligor 2017b M. Gligor, *Precucuteni-Type Ceramic Artefacts from Transylvania (Romania)*, în *PLURAL*, V, 1, 2017, 164-189.
- Graham 2013 L. D. Graham, *Terracotta Fertility Figurines of Prehistoric Eurasian Design from Modern East Africa*, [https://www.academia.edu/4685518/Terracotta\\_fertility\\_figurines\\_of\\_prehistoric\\_Eurasian\\_design\\_from\\_modern\\_East\\_Africa](https://www.academia.edu/4685518/Terracotta_fertility_figurines_of_prehistoric_Eurasian_design_from_modern_East_Africa), accesat 20.03.2016.
- Hansen 2007 S. Hansen, *Bilder vom Menschen der Steinzeit. Untersuchungen zur Anthropomorphen Plastik der Jungsteinzeit und Kupferzeit in Südosteuropa*, Teil I-II, Eurasien-Abteilung des Deutschen

- Archäologischen Instituts, Mainz, 2007.
- Horváth 1998 F. Horváth, *The Zoomorphic Figurines of the late Neolithic Gorzsa Group and their South-East European Relation*, în *Man and the Animal World: Studies in Archaeozoology, Archaeology, Anthropology and Paleolinguistics in Memoriam Sándor Bököny*, P. Andreiter, L. Bartosiewicz, Erzsébet Jerem, W. Meid eds, Archeolingua, Budapest, 1998, 285-305.
- Höckmann 1968 O. Höckmann, *Die Menschengestaltige Figuralplastik Der Südosteuropäischen Jungsteinzeit Und Steinkupferzeit*, I-II, Hildesheim, 1968.
- Ignat 1998 Doina Ignat, *Grupul cultural neolitic Suplacu de Barcău*, Ed. Mirton, Timișoara, 1998.
- Ignat 2001 Doina Ignat, *Arta neolitică în NV României*, în *Crisia*, XXI, 2001, 9-22.
- Ignat 2006 Doina Ignat, *Reprezentări plastice antropomorfe din așezarea neolitică de la Suplacu de Barcău*, în *Crisia*, XXXVI, 2006, 6-13.
- Ilie, Dumitru 2014 Ana Ilie, F. Dumitru, *Reprezentări zoomorfe eneolitice din colecțiile Complexului Național Muzeal „Curtea Domnească” Târgoviște*, în *Buletinul Muzeului Județean Teleorman, Seria Arheologie*, 6, 2014, 31-49.
- Kovács 2016a Adela Kovács, *Temple, sanctuare, altare în Neoliticul și Epoca Cuprului din sud-estul Europei*, Ed. Karl A. Romstorfer, Suceava, 2016.
- Lakó 1977 Éva Lakó, *Piese de cult din așezarea neolitică de la Zăuan (jud. Sălaj)*, în *ActaMP*, I, 1977, 41-46.
- Lakó 1978 Éva Lakó, *Raport preliminar de cercetare arheologică efectuată la așezarea neolitică de la Zăuan (jud. Sălaj) în anul 1977*, în *ActaMP*, II, 1978, 11-17.
- Lazarovici et al. 2009 C.-Magda Lazarovici, Gh. Lazarovici, Senica Țurcanu, *Cucuteni a Great Civilization of the Prehistoric World*, Iași, 2009.
- Lazarovici 1979 Gh. Lazarovici, *Neoliticul Banatului*, Cluj-Napoca, 1979.

- Lazarovici 1980 Gh. Lazarovici, *Câteva probleme privind sfârșitul neoliticului timpuriu din nord-vestul României*, în *ActaMN*, XVII, 1980, 13-30.
- Lazarovici 1985 Gh. Lazarovici, *Sincronisme etno-culturale în neoliticul timpuriu din Sălaj și din vestul României*, în *ActaMP*, IX, 1985, 69-91.
- Lazarovici 1991 Gh. Lazarovici, *Grupul și stațiunea Iclod*, Cluj-Napoca, 1991.
