

ACADÉMIE ROUMAINE  
INSTITUT D'ARCHÉOLOGIE « V. PÂRVAN »

# D A C I A

REVUE D'ARCHÉOLOGIE  
ET D'HISTOIRE ANCIENNE

NOUVELLE SÉRIE

LVI

2012



EDITURA ACADEMIEI ROMÂNE

## RÉDACTION

*Rédacteur en chef :*

ALEXANDRU VULPE

*Collège de rédaction :*

MARIA ALEXANDRESCU VIANU (București), ALEXANDRU AVRAM (Le Mans), DOUGLAS W. BAILEY (San Francisco), MIHAI BĂRBULESCU (Cluj-Napoca), PIERRE DUPONT (Lyon), SVEND HANSEN (Berlin), ANTHONY HARDING (Exeter), RADU HARHOIU (București), ATTILA LÁSZLÓ (Iași), SILVIA MARINESCU-BÎLCU (București), MONICA MĂRGINEANU-CÂRSTOIU (București), VIRGIL MIHAILESCU-BÎRLIBA (Iași), JEAN-PAUL MOREL (Aix-en-Provence), IOAN PISO (Cluj-Napoca), CLAUDE RAPIN (Aix-en-Provence), WOLFRAM SCHIER (Berlin), VICTOR SPINEI (Iași), ALEXANDRU SUCEVEANU (București)

*Rédacteur en chef adjoint :*

FLORIAN MATEI-POPESCU

*Comité de rédaction :*

CRISTINA ALEXANDRESCU, IULIAN BÎRZESCU, ALEXANDRU DRAGOMAN, EUGEN NICOLAE, ALEXANDRU NICULESCU, CONSTANTIN C. PETOLESCU, DANIEL SPÂNU

*Secrétaire de rédaction :* LILIANA ZAHARIA

*Rédaction éditoriale :* MONICA STANCIU

*Informatique éditoriale :* LUIZA STAN

Toute commande sera adressée à :

**EDITURA ACADEMIEI ROMÂNÊNE**, Calea 13 Septembrie nr. 13, sector 5, 050711, București, România ;  
Tél. 4021-318 8146, 4021-318 8106, Fax 4021-318 2444, E-mail : edacad@ear.ro

**ORION PRESS IMPEX 2000 S.R.L.**, P. O. Box 77-19, sector 3, București, România ; Tél./Fax : 4021-610 6765,  
4021-210 6787, Tél. 0311 044 668, E-mail : office@orionpress.ro

**S.C. MANPRES DISTRIBUTION S.R.L.**, Piața Presei Libere, nr. 1, Corp B, Etaj 3, Cam. 301-302, sector 1,  
București, Tel.: 4021 314 63 39, fax: 4021 314 63 39, E-mail: abonamente@manpres.ro, office@manpres.ro,  
www.manpres.ro

Les manuscrits et les périodiques proposés en échange, ainsi que toute correspondance seront adressés à la Rédaction : Institut d'Archéologie « V. Pârvan », 11, rue H. Coandă, 010667 Bucarest, Roumanie, Tél./Fax 4021 212 88 62, E-mail : redactie\_iab@yahoo.com



© 2 0 1 2 , E D I T U R A A C A D E M I E I R O M Â N E  
www.ear.ro

ACADÉMIE ROUMAINE  
INSTITUT D'ARCHÉOLOGIE «V. PÂRVAN»

DACIA LVI, 2012

REVUE D'ARCHÉOLOGIE ET D'HISTOIRE ANCIENNE  
JOURNAL OF ARCHAEOLOGY AND ANCIENT HISTORY  
ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR ARCHÄOLOGIE UND GESCHICHTE DES ALTERTUMS  
ЖУРНАЛ АРХЕОЛОГИИ И ДРЕВНЕЙ ИСТОРИИ

SOMMAIRE  
CONTENTS  
I N H A L T

<i>ÉTUDES</i>	
ROBIN BRIGAND, ANDREI ASĂNDULESEI, OLIVIER WELLER, VASILE COTIUGĂ, <i>Contribution à l'étude du peuplement chalcolithique des bassins hydrographiques des Bahluiet et Valea Oii (Dép. Iași)</i> .....	5
ANA ILIE, <i>Un sceptre anthropomorphe de la collection d'archéologie du Complexe Nationale et Musée « La Cour Princièrè » de Târgoviște</i> .....	33
ALEXANRU VULPE, <i>Herodotus and the Scythian Problem in Romania</i> .....	47
IULIAN BÎRZESCU, <i>Die archaische Siedlung von Tariverde</i> .....	77
LUCREȚIU MIHAILESCU-BÎRLIBA, <i>Les « Romains » dans la cité d'Istros sous le Haut-Empire</i> .....	91
DAN APARASCHIVEI, <i>Physicians and Medicine in the Roman Army of Moesia Inferior</i> .....	99
IOAN PISO, FELIX MARCU, OVIDIU ȚENEA, GEORGE CUPCEA, RADU VARGA, <i>Das Kapitol von Sarmizegetusa</i> .....	119
IRINA ADRIANA ACHIM, <i>Paysage urbain tardo-antique à Histria : les églises paléochrétiennes entre le cadre architectural et la liturgie</i> .....	125
<i>DISCUSSIONS</i>	
UROŠ MATIĆ, <i>To queer or not to queer? That is the question: Sex/gender, prestige and burial no. 10 on the Mokrin necropolis</i> .....	169
<i>COMPTE RENDUS</i>	
Ion Motzoi Chicideanu, <i>Obiceiuri funerare din epoca bronzului la Dunărea Mijlocie și Inferioară</i> , vol. I (text), vol. II (planșe), Editura Academiei Române, București, 2011 ( <i>A. Vulpe</i> ) .....	187
Simona Lazăr, <i>Sfârșitul epocii bronzului și începutul epocii fierului în sud-estul României</i> , Academia Română, Institutul de Cercetări Socio-Umane „C. S. Ploșor”, Editura Universitaria, Craiova, 2011, ( <i>C. Kacsó</i> ) .....	193
C. Kacsó, <i>Repertoriul arheologic al județului Maramureș</i> , Muzeul Județean de Istorie și Arheologie Maramureș, Bibliotheca Marmatia 3, vol. I (text) 628 p.; vol. II, 318 p. (71 hărți și 323 fig.), Editura Eurotip, Baia Mare, 2011 ( <i>A. Vulpe</i> ) .....	197
<i>Roma e le province del Danubio, Atti del I Convegno Internazionale Ferrara – Cento, 15 – 17 Ottobre 2009</i> , a cura di Livio Zerbini, Rubbettino Editore, 2010, 499 p. ( <i>Adriana Panaite</i> ) .....	200
<i>ABRÉVIATIONS</i> .....	209



# C O M P T E S R E N D U S

Ion Motzoi Chicideanu, *Obiceiuri funerare din epoca bronzului la Dunărea Mijlocie și Inferioară*, vol. I (text), vol. II (plates), Editura Academiei Române, Bucharest, 2011.

This book contains 900 pages of text and illustrations, including a comprehensive summary in English and a rich bibliography, as well as 472 plates, thus placing it among the more extensive works available. It should be noted from the outset that both the size and contents of this work, which I will describe in what follows, reflect the importance and great value of its author's achievement.

A brief introduction, serving to justify the choice of region as part of the reasoning behind the interest in the subject at hand, is followed by the *Geographical Setting* chapter itself. Besides the territory of present-day Romania, this also encompasses certain parts of neighbouring states, an indispensable fact in any coherent study of the real situation during the Bronze Age. Thus, to the east, the border of the area under study is situated at the watershed between the Prut and the Dniester, while to the south it also contains Bugeac. In the south the border is formed by the northern chain of the Balkan mountains (Stara Planina), and to the west, the river Tisza. The author divides this space, entirely justifiably, into three study areas: south (the Lower Danube area), west (the Middle Danube basin) and east (historical Moldavia). Chicideanu highlights the difficulty of finding a suitable term by which to define the geographical space encompassing Romania. Broadly speaking, this space represents what Romanian geographers refer to as the *Carpatho-Danubian Region*, a term which, however, the author is careful to avoid for reasons which, I must admit, I am unable to fully comprehend. However, I do value the author's criticism of this term as well as that of *Carpathian Basin*, which is used by archaeologists in Central Europe, both of which reflect clear political motivations, both on the part of the Romanians and that of others. Replacing this term with *Danubian Basin*, as is the case in this work, is worthy of consideration. It appears, however, that the author is unaware of one of my contributions in which I attempted to explain the relative and subjective, politically motivated validity of the use of such terms in characterising, strictly geographically, situations identified in material culture during various historical periods, from the earliest of times until the present day: A. Vulpe, *The Legacy of Ancient Times*, in (D. C. Giurescu/St. Fischer-Galați) Romania. A Historic Perspective, New York, 1998, p. 3.

The following chapter is entitled *The History of the Research and A Critique of Sources*. I believe a more appropriate title would have been "The History of Research from a Critical Perspective" or similar, for "A

Critique of Sources" in fact represents the essence, the strong point of the entire work. This chapter begins with a recapitulation of all of the discoveries, beginning with that in Șișcani (1837-1838) and ending with the research carried out at the outset of this century. There is a discussion of the development of the research as function of the quantity, as well as quality, of funerary discoveries, something the author divides into nine stages, justified primarily by the development of the methodology applied to this subject throughout this long period. I would like to make special mention of the critical approach, applied with prudence, as well as the hierarchical evaluation vis-à-vis the works in which the funerary discoveries were published and discussed.

For the area studied in his book the author had at his disposal, broadly speaking, just over 10,000 burials originating from around 1,100 discoveries. In the second part of this chapter, Chicideanu discusses, too briefly in my opinion, the meaning of the term "culture" in archaeology. Although he rightly demonstrates that the "cultures" in question are in fact "ceramic groups" or "ceramic in style" (in the final chapter of the book he returns to the understanding of this concept with yet more vehemence), he is, however, eventually forced to accept the notion of "culture" as a criterion for assigning discoveries of a funerary nature to a given area, an area, however, characterised primarily by the type of ceramics. I would emphasise here the fully justified criticisms in respect of the connotations of an ethno-cultural or ethno-cultural linguistic nature attributed to the term "culture", which, in one form or another, continue to be used even today by many researchers and perhaps also indirectly in this book (a matter I will return to later).

In the following chapter, *Chronological Setting*, the author broadly speaking adopts the scheme proposed by me in *Istoria Românilor*, adding a series of new arguments in support of the "high" dating for the beginnings of the Bronze Age based in particular on new radiocarbon data. Chicideanu is tempted, to a greater extent than me, to rely on <sup>14</sup>C dating, which also produces very high values for the dating of the start of the middle period: approx. 3000 BC; in fact, it is at the beginning of this stage – which he calls IIa – that he places the Zimnicea and Glina groups, the spherical "amphora" and what he refers to as the "beginnings of the Monteoru culture". Naturally, the author is aware of the pragmatic nature of this chronological sketch, which could be modified and refined in the future.

Dacia N.S., tome LVI, Bucarest, 2012, p. 187-207

In another chapter, the importance of which is strictly related to the theme of the book, he discusses the notion of *Funerary Discovery* (ch. 5), enlarging on what he wrote previously under the entry for *tomb* in the *Enciclopedia arheologică* (coordinated by C. Preda), Bucharest, 2000, p. 108-112. In this work he avoids excessive use of ethnographic and sociologising parallels and the multitude of theories based on such elements found in particular in the Anglo-Saxon literature and thus tries to formulate his own perspective based on the model, considered to be of importance, put forward long ago by Van Gennep (1909) and adopted by many researchers to this day (bibliography, p. 58 onwards). In his opinion, “the close analysis of the funerary customs, the focus on their structure, is especially able to reveal data of a social nature, possibly [my emphasis] also religious”; I will return to this point below. As a defining element of a funerary discovery, the author places emphasis on the structure of the funerary space, its arrangement according to the social structure of the community. He explains the notions of *social persona* and *consumption of social energy*, which are also highlighted through the methods of statistical analysis of the funerary space (e.g. the Voronoi-Dirichlet-Thiessen or Delaunay-Kolmogorov triangulations), illustrated (vol. II) by the author in the case of many necropoli. He goes on to define the idea of a *standard funerary practice*, or *standard ritual/behaviour*, as an ensemble of the elements of funerary ritual from the necropoli of a community meant to express the social identity of the deceased. The author believes an approach based on a sociological perspective is able to provide “the necessary clarifications and adjustments in respect of the *definition of cultural groups* [my emphasis], their structure and internal dynamics”...

