

MINIJATURA IZ SMILČIĆA

U članku se raspravlja o dva keramička ulomka koja pripadaju keramičkom predmetu pronađenom prilikom istraživanja neolitičkog nalazišta u Smilčiću. Zahvaljujući njihovom međusobnom fizičkom povezivanju bilo je moguće predložiti rekonstrukciju koja prikazuje pročelje objekta koji posve odgovara predodžbi jedne neolitičke nastambe sa stiliziranim prikazom rogova postavljenim iznad ulaza. Minimalno sačuvana bočna strana na desnom ulomku pročelja vrlo uvjerljivo sugerira zaključak kako nije riječ samo o prikazu pročelja, nego o čitavom modelu objekta koji nalikuje neolitičkoj nastambi. Ipak, autor je mišljenja kako se ne radi o predočavanju neolitičke nastambe, nego neolitičkog svetišta u funkciji žrtvenika.

KLJUČNE RIJEČI: *Smilčić, naselje, srednji neolitik, danilska kultura, model svetišta, žrtvenik*

Pod inventarnim brojem P12319 i opisom „**neolitički glineni predmet u obliku pročelja kuće sa stiliziranom predstavom goveđe glave**“ u prapovijesnoj zbirci Arheološkog muzeja u Zadru čuva se dio keramičkog predmeta pronađenog prilikom istraživanja neolitičkog nalazišta u Smilčiću. Riječ je o dva keramička ulomka koja bi jedan bez drugoga vjerojatno ušla u skupinu onih tipološki i funkcionalno teško odredljivih nalaza koji se u publikacijama ili muzejskim inventarima obično opisuju formulacijom „dio predmeta nepoznate namjene“ (Sl. 1a-b). To tim prije što o nalazu, osim njegove provenijencije, nisu poznati nikakvi drugi podatci kao što su kontekst i uvjeti pronalaska. Međutim, ovako sretno međusobno povezani očigledno čine tek manji dio cjeline o čijem je potpunom izgledu ipak moguće raspravljati, što samo po sebi podrazumijeva

A MINIATURE FROM SMILČIĆ

The article deals with two fragments of a ceramic object found in the excavations of the Neolithic site of Smilčić. Owing to their physical joining it was possible to suggest a reconstruction which depicts front of an object which corresponds fully to concept of a Neolithic house with stylized depiction of horns placed above the entrance. Minimally preserved lateral side on the right fragment suggest very convincingly a conclusion that this was not depiction of the front only but model of entire object which resembles a Neolithic house. However the author believes that this was not depiction of a Neolithic house but of a Neolithic sanctuary functioning as altar.

KEYWORDS: *Smilčić, settlement, Middle Neolithic, Danilo culture, sanctuary model, altar*

Inventory number **P12319** and description “**Neolithic clay object in shape of a house front with stylized depiction of a bovine head**” in the prehistoric collection of the Archaeological Museum in Zadar refer to two conjoining fragments of a ceramic object recovered during the excavations of the Neolithic site in Smilčić. If these two ceramic fragments did not conjoin, they would probably be classified into a group of objects which are difficult to interpret in typological and functional terms and are usually described as “fragment of an object of unknown function” (Fig. 1a-b). Furthermore, except for its provenance, nothing else is known about the object, e.g. context and circumstances of discovery. However although they were joined they still make only a smaller portion of an object whose appearance nevertheless can be discussed offering in that way an opportunity to consid-



SL. I. / FIG. I.

(fototeka Arheološkog muzeja Zadar)

(Photo archive of the Archaeological Museum Zadar)

i priliku za raspravu o njegovu mogućem karakteru i namjeni.¹ Ovaj članak, posvećen sjećanju na kolegu Zdenka Brusića, pokušaj je u tomu pravcu, koji mi je omogućen ljubaznošću Natalije Čondić, više kustosice Arheološkog muzeja Zadar. Kolegici N. Čondić i Arheološkom muzeju najsrdačnije zahvaljujem na ustupljenim fotografijama nalaza u njihovom izvornom obliku i dopuštenju da nalaz obradim za ovu prigodu.

er its possible character and function.¹ This article, dedicated to the memory of colleague Zdenko Brusić, is an attempt in that direction, which was made possible owing to kindness of Natalija Čondić, senior custodian of the Archaeological Museum in Zadar. I would like to thank colleague N. Čondić and the Archaeological Museum in Zadar for allowing me to see the photographs of the find in their original form and permission to analyze the find for this occasion.

1 Istraživač Smilčića nije iscrpnije raspravljao o nalazu, a u kasnijoj sintezi samo ga je spomenuo: „Druga vrsta likova s pločicama ma leđima, u kojima se mogu prepoznati likovi svinja ili govečeta, teško se može razjasniti, osim možda u vezi s obredima oko kuće i govečeta u ulozi zaštitnika-čuvara, slično kao i jedna maketa pravokutne keramičke kuće sa stiliziranom goveđom glavom na pročelju (bukranij)“; Š. BATOVIĆ, 1979, 560-561.

1 The researcher of Smilčić did not discuss this find extensively, and in the later synthesis he only mentioned it: “Other type of figures with platelets on the back, in which cattle or pigs can be recognized, can hardly be explained, except perhaps in relation to rituals related to house and cattle as protectors-guardians, similar as a model of rectangular ceramic house with stylized bovine head on the front (bucranium)”; Š. BATOVIĆ, 1979, 560-561.

Premda je sačuvan samo mali dio cjeline, sretna je okolnost što je dva raspoloživa ulomka bilo moguće fizički povezati te što u takvoj međusobnoj povezanosti oni prikazuju onaj njezin dio koji je vjerojatno najvažniji i najinformativniji za rekonstrukciju upravo na način kako je to izvedeno u Arheološkom muzeju u Zadru (Sl. 2 i 3).

Although only a small part of the object was preserved, two available fragments were joined owing to lucky coincidence, and when joined they make a segment which is probably the most important and most instructive for the reconstruction exactly as it was made in the Archaeological Museum in Zadar (Fig. 2-3).



Sl. 2. / FIG. 2.

(fototeka Arheološkog muzeja Zadar)

(Photo archive of the Archaeological Museum Zadar)



Sl. 3. / FIG. 3.

(foto: B. Marijanović)

(photo: B. Marijanović)

Polazeći od te rekonstrukcije, kojoj držim nije moguće staviti nikakav ozbiljan prigovor, doista se gotovo s potpunom sigurnošću može tvrditi kako sačuvani dio prikazuje pročelje objekta koji bi mogao posve odgovarati predodžbi pročelja jedne neolitičke nastambe sa stiliziranim prikazom rogova postavjenim iznad ulaza. Posve ravna ploha ulomka s vodoravnom i relativno ravnom bazom, jednim okomitim rubom, a drugim ukoso izvedenim, sigurna su polazišta za simetričnu dogradnju drugoga ulomka, čime je postignut uvjerljiv izgled pročelja jednostavne nastambe, na čijem je središnjem dijelu prikazan i ulaz. Da je riječ o stiliziranom, ali duhovito prikazanom ulazu sugeriraju dvije polukružne okomito izvedene plastične aplikacije, jedna sačuvana gotovo u cijelosti na lijevoj i njoj simetrična, minimalno sačuvana na desnoj strani pročelja. Te bi aplikacije, koje flankiraju prazno pravokutno polje ulaznog otvora, mogle prikazivati stupove dovratnika, a možda i konstruktivne elemente. Vodoravno položena plastična aplikacija s izvijenim krajevima iznad ulaza doista neodoljivo asocira na masivne životinjske robove pričvršćene za pročelje, a možda i oslonjene na stupove. Međutim, da se ovdje ne radi samo o prikazu pročelja posve sigurno pokazuje minimalno sačuvan dio bočne strane na desnom ulomku pročelja (Sl. 1b, 2). Budući da je lijeva strana pročelja sačuvana samo djelomice, ostatci paralelne bočne strane nisu mogli biti sačuvani, ali to ne držim presudno bitnim razlogom koji bi osporio zaključak kako se u ovom slučaju ne radi samo o prikazu pročelja, nego o čitavom modelu objekta koji nalikuje neolitičkoj nastambi. Naime, već i sama naznaka postojanja barem jedne bočne strane tu mogućnost ne čini samo prihvatljivom nego, i vrlo vjerojatnom. S druge strane, slijedom sasvim izvjesnog postojanja triju strana, samo po sebi se podrazumijeva postojanje i četvrte, koja bi morala biti simetrična pročelju i zatvarati stražnji dio modela (Sl. 4).

Ukoso izveden rub na desnom dijelu pročelja i njegova simetrična rekonstrukcija na lijevom dijelu sasvim jasno ukazuje na prikaz dvoslijevnog krovišta, ali nema nikakvih naznaka da je krov na pretpostavljenom modelu i stvarno bio prikazan. Premda mogućnost odvojenog prikaza krova nije posve isključena, ipak je vjerojatnije da on nije postojao. To tim prije što su takvi primjeri vrlo dobro zastupljeni u poznatoj arheološkoj građi, a to će se vidjeti u daljnjem izlaganju. Nasuprot tome, na stražnjoj strani baze istog ulomka sačuvan je dio vodoravne plohe koja se razvija prema unutarnjem dijelu pretpostavljenog modela, što bi moralo odgovarati njegovu

Starting from this reconstruction for which I can find no objection, we can state with almost absolute certainty that the preserved segment depicts a front of the object which might correspond to concept of a Neolithic house front with stylized depiction of horns placed above the entrance. Flat surface of the fragment with horizontal and relatively simple base, one vertical edge, and the other one slanted, are firm starting points for symmetrical reconstruction of the second fragment providing in that way convincing appearance of a front of simple house in whose central part is depiction of entrance. Two semicircular vertically made plastic appliqués suggest that it was a stylized but witty depiction of an entrance. One of them was preserved almost completely on the left side, and the other, symmetrical appliqué is preserved in very small portion on the right side of the front. These appliqués which flank the empty rectangular field of the entrance opening, might depict columns of the doorjamb, perhaps even constructive elements. Horizontal plastic appliqué with everted ends is strongly evocative of massive animal horns attached to the front, and perhaps also resting on the columns. Minimally preserved part of the lateral side on the right fragment of the front indicates that this was not only a depiction of the front (Fig. 1b, 2). As left side of the front was preserved only partially, remains of the parallel lateral side could not have been preserved, but I do not believe it is a decisive reason to dispute conclusion that this was not just a front depiction but an entire model of an object similar to a Neolithic house. Namely an indication of existence of at least one lateral side makes this possibility not only acceptable but also very plausible. On the other hand, if it is certain that there were three sides, existence of the fourth one is understood. It must have been symmetrical to the front closing in that way back part of the model (Fig. 4).

