

Annales d'Université Valahia Targoviste,
Section d'Archéologie et d'Histoire,
Tome XIII, Numéro 1, 2011, p. 91-98
ISSN : 1584-1855

The Prehistory of Banat (Editors-in-chief Nikola Tasić and Florin Draşovean), I. ***The Palaeolithic and Mesolithic*** (Edited by Florin Draşovean and Borislav Jovanović), EA
The Publishing House of the Romanian Academy, Bucharest, 2011, 245 p., 77 fig.,
ISBN: 978-973-27-2057-8.

*Elena-Cristina Niţu**

*Valahia University, Doctoral School, Lt. Stancu Ion Street, nr. 34-34 Târgovişte, Dâmboviţa County, Romania,
email: elenacristinanitu@yahoo.com

The initiative of publishing a Prehistory of Banat, in several volumes, comprising the Romanian territory and northern Serbia, with Nikola Tasić and Florin Draşovean as editors in chief, is doubtlessly worth praising. The project, which will be concluded through a series of five volumes (*The Palaeolithic and Mesolithic, The Neolithic, The Eneolithic, The Bronze Age and The Iron Age*), has involved innumerable cultural institutions of Romania and Serbia, such as Romanian Academy of Sciences, the Timişoara Branch, the Museum of Banat, the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Art etc.

The first volume issued is called *The Palaeolithic and Mesolithic*, edited by Florin Draşovean and Borislav Jovanović. This work is structured in six chapters: I. Introduction, II. The Palaeolithic in Banat, III. The Paleolithic in northern Serbia, IV. The Mesolithic in Banat, V. The continuity and future research, VI. Appendix.

Even since the introduction, the authors present the difficulties encountered in the realization of this volume, due to the unequal research of the sites, to the poor knowledge of the paleogeography of the region, to the lack of absolute dating, to the insufficient information on the lithic raw matter sources “as well as the inadequate degree of publication of archaeological and palaeoecological material” (p. 17). At the same time, it is mentioned that some

research works will be published here for the first time and a special attention will be given to the transition from the Middle to the Upper Paleolithic.

The amplest part of this work is the second chapter, *The Paleolithic in Banat*, signed by Ion Cornel Bălţean, which, unfortunately, also presents the biggest problems. It is divided in its turn into numerous subchapters and starts with general considerations on the period under analysis. The features of the Palaeolithic are very briefly described and, despite its title, this subchapter is rather a pleading concerning the need to carry out geomorphological and sedimentological studies. Sure, these studies are very necessary, but we were about to realize that they were totally absent from this chapter.

The following subchapter is called *Some terminological remarks on the use of quartz/quartzite as raw material in some Palaeolithic settlements in the Banat*. The need for some terminological considerations on the use of quartz and quartzite is doubtless, yet the author does not use the specialized literature of this quite difficult domain sufficiently. Only two works of Vincent Mourre (1996, 1997) are quoted, just a few aspects on the use of quartz being selected (such as the difference between cortex and neo-cortex, knapping features, particular accidents), while many other characteristic elements have been neglected. One

could have expected that the notions proposed by Vincent Mourre (1996, 1997) would be used in the analysis of the lithic material of Banat, yet, as we were about to notice, except for the use of the term of neo-cortex, they are completely missing from this work. For this reason, we wonder what the role of this subchapter in the economy of this work may be, if the notions concerning the quartz technology are not used.

The part on the geological structure of Banat region is very ample and consistently documented. Unfortunately, there is no mention of the motivation and the goal of realizing such an ample study on the geological structure when this work deals with the Palaeolithic of the area. Then a study on the type of rocks used in Prehistory follows, describing the general petrographic features of the rocks and having no connection to the Paleolithic of Banat. A necessary and well-documented chapter is the one concerning the Quaternary deposits.

After that, the history of the research and the most consistent part of the study follows: (II. 5.) *The Palaeolithic archaeological evidence in the Banat area*. This part begins with a subchapter suggestively entitled (II. 5. 1) *Pedological analyzes, sedimentological remarks on stratigraphical profiles of the palaeolithic settlements in the Banat*. According to the title, we were expecting an extremely necessary and little approached study of the Romanian archeology. Unfortunately, we realized that this title does not correspond to the content. There is no pedological analysis, and the so-called stratigraphic considerations are totally missing. This chapter is just a simple compilation of stratigraphic descriptions published in time by the authors who carried out researches in the sites of Banat. Consequently, the title of this subchapter does not agree with its content.