Chapter six – *Catalogue of Funerary Discoveries* – contains 1,119 sites with funerary elements (necropoli or isolated tombs) and cites the main literature, and, in certain cases, also supplementary literature. Where the discoveries are referred to throughout the book, the catalogue number for the site in question is given. However, I fail to understand the absence of the tumulus in Susani, which, some believe, including the author himself, dates from before the beginning of the first Iron Age, as I have dated it; especially as the book also deals with tumuli from the so-called second phase of the necropolis in Lăpuș, which presents many analogies with the site in Susani.

The funerary discoveries themselves are discussed over four chapters: **1.** The last Neolithic burials and the first burials of the Bronze Age; **2.** Funerary discoveries from the first stage of the Bronze Age; **3.** Funerary discoveries from the middle stage of the Bronze Age; and **4.** Funerary discoveries from the late period of the Bronze Age. These chapters, spread over 493 pages, constitute the core of the book. The method employed to present the funerary discoveries from the four

chronological stages is, as mentioned above, to relate them to the main cultural groups as accepted by the majority of Romanian and foreign archaeologists. This method of associating the discoveries with cultural groups, principally based on ceramics, differs somewhat from what the author writes about the concept of “culture” in earlier chapters. Chicideanu consequently feels obliged on each occasion to provide a brief description of the given cultural group, taking the opportunity, more than once, to express briefly his opinions as to the origin, nature, dating and area of distribution of the different groups. While this engenders a certain amount of controversy, it does not, in my opinion, affect the actual content of the work (it is no accident that almost all of the opinions voiced against those of the reviewer refer only to this aspect, which I consider of secondary importance to the subject matter of the book and which I will therefore not dwell on in this review). In what follows I will provide a brief overview of the aforementioned four chapters. The first site to be discussed is the small cemetery in Decea Mureșului, a controversial site both in terms of its dating and its cultural classification. The author exercises caution as to the origin of this “mysterious” (as he puts it) cemetery, not ruling out, however, a possible cultural-archaeological explanation in terms of the penetration of the indigenous environment by a foreign population. In fact, he leaves the issue open to discussion, suggesting that clarification could be achieved through a comparison with the Cernavoda I necropolis in Brăilița.

A critical analysis is given of the burials from the Baden-Coțofeni “cultural bloc” – few in number compared with the large number of sites attributed to this cultural phenomenon. Chicideanu does not like the use of the expression “cultural bloc” to designate a phenomenon expressed primarily through ceramic forms and decorations widely distributed in the Middle Danube basin. In particular, the “lack of success in defining the Coțofeni phenomenon” causes him to exercise restraint in his analysis, all the more so given the paucity of documentary evidence for data of a funerary nature, which is inversely proportional to the number of settlements. The same is true of the Baden culture, which also has low presence in the area under study. All the same, as opposed to other researchers (myself included), the author believes the funerary rite practised in the case of the Coțofeni group to have been exclusively incineration.

A more extensive treatment is afforded to the late Tripolian burials as well as those presumed to be their contemporaries. As in the other sub-chapters, Chicideanu provides a harsh critique of the current state of the available data; he focuses in particular on the necropoli in Brăilița and Suceava (“Parcul Cetății”), emphasising, rightly so, the poor quality of the publication. As to the discoveries in Besserabia, published recently by Valentin Dergacev, the author

attempts to sketch a standard funerary model specific to the late Tripolian complex. The author views these burials as being illustrative of the beginnings of a new expression of man's attitude towards the afterlife and, consequently, attributes them to the Bronze Age.

A special place in the chapter on the funerary discoveries from the first period of the Bronze Age is given to the complex entitled "tumular burials of red ochre", to which 50 pages are dedicated. Here the author analyses tombs of the Jamnaja and Katakombnaja types. This is one of the more extensive analyses in the entire work and also includes the many discoveries from Bessarabia that were published relatively recently (see in particular, the necropolis in Balaban, which is partitioned into groups of tumuli). This also allows him to define models of standard funerary practice, which until now was difficult to imagine based only on the dispersed tumular tombs also widely attested in various parts of Romania. One exemplary case in this respect is given by the tumulus in Smeeni (Buzău county), which, in my opinion, was excellently excavated – unlike the crude type of digging employed to the east of the river Prut – but which for the time being stands alone among a larger group of mounds still to be researched and, therefore, its importance cannot be evaluated correctly. In concluding his analysis of the Jamnaja burials, Chicideanu underlines their conservative nature, which, through mortuary expression, characterises the identity and intra-community solidarity of the group in question. This idea is encountered frequently in processualism and, especially, in certain post-processualist theories, albeit these are not discussed in this book.

A sub-chapter of the book is devoted to the Zimnicea "culture" burials. The author rightly criticised me for not paying enough attention to this funerary group in the first edition (2001) of Volume I of *Istoria Românilor*. I bore this observation in mind while working on the latest edition of this work (published in 2010), all the more so as a number of ceramic forms from Zimnicea not mentioned in the book under review here suggest a relationship with the Aegean world.

This is followed by short descriptions of the funerary discoveries attributed to the Glina and Schneckenberg "cultures" and the Dâmbovița-Muscel group. In respect of the definition and denomination of these aspects, viewed from the perspective of the ceramic forms, my opinions differ significantly from those of Chicideanu; while for the funerary practice and type of tomb, I do not quite see the point of their division according to the criteria used to group ceramic types. The illustration (p. 376, fig. 32) of tomb no. 2 in Năeni ("Colarea") – the only one excavated by me from this group – shows clear similarities with tombs of the so-called Schneckenberg type. All the same, the author attributes it to the burials of the Monteoru culture. However, after stating (p. 299) that "a Schneckenberg funerary practice can still not be determined with

sufficient precision" and, later (p. 304), that "an archaeological manifestation accounting for the funerary practice in the Dâmbovița-Muscel region cannot be clearly identified," he returns, while discussing the Monteoru burials, to this issue: "a larger area emerges, characterised by biritualism and the depositing of the corpses in cists made of stone blocks or, as in Năeni ("Colarea"), in graves dug into the rock" (p. 378, quotation paraphrased). The author's observation, while certainly justified, is also in opposition to the assignment of the funerary discoveries to groups defined ambiguously based on the criteria of ceramic forms.

He then proceeds to review the burials from the Apuseni Mountains (the Liveziile group) as well as other burials from the early Bronze Age in Transylvania – here the author also discusses funerary discoveries from the ceramic groups situated in the Tisza Plain (Makó, Nyírség, Nagyrév, Hatvan, Vinkovci) – and concludes that, at least in the case of the discoveries from Transylvania, a reorganisation of the documentation is necessary to eliminate a series of "groupuscules" (his expression), exaggeratedly given the title of cultural groups; this is especially true of the "Zăbala group", which consists of a single discovery. I can only agree with this point of view.

In respect of the funerary discoveries from the middle period of the Bronze Age, Chicideanu appears to be aided in his endeavour by the fact that the respective ceramic groups, referred to as "cultures", generally belong to areas that can be considered homogenous from a geo-morphological point of view. Consequently, the definition of a model of standard funerary practice specific to a given ceramic group also seems plausible. He discusses in turn the funerary practices of the Periam-Pecica, Monteoru, Costișa, Tei, Verbicioara, Otomani, Gârla Mare, Wietenberg and Mnohоговалковaja "cultures". In the case of the Periam-Pecica, Monteoru and Otomani cultures, the relationship between the necropoli and the settlements is somewhat better documented, a fact well exploited in the book; in fact, the author, together with his wife, had previously studied the area of the Periam-Pecica culture (Dacia NS 33, 1989, p.5-38). This explains why this sub-chapter on the Periam-Pecica receives a more extensive treatment. The author concludes that, in this case, the ensemble of funerary practices is "rigorously structured", and that the "process of combining" common elements in a clearly hierarchised, well defined and "geographically and temporally coherent" structure, supports the identification as "an archaeological phenomenon of the Periam-Pecica culture" by comparison with the neighbouring cultures. For the time being, the Periam-Pecica case does indeed, in my opinion, appear to be the *only* case in which we are able to speak of a better documented relationship between the ceramic types discovered in *settlement* type sites and the funerary practices, though, also in this case, the predominant

factor in this chapter is the specific nature of the ceramic forms.

The situation is significantly different in the case of the Monteoru culture. First of all, as clearly transpires from the book and something I feel needs pointing out (the author himself does not state this explicitly), the level of research is, unfortunately, disastrous. This is all the more regrettable as the settlement/necropolis relationship in this case could have been studied. It is certainly not the fault of Chicideanu that he had to avoid a more detailed discussion of this aspect. The incomplete publication, divided into plots (and only two plots!), of the large necropolis beside the eponymous settlement and the complete lack of publication of the most extensive Bronze Age necropolis in Romania, that in Căndești-Vrancea, with over 800 tombs (personally I doubt whether the full potential of this discovery will ever be exploited) meant the author was forced to rely only on the study of smaller necropoli. This is particularly the case for the necropoli in Poiana-Tecuci and Pietroasa Mică, among others, all of which were at least correctly published, albeit given different interpretations (see, for example, the planimetric study of the necropolis in Pietroasa Mică, which is criticised harshly in the book).

Chicideanu claims to be able to identify a certain level of standardisation in Monteoru funerary behaviour, while at the same time noting “a certain amount of diversity”. Personally, I would say it is more a matter of a *large amount of diversity*, something clearly the case in Căndești, where tombs were identified “with a truly remarkable variety of funerary behaviours, mostly unreported so far in other Monteoru necropoli. This becomes even clearer if we compare the types of tombs with those from neighbouring areas (the book also alludes to a connection with “elements of eastern origin”). However, what is worth underscoring here is the fact that, as rightly stated in the book, the funerary practices of the bearers of Monteoru-style ceramic culture are in stark contrast with both those reported in the tumular tombs in the plain and the incineration tombs from the intra-Carpathian region. Although he mentions the incineration/inhumation relationship, the author avoids – and here I believe he is justified in doing so – discussion of the causes and origins of the different practice of the two rites within the same area. He believes the adoption, within the same “culture” but to different extents, of the incineration rite to be the result of influences from the west.

In terms of the sub-chapter devoted to the “Costișa culture” burials, I would like to remind the author that no tomb *has yet been uncovered* in the actual distribution area of the region in which ceramics known as *Costișa type ceramics* have been documented with certainty (the few skeletons discovered in the eponymous settlement belong to the beginning of the Bronze Age: A. Popescu/R. Băjenaru, *Dacia NS. 52*, 2008, p. 23). In fact, in his book, Chicideanu studies a series of funerary discoveries from the northern part of Moldavia which, in my opinion, do not belong to the

Costișa ceramic group, in the sense in which this has been defined, and which were placed in a separate group in a work by Lidia Dascălu (*Bronzul mijlociu și târziu în Câmpia Moldovei*, Iași, 2007, p. 40 onwards).

A similar situation is also encountered in the areas with concentrations of discoveries of Tei and Verbicioara type ceramics. In reality, there is a *lack* of evidence of burials specific to these ceramic groups. The author is able only to cite and discuss a few isolated cases that highlight the very phenomenon of the *lack* of archaeologically traceable burials, something he in fact underlines.

This book’s treatment of the burials attributed to the Otomani “culture” is wholly remarkable. I would like to point out that this is the *first attempt* to treat as a whole a group of funerary behaviours that can be related to the Otomani type ceramics and which are dispersed over many countries (Hungary, Slovakia, Trans-Carpathian Ukraine and Romania; and recently in Poland, too), having thus been studied according to the traditions of the archaeological schools in those countries. Clearly, any attempt to establish a standard funerary behaviour comes up against the characteristics specific to the different large necropoli in the area in question, all of which display a marked biritualism, albeit on a proportionately different level in terms of the relationship between the two main rites. All the same, Chicideanu believes that in the Otomani ceramic area, the funerary customs “do not appear to undergo changes in terms of substance, *of structure* [my emphasis], the continuity of mortuary traditions being well documented, even if new elements are appearing”; however, he also goes on to say – and here I agree with him – that “these changes, however, come about in a larger area also containing neighbouring regions” (p. 496). I wonder, then, what is left of the with the connection with the Otomani-style ceramics? I note, as a positive fact, the rejection of the theory of a migration from Central Europe, that of the “Tumulars”, seen as being the main cause of the transformations observed throughout the development of Otomani “culture”; in this respect I am entirely in agreement with the criticism of the publication by Tibor Kovács, based on preconceived criteria, of only a single part of the large necropolis in Tiszafüred.