Slanted edge on the right side of the front and its symmetrical reconstruction on the left side clearly indicate to depiction of gabled roof but there are no indications that the roof was really depicted on the assumed model. Although it is possible that separate depiction of the roof was made, it is more likely that it did not exist. All the more so since similar examples are well represented in the archaeological material, which will be discussed further on. As opposed to this, on the back side of the base of the same fragment a part of horizontal surface was preserved developing towards the inner part of the assumed model, which probably corresponds to its base i.e. floor depiction. However considering the preserved



SL. 4. / FIG. 4
 (crtež: D. Vujević)
 (drawing: D. Vujević)

dnu, odnosno prikazu poda. Međutim, s obzirom na sačuvane elemente modela, čak i sama pomisao o mogućem izgledu enterijera ne bi nadilazila razinu spekulacija.

Na donjoj polovici pročelja s obje strane ulaza, u pravokutnim poljima posebno označenim urezanim linijama, izvedene su višestruke okomito postavljene cik-cak trake ispunjene kratkim zarezima. Na gornjem dijelu pročelja nema takvih prikaza, ali je u zabatu, približno iznad sredine stiliziranog prikaza rogova, urezana okomita traka ispunjena višestrukim izlomljenim linijama. Motivi istovjetni onima na donjem dijelu pročelja vidljivi su i na djelomice sačuvanoj bočnoj strani, a sudeći prema veličini sačuvane kompozicije, pokrivali su zidnu plohu u čitavoj visini. Na njihov mogući smisao vratit ću se u kasnijem izlaganju, a ovdje bih se zadržao samo na značenju koju imaju za kulturnu i vremensku atribuciju nalaza jer se u nedostatku drugih podataka upravo oni

elements of the model, even a thought of possible appearance of the interior would belong to the realm of speculation.

On the lower half of the front on both sides of the entrance, multiple vertical zig-zag lines were made filled with short notches in rectangular fields marked with incised lines. On the upper part of the front there are no such depictions, but in the gable, approximately above the middle of the stylized horns depiction, a vertical line was incised filled with multiple broken lines. Motifs identical to the ones on the lower part of the front are visible on partially preserved lateral side, and judging from the size of preserved composition they covered wall surface throughout its height. I will return to their possible meaning in the upcoming discussion, and I will only mention their importance regarding cultural and chronological attribution of the finds because in lack of other information they stand out

iskazuju kao jedini signifikantan element. Naime, nema nikakve dvojbe da je riječ i o motivima i o kompoziciji koji čine jednu od standardnih pojava u ukrasnom sustavu na keramici danilske kulture, pa bi ta podudarnost morala imati i vrijednost sigurnog indikatora i kulturne pripadnosti i vremenske pozicije ovoga nalaza na Smilčiću. To tim prije što je osim naselja ranoga neolitika na Smilčiću postojalo i ono koje je pripadalo srednjemu neolitiku, odnosno danilskoj kulturi.²

Sumirajući sve dosad navedeno, moguće je ustvrditi kako dva sačuvana ulomka potječu iz danilskog naselja na Smilčiću, a sačuvani prikazi arhitekturnih elemenata, zajedno s onima koji se s velikom sigurnošću mogu pretpostaviti, ukazuju da raspoloživi ulomci pripadaju keramičkom objektu koji je mogao biti izrađen i prema uzoru na neolitičke nastambe kakve su tamo doista mogle postojati te da pripada skupini tzv. „otvorenih modela kuća“. Nema nikakvih elemenata koji bi ukazivali radi li se o modelu pravokutnog ili kvadratnog tlorisa, ali to pitanje držim posve nebitnim. Naime, premda ovaj model ima i svoju dokumentarnu dimenziju koja pridonosi boljem poznavanju jednog aspekta neolitičkih naselja, pogotovo onda kada je to poznavanje skromno kao što je slučaj s neolitičkim naseljima na istočnom Jadranu, puno je važnije pitanje predstavlja li on doista samo jednostavan prikaz nastambe ili u njegovu oblikovanju i svrsi treba tražiti neke druge ideje i znatno šire značenje od onoga koje bi mogla imati samo likovna vizualizacija jednoga neolitičkog realiteta.

Samo po sebi razumije se da odgovor na to pitanje nije moguće tražiti ni na Smilčiću, a ni na drugim neolitičkim nalazištima s područja istočnog Jadrana. Naime, ovdje ne treba posebno ukazivati na činjenicu kako je ovo jedini nalaz te vrste na ovom području, pa slični primjeri koji bi svojim kontekstom, likovnošću, oblikovnim ili kakvim drugim indikativnim elementima mogli pridonijeti odgovoru na postavljeno pitanje jednostavno ne postoje. Štoviše, slični nalazi nisu poznati ni na drugim neolitičkim nalazištima iz užega prostornog i kulturnog okruženja, pa je s obzirom na to potrebno okrenuti se prema onim kulturnim ambijentima u kojima su slični nalazi već dobro poznati, a redovito determinirani kao modeli kuća, odnosno svetišta u funkciji žrtvenika.

Tu u prvom redu mislim na već dobro poznate primjere takvih modela s više neolitičkih nalazišta u Makedoniji koji već i svojim brojem, a naročito

as the only significant element. There is no doubt that the motifs and the composition make one of standard phenomena in the decorative system on the pottery of the Danilo culture. This correspondence should have importance of definite indicator of cultural affiliation and chronological position of this find in Smilčić. All the more so since a settlement from the Middle Neolithic i.e. Danilo culture existed in Smilčić in addition to the Early Neolithic settlement.²

If we summarize all the aforementioned we can state that two preserved fragments belonged to the Danilo settlement in Smilčić, and preserved depictions of the architectural elements, together with the ones which can be assumed with great degree of certainty, indicate that they belonged to a ceramic object which could have been made after the model of actual Neolithic houses at the time, and it belongs to the group of “open house models”. There are no elements to indicate whether the model had rectangular or square layout but I deem this question irrelevant. Namely although this model has its documentary dimension which contributes to better understanding of one aspect of the Neolithic settlements, particularly when that knowledge is modest as in case of the Neolithic settlements on the Eastern Adriatic, it is more important to pay attention to the question whether it is really only a simplified depiction of a house or its formation and function could be related to some other ideas and much broader importance than the one implied in visualisation of one aspect of the Neolithic way of life

It is understandable that the answer to this question cannot be found in Smilčić or at some other Neolithic site from the region of the eastern Adriatic. We need not emphasize that this is the only example of the kind in this region so that there are no similar examples which may contribute to providing answer to the mentioned question by their context, visual aspects, morphological or some other indicative elements. What is more similar finds are not known from other Neolithic sites from the nearby spatial and cultural surrounding, so we need to turn to those cultural environments in which similar finds are well known, and regularly interpreted as house models, i.e. sanctuaries functioning as altars.

In the first place I refer to well known examples of such models from several Neolithic sites in Macedonia which owing to their number and in particular

2 Rukovodeći se vjerojatno istim razlozima, i Š. Batović je nalaz pripisao danilskoj kulturi; Š. BATOVIĆ, 1979, 560-561.

2 Š. Batović also ascribed this find to the Danilo culture on the basis of probably identical reasons; Š. BATOVIĆ, 1979, 560-561.

iznimno naglašenom antropomorfnom dimenzijom svojih oblikovnih značajki, nemaju vrijednost samo pokazatelja likovne i oblikovne originalnosti, nego i ideološkog partikularizma neolitičkih zajednica s tog područja u cjelini neolitičkog svijeta jugoistočne Europe (Porodin, Madjari, Suvodol, Mrševci, Veluška Tumba, Dobromiri, Stenće, Topolčani i dr.).³ Premda u oblikovnim značajkama njihove antropomorfne dimenzije postoje uočljive divergencije u spolu, ikonografskim pojedinostima i atributima koje bi teško mogle podržati zamisao o rigidnosti temeljnoga ideološkog postulata na kojem počiva posebnost njihove oblikovne i likovne koncepcije, nego više sugeriraju njegovu kompleksnost i raslojenost na brojne aspekte koji jedan drugomu ne proturječe, što otvara prostor i suptilnijim nijansiranjima u interpretiranju njihove namjene i uporabe, jedno je izvjesno: svi su ti primjeri izraz duhovnosti neolitičkih zajednica toga područja koji u njihovoj ritualnoj praksi imaju funkciju žrtvenika. Oko toga postoji visok stupanj suglasnosti autora koji su ih se u različitim kontekstima doticali.⁴ S druge strane, vizualna predodžba kuće nije slučajna, a po mojem mišljenju ima primarno simboličku dimenziju prostornog okvira na koji je koncentrirana ritualna procedura, dok antropomorfna komponenta sa svim svojim likovnim i ikonografskim variranjima konkretizira njezin smisao i povezuje je sa sasvim određenim kulturnim aspektom, odnosno jasno determiniranim ciljem. Kako u ovoj prilici nemam prostora za temeljito elaboriranje te ideje, ovdje ću navesti samo jedan od mogućih pokazatelja takvih razlika. Naime, čini mi se da smisao i značenje konceptualne simbioze kuće i muškoga lika nije moguće posve izjednačiti s smislom koji ima simbioza kuće i ženskoga lika, posebno onda kada su u te prikaze izrazito naglašeno uključene one pojedinosti ili atributi – npr. graviditet – čija se simbolika ne kreće u okvirima općih, univerzalnih ili apstraktnih, nego se zadržava i koncentrira na posve konkretne ideje. Stoga ne treba isključiti ni mogućnost stanovitih individualiziranosti u njihovoj namjeni, smisao kojih može biti određen posve konkretnim razlozima i povodima, do određene mjere vidljivim u oblikovnim i likovnim rješenjima.