- Lazarovici, Lakó 1981 Gh. Lazarovici, Éva Lakó, *Săpăturile de la Zăuan – Campania din 1980 și importanța acestor descoperiri pentru neoliticul din nord-vestul României*, în *ActaMN*, 18, 1981, 13-44.
- Lazarovici, Pădureanu 1981 Gh. Lazarovici, E. D. Pădureanu, *Așezarea neolitică de la Arad – Strada Voievod Moga*, în *Ziridava*, XIII, 1981, 49-73.
- Lazarovici, Dumitrescu 1985-1986 Gh. Lazarovici, Hortensia Dumitrescu, *Cercetări arheologice de la Tăuલાș-Deva (partea a II-a)*, în *ActaMN*, XXII-XXIII, 1985-1986, 3-40.
- Lazarovici, Maxim 1989-1993 Gh. Lazarovici, Zoia Maxim, *Șantierul arheologic Iclod (Campania 1989)*, în *ActaMN*, 26-30 I/2, 1989-1993, 337-363.
- Lazarovici, Kalmar-Maxim 1990 Gh. Lazarovici, Zoia Kalmar-Maxim, *Săpăturile arheologice de la Iclod (Campania 1988)*, în *Apulum*, XXVII-XXX, 1990, 23-57.
- Lazarovici, Maxim 1995 Gh. Lazarovici, Zoia Maxim, *Gura Baciului. Monografie arheologică*, Cluj-Napoca, 1995.
- Lazarovici et al. 2002 Gh. Lazarovici et al., *Descoperiri eneolitice de la Păuleni. Campania 2001*, în *Angustia*, 7, 2002, 19-40.
- Lazarovici et al. 2011 Gh. Lazarovici, C. Magda Lazarovici, M. Merline, *Tărtăria and the Sacred Tablets*, Ed. Mega, Cluj-Napoca, 2011.
- Lazăr 1974-1975 M. D. Lazăr, *Plastica culturii Vinča-Turdaș din colecțiile Muzeului Județean Hunedoara-Deva*, în *Sargetia*, XI-XII, 1974-1975, 11-18.
- Luca 1994 S. A. Luca, *Complexul ritual de la Orăștie-Dealul Pemilor Punct X<sub>2</sub> (jud. Hunedoara)*, în *SCIVA*, 4, 45, 1994, 363-367.
- Luca 2001 S. A. Luca, *Cercetări arheologice la Oradea – Salca și câteva probleme legate de cultura Salca-Herpály – lui Gheorghe*

- Lazarovici la împlinirea vârstei de 60 de ani, în Apulum, XXXVIII/1, 2001, 27-83.*
- Luca 2014 S. A. Luca, *Art and Religious Beliefs in the Neolithic and Aeneolithic from Romania*, Ed. Muzeului Național Brukenthal, Sibiu, 2014.
- Luca 2015 S. A. Luca, *Viața trăită sub zei. Situl Starčevo-Criș I de la Cristian I, jud. Sibiu, România*, C. E. Ursu, S. Țerna eds., Ed. Academiei Române, Ed. Karl A. Romstorfer, Suceava, 2015.
- Luca 2016 S. A. Luca, *Tărtăria Rediviva, Bibliotheca Brukenthal, LXXI*, Ed. Altip, Alba Iulia, 2016.
- Luca, Iercoșan 1998 S. A. Luca, N. Iercoșan, *Noi descoperiri de artă plastică antropomorfă preistorică din zona Careiului, în AB, (S.N.), VI, 1, 1998, 153-166.*
- Luca, Luca 2015 S. A. Luca, A. Luca, *Prehistoric Signs and Symbol in Transylvania (3). „Prometheus” Before Prometheus. The Neolithic and Aeneolithic Settlement from Tărtăria – Gura Luncii (Alba County)*, în *ActaTS, XIV, 2015, 107-115.*
- Luca et al. 2017 S. A. Luca, A. Georgescu, Anamaria Tudorie, Florentina Marțiș, *Cristian III realități cronologice și culturale preistorice dovedite prin cercetările preventive*, Ed. Karl A. Romstorfer, Suceava, 2017.