The following subchapter is entitled (II.5.2.) *Repertoire of Palaeolithic archaeological sites*. Considering this title, we were expecting to find a repertoire of the settlements in the area, although these sites have been catalogued recently (Sabin Adrian Luca, 2009). We were about to realize that this subchapter is the author's own study on the settlements, so again the title does not correspond to the content. This part, which was supposed to

represent in fact the author's contribution, presents innumerable irregularities. In order not to abuse of the space usually given to such an analysis, we have contented ourselves with just a few examples, each time presenting in brief the bibliographic references needed in order to identify the irregularities.

The first aspect that needs to be pointed out is that there is not one original technotypological analysis. This would not necessarily be a problem, provided a correct synthesis on the Paleolithic series had been realized. Unfortunately, all the information and the analysis of the lithic material is taken over as such and translated from Fl. Mogoșanu (1978) and Al. Păunescu (2001). In the economy of this work, a much too important part is occupied by typological tables, which are translated, without adding any supplementary information, from the above-mentioned authors. In a few cases, to avoid the impression of total imitation, the pieces whose coefficient was zero were eliminated from the tables. None of the typological tables has been provided with any explanation and the authors it has been taken from, namely Fl. Mogoșanu (1978) and Al. Păunescu (2001), under it. They are simply mentioned here and there only in the text. A minimum of scientific rigor requires that a table or graph in a scientific work should have an explanation and be numbered. For someone who does not know the Romanian Paleolithic bibliography, or for someone who does not know Romanian, this chapter may give the impression of being the labor of Ion C. Bălțean. Taking over a table as such from an author, even though it may be translated into a foreign language, without explaining underneath where it has been taken from, is called *plagiarism*.

In order to support the above-mentioned statements, below, we will provide, out of the countless examples (the tables for levels I, II, III from Coșava (p. 47, 48, 49) are taken over from Fl. Mogoșanu (1978, p. 80); the table for the Mousterian level from Gornea (p. 50) is copied from Al. Păunescu (2001, p. 151); the tables for levels III, IV, V, VI from Românești-Dumbrăvița (p. 57, 59) are taken over from Fl. Mogoșanu (1978, p. 72-73)), only two (fig. 1, 2).

		1			2			3		
Ord. no.	Types of pieces	No.	%							
1.	End-scrapers	2	1,81	1. Grattoir sur bout de lame	2	1,81				
2.	Atypical end-scrapers	2	1,81	2. Grattoir sur bout de lame atypique	2	1,81				
4.	Ogival scrapers	1	0,90	4. Grattoir ogival	1	0,90				
5.	End-scrapers on retouched blade	3	2,72	5. Grattoir sur lame retouchée	3	2,72				
6.	End-scrapers on Aurignacian blade	3	2,72	6. Grattoir sur lame aurignacienne	3	2,72				
7.	Fan shaped end-scrapers	1	0,90	7. Grattoir éventail	1	0,90				
8.	End-scrapers on flake	8	7,27	8. Grattoir sur éclat	8	7,27				
11.	Carinated end-scrapers	9	8,18	9. Grattoir écreusé	0	0				
12.	Atypical carinated end-scrapers	4	3,63	10. Grattoir unghiiforme	0	0				
13.	Nosed end-scrapers	2	1,81	11. Grattoir caréné	9	8,18				
13a.	Atypical nosed end-scrapers	3	2,72	12. Grattoir coréné atypique	4	3,63				
15.	Core-like end-scrapers	5	4,54	13. Grattoir à museau	2	1,81				
16.	Rabot	2	1,81	14. Grattoir à museau atypique	3	2,72				
27.	Dihedral straight burin	3	2,72	15. Grattoir nucléiforme	5	4,54				
28.	Offset dihedral burin	1	0,90	16. Rabot	2	1,81				
29.	Dihedral angle burin	3	2,72	24. Perçoir atypique	0	0				
30.	Burin de angle along the break	1	0,90	27. Burin dièdre droit	3	2,72				
31.	Multiple dihedral burin	1	0,90	28. Burin dièdre déjété	1	0,90				
47.	Atypical Châtelperron point	1	0,90	29. Burin dièdre d'angle	3	2,72				
52.	Font-Yves point	1	0,90	30. Burin dièdre sur lame cousée	1	0,90				
65.	Blade with continuous retouch on one side	15	13,63	33. Burin dièdre multiple	1	0,90				
66.	Blade with continuous retouch on two sides	15	13,63	47. Pointe de Châtelperron atypique	1	0,90				
67.	Aurignacian blade	10	9,09	52. Pointe de Font-Yves (Krems)	1	0,90				
68.	Strangled blade	1	0,90	65. Lame à retouches continues sur un cord	15	13,63				
74.	Notched piece	2	1,81	66. Lame à retouches continues sur les deux bords	15	13,63				
75.	Denticulated piece	4	3,63	67. Lame aurignacienne	10	9,09				
77.	Side-scrapers	6	5,45	68. Lame à élargissement	1	0,80				
90.	Dufour bladelet	1	0,90	74. Pièce à encoche	2	1,81				
				75. Pièce denticulée	4	3,63				
				77. Racloir	6	5,45				
				78. Lamelle Dufour	1	0,90				