to exceptionally pronounced anthropomorphous dimension of their morphological characteristics have not only meaning of indicator of visual and morphological originality but also of ideological particularism of the Neolithic communities within the whole of the Neolithic world from the region of south-eastern Europe (Porodin, Madjari, Suvodol, Mrševci, Veluška Tumba, Dobromiri, Stenće, Topolčani etc.).³ Although in morphological characteristics of their anthropomorphous dimensions there are evident divergencies in gender, iconographic particularities and attributes which could hardly support idea of rigidity of the basic ideological postulate which is a basis of uniqueness of their morphological and visual concept, they serve more as a suggestion of its complexity and stratification into many aspects which are not contradictory in themselves, one thing is for sure: all these examples are an expression of spirituality of the Neolithic communities of this region having function of an altar in their ritual practice. Most authors dealing with this theme in various contexts agreed upon this matter.⁴ On the other hand visual depiction of a house is not accidental, and in my opinion it has primarily symbolical dimension of spatial framework on which ritual procedure is concentrated, while anthropomorphous component with all its visual and iconographic variations concretizes its meaning and relates it to very specific cult aspect i.e. clearly determined aim. As I do not have enough space for a thorough elaboration of this idea, I will only mention one of possible indicators of such differences. Namely in my opinion meaning and importance of conceptual symbiosis of house and male figure cannot be equalized entirely with the meaning of symbiosis of house and female figure, particularly when these depictions contain pronounced particularities or attributes (such as gravidity) whose symbolics was not associated to general, universal or abstract ideas but it remains within and concentrates on very specific ideas. Therefore we have to keep in mind certain individualizations in their function, whose meaning can be determined by very specific reasons and causes, visible to a certain extent in morphological and visual solutions.

3 N. CHAUSIDIS, 1995, 32, fig. 6 (Govrlevo); I. KOLIŠTRKOVSKA-NAŠTEVA, 2005, 59-61, 64, fig. 42-45, 48 (Porodin, Madjari, Suvodol, Mrševci); M. VASILEVA, 2005, 26-27 (Veluška Tumba, Dobromiri); D. ZDRAVKOVSKI, 2005, 27, fig. 10 (Stenće); A. ŠEMROV, P. TURK, 2008, 213 (Topolčani).

4 H. MÜLLER-KARPE, 1968; M. GIMBUTAS, 1982; D. TEMELKOSKI, A. MITKOSKI, 2005; G. LAZAROVICI, C. M. LAZAROVICI, 2010a; G. NAUMOV, 2011. i dr.

3 N. CHAUSIDIS, 1995, 32, fig. 6 (Govrlevo); I. KOLIŠTRKOVSKA-NAŠTEVA, 2005, 59-61, 64, fig. 42-45, 48 (Porodin, Madjari, Suvodol, Mrševci); M. VASILEVA, 2005, 26-27 (Veluška Tumba, Dobromiri); D. ZDRAVKOVSKI, 2005, 27, fig. 10 (Stenće); A. ŠEMROV, P. TURK, 2008, 213 (Topolčani).

4 H. MÜLLER-KARPE, 1968; M. GIMBUTAS, 1982; D. TEMELKOSKI, A. MITKOSKI, 2005; G. LAZAROVICI, C. M. LAZAROVICI, 2010a; G. NAUMOV, 2011 etc.

S istog područja potječe još jedna skupina mogućih komparabilnih pojava. Riječ je o otvorenim žrtvenicima na četiri različito oblikovane i profilirane noge s plitkim, redovito praznim recipijentima koji su vizualno i konceptualno, a time vjerojatno na isti način i simbolično povezani s predodžbom kuće (Porodin, Veluška Tumba, Tarinci, Topolčani i dr.).⁵ Bliskost s prikazom kuće očita je u naglašenim, često i hipertrofiranim prikazima zabata na užim stranama recipijenta te stiliziranim prikazima ulaznih otvora na bočnim stranama. Disproporcija koja postoji između hipertrofiranih prikaza užih i reduciranih prikaza bočnih strana ne umanjuje tu bliskost jer je minimalizam u prikazivanju dijela arhitekturnih elemenata samo posljedica praktične prilagodbe recipijenta ritualnoj namjeni i proceduri.

Međutim, imajući u vidu činjenicu da su obje vrste žrtvenika vezane za isto područje i iste kulturne ambijente, nameće se pitanje razloga njihovih oblikovnih divergencija koje, po mojem mišljenju, nisu posljedica jednostavnih tipoloških varijabilnosti, nego izraz substancijalnih divergencija u ritualnim procedurama, odnosno idejama koje ih pokreću. Naime, ako zatvoreni modeli svojim oblicima sugeriraju simboličku koncentriranost ritualne procedure na određen i individualiziran prostorni okvir dijela društvene zajednice, onda bi oblikovna otvorenost i potpuna odsutnost pojedinosti u prikazivanju enterijera kod ove druge vrste žrtvenika mogla sugerirati posve suprotan smjer ritualne procedure. On bi morao biti univerzalniji u značenju i praksi koja ne polazi od konkretnog povoda, nego izražava opću ideološku apstrakciju odnosa realnog i nadrealnog.

Slični nalazi poznati su i s grčkih neolitičkih nalazišta. Među njima posebno mjesto zauzima čuveni nalaz iz Platie Magoula Zarkou koji unatoč svojoj jednostavnosti i likovnom minimalizmu jasno predočava jedan od onih objekata koji su činili dio realnoga neolitičkog životnog ambijenta u kojem je prebivala veća ili manja socijalna zajednica. Jednako kao što to predočava i pretpostavljeni model iz Smilčića, a i već spomenuti makedonski nalazi. Međutim, kontekst toga nalaza posve je siguran i sam po sebi ima posebnu simboliku, čiji smisao još slojevitijim čini osam pripadajućih minijatur-

Another group of possibly comparative phenomena originates from the same region. These are open altars on four legs shaped differently, with shallow, regularly empty recipients which are related to house concept in visual and conceptual terms and accordingly probably also in symbolical terms (Porodin, Veluška tumba, Tarinci, Topolčani etc.).⁵ Similarities with the house depiction are evident in emphasized, often hypertrophied depictions of gables on narrower sides of the recipient and stylized depictions of entrance openings on the lateral sides. Disproportion between the hypertrophied depictions of narrower and reduced depictions of the lateral sides does not diminish the similarity, as minimalism in depicting architectural elements was just a consequence of practical adjustment of the recipient to ritual function and procedure.

However having in mind the fact that both types of altars were associated with the same region and identical cultural environments the implying question relates to their morphological divergencies which, in my opinion, do not represent a consequence of simple typological variabilities but an expression of substantial divergencies in ritual procedures, i.e. ideas behind them. Namely if closed models suggest with their forms symbolical concentration of the ritual procedure on a specific and individualized spatial framework of a part of social community, then morphological openness and complete absence of particularities in depicting interior on this second kind of the altar might suggest quite opposite direction of the ritual procedure which should be more universal in meaning and practice which does not start from a specific cause but it expresses general ideological abstraction of relation between real and surreal.

Similar finds were found at the Greek Neolithic sites. Special place among these finds belongs to the famous find from Platia Magoula Zarkou which despite its simplicity and visual minimalism still manages to clearly depict one of those objects which made part of actual Neolithic living environment in which large or small social community resided. The same idea is depicted by the assumed model from Smilčić, and previously mentioned finds from Macedonia. However context of this find is quite certain and has symbolics in itself, whose meaning is made even more complex by eight accompanying

5 M. VASILEVA, 2005, 27 (Porodin); M. VASILEVA, 2005, 40; D. TEMELKOSKI, A. MITKOSKI, 2005, fig. 19 (Topolčani); G. NAUMOV, 2011, fig 7.4, 7.6 (Veluška tumba); G. NAUMOV, 2011, fig 7.5 (Tarinci).

5 M. VASILEVA, 2005, 27 (Porodin); M. VASILEVA, 2005, 40; G. NAUMOV, 2011, fig 7.4, 7.6 (Veluška tumba); G. NAUMOV, 2011, fig 7.5 (Tarinci); D. TEMELKOSKI, A. MITKOSKI, 2005, fig. 19 (Topolčani).

nih figurica raspoređenih u njegovoj unutrašnjosti.⁶ Zamršenost, pa i višeznačnost poruke koju skriva kontekst nalaza, a i on sam po sebi, dobro ilustriraju ne samo razlike u interpretacijama nego i dvojbe koje u tom smislu imaju i sami autori koji su se njegovom problematikom bavili.⁷ Unatoč tome što će simbolika toga nalaza i nadalje biti predmetom rasprava, jedno je sigurno: on sam po sebi, a potom svojim sadržajem i kontekstom daleko nadilazi razinu dokumentarnosti i likovne vizualizacije prostornog okvira i životnog ambijenta jedne socijalne kategorije neolitičkog naselja.

Dosta je blizak nalazu iz Platie Magoula Zarkou otvoreni model kuće iz Sitagroija koji prikazuje njezinu unutrašnjost s podjelom prostora, fiksiranim prikazom ognjišta i klupa.⁸ Premda njegov kontekst, a ni cjelina nalaza nemaju tako slojevite značenjske konotacije koje karakteriziraju nalaz iz Platie Magoula Zarkou, već i sama koncepcijska bliskost sugerira i slične razine simboličkog izražavanja.

Druga dva već odavna poznata modela iz Krannona⁹ (Crannonas) i Chaironeia (Chaeronea)¹⁰ pripadaju skupini tzv. zatvorenih modela, a cjelinu nastambi predočuju u stiliziranom obliku. Premda u njihovim stilizacijama nedvojbeno postoje i stanoviti elementi nasebinskih realiteta, pa kao takvi imaju i određenu dokumentarnu vrijednost, ne treba sumnjati da se ni u tim slučajevima ne radi o tek o likovnim predodžbama lišenim svake simbolike i da iza njih ne stoje slične ideje koje su oblikovale i druge primjere te vrste.