The book also covers the middle Bronze Age burials of the Žuto Brdo-Gârla Mare ceramic group (*culture* in the book), about which Chicideanu also wrote an important work in which he provides us with what, in my opinion, is the most plausible interpretation of the structure of these urn fields (*Dacia NS 30*, 1986, p. 7 onwards). This issue is revisited in a broader context in this book. In an annex to the catalogue, Chicideanu also publishes 83 new tombs recently excavated at the necropolis in Plosca; it should be noted that his wife had recently published a monographic work about this “culture” (M. Șandor-Chicideanu, *Cultura Žuto Brdo-Gârla Mare*, Cluj, 2003). The fact that within the area of ceramics of the Žuto Brdo-Gârla Mare type more



than 1,500 incineration tombs were discovered, and, at the same time, many other urn fields were well excavated and published, will always excite the interest of researchers, having already been the subject of a number of papers to date. We are in fact dealing with a ceramic group primarily intended for funerary practices. Despite the large number of finds, we know very little about the way of life of these communities spread along the Danube. I recently referred to this cultural phenomenon on the occasion of the publication of the small necropolis in Hinova (M. Davidescu/A. Vulpe, *Dacia NS*, 54, 2010, p. 43; cf. also S. Lazăr, *Sfârșitul epocii bronzului și începutul epocii fierului în sud-estul României*, Craiova, 2011, p. 33 onwards).

The book continues by examining the burials of the Wietenberg and Mnogovalikovaja “cultures”. Worthy of note in the case of the Wietenberg “culture” is the predominance of the incineration rite among a total of around 200 burials identified to date in the form of small groups of tombs located in the immediate vicinity of the settlement (a situation also observed from the excavations carried in 2005 by L. and O. Dietrich in Rotbav-Brașov, where the chronological separation of the Wietenberg-type ceramics from the Noua-type ceramics was in fact reconfirmed). Chicideanu returns to this issue later on while discussing the Noua tombs when he writes: “If, as is to be assumed, the Noua *communities* [my emphasis] co-existed in Transylvania with the Wietenberg *communities*, then we should bear in mind that, whatever the relationship between the two groups, each retained its individuality in terms of its funerary customs” (p. 598). I believe the author in this case should have explained what he means by *community* and in what form they *co-existed*. My opinion in this matter differs, something I will come back below.

The chapter dedicated to the funerary discoveries dating from the late Bronze Age period looks at the burials from the areas with Coslogeni, Noua, Sabatinovka, Zimnicea-Plovdiv, Belegiš, Bistreț-Ișalnița and Suciude-Sus ceramics as well as “other funerary complexes of the middle and late Bronze Age periods in the lower Tisza area”. The Noua-type burials are afforded a more rigorous and extensive analysis, given the greater amount of data available and the large number of tombs identified (144 mortuary discoveries, including 725 tombs). A fairly well defined, but not fully verified standard funerary practice is identified. The author also notes the “poverty” of the inventories, the predominance of inhumation (incineration appears at most in 5-10% in all of the necropoli, in the form of an “accepted secondary rite”), and, in Bessarabia, in Bădragii Vechi, the relationship between flat tombs and tumular tombs (here we might also discuss the apparent unity, posited some time ago by, among others, Sebastian Morintz and Adrian Florescu, between the Noua and Sabatinovka “cultures”, that is the “complex” of the same name to which they also add the Coslogeni group).

The author does not expand his analysis to include the possible relationships between the predominantly

pastoral economy of the bearers of the Noua ceramic (and also funerary) group and the characteristic ideology (to the extent to which this can be verified, I might add!). I believe that this case in particular represents a promising area for future research. In this respect, the relationship with the bearers of the previous ceramic groups (Wietenberg, Monteoru, Komariv and the group of funerary discoveries from Northern Moldavia – with the exception of the Costișa group!), to the extent that these ceramic groups contributed to the “formation” of the Noua “culture”, might very well turn out to be entirely different from how we see it today.

The study of the burials of the Zimnicea-Plovdiv “culture” is mainly limited to the Zimnicea necropolis, alongside which the author cites a few discoveries from northern Bulgaria. The question I would ask here is what is known for sure about what in the literature is called the Coslogeni and Zimnicea-Plovdiv “cultures”? In fact we more or less know of a settlement, apparently of the “ash-pit”-type, in Coslogeni; two sites with deposits in which the ceramics were, perhaps exaggeratedly, denoted as being of the Zimnicea Plovdiv type (Popești and Radovanu); and a necropolis (Zimnicea) and two vessel deposits (Čerkovna, Plovdiv). In this respect, Chicideanu is above reproach. I believe he did all that was possible at the time. As far as funerary practices go, he identifies a “standard funerary practice” (I wonder whether the word “standard” is appropriate in this case?) that differs from “neighbouring contemporary groups north of the Danube”, something that would seem obvious today.

The analysis of the burials of the Belegiš “culture” provides the author with an opportunity to analyse the development of the ceramic groups from the lower Tisza Basin from this perspective, albeit these are known almost exclusively through funerary discoveries. He is thus obliged to make mostly indirect references to the many unpublished and unstudied materials from the deposits of the Banat Museum in Timișoara – a regrettable state of affairs. I note the author’s observation in respect of the phenomenon that “apart from the drastic transformation in ceramic style, it seems that in the second stage the funerary expressions become more sober, most likely as part of an as yet not very clear restructuring in its social anatomy but with significant consequences for the following period (p. 631). This statement, which I consider a welcome intuition, can be added to the explanations for the fundamental transformations identified in the majority of the Carpatho-Danubian region at the beginning of the Iron Age. Here, I believe, it would have been useful to include a reference to the case of the tumulus in Susani. I make this observation in particular because, in the following sub-chapter, entitled *Observations on the Funerary Behaviour of the Suciude Sus Culture*, Chicideanu also refers to the discoveries in Lăpuș, citing Biba Teržan’s opinion that “the cemetery in Lăpuș sheds light on how (...) a new ideology [my emphasis] that is reflected in funerary customs is constructed”, something

with which he states his agreement. I fully agree with this statement, which, however, refers only to Lăpuș. Why not also apply this to the many other similar cases mentioned in the book? I recently discussed this phenomenon of cultural transformations at the beginning of the Iron Age in a presentation given in Iași, which I hope will soon appear in print.

The last sub-chapter of the book touches on the problem of the funerary complexes of the middle and late Bronze Age from the lower Tisza area, which form highly diverse groups whose origin and cultural provenance place them far to the west, which, as in the case of the Berkesz-Demecser group, “is incredibly dense” (p. 657). Although he does not spend a lot of time discussing these cases, he analyses the large cemetery in Tápé located not far from where the Mureș flows into the Tisza. After “outlining what I considered important to the understanding of the mortuary customs of the community” (p. 671), Chicideanu writes that this method of study reflects “the clear continuity of older traditions, especially from the Periam-Pecica environment”, an indirect archaeological proof of which being the changes “visible in clothing and ceramic style”, “changes to the structure” of the community in Tápé. I share this opinion and, at the same time, like Chicideanu, believe that the cemetery from the following period, that in Csorva, might be able to provide us with an answer to these cultural transformations, which, in my opinion, encompass a large part of the western half of the Carpatho-Danubian region.

The book ends with a short chapter entitled *In Lieu of Conclusions*. This provides a splendid overview of how many Romanian archaeologists approach the subject of funerary practices and the cultural and, in particular, historical implications for the study of the Bronze Age in the region under study in this work. It is written in a mildly satirical style, well suited to the author’s temperament and revealing an impressive literary talent.

A first general observation on this book, highlighting its current and future importance to and impact on Romanian archaeological research, relates to the author’s critical study of all funerary discovery related matters in the chosen region and period. I consider this study – remarkable both in terms of the effort that went into its realisation and the value of interpretation of the issues studied – obligatory reading for all those working on Bronze Age funerary discoveries (though not exclusively) in the future. Chicideanu has provided the best and most comprehensive critical discussion of the current state of the documentary evidence for the discoveries. I would also like to take this opportunity to note the rich visual material accompanying the work (vol. II), such as the planimetric analysis of many necropoli, statistical charts, plans, discovery distribution maps, etc., most of which are the work of the author himself. It is hard for me to find the right words with which to describe the true value of this work, so I will do so indirectly, by asking what remains to be done in the future in the field studied in the book, my having

been the first to read it, when it was presented as a doctoral thesis in 2005. These questions, while they might come across as critical, in fact reflect the high regard in which I hold the author’s work.

In order to correlate the funerary discoveries with an almost unanimously accepted notion in European archaeology, Chicideanu dealt with them by *cultures*. In doing so, he came across the ambiguity of the notion of “culture” (only accepting it in the traditional sense formulated by the generation of Gordon Childe and Ion Nestor and still accepted almost without hesitation today by the majority of archaeologists in Romania as well as Europe) and consciously correlated the funerary practices and the types of funerary monuments with the groups of ceramic styles and forms. This is a dilemma I was unable to solve when I coordinated the first volume of *Istoria Românilor* (I was also unable to avoid it in the latest, 2010 edition). All the same, I think the matter should be re-examined. The types of tombs and burial practices only partially coincide with the areal distribution of the ceramic groups.

This leads to my second question: what do the groups with similar funerary practices represent from the perspective of the type of tomb? Chicideanu rightly refuses to adopt an ethnic-historicising interpretation. But then what do the expressions *Iamnaja communities* (see the tumulus in Târnavă) or Noua or Wietenberg *communities* mean? Are they human communities organised according to ethnic criteria or simple typological groups of funerary practices? I do not believe this notion, which occurs in many places in the book, is clarified. I am of the opinion that more attention should be paid to the *religious ideology* of the respective communities, an ideology which may be – and in fact is in the majority of cases – supra-regional and supra-ethnic. Sceptical about being able to reconstruct funerary ideology – which is implicitly also a result of religious identity – and with the aid of the material remains (an *ideotechnic* category of material culture, to use Binford’s term), Chicideanu steers clear of approaching the funerary discoveries in *this* sense. He is more concerned with the social aspect and, something with which I agree, many of the analyses in his thesis of necropoli from different periods shed light predominantly on the social structure of the community under study. The consumption of social energy in the construction of the funerary monument without doubt reveals the importance of the deceased as a social persona. But how is this phenomenon reflected in other artefacts, in the social persona of the individual, in terms of the mentality (and, I would add, ideology, too) of the communities in question? Thus, objects such as bronzes (in the shape of arms or jewels), figurines (where they exist) and depictions of aspects of the human body in certain ceramic forms and decorative symbols with indications of gender (and sex) can be understood as means of representation (or substitution) of identity understood in terms of the social persona, both of the living and, especially, the deceased. And, in

this situation, the symbolic value of the tomb as a funerary monument varies significantly. Recently, for example, Douglas Bailey suggested as a possible explanation for the lack of burials, a phenomenon specific to the area of the Cucuteni culture, the fact that, in this area, the frequency of figurines and meticulously decorated vessels constitutes sufficient means by which to express the identity of both the community and individual (*Scripta praehistorica*, Tribute to M. Petrescu-Dîmbovița, Iași, 2005, p. 329).