Fig. 1: Level I from the site of Coşava: the left table has been published by Ion. C. Bălţean (2011, p. 47) and the one on the right by Fl. Mogoşanu (1978, p. 80)

Elena-Cristina Nițu

Ord. no.	Types of pieces	Lev. III	%	Lev. IV	Lev. V
1.	End-scraper on blade	6	5.26	1	0
2.	Atypical end-scraper on blade	1	0.88	1	4
3.	Double end-scraper	1	0.88	0	1
5.	End-scraper on retouched blade	1	0.88	0	1
6.	End-scraper on Aurignacian blade	2	1.75	0	1
8.	End-scraper on flake	15	13.16	3	1
10.	Thumb-nail end-scraper	1	0.88	1	0
11.	Carinated end-scraper	7	6.14	0	1
12.	Atypical carinated end-scraper	6	5.26	1	2
13.	End-scraper à museau	2	1.75	1	0
14.	Nosed end-scraper	1	0.88	0	0
15.	Core-like end-scraper	8	7.02	3	1
16.	Rabot	6	5.26	1	3
17.	End-scraper-burin	1	0.88	1	1
21.	Piercer end-scraper	1	0.88	0	0
24.	Atypical piercer	2	1.75	0	0
27.	Dihedral straight burin	7	6.14	6	5
28.	Dihedral offset burin	3	2.63	3	2
29.	Dihedral angle burin	2	1.75	4	3
30.	Angle burin along the break	4	3.51	2	4
31.	Multiple dihedral burin	1	0.88	1	4
32.	Burin busqué	1	0.88	0	0
34.	Burin on straight retouched truncation	2	1.75	3	1
35.	Burin on oblique retouched truncation	2	1.75	4	0
36.	Burin on concave truncation	1	0.88	1	0
37.	Burin on convex retouched truncation	1	0.88	1	0
39.	Transversal burin on a notch	1	0.88	0	0
43.	Core-like burin nucleiform	1	0.88	0	0
60.	Piece on straight retouched truncation	0	0.00	2	0
61.	Blade with oblique retouched truncation	1	0.88	3	0
63.	Blade with convex retouched truncation	1	0.88	3	0
65.	Blade with continuous retouches on one side	6	5.26	0	1
66.	Blade with continuous on both sides	1	0.88	3	0
67.	Aurignacian blade	5	4.39	1	0
74.	Notched piece	1	0.88	1	0
75.	Denticulated piece	1	0.88	2	0
76.	Scalar piece	0	0.00	1	0
77.	Side-scraper	2	1.75	4	0
84.	Truncated blade	0	0.00	2	0
85.	Backed bladelets	0	0.00	0	1
89.	À coche flake	1	0.88	1	1
90.	Dufour bladelets	8	7.02	0	0
Total tools		114		61	38
Simple blades		788			
Flakes		1941			
Cores		47			
Atypical flakes		2165			
General total		5055			