- Mantu 1994 C. Magda Mantu, *Plastica zoomorfă a așezării cucuteniene de la Scânteia (jud. Iași)*, în *AM, XVII, 1994, 161-168.*
- Marinescu-Bîlcu 1974 Silvia Marinescu-Bîlcu, *Cultura Precucuteni pe teritoriul României*, București, 1974.
- Maxim et al. 2009 Zoia Maxim, J. Marler, Viorica Crișan eds., *The Danube Script in the Light of the Turdaș and Tărtăria Discoveries. Exhibition Catalogue*, Ed. Mega, Cluj-Napoca, 2009.
- Meskeel et al. 2008 Lynn Meskeel, Carolyn Nakamura, Rachel King, Shahina Farid, *Figured Lifeworlds and Depositional Practices at Çatalhöyük*, în *Cambridge Archaeological Journal, 18, 2008, 139-161.*

- Monah 1997 D. Monah, *Plastica antropomorfă a culturii Cucuteni-Tripolie*, Piatra Neamț, 1997.
- Monah 2012 D. Monah, *Plastica antropomorfă a culturii Cucuteni-Tripolie*, (ed. a II-a), Piatra Neamț, 2012.
- Németi, Hágó 2015 J. Németi, A. N. Hágó, *Cultic and Miscellaneous Clay Finds from Pișcolt-Lutărie*, în *Neolithic Cultural Phenomena in the Upper Tisa Basin*, C. Virag ed., Satu Mare, 2015, 185-219.
- Nițu 1970 A. Nițu, *Reprezentările feminine dorsale pe ceramica neoneolitică Carpat-Balcanică*, în *MemAntiq*, II, 1970, 75-99.
- Nițu 1971 A. Nițu, *Noi descoperiri de reprezentări antropomorfe în relief pe ceramica Cucuteni A*, în *Carpica*, IV, 1971, 81-88.
- Nițu 1972 A. Nițu, *Reprezentările zoomorfe plastice pe ceramica neoneolitică carpato-dunareană*, în *AM*, VII, 1972, 9-52.
- Paul 1992 I. Paul, *Cultura Petrești*, Ed. Museion, București, 1992.
- Pădureanu 1973 E. D. Pădureanu, *Noi descoperiri neolitice și din epoca bronzului în jud. Arad*, în *Banatica*, 2, 1973, 395-402.
- Pop 2003 G. P. Pop, *Transilvania, Banat, Crișana și Maramureș. Caracteristici geografice*, în *Istoria Transilvaniei*, vol. I, I. A. Pop, T. Năgler coord., Institutul Cultural Român, Cluj-Napoca, 2003, 11-27.
- Popa, Fazecaș 2012 C. I. Popa, G. T. Fazecaș, *Contribuții la cunoașterea plasticii antropomorfe din așezarea neolitică de la Suplacu de Barcău (jud. Bihor)*, în *Sargetia*, III (XXXIX) S.N., 2012, 7-26.
- Porčić 2012 M. Porčić, *Contextual Analysis of Fragmentation of the Anthropomorphic Figurines from the Late Neolithic site of Selevac*, în *Ethnology and Anthropology*, n. s., 7, 3, 2012, 809-827.
- Porčić, Blagojević 2014 M. Porčić, Tamara Blagojević, *Fragmentation, Context and Spatial Distribution of the Late Neolithic Figurines from Divostin, Serbia*, în *Anthrophmorphism and Symbolic Behaviour in the Neolithic and Cooper Age Communities of South-Eastern Europe*,

- C. E. Ursu, S. Țerna eds., Suceava, 2014, 91-107.
- Roska 1941 M. Roska, *A Torma Zsófia – Gyűjtemény, Az erdélyi Nemzeti Múzeum Érem- És Régiségtárában*, Kolozsvár, 1941.
- Rustoiu 2001 G. T. Rustoiu, *Așezarea de la Oarda – Dublihan*, în *PA*, I, 2001, 55-70.
- Sava 2015 V. Sava, *Neolithic and Eneolithic in the Lower Mureș Basin*, Ed. Mega, Cluj-Napoca, 2015.