Without dwelling further on this subject, which is worthy of more thorough analysis, I feel obliged to ask the question: What happens with the deceased from the areas of ceramic groups where no necropoli have been found? And, something I consider more important, to what extent does the number of tombs in a necropolis, however large it may be, reflect the real size of the population of a community? In his book the author only briefly touches on this issue. However we choose to estimate the number of still undiscovered tombs within a “culture”, it is clear this does not reflect the demographic reality (e.g. in the Monteoru area, where some 1,500 tombs are currently known about, judging by the duration of the settlements of this ceramic group, even if we triple their number, we still only obtain an unnaturally low number of tombs for each generation). Consequently, we must inevitably conclude that the social status of the deceased and their identity within the community are only partially – in some situations only marginally – revealed by the funerary practices identifiable using current archaeological methods. We can thus outline three main categories of how the social persona of the deceased is represented, as reflected by the type of tomb: those to whom an elaborate ritual is dedicated; the “ordinary” people; and, finally, those not found in necropoli, whom we might call the “tombless”, perhaps on account of their low social status. That is, an “equalisation”, a broader ideological levelling on a religiously reforming level. This way of interpreting the meaning of the funerary practices of a community is, in my opinion, all the more interesting for the fact that, beginning with the first Iron Age, the majority of the area studied in the book shows what we might call a “disappearance” of necropoli in complete contrast to the

large number of sites (“settlements”) identified (I discussed this phenomenon in an article published in *Festschrift für A. Jockenhövel, Durch die Zeiten...*, Rahden/Westf., 2008, p. 269, in which I chose the example of the tumular “necropolis” in Lăpuș explored by Carol Kacsó).

Finally, in respect of the aforementioned issue, I would ask another question: To what extent is the distinction between a *funerary* site (tomb, necropolis) and a *non-funerary* site (settlement) still justified, given the modern way of thinking? I have spoken here about “cultures” without tombs, but we can also talk of “cultures” without settlements. This, for example, is the case with the urn fields from the Middle and Lower Danube area, including the Gârla Mare group. This is a matter worthy of further consideration, all the more so as there are many sites that have been given the name of “settlement”, although their function is in fact far more complex (I won’t dwell further on this point here).

Naturally, there is more to discuss here, but this is a review, with its corresponding limitations in terms of space, and not a conference. All the same, I would reiterate here that I have for a long time been considering the question as to how Romanian prehistory, the Metal Age in particular, should be rewritten from the perspective of an anthropological approach, and, ever since I first read and reviewed this book, I have been thinking about how funerary discoveries should be presented according to their own categories, independently of their relationship with the ceramic groups, and interpreted as such. I have not arrived at a solution, but it is clear to me that Chicideanu’s work represents a starting point in this respect.

As I have suggested repeatedly in this review, Chicideanu’s book represents one of the most important achievements in post-war Romanian archaeology. Both its content and its remarkable visual presentation (the only obvious absence is that of an index!) will make it indispensable in the field of archaeological research for many years to come.

*Alexandru Vulpe*

Simona Lazăr, *Sfârșitul epocii bronzului și începutul epocii fierului în sud-vestul României*, Academia Română, Institutul de Cercetări Socio-umane „C. S. Ploșor”, Editura Universitaria, Craiova, 2011, 323 p. + 114 pl. and 13 maps.

This book is a slightly modified version of the doctoral thesis submitted by the author in 2008 and deals with a period of time stretching from the end of the middle period of the Bronze Age to the beginning of

the Middle Hallstatt. The area of study covers mainly Oltenia, the Danube Gorges area and the southern Banat as well as the neighbouring south-Danubian regions in Bulgaria and Serbia. The sources on which the book is

based comprise the relatively rich literature on the geographical area and period under study as well as the author's own archaeological research (excavations, fieldwork) in Ghidici, Cârcea, Piatra Olt, etc., and the unpublished or partially published discoveries of other researchers, some dating back several decades.

After making a relevant presentation of the chronological systems developed for the end of the Bronze Age and beginning of the Iron Age and a discussion of the relative and absolute chronology of the early Hallstatt period in southwest Romania with a main focus on the analysis of funerary and metal discoveries in the Banat and certain parallels also being drawn with the discoveries in Greece, there follows a comprehensive chapter on material culture: ceramics and metal pieces.

In late Bronze-Age Oltenia two cultural aspects can be identified in distinct geographical areas and characterised by different ceramic inventories. The hilly, sub-Carpathian areas are home to discoveries with ceramics of the Govora type (late Verbicioara), while along the Danube and in the Oltenian Plane fluted ceramics appear from as early as the last phase of the Gârla Mare culture, becoming a common feature of the Bistreţ-Işalniţa group.

In the period conventionally considered, by the author and other researchers, as being the beginning of the Iron Age, the fluting of fine ceramics became widespread in Oltenia, and the cultural phenomenon of these ceramics is known as the Vârtop culture.

The ceramics characteristic of this culture originate from the tumuli in Vârtop and Ploşor, as well as a number of settlements in the vicinity.

Recent research by Simona Lazăr (hereafter S. L.) has made it possible to locate the tumuli in Vârtop, of which two flattened mounds with diameters of approximately 10 metres still exist, and to attribute them to a "necropolis" also including the tumulus from Ploşor.

Earlier references to the Vârtop discoveries mention the existence of calcined bones among the stones and ceramics believed to be the remains of the incinerated body of the deceased. I argued some time ago (Kacsó 1990, n. 24) that in the absence of osteological analysis such an interpretation is only hypothetical, something the author also mentions.

The almost complete absence of calcined bones also leads S. L. to seek other interpretations of the tumuli in Vârtop than as tombs. We should consider the possibility that these monuments were cenotaphs or sites for cult-related deposits, the most plausible explanation in the author's view being that the tumuli were mortuary constructions, "houses", erected as part of the funerary procession.

Among similar cases to those in Vârtop, the author cites Konopişte, on the right bank of the Danube, where a cultic pit with Vârtop and Hinova type ceramics was discovered with no calcined bones. In this context the author also discusses the discoveries from Lăpuş and Libotin, in the north of Transylvania, where a number of

structures were found related to the funerary cult, similarly with no human calcined bones. She also mentions, based on oral information, the most recent research conducted in Lăpuş. Naturally, access to the data published in the meantime in respect of this research (Metzner-Nebelsick, Kacsó, Nebelsick 2010a; idem 2010b; Kacsó, Metzner-Nebelsick 2011; Kacsó, Metzner-Nebelsick, Nebelsick 2011) would have allowed the author to draw more extensive conclusions in terms of the relationship between the discoveries in Vârtop and those from Lăpuş.

Given the relatively greater age of some of the monuments from northern Transylvania compared with those from Oltenia, as well as their similar characteristics, it is, in my opinion, to be assumed that in the creation of the cultic rituals practiced during the later centuries of the second millennium BC, in the Lower Danube area, certain influences also came from the north-eastern part of the Carpathian Basin, the intermediate area between the two regions and the channel through which these influences were transmitted being the Banat (see the tumulus in Susani).

These influences also lead to the appearance in the south of ceramic forms with North-Transylvanian origins, a clear example of which being the hearth vessel (*pyraunos*) found in Vârtop and Konopişte, as well as in Meri and Ocnele Mari, which did not reflect the evolution of local form, but, rather, that characteristic of Suciul de Sus-Lăpuş.

The chapter on the Vârtop culture also mentions the necropolis in Hinova, without explicitly stating its cultural group. In fact, the authors of the monographic work on this necropolis, Davidescu and Vulpe (2010a, 138; 2010b, 58), also emphasise the difficulty of classifying the necropolis by comparison with other ceramic discoveries. They speak of fluted ceramics of the Hinova type, which are placed at the end of the Gârla Mare ceramics period. Revisiting older terminology, S. L. also uses the term Susani-Hinova-Vârtop-type fluted ceramics (Gumă 1993, 179, with the bibliography).

A separate sub-chapter looks at the discoveries dating from the beginning of the Iron Age in the Râmnicu Vâlcea area. Based on sketches, S. L. attempts to reconstruct the important cemetery in Râuveni for which the majority of the excavation reports were lost following the death of the person who carried out the research, E. Moscalu. She was only partially successful; many questions remain unanswered in respect of the placement of the tombs and the relationship between earlier tombs and those of the Ferigile type. The author considers the possibility that the Râuveni I cemetery was in use for a period of 200-300 years, while nonetheless also stating that its dating mainly to the Hallstatt A period is the most justified. Thus the author distances herself from the dating proposed by A. Vulpe (Vulpe, Popescu 1972, 75; Vulpe 1977, 92), providing a critical analysis of the results of excavations in Tigveni, Argeş county.

The second stage of the early Hallstatt in southwest Romania is characterised by ceramics of the Gornea-Kalakača and Insula Banului types, both of which having already been described in the specialist literature some time ago. While there are no new, important discoveries implying any essential changes to the conclusions already formulated in respect of these groups, all the same we should note the relatively large presence of Gornea-Kalakača-type discoveries in southwest Oltenia. S. L. believes these two ceramic groups to date from the same period, each having been produced in different centres, each with its own style of decoration.

Together with other authors, S. L. proposes the 12th-11th centuries BC for the absolute dating of the fluted ceramics from Oltenia, and the 10th-9th centuries BC for the Gornea-Kalakača and Insula Banului type imprinted ceramics. These were followed by the Basarabi culture, whose beginnings date to the end of the 9th century or the beginning of the 8th century BC. In terms of the sub-Carpathian region of Oltenia, where the Insula Banului and Basarabi discoveries are missing, the author believes there to have been a hiatus between the early Hallstatt discoveries of the Râureni and Tigveni type and those belonging to the Ferigile group.

It should be clarified that the conclusions drawn with respect to the absolute datings of certain cultural aspects discussed in S. L.'s book are mainly based on the literary tradition, starting with the dates established for various chronological timespans of the late Bronze Age by H. Müller-Karpe (1959).

It should also be noted that there is no radiocarbon dating for the discoveries in Oltenia belonging to the aforementioned cultural aspects. Recently there has been an increase in the amount of  $^{14}\text{C}$  analysis for different sites with fluted ceramics. Consequently, the results of the tests carried out on samples from tumulus 26 in the Lăpuș necropolis clearly show that this ceramic type was in use during the 13th century BC, there also even existing indications that it was already in use in the second half of the 14th century BC (Metzner-Nebelsick, Kacsó, Nebelsick 2010b, 223, fig. 7; Kacsó, Metzner-Nebelsick, Nebelsick 2011, 349, fig. 6). Similar results were also obtained from other sites in the intra and extra-Carpathian regions, including the Banat (Figler 1996, 11 sq.[Győr]; Ilon 2005, 137 [Németbánya]; Szabó 2005, 158 [Polgár]; Görsdorf 2006, 390; László 2008, 103; idem 2010, 121 sq. [Siret]). Given the new datings for the start of the widespread use of fluted ceramics, it may be necessary to reconsider the chronological dating of the sites featuring this type of ceramics in Oltenia as well. Naturally, this would also require the performance of  $^{14}\text{C}$  analysis on samples from these sites, which would probably not yield essentially different data from those from the Banat, the neighbouring region to the northwest.

In the chapter dealing with metal and metallurgic objects, the author discusses a range of different categories of artefact (swords, spear tips, daggers,

socketed axes, sickles, knives, items of jewellery) and the deposits found in the area studied. Of the latter, only those containing at least two items are analysed, albeit S. L. herself admits that the interpretation of isolated deposits could turn out to be identical with that based on deposits with many items. In the study of metal deposits the view has long existed that a significant proportion of the pieces discovered in isolation represent single item deposits (*Einzelstückdepots*). Although aware of this fact, the author does not go on to classify the pieces discovered in isolation. If she had also studied this category of deposit, S. L. would have been able to obtain more conclusive data in terms of the distribution, characteristics and significance of the deposits of metal pieces.

We note, particularly in this chapter, a dominant focus on the Oltenia and Danube Gorges areas. In quite understandably also discussing the discoveries from the right bank of the river as well as areas further afield, the author relies only on literature that is not always available to her, something which results in a series of gaps or incomplete data, which I will mention below. The metal items are analysed according to different categories of artefact, not all of which being accorded the attention they deserve. After a comprehensive discussion of the swords found in the area, less space is dedicated to other artefacts, such as socketed axes, fibulae, etc. After discussing the metal pieces, S. L. attempts, by way of a conclusion, to present the principal characteristics resulting from the cultural influences and effects present in the area under study, especially Oltenia. Consequently, the influences stemming from the southern regions, from the Aegean area, do not exceed the Danube to the north. Those from Central Europe and the Middle Danube basin become predominant at the beginning of the early Hallstatt. The author cites as an example of different behaviour the deposit in Ovča Mogila, where, alongside an item of Mycenaean-type equipment there is also a group of socketed axes of clearly great value. On the other hand, the influences from the east are only felt in the south-eastern extremity of the study area.