	Niv. III		Niv. IV		Niv. V	
	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%
0	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Grattoire sur bout de lame	6	5,26	1	1,63	0	0
2. Grattoir sur bout de lame atypique	1	0,87	1	1,63	4	10,25
3. Grattoir double	1	0,87	0	0	1	2,56
5. Grattoir sur lame retouchée	1	0,87	0	0	1	2,56
6. Grattoir sur lame aurignacienne	2	1,75	0	0	1	2,56
7. Grattoir éventaillé	0	0	0	0	0	0
8. Grattoir sur éclat	15	13,15	3	4,91	1	2,56
9. Grattoir circulaire	0	0	0	0	0	0
10. Grattoir unguiforme	1	0,87	1	1,63	0	0
11. Grattoir caréné	7	6,14	0	0	1	2,56
12. Grattoir caréné atypique	6	5,26	1	1,63	2	5,12
13. Grattoir à museau	2	1,75	1	1,63	0	0
14. Grattoir à museau atypique	1	0,87	0	0	0	0
15. Grattoir nucléiforme	8	7,01	3	4,91	1	2,56
16. Rabot	6	5,26	1	1,63	3	7,69
17. Grattoir-burin	1	1,87	1	1,63	1	2,56
21. Perçoir-grattoir	1	0,87	0	0	0	0
24. Perçoir-atypique	2	1,75	0	0	0	0
27. Burin dièdre droit	7	6,14	6	9,83	5	12,82
28. Burin dièdre déjeté	3	2,63	3	4,91	2	5,12
29. Burin dièdre d'angle	2	1,75	4	6,55	3	7,69
30. Burin dièdre sur lame cassée	4	3,50	2	3,27	4	10,25
31. Burin dièdre multiple	1	0,87	1	1,63	4	10,25
32. Burin busqué	1	0,87	0	0	0	0
34. Burin sur troncature retouchée droit	2	1,75	3	4,91	1	2,56
35. Burin sur troncature retouchée oblique	2	1,75	4	6,55	0	0
36. Burin sur troncature retouchée concave	1	0,87	1	1,63	0	0
37. Burin sur troncature retouchée convexe	1	0,87	1	1,63	0	0
39. Burin transverse sur encoche	1	0,87	0	0	0	0
43. Burin nucléiforme	1	0,87	0	0	0	0
48. Pointes de la Gravelle	0	0	0	0	0	0
60. Lame (pièce) à troncature retouchée droite	0	0	2	3,27	0	0
61. Lame à troncature retouchée oblique	1	0,87	3	4,91	0	0
63. Lame à troncature retouchée convexe	1	0,87	3	4,91	0	0
65. Lame à retouches continue sur un bord	6	5,26	0	0	1	2,56
66. Lame à retouche continues sur deux bords	1	0,87	3	4,91	0	0
67. Lame aurignacienne	5	4,38	1	1,63	0	0
74. Pièce à encoche	1	0,87	1	1,63	0	0
75. Pièce denticulée	1	0,87	2	3,27	0	0
76. Pièce esquilée	0	0	1	1,63	0	0
77. Racloir	2	1,75	4	6,55	0	0
78. Raclette	0	0	0	0	0	0
79. Triangle	0	0	0	0	0	0
84. Lamelle tronquée	0	0	2	3,27	0	0
85. Lamelle à dos	0	0	0	0	1	2,56
89. Lamelle à coche	1	0,87	1	1,63	1	2,56
90. Lamelle Dufour	8	7,01	—	—	—	—
Total :	114	99,98	61	99,75	39	99,91

Fig 2: Levels III, IV and V from the site of Românești-Dumbrăvița: the table on the left has been published by Ion. C. Bălțean (2011), and the one on the right by Fl. Mogoșanu (1978, p. 72-73)

The examples of plagiarism do not stop at the typological tables, but continue as well when commenting them. Here are just a few examples:

<p>„...cele două gratoare tipice cu bot („à museau”) sînt făcute astfel: unul plat pe lamă aurignaciană, iar celălalt pe aşchie-capac de nucleu...”(Fl. Mogoşanu, 1978, p. 75)</p>	<p>„The two nosed end-scraper were manufactured, one on a <i>core tablet</i>, and the other on an Aurignacian blade.” (I. C. Bălţean, 2011, p. 48).</p>
<p>Nu lipsesc nici gratoarele nucleiforme şi nici gialăile („rabots”)..” (Fl. Mogoşanu, 1978, p. 75)</p>	<p>„One should remember the presence of the core-like end-scraper and the <i>rabot</i> type pieces..” (I. C. Bălţean, 2011, p. 48)</p>
<p>„Pe baza acestor observaţii credem că este vorba despre un facies mustertian în care tehnica Levallois este absentă, fără forme bifaciale dar bogat în racloare ...” (Al. Păunescu, 2001, p. 142)</p>	<p>„This tool poin out to a Mousterian industry characterized by the absence of the Levallois technique and of the bifacial shape, but rich in scarpers”. (I. C. Bălţean, 2011, p. 45).</p>
<p>„Indici tipologici pentru stratul inferior: IG = 39,09 IB = 8,18 IGA = 16,36 Ibd = 8,18” (Fl. Mogoşanu, 1978, p. 80)</p>	<p>„The characteristic tipological indices for this level are: IG 39.09% IB 8.18% IGA 16.36% IBd 8.18% „ Ion. C. Bălţean, 2011, p. 48)</p>

Much more serious is the association between plagiarism and forgery. For the settlement of Gornea-Dealul Căuniţei, the author of the chapter enthusiastically mentions: “Although the number of typical pieces is very small and cannot be subjected to the technical-typological analysis after the Bordian method, we can still identify types such as” (p. 50). We realized with amazement that it was not the author that identified those types, but Al. Păunescu (2001, p. 151) whom once again the author “forgot” to quote. Ion C. Bălţean only “has the merit” of putting the data in a table, probably in order to make it look less like the original text of Al. Păunescu (2001, p. 151) and to distract the reader’s attention from plagiarism.

It is only a page after this, when the typological table is discussed, that a footnote reminds of Al. Păunescu (2001). Below, we will quote the original text of Al. Păunescu (2001, p. 151) with the determination of the tools, from which we have excluded the types of butts identified, along with the table published by Ion. C. Bălţean, p. 50.

„I. Aşchii Levallois tipice: 19 (...); Ia. Lame Levallois: 5 (...); II. Aşchii Levallois atipice: 7 (...); III. Vârfuri Levallois neretuşate: 5 (...); IV. Vârfuri Levallois retuşate: 3 (...); V. Racloare simplu drepte: 2 (...); VI. Racloare simplu concav: 2 (...); VII. Racloar dublu-drept: 1 (...); VIII. Racloar dublu drept-concav: 1 (...); IX. Racloar dublu convex-concav: 2 (...); X. Cuţit à dos natural : 1,

Ord. no.	Types of pieces	No.
1	Typical Levallois flake	19
1a	Typical Levallois blade	5
2	Atypical Levallois flake	7
3	Unretouched Levallois point	5
4	Retouched Levallois point	3
9	Single straight side-scrapers	2
11	Single concave side-scrapers	2
12	Double straight side-scrapers	1
14	Double straight-concave side-scrapers	1
17	Double convex-concave side-scrapers	2
38	Naturally backed knife	1
42	Notched piece	1
43	Denticulated piece	1
Total implements		50

Typological structure of the lithic series according to Ion. C. Bălțean (2011), p. 50

Ord. no.	Types of pieces	No.
	Non-Levallois points	21
	Non-Levallois blades	4
	Levallois core	1
	Discoidal core	1
	Quasi-discoidal core	1
	Atypical flakes	76
Overall total		154

Composition of the raw lithic material according to Ion. C. Bălțean (2011), p. 51.

(...); XI. Piesă cu *encoche* clactoniană: 2 (...); XII. Piesă denticulată: 1 ...” (Al. Păunescu, 2001 p. 151).