- Schier 2014 W. Schier, *The Copper Age in Southeast Europe – Historical Epoch or Typo-Chronological Construct?*, în *The Neolithic and Eneolithic in Southeast Europe. New Approaches to Dating and Cultural Dynamics in the 6<sup>th</sup> to 4<sup>th</sup> Millennium BC*, W. Schier, F. Drașovean eds., Rahden/Westf., Leidorf, 2014, 419-425.
- Schmandt-Besserat 1997 Denise Schmandt-Besserat, *Animal Symbols at Ain Ghazal*, în *Expedition*, 39, 1, 1997, 48-58.
- Suciu 2009 C. I. Suciu, *Cultura Vinča în Transilvania*, Sibiu, 2009.
- Sztáncsu 2007 S. J. Sztáncsu, *Plastică și reprezentări zoomorfe din așezarea eneolitică de la Ariușd (Erősd)*, în *ActaS*, 2007, 187-206.
- Sztáncsu 2009 S. J. Sztáncsu, *Human Representations in the Ariușd Culture in Transylvania*, în *Medias Res Praehistoriae Miscellanea in Honorem Annos LXV Peragentis Professoris Dan Monah Oblata*, G. Bodi ed., Editura Universității „Al. I. Cuza” Iași, 2009, 409-434.
- Sztáncsu 2015 S. J. Sztáncsu, *Grupul cultural Ariușd pe teritoriul Transilvaniei*, Ed. Mega, Cluj-Napoca, 2015.
- Ștefan 2014 C. E. Ștefan, *Some Special Clay Artifacts from Șoimuș – La Avicola (Ferma 2), Hunedoara County, Romania*, în *The Old Potter's Almanack*, 19, 2, 14-22.
- Ștefan 2016 C. E. Ștefan, *Playing with Clay: Anthropomorphic Figurines from Șoimuș – La Avicola (Ferma 2), Hunedoara County*, în *Dacia*, LX, 2016, 31-66.
- Ștefan, Petcu 2015 C. E. Ștefan, R. Petcu, *Notă asupra unor capace de lut cu*

- trăsături umane de la Șoimuș – La Avicola (Ferma 2), jud. Hunedoara, în SP, 12, 2015, 117-126.*
- Ștefan *et al.* 2013 C. E. Ștefan *et al.*, *Reprezentări antropomorfe din așezarea neolitică de la Șoimuș – La Avicola (Ferma 2), jud. Hunedoara, în SP, 10, 2013, 49-66.*
- Ștefan *et al.* 2015 C. E. Ștefan, R. Petcu, R. Petcu, *Vase cu picioare de la Șoimuș – La Avicola (Ferma 2), jud. Hunedoara, în SCIVA, 66, 3-4, 2015, 183-209.*
- Talalay 1993 Lauren E. Talalay, *Deities, Dolls, and Devices. Neolithic Figurines from Franchthi Cave, Greece*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington & Indianapolis, 1993.
- Tincu, Marc 2008 S. Tincu, A. Marc, *Discuții pe marginea a două statuete antropomorfe descoperite în așezarea de la Brănișca Pe Hotar (județul Hunedoara), în Acta Musei Corvinensis, XII, 2008, 55-65.*
- Ursuțiu 2000 A. Ursuțiu, *O statueta neolitică de la Bernadea (jud. Mureș), în Marisia, 25, 2000, 25-28.*
- Virag 2015 C. Virag, *Halmeu-Vamă*, Ed. Muzeului Sătmărean, Satu Mare, 2015.
- Vitezović 2015 Selena Vitezović, *Animal Symbolism in Starčevo Culture, în Representations, Signs and Symbols, Proceedings of the Symposium on Religion and Magic*, N. C. Rișcuță, V. I. Ferencz, Oana Tutilă Bărbat eds., Ed. Mega, Cluj Napoca, 2015, 7-24.
- Vlassa 1976 N. Vlassa, *Neoliticul Transilvaniei. Studii, articole, note*, Cluj-Napoca, 1976.
- Zrinyi 1981-1982 A. Zrinyi, *Contribuții la cunoașterea neoliticului din valea superioară a Mureșului: săpăturile de la Goreni, în Marisia, XI-XII, 1981-1982, 17-29.*