S. L. identifies 104 deposits containing at least two pieces, but says only 62 of these originate from the restricted study area. She does not state clearly the criteria according to which the other deposits were selected for discussion; we can only assume that they were found in the immediate vicinity of the study area. However, the author also identifies a deposit relatively far from the study area, that of Hajdukovo (no. 38). Some bronze deposits were omitted, with the result that the phenomenon of deposits appears less varied than it was in reality. Important discoveries are missing, such as those from Aljudovo, Brusnik, Čoka, Dvorište, Male Izvor, Manastirica, Ritiševo, Rujište, Šarbanovac, Vrmdža, Žirovnica etc., as well as from the Romanian Banat, as, for example, Deposit II in Zăgujeni, even though the latter has frequently been mentioned in the

literature and even partially published recently (Gumă 1997, 64; Kacsó 1999, 116, no. 29; Szentmiklósi, Draşovean 2004, no. 84-89).

Mention is made, based on R. Petrovsky and M. Gumă, albeit without specifying the contents, of a deposit in Carlsdorf, the place known today as Moldoviţa, being part of the town of Moldova Nouă; it has already been established that this deposit originates in reality from a place located in the Serbian Banat, which used to be called, at the turn of the 20th century, *Károlyfalva*, today known as Banatski Karlovac (Kacsó 1996, 242).

As to the contents of some of the discoveries, the data given in the book are extremely scarce, even though they were published some time ago. As to the deposit in Ivanovo, the author only notes that it contained 41 pieces of jewellery, the source cited being the work published by R. Vasić in PAS 1, 1982 (Vasić 1982, 267 sqq.). There exists, however, an interesting discussion in the Romanian literature about this controversial discovery in which an attempt is made to locate, reconstruct and date it. (Medeţ, Rogozea, Szentmiklósi 2001, 197-204). With regard to the discoveries of bronze items in Moldova Veche, S. L. uses the data published and datings proposed by M. Petrescu-Dîmboviţa without recourse to more recent research and conclusions vis-à-vis these discoveries (Soroceanu, Medeţ 1999, 181-213; Soroceanu 2008, 214 sq., no. 156-158).

On the one hand, it appears fairly likely that the links described as part of the Moldova Veche III discovery are in reality part of the pendant chain, while, on the other hand, the chronological classification of this item differs entirely from that proposed previously, as from a more recent period, most likely Hallstatt C. Naturally, while S. L. was not obliged to adopt this dating, she should have discussed it.

I suggest it would have been to the benefit of the book if the author had consulted the literature on certain deposits more thoroughly. This would have allowed her to provide more details as to their contents, something which would have been important to the discussion about the significance of the deposits. I will cite two examples, though there are many more. Only one item is mentioned from the deposit in Dobrinici: a fragment of a fibula in *passementerie* style. The discovery also contains another fibula, as well as socketed axes, sickles, spear tips, sword fragments, a razor blade, a pendant, arm bands, necklaces, a pin, saw blades, etc. (Vasić 1999, 23, no. 47, 29, no. 101). None of the three deposits in Sečanj appears on the list of deposits on p. 111 sqq., while only that discovered in 1957 (Deposit I) features in the catalogue of metal items, with the note that it contains two *passementerie* style fibulae. These are accompanied by two spear tips, three socketed axes, chain links, arm bands and pendants (Radišić 1958, 115-122; Vasić 1999, 24, no. 92.93). Deposit II, discovered in 1970, contains fragments of a hanging chain, armbands, necklaces, phalera, two fibulae, both broken into two pieces, belt plates (Garašanin, Tasić [red.] 1994, 42 sqq., pl. 32,10-36 – 35; Vasić, *op. cit.*,

38, no. 208. 209). Deposit III, discovered in 1977, contains six socketed axes, three ankle chains and six armbands (Marincović 1991, 17-22). The items that are not mentioned in the catalogue are not listed and discussed in the sub-chapters on the various metal artefacts, which to some extent diminishes the accuracy of the analysis.

In respect of the record of the discoveries of metal items drawn up by S. L., it should also be noted that Hetin and Tamásfalva, given as distinct places with such discoveries, are in fact different names, one in Serbian, the other Hungarian, for the same place. It is from here that the deposit of bronze items originates that was made available to the scientific community as early as the end of the 19th century (Hampel 1886, pl. 126-127) and which many authors have cited using one or other of its names.

S. L. provides a brief discussion on the interpretation of the deposits of metal items. Perhaps here, too, it would have been useful to focus more closely on the publications based on the analysis of discoveries on Romanian territory, all the more so as, besides that cited by the author, the research performed by T. Soroceanu, I. Motzoi-Chicideanu, T. Bader, A. László and others also provides a clear contribution to the debate on the significance of the deposits.

By tracing the distribution of the discoveries of metal items in the study area, two areas containing such discoveries come to light, one encompassing the Banat, northeast of Serbia and extending along the Danube, the other central and sub-Carpathian Oltenia, where there are fewer such discoveries. According to S. L., this situation corresponds in many respects with that resulting from the mapping of the ceramic groups and very likely reflects a cultural and historical reality.

In the chapter dealing with funerary practices the author draws attention to a less common ritual practice, namely the depositing of ceramic fragments, decorated in the Verbiciora V style, in the urn of the main tomb in Tumulus 4 in Tigveni, which belongs to the Răureni-Tigveni-type group of necropoli from the early Hallstatt. A possible explanation for this practice, according S. L., has to do with the perception of a community that uses undecorated urns vis-à-vis the value of decorated ceramics and the symbolism contained in the decoration.

In the analysis of the different types of habitat, as a theoretical basis, the author draws on works based on structuralist and ethno-archaeological research, among others. The description of the archaeological realities on the ground indicates that the author is still at an early stage in terms of her knowledge of the characteristics of the habitat, especially during the early Hallstatt, in the area studied. Although many fortified settlements have been identified, only a few have been researched, such that an answer is yet to be found to the fundamental problem of the relationship between these settlements and the open settlements, normally small in size and seemingly inhabited for a short time.

The book is accompanied by a comprehensive summary in English, catalogues of the discoveries of ceramic and metal items, a bibliography (repeating the

list of works cited in the footnotes), 114 plates with drawings of artefacts and plans/elevations of the archaeological sites, as well as 14 maps.

Thanks to the substantial amount of materials discussed and the proposed solutions to a wide range of issues, this work by Simona Lazăr undoubtedly represents an important contribution to our knowledge of the centuries around the end of the second millennium and the beginning of the first millennium BC in the Lower Danube region.

### Bibliography

- Davidescu, Vulpe 2010 – M. Davidescu, A. Vulpe, *Dacia N.S.* 54, 2010, p. 43-95.
- Figler 1996 – A. Figler, *Pápai Múzeumi Értesítő* 6, 1996, p. 7-29.
- Garašanin, Tasić (red.) 1994 - M. Garašanin, N. Tasić (red.), *Les dépôts préhistoriques de la Serbie et de la Voïvodine*, II, Beograd, 1994.
- Görsdorf 2006 - J. Görsdorf, *Eurasia Antiqua* 12, 2006, p. 385-390.
- Gumă 1993 – M. Gumă, *Civilizația primei epoci a fierului în sud-vestul României*, București, 1993.
- Gumă 1997 – M. Gumă, *Epoca bronzului în Banat*. Timișoara, 1997.
- Hampel 1886 – J. Hampel, *A bronzkor emlékei Magyarhonban*, I, Budapest, 1886.
- Ilon 1996 – G. Ilon, *Pápai Múzeumi Értesítő* 6, 1996, p. 89-208.
- Kacsó 1990 – C. Kacsó, *TD* 11, 1990, p. 79-98.
- Kacsó 1996 – C. Kacsó, *Analele Banatului-Istorie* 4, 1996, p. 237-246.
- Kacsó 1999 – C. Kacsó, *Apulum* 36, 1999, p. 107-133.
- Kacsó, Metzner-Nebelsick 2011 – C. Kacsó, C. Metzner-Nebelsick, *Науковий Збірник Закарпатського Краєзнавчого Музею XI, Ужгород*, 2011, p. 253-262.
- Kacsó, Metzner-Nebelsick, Nebelsick 2011 – C. Kacsó, C. Metzner-Nebelsick, L. D. Nebelsick, in E. Borgna, S. Müller Celka (ed.), *Ancestral Landscapes: Burial Mounds in the Copper and Bronze Ages (Central and Eastern Europe-Balkans-Adriatic-Aegean, 4<sup>th</sup>-2<sup>nd</sup> millenium BC)*, TMO 61, Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée, Lyon, 2011, p. 341-354.
- László 2008 – A. László, *Keltezés a régészetben*, Kolozsvár, 2008.
- László 2010 – A. László, *Studii și Comunicări Satu Mare XXVI/I*, 2010, p. 121-132.
- Marincović 1991 – S. Marincović, *RVM* 33, 1991, p. 17-22.
- Medeleț, Rogozea, Szentmiklosi 2001 - F. Medeleț, P. Rogozea, A. Szentmiklosi, *TD* 22, 2001, p. 197-204.
- Metzner-Nebelsick, Kacsó, Nebelsick 2010a – C. Metzner-Nebelsick, C. Kacsó, L. D. Nebelsick, *Archäologie in Deutschland* 3, 2010, p. 54-57.
- Metzner-Nebelsick, Kacsó, Nebelsick 2010b – C. Metzner-Nebelsick, C. Kacsó, L. D. Nebelsick, *Studii și Comunicări Satu Mare XXVI/I*, 2010, p. 219-233.
- Müller-Karpe 1959 – H. Müller-Karpe, *Beiträge zur Chronologie der Urnenfelderzeit nördlich und südlich der Alpen*, RFG 22, Berlin, 1959.
- Radišić 1958 - R. Radišić, *RVM* 7, 1958, p. 115-122.
- Soroceanu 2008 – T. Soroceanu, *Die vorskythenzeitlichen Metallgefäße im Gebiet des heutigen Rumäniens*, Bistrița, Cluj-Napoca, 2008.
- Soroceanu, Medeleț 1999 – T. Soroceanu, F. Medeleț, in T. Soroceanu, N. Boroffka (ed.), *Transsilvanica. Gedenkschrift für Kurt Horedt*, *Studia honoraria* 7, Rahden/Westf., 1999, p. 181-213.
- Szabó 2005 – G. V. Szabó, *Ősrégészeti Levelek* 7, 2005, p. 146-165.
- Szentmiklosi, Drașovean 2004 – A. Szentmiklosi, F. Drașovean, *Arta prelucrării bronzului în Banat*, Timișoara, 2004.
- Vasić 1982 – R. Vasić, in *Südosteuropa zwischen 1600 und 1000 v. Chr.*, PAS 1, Berlin, 1982, p. 267-285.
- Vasić 1999 – R. Vasić, *Die Fibeln im Zentralbalkan*, PBF XIV, 12, Stuttgart, 1999.
- Vulpe 1977 – A. Vulpe, *Dacia N.S.* 21, 1977, p. 81-111.
- Vulpe, Popescu 1972 – A. Vulpe, E. Popescu, *Dacia N.S.* 16, 1972, p. 75-112.

C.Kacsó

Carol Kacsó, *Repertoriul arheologic al județului Maramureș* [The Archaeological Record of Maramureș County], Maramureș County Museum of History and Archaeology, Bibliotheca Marmatia 3, vol. I (text): 628 p.; vol. II: 318 p. (71 maps and 323 figs.), Ed. Eurotip, Baia Mare, 2011.

The author, a well-known archaeologist in our country, but also in Europe is by far the only competent person capable to edit an archaeological record of the area which is included in what is today known as Maramureș county. This current administrative territory includes both the Romanian part of the historical

Maramureș, but also a wide area in its south, respectively the depression in the Someș basin of Baia Mare with the adjacent areas, known in the historical tradition under the name of Țara Lăpușului, Țara Chioarului and Țara Codrului.