At the end of his study, Ion C. Bălțean mentions „As there no match between the total number of discovered pieces claimed by Florea Mogoșanu (147) and the number resulting from above table (154)”. This affirmation is surprising, as Fl. Mogoșanu (1978) and Al. Păunescu (2001) present the same number of tools, namely 154. The explanation of this “mystery” is simple: Mr. Bălțean copies information from two authors, forgetting to mention it. In the table on page 51, he takes over as such the information on the raw material from Al. Păunescu (2001, p. 151), to which he adds a number of 76 atypical flakes determined by Fl. Mogoșanu (1978, p. 31). Subsequently, we will present the original information from Al. Păunescu (2001, p. 151) and Fl. Mogoșanu (1978, p. 31), next to the table published by Ion. C. Bălțean (2001, p. 51):

„XIII. Nuclee: 3, de tip Levallois (1), discoidal (1) și cvasidiscoidal (1); XIV. Așchii non Levallois: 21 (...); XV. Lame non Levallois: 4 ...” (Al. Păunescu, 2001, p. 151).

„La toate aceste piese tipice se mai adaugă și 76 de spărturi și așchii atipice” (Fl. Mogoșanu, 1978, p. 31).

This is an example of double plagiarism, but also of forgery of the structure of the lithic industry from this settlement, which is extremely serious.

We can provide as well a few examples of pieces of information taken over from Fl. Mogoșanu (1978), whom he does not cite. There are entire paragraphs synthesized based on the conclusions of the above-mentioned author:

-the typological makeup of levels I and II from Românești-Dumbrăvița (p. 56) is taken over from Fl. Mogoșanu (1978, p. 54);

-the description of the lithic series of level IV from Românești-Dumbrăvița (p. 58) is taken over from Fl. Mogoșanu (1978, p. 62), and

level V from Fl. Mogoşanu (1978, p. 61-63); the conclusions for level VI are synthesized based on Fl. Mogoşanu (1978, p. 66)

It is useless to mention that absolutely all the settlements presented in this chapter are treated in the same way, so there is no analysis carried out by the author, and not even a synthesis of the studies of the researchers who worked in Banat. All the analyses presented have been taken over as such, without any addition, often “forgetting” to quote the authors who carried them out. The text is made up in a very confusing way so that the reader is not able to identify the authors who actually studied the material but will not completely exclude them either. We are dealing with a simple compilation of some older studies, sprinkled with plagiarisms here and there.

Although the author has no contribution whatsoever, except for the translation of some older articles and studies, he criticizes some aspects of the lithic analysis carried out by others. About the settlement of Coşava, he states: „We regret that we cannot have a view of the butt types, of the metrical variation of the support, of the frequency of the pieces that stem from the first stages of the reduction sequence as the material (nowadays in the custody of the History Museum of Lugoj), whose storing conditions render its study difficult if not even impossible with a view to reconstructing its archaeological context from which it stems has not been processed and one makes no references to the lithic implements (the same holds for the other two levels)” (p. 48). If he had known the specialized literature well, he would have noticed that for the settlement of Coşava there is an identification of the types of butts and of the metric relations carried out by Al. Păunescu (2001). Similarly, the author is discontent with the analysis of other archeological settlements as well, because of the lack of metrical and technological data and of the refittings (for example at Româneşti-Dumbrăviţa). We are wondering, naturally, why has the author taken over the analyses carried out by others if he was discontent with them? At the same time, we do not understand why he did not make himself new techno-typological analyses, better than the older ones. Concerning the diggings of 1989 from the

settlement of Gornea-Păzărişte, the author mentions that the drawings of the published tools are irrelevant and do not respect the scientific rigors: “We would not have been so disappointed if the drawings had been carried out after the required principles of the graphic rendering of lithic material, but in the present case this thing is of little avail, too” (p. 52). After such a statement, in this chapter we would have expected to find only drawings realized according to modern graphic principles, made by the author of the chapter himself. We noticed with amazement that the drawings used are still the old ones published by Fl. Mogoşanu (1978) and Al. Păunescu (2001). Moreover, the figures made based on the old drawings do not respect even a minimum of rigor. The author does not know that when one presents the drawings of some tools, they need to be provided with a scale, too. And on top of it all, when it comes to the dimension of the tools, they are “thrown” helter-skelter on a page in a group of drawings under which it is mentioned that the tools have variable scales (!), so the reader can attribute any « variable » dimension to the items in front of his eyes.