Dva otvorena žrtvenika u obliku stilizirane kuće poznata su iz Promachon/Topolnice,¹¹ a otvoreni žrtvenik sličan onima iz Porodina, Platie Magoula Zarkou i Sitagroija potječe iz Ovčarova.¹² Slični modeli – otvorenih ili zatvorenih formi – poznati su i u drugim kulturnim ambijentima: Vršac-At,¹³ Gradshnitsa,¹⁴ Izvoarele, Popudnia, Šušková, Vladimirovka i još preko pedesetak nalazišta Gumelnița,

miniature figures distributed in its interior.⁶ Intricacy and even multiple meaning of the message hidden by the context of the find, and the find in itself illustrate not only differences in interpretations but also doubts experienced by the authors who dealt with these issues.⁷ Despite the fact that symbolics of that find will remain subject of discussions one thing is certain: the find in itself, and then by its contents and context surpasses by far level of documentary and artistic visualisation of the spatial framework and living environment of a social category of the Neolithic settlement.

Find from Platia Magoula Zarkou has a close analogy in an open house model from Sitagroii depicting its interior with division of space, fixed depiction of hearth and benches.⁸ Although its context, and the entirety of the find do not have such complex semantical connotations which characterize find from Platia Magoula Zarkou, similarity in concept is enough to suggest similar levels of symbolic expression.

The other two well known models from Crannonas⁹ and Chaeronea¹⁰ belong to the group of “closed models”, depicting a house in stylized form. Although there are certain elements of actual settlement characteristics, having therefore documentary value, it is beyond doubt that neither of these cases represents only artistic depictions bereft of any symbolics and that they are based on similar ideas as in the cases of other examples of the kind.

Two open altars in form of stylized house are known from Promachon/Topolnica,¹¹ and an open altar similar to the ones from Porodin, Platia Magoula Zarkou and Sitagroii was found in Ovčarovo.¹² Similar models of open or closed forms are known in other cultural environments: Vršac-At,¹³ Gradshnitsa,¹⁴ Izvoarele, Popudnia, Šušková, Vladimirovka and over about fifty sites of Gumelnița, Precucuteni-Cucuteni and Tripolje cultures with various types of

6 K. GALLIS, 1985, 20-24.

7 K. GALLIS, 1985, 20-24; A. W. R. WHITTLE, 1996, 87; S. NANOGLOU, 2005, 149; D. BORIĆ, 2008, 132; S. G. SOUVATZI, 2008, 97; S. G. SOUVATZI, 2012, 30.

8 C. RENFREW *et al.*, 1986., fig. 8.20a, pl. XL,1; XCV, 4.

9 D. R. THEOCHARIS, 1973, fig. 8.

10 D. R. THEOCHARIS, 1973, fig. 10.

11 C. KOUKOULI-CHRYSANTHAKI *et al.*, 2007, 60, fig. 25a-b, 26.

12 C. MARANGANU, 1996, fig. 1.

13 Š. JOVANOVIĆ, 1995, 331-342. Za rekonstrukciju usporediti: G. LAZAROVICI, C. M. M. LAZAROVICI, 2010a, fig. 21.

14 M. MERLINI, 2005, fig. 7.

6 K. GALLIS, 1985, 20-24.

7 K. GALLIS, 1985, 20-24; A. W. R. WHITTLE, 1996, 87; S. NANOGLOU, 2005, 149; D. BORIĆ, 2008, 132; S. G. SOUVATZI, 2008, 97; S. G. SOUVATZI, 2012, 30.

8 C. RENFREW *et al.*, 1986, fig. 8.20a, pl. XL,1; XCV, 4.

9 D. R. THEOCHARIS, 1973, fig. 8.

10 D. R. THEOCHARIS, 1973, fig. 10.

11 C. KOUKOULI-CHRYSANTHAKI *et al.*, 2007, 60, fig. 25a-b, 26.

12 C. MARANGANU, 1996, fig. 1.

13 Š. JOVANOVIĆ, 1995, 331-342. For reconstruction cf: G. LAZAROVICI, C. M. M. LAZAROVICI, 2010a, fig. 21.

14 M. MERLINI, 2005, fig. 7.

Precucuteni-Cucuteni i Tripolje kulture s različitim tipovima ove vrste nalaza.¹⁵ U ovome prilogu međutim nemam ni prostora ni mogućnosti obuhvatiti sve poznate nalaze, niti se baviti pitanjima njihova općeg značenja na razini perioda i posebnog značenja u kulturnim ili nalazišnim ambijentima, univerzalnošću ideja, interkulturnim relacijama i sličnim pitanjima, a i oni dosad navedeni ovdje imaju primarno značenje indikatora mogućeg smisla nalaza iz Smilčića.¹⁶

Premda svi navedeni primjeri i mišljenja povezana s njihovom prisutnošću posve jasno sugeriraju zaključak da i nalaz iz Smilčića nije samo jednostavna likovna predodžba neolitičke nastambe, u tom kontekstu zadržat ću se na tri, čini mi se, posebno važna primjera: dva već spomenuta modela iz Promachon/Topolnice i već dugo poznatom modelu iz Střelice.

Prvi model iz Promachon/Topolnice pronađen je na donjoj podnici ukopanog objekta kružnog tlorisa. Mala veranda formirana na pročelju vodi u unutrašnjost koju čine dvije prostorije: jedna pravokutnog oblika, a druga s apsidnim završetkom. Krovište je dvoslijevno, vrata su lučno oblikovana, a prozori kružnog ili eliptičnog oblika. Vanjski zidovi ukrašeni su urezanim i slikanim motivima koji odgovaraju ukrasima na keramici, a na njegovu pročelju, ogradnim zidovima verande i unutarnjim zidovima izvedeni su reljefni prikazi bukranija.¹⁷

Drugi model, pronađen izvan kružne strukture, ali na razini koja odgovara njezinoj donjoj podnici, istog je oblika kao prethodni, s verandom i bukranijima izvedenim na unutarnjim zidovima.¹⁸

Model iz Střelice pripada tipu zatvorenih modela pravokutnog tlorisa s potpuno otvorenim pročeljem, dvoslijevnim krovom, istaknutim plastičnim rebrima na zidnim ploham i krovu koji su vjerojatno prikaz konstruktivnih elemenata, pa već i zbog tih stilizacija arhitekturnog realizma ima veliku vrijednost. Premda konceptualno posve drukčiji od nalaza iz Promachon/Topolnice, s tim ga primjerima povezuje jedna pojedinost jednako važna i za nalaz iz Smilčića. To je reljefni prikaz bukranija po-

this kind of finds.¹⁵ In this work I have neither space nor possibility to encompass all known finds, or to address questions of their general meaning in relation to the period and special meaning in cultural environments or within the sites of their discovery, universality of ideas, intercultural relations and similar questions, and the issues mentioned here are important primarily as indicators of possible meaning of the find from Smilčić.¹⁶

Although all mentioned examples and opinions associated with their presence clearly suggest the conclusion that the find from Smilčić is not just a simple visual representation of a Neolithic house, in that context I will concentrate on three particularly important examples in my opinion: two previously mentioned models from Promachon/Topolnica and model from Střelice which has been known for a while.

The first model from Promachon/Topolnica was found on the lower floor of a dug-in object with round layout. Small veranda at the front leads into interior consisting of two rooms: one has rectangular shape, and the other apsidal ending. The roof is gabled, doors have arched shape, and the windows are round or elliptical. Outer walls are decorated with incised or painted motifs which correspond to ornaments on pottery. The front, enclosing walls of veranda and inner walls bear relief depictions of bucrania.¹⁷

The second model, found outside the round structure, but on the level which corresponds to its lower floor, has the same form as the previous one, with a veranda and bucrania made on the inner walls.¹⁸

Model from Střelice belongs to the type of closed models with rectangular layout and completely open front, gabled roof, pronounced plastic ribs on the walls and roof which were probably depictions of constructive elements, having great importance already due to these stylizations of the architectural realism. Although quite different in conceptual terms from the find from Promachon/Topolnice it is associated with these examples by a characteristic equally important for the find from Smilčić. It is a relief

15 C. M. M. LAZAROVICI, 2004, 53-57, fig. 11-13, 19-20. Usporediti i popis nalazišta. S. A. GUSEV, 1995, 175-189.

16 H. DUMITRESCU, 1968, 381-394; M. GIMBUTAS, 1982, 67-71; C. M. M. LAZAROVICI, 2004, 47-67; G. LAZAROVICI, C. M. LAZAROVICI, 2010a, 503-520.

17 C. KOUKOULI-CHRYSANTHAKI *et al.*, 2007, 59-60, fig. 26.

18 C. KOUKOULI-CHRYSANTHAKI *et al.*, 2007, fig. 25a-25b.

15 C. M. M. LAZAROVICI, 2004, 53-57, fig. 11-13, 19-20. Cf. also site list. S. A. GUSEV, 1995, 175-189.

16 H. DUMITRESCU, 1968, 381-394; M. GIMBUTAS, 1982, 67-71; C. M. M. LAZAROVICI, 2004, 47-67; G. LAZAROVICI, C. M. LAZAROVICI, 2010a, 503-520.

17 C. KOUKOULI-CHRYSANTHAKI *et al.*, 2007, 59-60, fig. 26.

18 C. KOUKOULI-CHRYSANTHAKI *et al.*, 2007, fig. 25a-25b.

zicioniran na pročelju, i to u samom vrhu krovne konstrukcije.¹⁹

Bukraniji, autentične lubanje goveda s rogovima, odnosno njihovi djelomični ili potpuni modeli, već su odavno poznat fenomen za čiju su simboliku i značenje vezana različita mišljenja i interpretacije,²⁰ a javljaju se u dugom vremenskom rasponu i različitim kulturnim ambijentima kao samostalni objekti, kao sastavni dijelovi eksterijera ili kompleksno strukturiranih enterijera u posebnim objektima, koji upravo zbog svoje strukture nikako ne odgovaraju objektima primarno ili isključivo stambenog karaktera, zbog čega im se s pravom pripisuje karakter svetišta.²¹

Ostavljajući ovdje po strani brojne i glasovite primjere bukranija iz Çatal Hüyüka i jednako poznate primjere minojskih bukranija te istovrsne primjere iz drugih kulturnih ambijenata,²² najveći broj ovdje zanimljivih objekata te vrste potječe s vinčanskih nalazišta.