Although the project of making up an archaeological record for the whole territory of Romania was initiated in the 50s, it has never been accomplished. Meanwhile, records of various Romanian counties have been drawn out, from local or regional initiative, according to the current administrative division. Instead of a unitary system of editing, each of these records has its own manner of presentation. Thus, the quality of these works varies a lot. It is not my intention neither to insist upon this problem, not to make a hierarchization of the qualities of different county archaeological repertoires. However, it should be mentioned that *Repertoriul arheologic al județului Maramureș* [The Archaeological Record of Maramureș County] represents one of the most well-done accomplishments in this field as the following lines should reveal.

As the author states, the current record “is also different, as regards some of its formulations, from the similar works published by now”. The alphabetically arranged entries include 71 administrative units, each identified with a Roman numeral (I-LXXI). The landmark was considered the administrative situation of 2000. Meanwhile, some modifications in the county administrative and territorial organization occurred, which could not be taken into account at the date of editing this record (2010), but which are specified in the annexed list at the end of the work. On the other hand, the author mentions that the state of knowledge is that of 2006, but in several cases of important discoveries (for instance the tumuli from Lăpuș) have been given the results of the last year researches (still in development) and the recent bibliography.

This record has taken into account, besides the prehistorical, protohistorical and medieval discoveries, finds belonging to the field of industrial archaeology, especially from the mining and mountain activity, well represented in Maramureș county. A series of *excursus* regarding the history of mining, one of the most representative economic phenomena of this county, essentially contributes to the understanding and functional interpretation of many discoveries, even from prehistorical epochs (see Bronze Age).

For a better space orientation of the field identification of the sites, in vol. II, the maps of the administrative units are illustrated, specifying where it was possible the places of discoveries. Within many such units the number of the sites is often quite big, and the marking with a simple hyphen might have not been the easiest way to trace them; maybe marking the findings with an Arabic numeral or a letter would have been more reader-friendly. Volume II displays an important number of illustrations, representing archaeological material, drawings, plans and high technical quality photos (most of them in color). Even if many of these have been already edited by the authors on other occasions, gathering them in this record and

reproducing them in more than favourable graphic conditions are welcome.

The respective bibliography is specified at the end of each finding. Taking into account the special interest paid to the archaeological research of this area, rich in sites that offered surprising findings from various epochs, it was normal that the list of the papers concerning them should be quite extensive. Mr. Kacsó proves one more time to master this field, as he is also a good connoisseur of the languages of many articles. As the territory of the today Maramureș county belonged, over the time, to various political powers and was the object of the studies and interpretations of researchers from different schools, the problem of arranging these results is quite complex, yet was dealt with by the author with objectivity. It seems especially well-chosen the way he tries to hierarchize the papers cited in the bibliography: he highlights in bold the names of the authors that have brought contributions directly connected to the respective site, distinguishing them from those who just mentioned that finding.

A short English abstract, representing the translation of the foreword, an index of localities, one of authors and another one dedicated to the clustering of the findings on epochs end the current record.

In order to understand better the way in which the archaeological sites in the above-mentioned indices are clustered on epochs, the reader should approach firstly the succinct, but consistent chapter regarding the geographical framework and the ferrous and non-ferrous mineral resources available and exploitable in the Maramureș county, which the author placed, together with a short history of the researches, as it was normal, before the record of sites. All these data are very helpful for the interpretation of the cultural and historical phenomena happened over the millennia on the territory of Maramureș county and which distinguish it from the aspect of other counties (respectively territories) in the north and north-west of Romania.

Although the record includes findings from all the epochs, a quick view on the list of the findings clustered on periods of time shows us clearly that those from the Bronze Age are by far the most numerous and enjoyed the researchers' special interest. The second most numerous are those from the medieval and modern epoch. A regrettable lack is represented by the omission in the current record of the many wood churches, frequent in the Maramureș villages, most of them dating from XVIIth or XVIIIth centuries, even if the local people assign them to an older tradition.

As regards the distribution of the findings on epochs there should be mentioned the big discrepancies between the various periods, which, in certain areas – for example Țara Lăpușului or the historical Țara Maramureșului – give even the impression that they were not inhabited for long periods of time. This



situation, obviously only apparent, finds a plausible explanation in the aspect of the environment. Until recently, the main construction material was – and still is important – the wood. I believe that this fact, which I have discussed on another occasion (Dacia NS 19, 1975, p. 69), is decisive for the understanding of the cultural processes happened over the time in these parts of Romania. This would explain the apparent demographic boom with a visible impact at the archaeological level, noticed in the area of Lăpuș, at the end of the Bronze Age. It is a quite short phenomenon (not more than three/four centuries), then, for millennia (up to the Middle Age) few relevant findings appear. It is argued that these apparent discrepancies do not reflect the real, demographic situation of the pre- and protohistorical communities which lived in those areas, but represent first of all the reflection at the level of the archaeological findings of some economic processes, and implicitly ideological. I refer again to the above-mentioned case of Lăpuș, where the members of a community practiced for a short period of time a ritual deeply mirrored in the archaeologically preserved material culture. The rest of the activities of these communities, based almost exclusively on the wood industry, is difficult or even impossible to be archaeologically traced, at least with the current means. I recommend to the readers, both of the record and of the current review, to go sightseeing to the Museum of the Maramureș Village in Sighetul Marmației, excellently organized and exhibited, in order to convince themselves of my statements – and I believe that Mr. Kacsó shares my view – referring to the traditional way of life of these regions.

As it was expected, certain findings that the author has dealt with over his life have a special place in the record. I remark the extended part dedicated to the findings on the territory of Baia Mare, a city with a rich history, especially at the level of mining industry and of its consequences in economy and culture, starting from the Middle Ages (114 pages, including the neighbor locality, Baia Sprie) and up to the modern epoch. This subchapter is very well synthetically structured and offers the reader all the historical and archaeological information needed.

Of the prehistorical sites there should be mentioned the findings from the Bronze Age in Oarța de Jos and Bicăz communes, where is a limited area including a site justly considered to be a ritual place (*Giile Botii* point), belonging to the Wietenberg ceramics area, a tumular necropolis (*Togul Nemților* point) and close to it two big deposits of bronze pieces (*Bicăz A* and *B*, the former with 495, the latter with 736 pieces). These sites, together with others in the areas, represent undoubtedly, and important cultural, material and ideological centre, of a community/some communities that lived from the

middle to the end of the Bronze Age in the north-west of Romania (cca. 2000/1800-1200/1000 a. Chr., according to some <sup>14</sup>C data drawn and calibrated in different laboratories). Unfortunately, most of the huge archaeological material obtained from these researches was only partially published, and their mentioning in the literature cannot reveal their special significance. Even more regrettable is the fact that the two bronze deposits, although many times described in the literature (inclusively by the author), were only selectively illustrated.

Of course, one may discuss a lot about the different aspects of the discoveries in the Bronze Age in Maramureș county, rich in treasures and storehouses, also in the great number of bronze pieces, for example axes, swords, etc. and a large quantity of metal, frequently under the form of *ingolts*, deposited in the earth. It is natural to think about the non-ferrous resources that distinguish this territory from others and about the consequent exchange relations with other areas, all these offering a possible explanation for the spectacular image of the material and spiritual culture of this county.

I end this presentation of the record with a short discussion about the findings at Lăpuș (39 p. in the volume). Undoubtedly, these represent one of the most interesting discoveries at the European level. In the current record it is named “tumular necropolis“, a term reproduced in all the publications, including those of the reviewed. I would like to mention that I visited this site several times, beginning with 1973 up to now. Not once did I express my views about those findings, about their significance and chronology. In principle, they do not differ essentially from those of the author of the digging. We both agree that two phases are clearly distinguished – the former with ceramics bearing the tradition of the Suciú-type ceramic style (Suciú de Sus, as the author mentions) and the latter in which Gáva-type grooved ceramic prevails. Other points of view have also been expressed as regards the chronology of the findings and a planimetric analysis of the tumulus setting has been tried. All these were based on a preliminary plan of the site, taken from the original thesis, without Mr. Kacsó’s approval, including the plans presented then as provisional. In the current record all these papers are mentioned besides all the literature concerning this site. All the opinions formulated up to now were based upon the documentation published by Mr. Kacsó: *Dacia* NS 19, 1975, p. 45-68 and in (ed. C. Kacsó) *Der nordkarpatische Raum in der Bronzezeit*, Baia Mare, 2001, p. 231-278, but also in the original dissertation of Cluj Univ. 1981. I consider the current synthetical and updated presentation of the findings at this site to be the author’s special merit. Each of the 29 tumuli explored up to now is described succinctly, inclusively the recent diggings carried out by the author together with a team of

archaeologists from Munich University (led by Carola Metzner Nebelsick). On this occasion it was published the plan with the respective profile for four tumuli (6, 7, 16, 18), illustration that had been misreproduced in the above-mentioned publications.

After the two last visits during the diggings in 2010 and 2011 and after I read the recent reports by C. Kacsó, C. Metzner-Nebelsick, L. D. Nebelsick, issued in more publications (all cited in the record) and I found out the obtained results, I wondered if the “necropolis” term is or not appropriate to designate the discoveries at Lăpuș. What do we certainly know today about these findings?

The site represents undoubtedly a well-marked area where ritual activities took place, including those dedicated to the funeral rites. The practiced ritual is still particularly complex. The presence of the elements indicating a funeral cult is based especially on the form of the monuments (tumuli) and on the great quantity of calcined bones found under different forms – deposited on the earth, often all of a heap or in an urn – everything associated to a considerable archaeological material (ceramics, metal etc.), usually fragmented. Up to the present a type of standard ritual has not been traced yet. I have the impression that almost each tumulus displays particular aspects distinguishing it from the others. First of all are expected the results of the calcined bones, especially of the recently discovered ones. An older analysis, carried out at Bucharest, shows that most, if not all of the cremated remains belong to animals. The burnt bones from the first tumuli searched in the 60s, believed to be human, were lost – as far as I know – before a specialized expertise. Obviously, the lack of some human bone remains does not lead to the denial of the funerally prevailing character of this site. The lack (or the scarcity) of the presence of human bones seems to be a phenomenon specific to large intervals in the first millennium a. Chr. In the Carpathian-Danubian space (I wrote about these in other papers: for example in *Festschrift für A. Jockenhövel...*, Rahden/Westf., 2008, p. 269-272). In fact, one can state that in the cases of Lăpuș discoveries the funeral ritual practiced there is not known. The assumption that incineration prevailed

does not have for the moment a certain documentary support.

On the other hand, the identification by the means of magnetometric prospection of some wood and clay constructions at the base of the recently explored tumuli – fact also proved by the previous digging – can suggest the presence of some “mortuary chapels” (*Totenhäuser* type) and of some sanctuaries. Thus, there is no contradiction between the two aspects of the respective constructions; their functions can coexist. The similitude of these constructions with the post-Mycenian funeral sanctuary (cca. XIIth-XIth centuries a. Chr.) at Lefkandi (Euboia), published by Popham et alii in 1993, does not seem to be accidental, neither from the typological, nor from the chronological point of view. It will be seen if such structures will be discovered in other tumuli or if they were present, without being identified by now, in some already dug tumuli.

In the end, in order to obtain a clarifying picture of the Lăpuș discoveries, we will have to wait for the complete publishing of the inventories of those tumuli, a fact which is not easy to accomplish. I should mention that the number of the ceramic pieces in some tumuli reaches hundreds or even thousands. Moreover, Baia Mare County Museum has more ceramic pieces whose curious form does not allow us to appreciate their function which is presumed to be connected with the cult practiced in the respective site.

All these thoughts, not necessarily critical and that regard strictly a punctual discovery – Lăpuș tumuli – which I am personally interested and involved in – do not affect at all the value and the importance of the current record. Besides its usefulness, indispensable to each interested researcher, the record drawn up by Mr. Kacsó is a good example for the way this profile papers should be edited for the whole Romania. I warmly recommend the consultation of this archaeological record.

*A. Vulpe*

*Roma e le province del Danubio, Atti del I Convegno Internazionale Ferrara – Cento, 15 – 17 Ottobre 2009, a cura di Livio Zerbini, Rubbettino Editore 2010, 499 p.*

The present volume was published on the initiative of the Laboratory for study and researches on Ancient Danubian provinces of the Department of Historical Sciences of the University of Ferrara and collects the texts of the papers presented at the International Conference „Rome and the provinces of the Danube”, held in Ferrara and Cento, 15-17 October 2009.