Except for the elements signaled above, the study also misses some minimal techno-typological knowledge. We find out with surprise that the presence of plane (sometimes wide) and faceted butts and of a well developed bulb are proof of the use of an “indirect percussion with hard percussor or punctiform percussor” (p. 67). In such a small sentence, which this time is the author’s contribution, are included very many mistakes. First of all, there is no such thing as indirect percussion with hard percussor, these terms are totally antithetic. There is no such thing as punctiform percussor, yet there is punctiform butt. The presence of a very prominent bulb is no proof of an indirect percussion; on the contrary it is evidence of a direct hard percussion. Referring to the scrapers from the settlement of Gornea-Dealul Căuniţei, the author affirms that they were made on Levallois points with “faceted convex butt, non-Levallois butt and Levallois blade butt” p. 51). What is striking is the fact that the author does not know the types of butts, as there are no non-Levallois or Levallois butts, there are only flakes, points or blades. Out of the examples provided, there is an obvious use of certain

notions without knowing their meaning well, although these notions are elementary for a paleolithician. Reading these sentences, we understand why the author did not carry out an analysis of his own on the lithic material and why he only compiled the types of tools from a typological study.

Another quite serious element is that he is not familiar with the Romanian bibliography. For the settlement of Constantin Daicoviciu the author mentioned Octavian Popescu, personal communication, as a source. This settlement has already been published by Al. Păunescu (2001, p. 148), so it is no novelty as the author would like to suggest. Actually, the information presented is just an abstract of the text of Al. Păunescu (2001). The same thing can be noticed when it comes to the discovery of three flakes made on quartzite in the point of Curtea, where it is mentioned that the information comes from Emilian Alexandrescu, personal communication, although the materials were published by Al. Păunescu (2001, p. 181).

From a bibliographic viewpoint, the author makes a few confusions. Throughout the text, he insistently quotes Al. Păunescu, 2002, when he refers to the work *Paleoliticul din spațiul Transilvan (The Paleolithic in the Transylvanian Area)*. It was actually published in the year 2001. At the same time, in the text, but also in the bibliography, the author quotes Al. Păunescu, 2001, *Paleoliticul și mezoliticul cuprins între Carpați și Dunăre (The Paleolithic and the Mesolithic in-between the Carpathians and the Danube)*, while this work was actually published in 2000.

The conclusions of this chapter are in agreement with the content; they are just a presentation of the diverse cultural determinations realized by the Romanian archeologists in time, that is why we will no longer insist on them anymore.

To conclude, the author has no contribution of his own, except for rendering, more often than not in totality, the technotypical analyses made by others according to

models launched in the 1950s-1960s. If someone had wanted to see the stage of the Paleolithic research in this region, he would have been able to read without any help the works of Fl. Mogoșanu (1978) and of Păunescu (2001), without needing any « republication » of these works.

Taking into account the almost complete rendering of the work of the above-mentioned authors, it would have been more correct for this chapter to have been signed by Fl. Mogoșanu and Al. Păunescu.

The third chapter of this work is entitled *The Palaeolithic in northern Serbia*. The structure of this chapter is lighter than that of the previous one, presenting the geographic environment, the history of research, the description of the settlements and conclusions. The analysis of the sites, even though some of them are poorer in lithic materials, is quite well realized. At the same time, the lithic sets are described technologically and typologically. The conclusions are pertinent and very useful for the knowledge of the Paleolithic of this area.

Chapter IV, The Mesolithic in Banat, signed by Adina Boroneanț, is a very useful synthesis on the Mesolithic of the region. At the same time, beside the comprehensive information, the chapter also presents a rich illustration, archive images being extremely necessary for the history of the archeological research.

We are aware of the good intentions and of the effort of the editors-in-chief of this series who meant to provide a necessary and useful regional synthesis under the title *The Prehistory of Banat*. For this reason, our regret is even deeper as this enterprise was lamentably compromised by the plagiarism practiced in most of the chapter signed by I. C. Bălțean, through the total lack of originality and the inutility of his signing a text that actually does not represent him except if we kindly award it the attribute of compilation.