Vjerojatno je najspektakularniji primjer takvih objekata „Svetište 2“ u Parți. Budući da se radi o vrlo dobro poznatom primjeru, njegova iscrpna deskripcija ovdje nije potrebna. Jedan monumentalni bukranij bio je postavljen već iznad ulaza u Svetište u posebno pripremljenoj niši. Međutim, Svetištem je potpuno dominirala monumentalna dvojna kompozicija u prostoriji A, postavljena na masivno postolje približno na sredini između žrtvenika D i istočnog zida, a vidljiva kroz široki prozor pokraj ulaza. Dvojna figura prikazuje dva geometrijski stilizirana tijela, razdvojena tek od razine ramena, od kojih jedno ima ljudsku (žensku), a drugo bikovu glavu. Nasuprot toj skulpturi, s obje strane prozora, na posebnim stupovima stajala su još dva bukranija, a u drugim dijelovima Svetišta registrirana su još tri postolja za bukranije te jedna autentična bikova lubanja s rogovima.²³

bucranion positioned on the front, at the top of the roof construction.¹⁹

Bucrania, authentic skulls of bulls with horns, that is their partial or complete models are long-standing phenomenon whose symbolics and meaning have been interpreted in different ways.²⁰ They appear over a long period and in various cultural environments as independent objects of exterior or complexly structured interiors in special objects, which due to their structure do not correspond to objects with primarily or exclusively residential character, which is why they are rightfully interpreted as sanctuaries.²¹

Leaving aside numerous and renowned examples of bucrania from Çatal Hüyük, equally famous examples of the Minoan bucrania, and identical examples from other cultural environments,²² largest number of objects relevant in this context were found at the sites of the Vinča culture.

“Sanctuary no. 2” in Parța is probably the most spectacular example of such objects. Since it is a well known object, its thorough description is not necessary. One monumental bucranon was placed above the entrance to the Sanctuary in specially arranged niche. However the Sanctuary was dominated by a monumental double composition in room A, placed on a massive pedestal approximately in the middle between altar D and eastern wall, and it is visible through a wide window next to the entrance. Double figure depicts two geometrically stylized bodies, separated from the shoulder level, one of which has human (female) head and the other bull’s head. Opposite to this sculpture, on both sides of the window, two more bucrania stood on special columns, and in the other parts of the Sanctuary three more stands for the bucrania were recorded, and an authentic bull’s skull with horns.²³

19 H. MÜLLER-KARPE, 1968, 487, T. 208/34. Usporediti i crtež u: G. LAZAROVICI, C. M. M. LAZAROVICI, 2010a, fig. 30-31.

20 M. MILIČEVIĆ-BRADAČ, 2005, 187-196 s citiranom literaturom; M. L. SÉFÉRIADÈS, 2005, 97-114; G. LAZAROVICI, 2009, 223-238; N. URLESCU *et al.*, 2013, 133-138; M. LAZAROVICI, G. LAZAROVICI, 2015, 47-83.

21 N. KALICZ, P. RACZKY, 1981, 5-20; M. L. SÉFÉRIADÈS, 2005; G. LAZAROVICI, M. LAZAROVICI, 2008, 9-40; G. LAZAROVICI, C. M. LAZAROVICI, 2010, 19-27; A. KOVÁCS, 2012, 31-57; N. URLESCU *et al.*, 2013, 133-138; A. KOVÁCS, 2014, 195-240; C. LICHTER, 2014, 119-136; M. LAZAROVICI, G. LAZAROVICI, 2015, 47-83.

22 Usporediti M. MILIČEVIĆ-BRADAČ, 2005, 187-195; M. LAZAROVICI, G. LAZAROVICI, 2015, 47-83.

23 G. LAZAROVICI, 1989, 149-174; G. LAZAROVICI *et al.*, 2001, 207-208, fig. 168a-b; G. LAZAROVICI *et al.*, 2002, 7-18, fig 3-5.

19 H. MÜLLER-KARPE, 1968, 487, T. 208/ 34. Cf. drawing in: G. LAZAROVICI, C. M. M. LAZAROVICI, 2010a, fig. 30-31.

20 M. MILIČEVIĆ-BRADAČ, 2005, 187-196 with cited bibliography; M. L. SÉFÉRIADÈS, 2005, 97-114; G. LAZAROVICI, 2009, 223-238; N. URLESCU *et al.* 2013, 133-138; M. LAZAROVICI, G. LAZAROVICI, 2015, 47-83.

21 N. KALICZ, P. RACZKY, 1981, 5-20; M. L. SÉFÉRIADÈS, 2005; G. LAZAROVICI, M. LAZAROVICI, 2008, 9-40; G. LAZAROVICI, C. M. LAZAROVICI, 2010, 19-27; A. KOVÁCS, 2012, 31-57; N. URLESCU *et al.* 2013, 133-138; A. KOVÁCS, 2014, 195-240; M. LAZAROVICI, G. LAZAROVICI, 2015, 47-83; C. LICHTER, 2014, 119-136.

22 Cf. M. MILIČEVIĆ-BRADAČ, 2005, 187-195; M. LAZAROVICI, G. LAZAROVICI, 2015, 47-83.

23 G. LAZAROVICI, 1989, 149-174; G. LAZAROVICI *et al.* 2001, 207-208, fig. 168a-b; G. LAZAROVICI *et al.* 2002, 7-18, fig 3-5.

S istog nalazišta, iz ne tako monumentalnog, ali jednako važnog „Svetišta 1“ potječu još tri bukranija raspoređena i postavljena u izrazito bliskom suodnosu prema strukturama na kojima ritualna procedura dostiže vrhunac, a kultno slavlje svoju svrhu. Jedan je bio fiksiran na zidu iznad žrtvenika A, a dva na stupovima iznad žrtvenika B.²⁴

Ulomci triju bukranija – glave bikova obložene glinom – potječu iz dviju kuća vinčanskog naselja Jakovo Kormadin, drugoga važnog naselja vinčanske kulture s objektima ove vrste. Dva ulomka pronađena su u trodijelnoj kući br. 1/1957, označenoj i kao „Svetište 1“. Prvi je pripadao posebno komponiranoj cjelini koju su činile tri različito oblikovane figurice, četvrtasti žrtvenik sa stiliziranim prikazom rogova na prednjoj strani te posebno ukrašen glineni zid, a bukranij je izvorno vjerojatno stajao na posebnom stupu – nosaču u blizini ili iznad žrtvenika.²⁵ Drugi nalaz iz iste kuće pronađen je u drugoj prostoriji zajedno s ukrašenim komadima kućnog lijepa. Treći bukranij pronađen je na podnici središnjeg dijela trodijelne kuće broj 2/1958 („Svetište 2“), u neposrednoj blizini peći.²⁶

Tijekom četvrtstoljetnih iskopavanja u kasnovinčanskom sloju Gomolave pronađeno je osam bukranija. Dva u glini oblikovana primjerka povezana su s kućom br. 6/1956: jedan unutar kuće u prostoriji br. 3, a drugi s hibridnim antropo/zoomorfnim crtama vjerojatno na njezinu ulazu.²⁷

Druga dva, znatno manjih dimenzija od prethodnih, potječu iz kuće br. 4/1975.²⁸ Jedan je pronađen u središnjem dijelu kuće blizu ognjišta, dok je drugi ležao u masi kućnog lijepa nastalog njezinim urušavanjem. Dva bukranija pronađena su i na podnici kuće broj 6/1980, svaki u drugoj prostoriji, ali uz unutarne pregradne zidove: manji u glini oblikovani primjerak uz pregradni zid između prostorija 1 i 4, a drugi – glava bika modelirana glinom – uz pregradni zid između prostorija 3 i 4.²⁹

The same site yielded less monumental but equally important “Sanctuary 1” where three bucrania were distributed and placed in very close relation to the structures on which ritual procedure reached its culmination, and cult celebration found its aim. One was fixed on the wall above the altar A, and two were placed on the columns above altar B.²⁴

Fragments of three bucrania – bull’s heads coated with clay – were found in two houses of the settlement of the Vinča culture Jakovo Kormadin, second important site of the Vinča culture with objects of this type. Fragments of two examples were found in three-part house no. 1/1957, marked also as “Sanctuary 1”. The first one belonged to specially composed whole consisting of three different figures, rectangular altar with stylized depiction of horns on the front side, and specially decorated clay wall, and the bucranium originally probably stood on a special supporting pillar near or above the altar.²⁵ The second find from the same house was found in the second room together with decorated pieces of daub. The third bucranium was found on the floor of the central part of three-part house number 2/1958 (“Sanctuary 2”), in immediate vicinity of the oven.²⁶

Eight bucrania were found during the excavations lasting for quarter of century in the late Vinča layer of Gomolava. Two clay specimens were associated with house 6/1956: one is inside the house in room no. 3, and the second with hybrid anthropo/zoomorphic characteristics was probably at its entrance.²⁷

The other two, significantly smaller than the aforementioned ones were found in house no. 4/1975.²⁸ One of them was found in the central part of the house next to the hearth, while the other laid in a mass of daub resulting from collapsing of the house. Two bucrania were found on the floor of house no. 6/1980, each in another room, but with inner partition walls: smaller clay example next to the partition wall between rooms 1 and 4; and the other – head of a bull modelled in clay – next to the partition wall between rooms 3 and 4.²⁹