This publication, edited by Livio Zerbini, through the contributions of some of the most respected

historians, scholars and researchers of the Roman Empire, from eleven countries, presents the *status quaestionis* of studies and research on the ancient Danubian area. The topics they focus on, in-depth various aspects, are: methods of colonization and Romanization, the administration, the process of urbanization, society, economy and religion. The latest archaeological excavations and findings of recent research point out that this area is not a uniform and

homogeneous body, each province has its own identity, whose specific features deserve to be further investigated and studied.

The volume includes at the beginning a short introduction (Angela Donati, p. 7) and two other papers. The first one is about the activity of the Laboratory for study and researches on Ancient Danubian provinces of the Department of Historical Sciences of the University of Ferrara (Livio Zerbini, p. 9-10). The second one is about the Interdisciplinary Center for the Roman provinces of the University from Sassari (Attilio Mastino, p. 11-18).

The papers presented at the conference are: Werner Eck, *Die Donau als Ziel römischer Politik: Augustus und die Eroberung des Balkan* (p. 19-33); Leszek Mrozewicz, *I Flavi e il bacino danubiano* (p. 35-45); Maria Bollini, *Le guerre daciche di Domiziano, il Danubio e il mar Nero* (p. 47-52); Claudio Zaccaria, „*Dal Aquileiense portorium*” al “*publicum portorii Illyrici*”: revisione e aggiornamento della documentazione epigrafica (p. 53-78); Lietta De Salvo, *Circolazione e commercio per via d’acqua nelle province danubiane* (p. 79-94); Barbara Sanna, Raimondo Zucca, *I praetoria del cursus publicus nelle provinciae danubiane* (p. 95-111); Mauro Calzolari, *Il Danubio nella Tabula Peutingeriana* (p. 113-123); Dénes Gabler, *La campagna progettata contro Maroboduo e le sue conseguenze* (p. 125-151); Lucietta Di Paola, *Roma e la Pannonia nella testimonianza di alcune fonti tardoantiche* (p. 153-173); Miroslava Mirković, *Les inscriptions du Djerdap et la politique romaine sur le Danube de Tibère à Trajan* (p. 175-195); Ekkehard Weber, *I lavori di riedizione del CIL III (Pannonia): problemi e risultati* (p. 197-207); Marjeta Šašel Kos, *The early urbanization of Noricum and Pannonia* (p.209-230); Dilyana Boteva, *Roman Emperors visiting the Danubian province of Lower Moesia: July 193 – February 211* (p. 231-248); Andreina Magioncalda, *Il principe e le suppliche di comunità provinciali: l’epigrafe da Skaptopara (Thracia) ed altre testimonianze dall’Impero* (p. 249-268); Ioan Piso, *Il Capitolium, l’Epulum Iovis e il Dies Iovis nella Dacia Romana* (p. 269-278); Radu Ardevan, *La divisione amministrativa della Dacia Romana nella storiografia* (p. 279-289); Livio Zerbini, *Vivere lontano dall’Italia: gli Italici in Dacia* (p. 291-304); Daniela Pupillo, *La presenza femminile nella familia Caesaris della Dacia romana* (p. 305-314); Sara Faccini, *Auxilia e religione nella documentazione epigrafica della Dacia romana: ufficialità, integrazione e devozione* (p. 315-329); Eleonora Mancini, *L’evrgetismo municipale in Dacia* (p. 331-341); Gian Paolo Marchi, *Iscrizioni di Transilvania postillate da Scipione Maffei nel codice CCLXVII della Biblioteca Capitolare di Verona* (p. 343-348); Alfredo Buonopane, *Giuseppe Ariosti e le iscrizioni di Transilvania. Alcune considerazioni in margine al codice CCLXVII della Bibliotheca Capitolare di Verona* (p. 349-373); Jacopo Ortalli, *Note*

sull’iconografia sepolcrale della Dacia romana (p. 375-389); Giovanni Brizzi e Cristiano Sigurani, *Leoni sul Danubio: nuove considerazioni su un episodio delle guerre di Marco Aurelio* (p. 391-401); Eva M<sup>a</sup> Morales Rodríguez, *Presencia temporal hispana en las provincias danubianas* (p. 403-419); Vincenzo Aiello, *Le fabbriche di armi nelle province danubiane in età tardoantica* (p. 421-435); Claudia Neri, *Martiri, vescovi e monaci nelle province danubiane: cristianesimo e romanità* (p. 437-447); Giovanni Di Stefano, *Artur Evans nei Balcani. Ricerche ad Epidaurum* (p. 449-459); Arbia Hilali, *Hommes et dieux du Danube dans la légion III<sup>a</sup> Augusta. Le culte de Jupiter Depulsor* (p. 461-468); Mattia Vitelli Casella, *Rotte argonautiche lungo il Danubio: alcune note su A. R. 4 304 – 4. 595* (p. 469-487) *Coclusioni*, Attilio Mastino (p. 489-495).

The first two articles, belonging to Leszek Mrozewicz (*The Flavian and the Danube Basin*) and Werner Eck (*The Roman Danube as a policy goal: Augustus and the conquest of the Balkans*) refer to the conquest and organization of middle and lower basin of the Danube. If Eck presents detailed stages in the Roman penetration in Illyricum and the importance of the Danube river as a natural border, Mrozewicz refers to the particular position of the area in the policy of the Flavians. Both of them agree in terms of the strategic role of this region for the Roman Empire. The strengthening of the middle and lower Danube area and its inclusion in the strategic conception of the Empire is made in the same time with the actions on the Rhine (*Batavia, agri decumates*, p. 37), and even further (Britannia). This process requires the presence of military troops on the river line and building of related fortifications. On the other side this kind of actions are always coupled with diplomatic action: *foedera* concluded with the barbarians who were crossing the Danube (p. 38: ancient source is Flavius Josephus, confirmed epigraphically at Appiaria, Durosorum, Aegyssus (footnote 15, p. 38). Next steps in organizing and integrating the area are represented by the construction of a good communication network, organizing the fleet, urbanization, municipalization, all of them opening the way for Nerva and Trajan's victories.

Augustus’ strategic conception is also the subject of Dénes Gabler article (*La campagna progettata contro Maroboduo e le sue conseguenze*). Based on written (Velleius Paterculus, Cassius Dio, Suetonius and Orosius) and archaeological (results of excavations in Carnuntum – Bad Deutsch-Altenburg and Dévény) sources the author is analyzing the causes and consequences of the campaign against the king of Marcomans Maroboduus. Carnuntum was used by Tiberius as main base of operations and the archaeological materials discovered here and Dévény – *terra sigillata*, amforas, coins, lamps and fibulae dated in the last decade B.C. and the first ones A.D. – had to be part of the supplies sent to Carnuntum and the region near by for the troops on the march, led by Tiberius

against Maroboduus (p.134-139). Same time the dalmato-pannonic revolt played a major role for the further evolution on organizing the area by the Romans. As the main consequence of them was the decision of Augustus to set up the border on the Rhine and Danube.

In her article (Domitian's Dacian Wars, the Danube and the Black Sea) Maria Bollini is analyzing the fleet role during Domitian's Dacian war based on information about military ornaments (*coronae classicae*) mentioned in written sources. According to her the fleet role was not only in transportation but also attacking troops garrisoned on the Danube, and cannot be excluded some confrontations on the water, as a part of the general struggles (p. 50-51).

The conquest of territories included in the future provinces Pannonia and Moesia, especially the organization and fortification of Djerdap area is the theme of article written by Miroslava Mirković (The inscriptions of Djerdap and Roman policy on the Danube from Tiberius to Trajan). She re-discusses all inscriptions belonging to Tiberius, Claudius, and other roman emperors from the Flavian dynasty – reconsidering all preserved variations of the inscriptions text and establishes the chronology of the work on the Iron Gates - Djerdap road along the Danube. The author emphasizes the connection between building a *limes* road along the Danube and organization of the province, in terms of strategy. Construction of the road along the Danube on the route Singidunum - Viminacium - Ratiaria - Oescus - Novae - Durostorum and further up the Delta was started by Tiberius, who begins with works from the Djerdap - Iron Gates and continued by Claudius. In 93-94 Domitian ordered the restoration of the road that had not been used for some time and was deteriorated. Traian continues its construction to the Danube Delta, and also, build a new one, to the North, as a preparation to conquest Dacia. After the wars and including Dacia into the Roman Empire the Danube is no longer the frontier of the Empire but instead it is necessary to build a road to the South, from Naissus to Viminacium along Great Morava valley, because the orientation of the roads system is changed. Thus, the communication network is completed. Construction of these roads coincides with stages of the organization of the *limes*.

The Danube river is also the main point of two other articles. First one, written by Mauro Calzolari (The Danube river on the *Tabula Peutingeriana*), represents a first study focused on the representation of Danube River on *Tabula Peutingeriana*. The author already made a similar study for the River Po, the work was published in 2004. The working method was based on gathering information from written sources mentioning the river Po, about different aspects such as: relief, settlements, waterway, ways to cross, general information about the history of the area crossed by, to which are added data about how is regarded the river, as a border or limit and elements of worshipping it. But how

looks like Danube on *Tabula Peutingeriana*? Ancient authors said it is the most important river of Europe (p. 114, footnote 5). It is represented as a straight line continuing the Rhine, on four segments of the document. There are highlighted some errors due to the copyists because in reality the situation was well known: Sava and Drava (p. 117 and footnote 16 of the same page), Delta is represented with 5-6 arms, a number close to the clues found in ancient authors, who speak of seven arms (p 119, footnote 25). *Tabula Peutingeriana* uses only the name of Danubius on the entire length of the river, the comparison with data from Ptolemy's Geography, is accurate and is verified by the riverbed representation: the flexion from Dinogetia, important information about roads and settlements in Dacia, well completed with those from Itinerarium Antonini. In conclusion, it is a fair representation, a quite detailed one, of an international river which is a barrier, a separating element, between the Empire and the Barbarians.

Trade and circulation on the Danube are the main topics in the article of Lietta De Salvo (Circulation and Commercial by of water in the Danubian provinces). The Danube was the most important river during the antic times. It separates the Roman world of Barbarians and Occident of Orient, according to ancient writers. Same time it is an important traffic route, also in connection with land roads. The beginning of the Roman trade with Danubian provinces is marked by the founding of the colony Aquileia, a relevant place because from here starts the Amber Road. There is a large quantity of inscriptions attesting traders in the Danubian provinces: in Raetia – half of total inscriptions is concentrated in the provincial capital Augusta Vindelicorum (Augsburg); in Noricum there are soldiers who are in charge to maintain the roads in good condition; in Pannonia inscriptions are concentrated in the area close to the rivers Drava and Sava, but also next to the Danube and *limes*. A lot of merchants were organized in corporations, also attested epigraphically in settlements in the immediate vicinity of the fortifications as those of Carnuntum and Aquincum (Pannonia). The same events are documented also in Moesia. The first to take interest in these areas were merchants. The author focuses on road construction as an important element of romanization (p. 85-86). Another equally important element is the presence of numerous Roman citizens – *cives Romani consistentes* and tradesmen - *negotiatores* epigraphically certified across the province. To these we must add the information on navigation on the Danube.

The urbanization, as an important feature of romanization is analyzed by Marjeta Šašel Kos (The early urbanization of Noricum and Pannonia). The author presents the elements known till our days on urbanization in Noricum and Pannonia. What characterize this process in both provinces is road construction and development of settlements and trade

relations along them. The main directions led towards Virunum, Nauportus, Emona (p. 209-211). The author presents separately for each province data that we have today on the beginning of urbanization and municipalization in Noricum and Pannonia.

When and by whom was founded the province of Noricum: the discussion is between Caligula, Claudius, Tiberius, as a procuratorian province or initially under the authority of a prefect (p. 211-212). Arguments submitted by the author lead toward Claudius's time as long as then there is an information about one procurator and five Celtic *oppida* which became municipalities Celeia, Virunum, Teurnia, Aguntum, Iuvavum and Savaria who becomes *colonia*, but later is included into Pannonia.