24 G. LAZAROVICI, 1989, 149-174; G. LAZAROVICI *et al.*, 2001.

25 B. JOVANOVIĆ, J. GLIŠIĆ, 1961, 135, fig. 37-40.

26 B. JOVANOVIĆ, J. GLIŠIĆ, 1961, 129.

27 M. JOVANOVIĆ, 2011, 34-35.

28 J. PETROVIĆ, 1992, 21-22, sl. 4-5.

29 B. BRUKNER, 1988, Abb. 2, T.3.7-8; M. JOVANOVIĆ, 2011, 31.

24 G. LAZAROVICI, 1989, 149-174; G. LAZAROVICI *et al.* 2001.

25 B. JOVANOVIĆ, J. GLIŠIĆ, 1961, 135, fig. 37-40.

26 B. JOVANOVIĆ, J. GLIŠIĆ, 1961, 129.

27 M. JOVANOVIĆ, 2011, 34-35.

28 J. PETROVIĆ, 1992, 21-22, fig. 4-5.

29 B. BRUKNER, 1988, Abb. 2, T.3.7-8; M. JOVANOVIĆ, 2011, 31.

Tri bukranija – posve sačuvani autentični rogovi bika – potječu iz kuće br. 2/79 na Banjici, a svi su pronađeni u istoj prostoriji trodijelne kuće.³⁰

Dva bukranija – jedna gotovo potpuno sačuvana lubanja divljega goveda s rogovima, a druga modelirana u glini – potječu iz kasnovinčanskog sloja nalazišta Jela-Benska bara, a oba su pronađena na podu kuće.³¹

Na vinčanskom nalazištu Stubline jedan glineni primjerak bukranija pronađen je u središnjem dijelu kuće broj 1/2008 s vrlo složeno strukturiranim enterijerom i bogatim inventarom koji je, uz dvije sačuvane peći, činilo 12 keramičkih posuda, 43 figurine i 11 minijaturnih modela oruđa. Nisu sačuvani nikakvi konstruktivni elementi koji bi ukazivali na postojanje posebnog stupa-nosača, a ravna stražnja strana sugerira mogućnost njegova izravnog fiksiranja na zidnu plohu.³²

S istoga nalazišta, iz kuće br. 2/2010 s vrlo dobro sačuvanim enterijerom, strukturama i brojnim nalazima, potječu još tri glinena primjerka bukranija. Dva su pronađena na podnici kuće u blizini ognjišta, a treći s hibridnim antropo/zoomorfnim crtama u urušenom kućnom lijevu.³³

Među nalaze ove vrste s vinčanskih naselja ovdje treba dodati već odavno poznati primjerak pronađen na eponimnom nalazištu na dubini 2.89 m.³⁴

Izvan vinčanskoga kulturnog kruga ovdje ću spomenuti jedan bukranij – glavu bika obloženu glinom – iz Dikili Tash I³⁵ te njemu vrlo sličan glineni primjer iz velikoga ukopanog objekta ceremonijalnog karaktera iz Promachon/Topolnice II.³⁶

Kako sam već naglasio, ovo su samo neki od brojnih primjera bukranija koji se javljaju u dugom vremenskom rasponu, na vrlo velikom području, različitim kulturnim ambijentima i socijalnim sredinama, s različitim ikonografskim rješenjima i kompozicijama, zbog čega i postoje razlike ne samo u interpretiranjima njihove funkcije u kolektivnoj kulturnoj stvarnosti i ritualnoj praksi nego i u interpreti-

Three bucrania – fully preserved authentic horns of a bull – were found in house number 2/79 in Banjica, and they were all found in the same room of the three-part house.³⁰

Two bucrania – one almost completely preserved skull of a wild bovid with horns, and the other modelled in clay – were found in the late Vinča layer of the site of Jela-Benska bara, and they were both found on the house floor.³¹

At the Vinča culture site of Stubline a clay example of bucranium was found in the central part of house number 1/2008 with very complex structure of the interior and rich inventory which consisted of two ovens, 12 ceramic vessels, 43 figurines and 11 miniature tool models. There were no constructive elements to indicate to existence of special supporting pillar), and flat back side suggests possibility of its direct fixation on the wall surface.³²

Three more clay bucrania were found at the same site, from house 2/2010, with very well preserved interior, structures and numerous finds. Two specimens were found on the house floor next to the hearth, and the third one with hybrid anthropo/zoomorphic characteristics was in the collapsed daub.³³

We need to add one more example to the Vinča culture finds of this type from the eponymous site found at the depth of 2.89 m.³⁴

Outside the Vinča culture circle I will mention a bucranium – bull's head coated with clay from Dikili Tash I,³⁵ and a very similar clay example from large dug-in object of ceremonial character from Promachon/Topolnice II.³⁶

As already emphasized, these are only some of numerous examples of bucrania which appear over a long period, in wide region and various cultural and social environments, with different iconographic solutions and compositions, resulting in differences not only of their function in the collective cult reality and ritual practice, but also in interpretations of

30 J. TODOROVIĆ, 1981, 15. Iste nalaze B. Tripković promatra samo kao sirovine uskladištene do trenutka uporabe; B. TRIPKOVIĆ, 2007, 90-95.

31 M. SPASIĆ, 2012, 301-302, fig. 8-9.

32 A. CRNOBRNJA *et al.*, 2009, fig. 5/8, 6.

33 A. CRNOBRNJA, 2012, 57-58, fig. 16-18.

34 M. VASIĆ, 1936, 50-51, sl. 85-86.

35 R. TREUIL, P. DARCQUE, 1998, 1-25, fig. 1-11; P. DARCQUE *et al.*, 2007, 249-250, fig. 2-3; S. PAPADOPULOS, N. NERANTZIS, 2014, 42, fig. 11. Za kritiku usporediti: M. L. SÉFÉRIADÈS, 2005, 97-114.

36 C. KOUKOULI-CHRYSANTHAKI *et al.*, 2007, 60.

30 J. TODOROVIĆ, 1981, 15. Same finds are interpreted as raw material stored until the moment of use by B. Tripković; B. TRIPKOVIĆ, 2007, 90-95.

31 M. SPASIĆ, 2012., 301-302, fig. 8-9.

32 A. CRNOBRNJA *et al.* 2009, fig. 5/8, 6.

33 A. CRNOBRNJA, 2012, 57-58, fig. 16-18.

34 M. VASIĆ, 1936, 50-51, fig. 85-86.

35 R. TREUIL, P. DARCQUE, 1998, 1-25, fig. 1-11; P. DARCQUE, *et al.*, 2007, 249-250, fig. 2-3; S. PAPADOPULOS, N. NERANTZIS, 2014, 42, fig. 11. For critical review cf: M. L. SÉFÉRIADÈS, 2005, 97-114.

36 C. KOUKOULI-CHRYSANTHAKI *et al.* 2007, 60.

ranjima samih ideja koje su ih oblikovale, a koje oni simboliziraju. U vezi s tim posve mi je bliska ideja o mnogostrukosti njihova značenja,³⁷ pri čemu tu mogućnost razumijem kroz varijabilnosti u nivoima simboličkog izražavanja.

Upravo zbog prikazanih bukranija, koji nisu nikakav dekorativni element, nego imaju istu simboličku vrijednost, sa svim prethodno navedenim objektima namijenjenim kolektivnoj ritualnoj praksi moraju biti povezani i spomenuti modeli iz Promachon/Topolnice i Střelice, ali ne kao njihova likovna imitacija, nego simboličko-funkcionalna adaptacija za individualiziranu ritualnu praksu u funkciji kućnih žrtvenika.

Ta je povezanost jednako važna i za nalaz iz Smilčića. Naime, kako je već prethodno navedeno, vodoravna plastična aplikacija sa savijenim krajevima, postavljena iznad stiliziranoga prikazanog ulaza, neodoljivo asocira na stilizaciju masivnih rogova. Istina, zbog načina na koji je izveden, taj prikaz nije moguće posve izjednačiti s prikazima na tri spomenuta modela, a u cjelini je znatno bliži pojavi za koju je već davno usvojen naziv *konsekrativni rogovi*. Međutim, teško je decidirano reći stoji li iza takvog prikaza jasna namjera ili je redukcija u prikazu samo posljedica ekstremne stilizacije. No, to pitanje ne držim posebno važnim jer bi neovisno o namjeri ili slučajnosti simbolika prikaza u oba slučaja morala biti vrlo bliska, ako ne i posve podudarna.

Ako se prihvati tumačenje da sačuvani ulomci iz Smilčića pripadaju keramičkom objektu koji je moguće uspoređivati s velikim brojem takvih nalaza na širem području jugoistočne Europe, onda bi se i njegov smisao morao izjednačiti sa smislom koji oni imaju u svojim kulturnim ambijentima, što bi samo po sebi moralo podrazumijevati i barem djelomično izjednačavanje sa sličnim kulturnim i religijskim obrascima koji se javljaju u neolitičkim kulturama jugoistočne Europe. Drugim riječima, keramički objekt iz Smilčića, sačuvan u dva ulomka, nije rezultat nikakve trenutačne likovne inspiracije i kreativne preokupacije nekog od stanovnika toga naselja, nego vjerojatno pripada skupini karakterističnih žrtvenika u obliku kuće, namijenjenih individualnoj ritualnoj praksi. Tu mogućnost sugeriraju i višestruki cik-cak motivi urezani na pročelju i njegovim bočnim stranama. Slična pojava zabilježena je i na drugim nalazima ove vrste koji pripadaju različitim kulturnim ambijentima i vremenskim odsjecima

ideas which formed them, and which are symbolized by bucrania. In this regard, idea about their multiple meaning seems quite plausible³⁷ if this possibility is understood in terms of variability in the levels of symbolical expression.

Exactly due to depiction of the bucrania which do not represent a decorative element but have identical symbolical meaning, models from Promachon/Topolnica and Střelice need to be mentioned and associated with all previously mentioned objects intended for collective ritual practice, but not as their visual imitation but symbolical and functional adaptation for individualized ritual practice in the function of home altars.

This correlation is equally important for the find from Smilčić. Namely as already mentioned, horizontal plastic appliqué with bent ends, placed above the stylized depiction of the entrance, unmistakably calls to mind massive stylized horns. Admittedly, owing to the manner of its production, this depiction is not entirely identical to the depictions on the three mentioned models, and as a whole it is much closer to a phenomenon known as *horns of consecration*. However it is difficult to say with certainty whether such depiction has to do with clear intention or reduction in depiction is just a consequence of extreme stylization. However I do not think this question is of particular importance because regardless of intention or coincidence symbolics of depiction in both cases should be very close, if not absolutely corresponding.

If we accept the interpretation that the preserved fragments from Smilčić belong to a ceramic object which may be compared to a great number of such finds in the wider region of south-eastern Europe, then its meaning should be equalized with their meaning in their cultural environments implying at least partial correspondence with similar cult and religious patterns appearing in the Neolithic cultures of south-eastern Europe. In other words, ceramic object from Smilčić, preserved in two fragments, is not a result of some momentary artistic inspiration and creative preoccupation of some inhabitant of the settlement, but it probably belongs to a group of altars in the shape of a house, intended for individual ritual practice. This possibility is suggested by multiple zig-zag motifs incised on the front and its lateral sides. Similar phenomenon was recorded on other finds of this type which belong to various cultural environments and chronological segments of the Neolithic:

37 M. MILIČEVIĆ-BRADAČ, 2005, 194.

37 M. MILIČEVIĆ-BRADAČ, 2005, 194.

neolitika: Krannon,³⁸ Tarinci,³⁹ Ovčarovo,⁴⁰ Gradeshnitsa,⁴¹ Promachon/Topolnica,⁴² At-Vršac⁴³ te na primjercima koji potječu s više nalazišta Pretcuteni/Cucuteni i Tripolje kulture.⁴⁴ S motivima na nalazu iz Smilčića moguće je usporediti samo one izvedene na primjerku iz At-Vršca, ali tu usporedbu ne držim posebno indikativnom ponajprije zbog prostornih i kronoloških razloga, a i zbog toga što ni međusobne usporedbe drugih poznatih nalaza ne pružaju čvrsto uporište za izvođenje određenijih zaključaka o simboličkoj ili kakvoj drugoj značenjskoj korelaciji među izvedenim motivima. Naime, gotovo svi poznati primjeri na kojima je ta pojava zabilježena pokazuju značajne razlike u izboru motiva, njihovu komponiranju i tehnikama izvođenja. Zbog toga sam u toj pojavi sklon vidjeti drugi smisao: potrebu da se posebnim znakovima obilježi i posebnost mjesta, a time pojača i percepcija njegove „posvećenosti“ u ambijentu kojem pripada i prostoru koji ga okružuje. Ako su minijturni modeli svetišta oblikovani prema uzorima iz kolektivne kultne stvarnosti, a čini mi se da bi to moglo odgovarati odnosu kolektivnog i individualnog, općeg i pojedinačnog, onda bi i izvođenje različitih motiva moralo biti samo dio toga oponašanja.

S druge strane, prisutnošću ovoga primjerka u Smilčiću otvara se i pitanje mogućeg postojanja takvih kulturnih objekata ne samo na tome nego i na drugim neolitičkim naseljima s ovoga područja. Premda na današnjoj razini poznavanja strukture, organizacije i funkcioniranja neolitičkih naseobinskih cjelina nema nikakvih indicija koje bi na takvo što upućivale, ne treba izgubiti iz vida da je dosegnuta razina poznavanja neolitičkih naseobinskih cjelina vrlo skromna pa tu mogućnost ne treba unaprijed isključiti. To tim prije što je malo vjerojatno da bi model o kojemu je riječ bio izrađen bez ikakvog iskustva o kolektivnoj ritualnoj praksi u objektima te vrste. No, za potvrdu ili barem jasnije naznake te mogućnosti potrebna je ozbiljna promjena u strategiji istraživanja neolitičkih naselja na istočnom Jadranu.⁴⁵

Krannon,³⁸ Tarinci,³⁹ Ovčarovo,⁴⁰ Gradeshnitsa,⁴¹ Promachon/Topolnica,⁴² At-Vršac,⁴³ and on the examples from several sites of the Pretcuteni/Cucuteni and Tripolje cultures.⁴⁴ Motifs on the find from Smilčić are comparable only with the ones executed on the specimen from At-Vršac, but I do not think that this comparison is particularly indicative primarily due to spatial and chronological reasons, and also because mutual comparisons of other known finds do not offer a firm basis for making more definite conclusions about the symbolical or some other semantical correlation between the motifs. Namely almost all known examples on which this technique was recorded exhibit significant differences in the selection of motifs, their composition and techniques of execution. Therefore I am inclined to interpret their emergence in a different way: as a need to mark speciality of the place with special signs, and in that way enhance perception of it “consecration” in the environment it belongs to and space surrounding it. If the miniature models of sanctuaries were shaped after models from the collective cult reality, and it seems to me that this phenomenon may correspond to relation of the collective and individual, general and particular, then execution of various motifs would be just a part of that imitation.

On the other hand, presence of this example in Smilčić opens up the question of possible existence of such cult objects not only at this but also at other Neolithic sites from this region. Although on the present level of understanding the structure, organization and functioning of the Neolithic settlement wholes there are no signs indicating in that direction, we need to keep in mind that knowledge about Neolithic settlement wholes is very modest so that this possibility should not be eliminated in advance, particularly as it is unlikely that model in question was made without any experience about the collective ritual practice in the objects of the kind. Significant change in the research strategy of the Neolithic settlements on the eastern Adriatic is necessary for confirmation or at least clear indications of such possibility.⁴⁵

Translation: Marija Kostić

38 D. R. THEOCHARIS, 1973, fig. 8.

39 G. NAUMOV, 2011, fig. 7.5.

40 C. MARANGANU, 1996, fig. 1.

41 M. MERLINI, 2005, fig. 7.

42 C. KOUKOULI-CHRYSANTHAKI *et al.*, 2007, 59-60, fig. 26.

43 G. LAZAROVICI, C. M. M. LAZAROVICI, 2010a, fig. 21.

44 S. A. GUSEV, 1995, 175-189; C. M. M. LAZAROVICI, 2002, fig. 5-7, 22.

45 B. MARIJANOVIĆ, 2013, 77-94.

38 D. R. THEOCHARIS, 1973, fig. 8.

39 G. NAUMOV, 2011, fig. 7.5.

40 C. MARANGANU, 1996, fig. 1.

41 M. MERLINI, 2005, fig. 7.

42 C. KOUKOULI-CHRYSANTHAKI *et al.*, 2007, 59-60, fig. 26.

43 G. LAZAROVICI, C. M. M. LAZAROVICI, 2010a, fig. 21.

44 C. M. M. LAZAROVICI, 2002, fig. 5-7, 22; S. A. GUSEV, 1995, 175-189.

45 B. MARIJANOVIĆ, 2013, 77-94.

LITERATURA / REFERENCES

- BATOVIĆ, Š., 1979. – Šime Batović, Jadranska zona, *Praistorija jugoslavenskih zemalja. Neolit*, II, Sarajevo, 473-634.
- BORIĆ, D., 2008. – Dušan Borić, First Households and “House Societies”, u/in: *European Prehistory, Prehistoric Europe: Theory and Practice* (ur./ed.: A. Jones), 109-142.
- BRUKNER, B., 1988. – Bogdan Brukner, Die siedlung der Vinča-gruppe auf Gomolava (die Wohnschicht des Spätneolithikums und Frühneolithikums (Gomolava Ia, Gomolava Ia-b und Gomolava Ib) und der Wohnhorizont des aneolithischen Humus (Gomolava II), u/in: *Gomolava: Chronologie und Stratigraphie der Vorgeschichtlichen und Antiken Kulturen der Donauniederung und Südosteuropas* (ur./eds.: N. Tasić, J. Petrović), Novi Sad, 19-38.
- CHAUSIDIS, N., 1995. – Nikos Chausidis, Predistorija, u/in: *Makedonija: kulturno nasledstvo*, Skopje, 17-45.
- CRNOBRNJA, A., 2012. – Adam Crnobrnja, Investigations of Late Vinča House 1/2010 at Crkvine in Stubline, *Starinar*, 62, Beograd, 45-64.
- CRNOBRNJA, A., JANKOVIĆ, M., SIMIĆ, Z., 2009. – Adam Crnobrnja, Marko Janković, Zoran Simić, Late Vinča culture settlement at Crkvine in Stubline: Household organization and urbanization in the Late Vinča culture period, *Starinar*, 59, Beograd, 9-25.
- DARCQUE, P. *et al.*, 2007. – Pascal Darcque, Chiado Koukouli-Chrysanthaki, Dimitra Malamidou, René Treuil, Zoï Tsirotsoni, Recent Researches at the Neolithic Settlement of Dikili Tash, Eastern Macedonia, Greece: an Overview, u/in: *The Struma/Strymon River Valley in Prehistory* (ur./eds.: H. Todorova, M. Stefanovich, G. Ivanov), Sofia, 247-256.
- DUMITRESCU, H., 1968. – Hortensia Dumitrescu, Un modèle de sanctuaire découvert dans la station énéolithique de Căscioarele, *Dacia*, n. s., 12, Bucuresti, 381-394.
- GALLIS, K., 1985. – A Late Neolithic Foundation Offering from Thessaly, *Antiquity*, 59, 20-24.
- GIMBUTAS, M., 1982. – Marija Gimbutas, *The Goddesses and Gods of old Europe*, Oakland.
- GUSEV, S. A., 1995. – Sergej A. Gusev, Hausmodelle der Tripolje-Kultur, *Praehistorische Zeitschrift*, 70, Berlin, 175-189.
- JOVANOVIĆ, B., GLIŠIĆ, J., 1961. – Borislav Jovanović, Jovan Glišić, Eneolitsko naselje na Kormadinu, *Starinar*, n. s., 11, Beograd, 113-142.
- JOVANOVIĆ, M., 2011. – Marija Jovanović, *Masters of clay and wheat*, Novi Sad.
- JOVANOVIĆ, Š., 1995. – Š. Jovanović, Modeli kuća iz At kod Vršca, *Glasnik Narodnog muzeja Pančevo*, 6, Pančevo, 331-342.
- KALICZ, N., RACZKY, P., 1981. – Nandor Kalicz, Pál Raczky, The precursors to the „Horns of Consecration”, u/in: *Southeast European Neolithic. Studia in honorem L. Gerevich dedicata*, I, *Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 33, Budapest, 5-20.
- KOLIŠTRKOVSKA-NASTEVA, I., 2005. – Irena Kolištrkovska-Nasteva, *Praistoriskite dami od Makedonija*, Skopje.
- KOUKOULI-CHRYSANTHAKI, C. *et al.*, 2007. – Chiado Koukouli-Chrysanthaki, Henrieta Todorova, Ioanis Aslanis, Ivan Vajsova, Magdalene Valla, Promachon-Topolnica. A Greek-Bulgarian archaeological project, u/in: *The Struma/Strymon River valley in prehistory* (ur./eds.: H. Todorova, M. Stefanovich, G. Ivanov), Sofia, 43-78.
- KOVÁCS, A., 2012. – Adela Kovács, Defining the sacred space: between monumentality and ritualism, *Analele Universității Creștine „Dimitrie Cantemir”, Seria Istorie – Serie nouă*, 3 (3-4), Bucuresti, 31-57.
- KOVÁCS, A., 2012. – Adela Kovács, Monumental architectonic features and inventory from European Neolithic and Copper Age sanctuaries, *Arheovest III - In Honorem Gheorghe Lazarovici*, Bucuresti, 195-240.
- LAZAROVICI, C. M., 2004. – Cornelia Magda Lazarovici, Sanctuarele Precucuteni-Cucuteni, *Arheologia Moldovei*, 25 (2002), Iași, 47-67.
- LAZAROVICI, G., 1989. – Gheorghe Lazarovici, Das neolithische Heiligtum von Parța, u/in: *Neolithic Southeastern Europe and its Near Eastern Connections, Varia Archaeologica Hungarica*, 2, Budapest, 149-174.
- LAZAROVICI, G., 2009. – Gheorghe Lazarovici, Ritualuri de fundare, rituluri de abandonare din cultura Cucuteni, *In medias res praehistoriae. Miscellanea in honorem annos 65 peragentis Professoris Dan Monah oblata* (ur./ed.: G. Bodi), Iași, 223-238.
- LAZAROVICI, G., LAZAROVICI, C. M., 2010. – Gheorghe Lazarovici, Cornelia Magda Lazarovici, Neo-Eneolithic cult constructions in Southeastern Europe: buildings techniques and space management - a brief overview, u/in: *Neolithic and Chalcolithic, Archaeology in Eurasia: Building Techniques and Spatial Organisation* (ur./ed.: D. Gheorghiu), BAR International Series 2097, Oxford, 19-27.
- LAZAROVICI, G., LAZAROVICI, C. M., 2010a. – Gheorghe Lazarovici, Cornelia Magda Lazarovici, „Sacred house” and her importance for the reconstruction of the architecture, inner arrangements and the spiritual life, *Prehistoric Studies I, Moments in Time, Papers Presented to Pál Raczký on His 60th Birthday* (ur./ed.: A. Anders, G. Kulcsár), Budapest, 503-520.
- LAZAROVICI, G., LAZAROVICI, M., 2008. – Gheorghe Lazarovici, Magda Lazarovici, Sanctuarele culturii Precucuteni-Cucuteni (The sanctuaries of Precucuteni-Cucuteni culture), *Angustia*, 12, Arheologie, Sfântu Gheorghe, 9-40.
- LAZAROVICI, M., LAZAROVICI, G., 2015. – Magda Lazarovici, Gheorghe Lazarovici, Bucraniul – simbol și semn. Bucraniile monumentale (Partea I), *Arheovest IIII - In memoriam Florin Medeleț*, Bucuresti, 47-83.
- LAZAROVICI, G., DRAȘOVEAN, F., MAXIM, Z., 2001. – Gheorghe Lazarovici, Florin Drașovean, Zoia Maxim, *Parța. Monografie arheologică*, Timișoara.
- LAZAROVICI, G. *et al.*, 2002. – Gheorghe Lazarovici, Gheorghe Criș, Oproiu Tiberiu, Iharka Csilik-Szücs, *The Neolithic Shrine at Parța*, Konkoly Observatory of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, 1, Budapest, 7-18.
- LICHTER, C., 2014. – Clemens Lichter, “Temples” in the Neolithic and Copper Age in Southeast Europe, *Documenta Praehistorica*, 41, Ljubljana, 119-136.
- MARANGANU, C., 1996. – Christiana Maranganu, Assembling, displaying, and disassembling Neolithic and Eneolithic figurines and models, *Journal of European Archaeology*, 4, Cambridge, 177-202.
- MARIJANOVIĆ, B., 2013. – Brunislav Marijanović, Prilog strategiji istraživanja neolitika na Jadranu, *Arheologia Adriatica*, 7, Zadar, 77-94.

- MERLINI, M., 2005. – Marco Merlini, Semiotic approach to the features of the “Danube Script”, *Documenta Praehistorica*, 32, Ljubljana, 233-251.
- MILIČEVIĆ-BRADAČ, M., 2005. – Marina Miličević-Bradač, The transfer of symbolism and meanings: the case of the “horns of consecration”, *Documenta Praehistorica*, 32, Ljubljana, 187-195.
- MÜLLER-KARPE, H., 1968. – Hermann Müller-Karpe, *Handbuch der Vorgeschichte*, 1, München.
- NANOGLU, S., 2005. – Stratos Nanoglou, Subjectivity and Material Culture in Thessaly, Greece: the Case of Neolithic Anthropomorphic Imagery, *Cambridge Archaeological Journal*, 15, 2, October 2005, Cambridge, 141-156.
- NAUMOV, G., 2011. – Goce Naumov, Visual And Conceptual Dynamism of the Neolithic Altars in the Republic of Macedonia, *Interdisziplinäre Forschungen zum Kulturerbe auf der Balkanhalbinsel* (ur./eds.: V. Nikolov, K. Bacvarov, H. Popov), Sofia – Nice, 89-129.
- PAPADOPULOS, S., NERANTZIS, N., 2014. – Stratis Papadopoulos, Nerantzis Nerantzis, Eastern Macedonia during the 5th millennium BC: Stability and Innovation, *The Neolithic and Eneolithic in Southeast Europe; New approaches to dating and cultural Dynamics in the 6th to 4th Millennium BC* (ur./eds.: W. Schier, F. Dragaşovean), *Prähistorische Archäologie in Südosteuropa*, Bd. 28, Rahden, 29-48.
- PETROVIĆ, J., 1992. – Jelka Petrović, Arhitektura kuće 4 na Gomolavi: naselje mlade Vinčanske kulture, *Rad Vojvođanskih muzeja*, 34, Novi Sad, 19-32.
- RENFREW, C., GIMBUTAS, M., ELSTER, S. E., 1986. – Colin Renfrew, Marija Gimbutas, Ernestine S. Elster, *Excavations at Sitagroi: A Prehistoric Village in Northeast Greece*, Los Angeles.
- SÉFÉRIADÈS, M. L., 2005. – Michel L. Sfériadès, Note shamanique: A propos du bucrane néolithique de Dikili Tash (Macédoine orientale grecque), *Cultură și Civilizație la Dunărea de Jos XXII, In Honorem Silvia Marinescu-Bîlcu 70 de ani*, Călărași, 97-114.
- SPASIĆ, M., 2012. – Miloš Spasić, Cattle to settle – bull to rule: on bovine iconography among Late Neolithic Vinča culture communities, *Documenta Praehistorica*, 39, Ljubljana, 295-308.
- SOUVATZI, S. G., 2008. – Stella G. Souvatzis, *A Social Archaeology of Households in Neolithic Greece: An Anthropological Approach*, Cambridge.
- SOUVATZI, S. G., 2012. – Stella G. Souvatzis, Between the Individual and the Collective: Household as a Social Process in Neolithic Greece, *New Perspectives on Household Archaeology* (ur./eds.: B. J. Parker, C. P. Foster), Winona Lake, 15-43.
- ŠEMROV, A., TURK, P., 2008. – Andrej Šemrov, Peter Turk, *Neolithic art in the Republic of Macedonia*, Ljubljana.
- TEMELKOSKI, D., MITKOSKI, A., 2005. – Duško Temelkoski, Aleksandar Mitkoski, Tipovi neolitski žrtvenici vo pristoriskata zbirka na Zavodot i muzej – Prilep, *Zbornik na Muzejot na Makedonija*, 2 (Arheologija), Skopje, 47-56.
- THEOCHARIS, D. R., 1973. – Demetrios R. Theocharis, *Neolithic Greece*, Athens.
- TODOROVIĆ, J., 1981. – Jovan Todorović, A recently discovered house in the Neolithic settlement of Banjica in Belgrade, *Archaeologica Iugoslavica*, 18, Beograd, 13-17.
- TREUIL, R., DARQUE, P., 1998. – René Treuil, Pascal Darque, Un «bucrane» néolithique à Dikili Tash (Macédoine orientale): parallèles et perspectives d'interprétation, *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, 122, Athènes, 1-25.
- TRIPKOVIĆ, B., 2007. – Boban Tripković, *Domaćinstvo i prostor u kasnom neolitu: vinčansko naselje na Banjici*, Beograd.
- URLESCU, N., COTIUGĂ, V., CALINIUC, Ș., 2013. – Nicolae Urlescu, Vasile Cotiugă, Ștefan Caliniuc, Religious themes from the plastic art of the Carpathian Chalcolithic and their echo in Greek mythology, *XXV Valcamonica Symposium. Art as a source of history/L'arte come sorgente di storia*, Capo di Ponte, 133-138.
- VASIĆ, M., 1936. – Miloje Vasić, *Preistorijska Vinča*, II, Beograd.
- VASILEVA, M., 2005. – M. Vasileva, *Kade e našeto minato. Voved kon praistorijata na Pelagonija*, Bitola.
- ZDRAVKOVSKI, D., 2005. – Dragiša Zdravkovski, Neolitska naselba “Pod selo – Tumba” s. Stenče, *Zbornik na Muzejot na Makedonija*, 2 (Arheologija), Skopje, 25-31.
- WHITTLE, A. W. R., 1996. – Alasdair W. R. Whittle, *Europe in the Neolithic, The creation of new worlds*, Cambridge.