Along with these reliable data there are however several hypotheses on the urbanization of the area. It is not well known where precisely the tribes were located and so the author assumes that at some time more *civitates peregrinae* come together and receive the legal status of *municipium* (p. 214).

Solva become *municipium* under Vespasian, but generally the northern part of the province remains non-urbanized during the first century AD, low level of romanization being demonstrated by the lack of inscriptions, which are considered a "Roman custom". Ovilavis and Cetium become *municipia* under Hadrian, and the urbanization process ends at Caracalla, when the civil settlement near Lauriacum becomes *municipium* and Ovilavis becomes *colonia*.

In Pannonia, urbanization began a generation later than in Noricum, under Vespasian who founded the first *municipia* and *coloniae*. It was long time erroneously thought that urbanization began under Tiberius who had founded the colony Julia Emona, whose inhabitants were enrolled in the tribe Claudia, but this colony belongs actually to Italy (p. 218). A milestone of the road from Aquileia to Emona was recently discovered and confirms that Emona belonged to Region X, already during the reign of Augustus, and was never part of Illyricum and Pannonia. Flavian cities appeared in Pannonia along two major routes of communication: the Amber Road and the main Illyricum's road, from the Apennines to the Balkans: Nevioudunum, Andautonia, Sisca, Sirmium. The first two settlements are *municipia*, the other two *colonia*, to which are added Scarbantia – *municipium* and Savaria – *colonia*. Pannonia – originally called Illyricum – was first under military rule, a *legatus exercitus*, and then passes under the civil administration and is organized as such at the time of Vespasian. An exact dating of this event cannot be done because for a period of time ancient sources use both name Illyricum and Pannonia, in parallel; we can only assume that it was organized same time with Noricum, the earliest document for this event is a military diplom of 61 AD, discovered in Vukovar (p. 222). After establishing the borders of both provinces – under Vespasian, urbanization continues; unlike in Noricum, in Pannonia some cities developed from camps of

auxiliary troops or as a reward for supporting the civil war (p. 223).

In his article Claudio Zaccaria („From *Aquileiense portorium* to *publicum portorii Illyrici*”: review and update of the epigraphic evidence) presents detail information about the organization and collection of customs dues, from the simple *portorium* of the city of Aquileia to the *publicum portorium Illyricum* (included Raetia, Noricum, Dalmatia, Pannonias, Upper Moesia and the Three Dacias and Moesia Inferior). The transition from *Aquileiense portorium*, generally from the system of *portoria* to the organization of *publicum portorium Illyricum*, still in hands of *socii*, occurs probably before the reign of Claudius, and should be related to the organization of provinces Dalmatia and Pannonia, after the end of wars of Augustus and Tiberius, in 6-9 A.D (p. 54-58). According to the author, after that, in Aquileia there is still an important custom bureau, but some other centers that were considered so far as *stationes* (custom offices), should not be considered as such: Patavium, Altinum, Tergeste, Pola, Gemona (p. 58-60). The author then, enumerate the inscriptions on the reorganization of customs and the personnel serving the stations noticing, on one hand the existence of a coherent and efficient levying customs system, and, on the other hand, the need for re-discuss and in-depth study of all information throughout all provinces included in Illyricum district (p. 65-68).

Barbara Sanna and Raimondo Zucca (The praetoria of the *cursus publicus* in the Danubian provinces) bring into question a specific type of construction occurring along the Roman roads, *praetoria* and their connection with the *cursus publicus* and its representations on Tabula Peutingeriana. The two of them suppose - based on an inscription from Ephesus - CIL III 6075 - mentioning a *praefectus vehiculationis Pannoniae utrusque et Moesiae superioris et Noricum*, that the Danubian provinces had a common organization of the *cursus publicus*. The public service of *cursus publicus* is supposed to be established after founding each province and based on the three inscriptions from Thrace, mentioning *viae militares: Tabernae et praetoria per vias militares fieri iussit*. According to their opinion it is likely that the *cursus publicus* have been organized by Augustus, Claudius reorganizes it and Nero equips it with necessary military infrastructure. But what exactly were *praetoria*? It is generally accepted that *praetoria* were resting places used by the governor when traveling through the province or high officials and soldiers.

Two recently discovered inscriptions at *municipium* Scardona in Dalmatia and *colonia* Julia Augusta Diensis in Macedonia give the information about the restoration of *praetorium* with a contribution of public money. The first one is dated Marcus Aurelius and Caracalla and the second one during the II century A.D. The first one is an example of a civil *praetorium* integrated in the structure of *cursus publicus* and the second one gives pretious information about facilities of the *praetorium* and *tabernae*.

The literary sources for the *cursus publicus* on the territory of Danubian provinces is scarce and the whole

epigraphic documentation is missing. It is very difficult to distinguish between civil and military buildings along the roads. In Moesia Inferior there are not *praetoria* on the Tabula Peutingeriana and those from Dacia, Copăceni and Mehădia, are military *praetoria*, for whom one can accept the function of *praetorium* for the *cursus publicus*, too.

Starting from the well-known inscription from Skaptopara Andreina Magioncalda (The Emperors and petitions of provincial communities: the inscription from Skaptopara (Thrace) and other evidence from the Empire) is analyzing the petitions addressed to the emperor across the empire. The comparison between the inscription from Skaptopara and others with similar content, especially from Asia Minor, highlights subjects and similar situations. Taken into account epigraphic documents dating from the end of the second century and the half of the next one and refers to abuses of civil officials or acts of injustice. While, it may be easily relate them with the third century crisis, many of petitions demonstrates, in fact, the inability to further apply the law and to restore order and justice, and also their indifference towards those who addressed the complaints. Thus, the emperor appears as the only one able to right the situation and relieve the situation of those who had addressed to him. Furthermore, we know that the emperors orders were applied and respected. These documents therefore, allow us to make our own opinion about the type of the existing relationship between local and provincial authorities, and especially, on the role assumed by the emperor in the confrontation between the two of them.

Dilyana Boteva (Roman Emperors visiting the Danubian province of Lower Moesia: July 193 – February 211) refers to three imperial visits reported by the ancient authors in Moesia Inferior, and to further three that left no traces in the ancient literary tradition. The author undertakes this task by highlighting a potential area of inquiry that need further attention. Some inscriptions and series of coins minted locally could attest imperial visits in the region. The author takes into account the mints from Marcianopolis and Nicopolis ad Istrum from Lower Moesia and Hadrianopolis and Augusta Traiana from Thracia. The gathered information is analysed together with data from the epigraphic evidence. As a result of the extensive demonstration the author assumes that it is possible that emperors Septimius Severus, Caracalla and Geta to be traveled in Moesia Inferior – because of the disorders after the death of Pertinax - in the years 194-195, 198 and respectively 208 A.D.

Giovanni Brizzi and Cristiano Sigurani (Lions on the Danube: new considerations on an episode of the wars of Marcus Aurelius) try to achieve a closer and accurate chronology of events related to Marcomannic wars, starting from the link which can be done between a relief, a scene from The Column of Marcus Aurelius (no. XIII) and a fragment (Alex. 48) from Lucian of

Samosata, which refers to the killing of two lions on the Danube bank, during the military confrontation in the second half of the II century A.D. Lion was the symbol of two legions: IV Felix, camped at Singidunum in Moesia Superior and XIII Gemina, stationed at Apulum in Dacia, near the area inhabited by the Sarmatians. The Quadi and Marcomanni attack upon Pannonia Superior Lucian speaks about dates from the year 170, but where was the emperor at this time? The chronology of the events is not clear, it is known that in 169 began the Roman offensive on the Lower Tisza River. Who led the confrontations was Claudius Fronto - military command of the Three Dacias and Moesia Superior, and only after his death the emperor arrives to the front. So in 169-170 the emperor was not in Pannonia but hundreds of miles away fighting the Iazyges. And then, the sacrifice of lions would not be put in touch with Quadi and Marcomans invasion but with the Roman offensive from the spring of the year 170.

A considerable number of articles is dedicated to the history and archeology of the province of Dacia.

Ioan Piso (The Capitolium the Epulum Jovis and the Dies Jovis in Roman Dacia) talks about the introduction of the cult of Jupiter in Dacia. The author starts from a very important inscription (IDR III/2, 242) dated by the *sufecti consuls*, in 124 A.D. Based on it, and on other epigraphic evidence, he precisely dated the beginning of the cult of Jupiter. His supposition has also an archaeological confirmation by the discovery of the temple of the god, maybe the Capitolium, in the so-called *forum vetus* from Sarmizegetusa.

Radu Ardevan (The administrative division of Dacia Roman in the historiography) made a historiographical research and reviewing the theories about the administrative organization of Dacia: A. von Domasyewski, A. Von Premerstein, C. Patsch (his supporter was Daicoviciu C.), D. Tudor, Fr. Vittinghoff, H. Wolff (p. 279-283).

The discovery of two important military diplomas changed the general overview. Interpreting the data provided by the one from Palarmarca (Bulgaria) the military units quartered on the river Olt came from Lower Moesia, and has thus proved that Dacia Inferior was also including the SE corner of Transylvania. The second one, from Gherla confirm the existence of the province already in 133 A.D. (p. 284). The author insists further on the work of Macrea and then Petolescu. Although Petolescu's ideas were well motivated they encountered the strong opposition of traditional view, supported among others by C. Vladescu. Petolescu was assuming the existence of Dacia Porolissensis even earlier, and this was subsequently confirmed by epigraphic discoveries. Among others it is a military diploma attesting the province in 123 A.D.

L. Zerbin (Living away from Italy: Italics in Dacia) makes a study of the Italics population in Dacia. He draws attention on the problems raised in the

demographic study (p. 297-298). They belong to different social levels - local elite, soldiers and veterans – but, generally speaking are few, and hardly identifiable. From the total of Italics documented in Dacia a significant part, 38 persons, 54.3% of the total evidence, then had returned in the homeland. Even so, their role in the process of Romanization cannot be denied or excluded.

The paper of Daniela Pupillo (The presence of women in the family of Caesar in Roman Dacia) presents an attempt to identify women from the *familia caesaris* in Roman Dacia. According to the author there are little and quite varied data that do not allow formulation of hypotheses. The general impression is that the imperial family - *familia caesaris* - relies on a small number of slaves, some of them may not have been mentioned in any inscription. The situation of freedwomens is also hard to specify since the accurate information is missing.

Sara Faccini (Auxilia and religion in the epigraphic documentation of Roman Dacia: officials, integration and devotion) undertakes a detailed analysis based on 121 inscriptions, representing dedications of auxiliary units to different deities, with the observation that were not counted the inscriptions belonging to the imperial cult. Most of them came from Dacia Superior, more than a half, then is Dacia Porolissensis, with about one third, and less from Dacia Inferior. Deities were divided into the following categories: Greco-Roman pantheon, oriental celtico German, Balkan, African. 68% are dedications to the deities of the Greco-Roman pantheon, 18% Oriental, Celtic, German and 5%, remaining - minimum represented. From Greco-Roman deities most represented is Juppiter, almost always with epithets Optimus Maximus, one third of the total, Junona and Minerva are far less documented; then, there are Diana, Mars, Apollo, and Mercury with one inscription. The deities specific to military environment are well represented (e.g. Fortuna Redux); Few atests divinities of health: Aesculapius, Hygeia, nymphs. Worthy to note are deities of field and forest, agriculture: Silvanus, which occurs most often with the epithet Domesticus, then is Liber Pater. Among the eastern deities most represented god is Jupiter Dolichenus; two temples dedicated to him have been archaeologically investigated, at Porolissum and Praetorium. The second important eastern god, with fewer inscriptions, is Mithra, but it is well-known that the military were worshiped him regardless of the origin of the troupe.

Unlike other auxiliary troops *numeri* remained more strongly faithful to the specific religious cults in the regions they come from (p. 319).

There are only 6 dedications to Celtic deities, despite the large number of troops recruited in the West, particularly Celtic, which can demonstrate a high degree of Romanization in those areas.

Dedications to Sol Invictus and Baal, are less and masked - as dedications to the emperor and it is understood that these were deities whose worship was spread also by the emperors (p. 319).

There are rare dedications to Balkan deities - Danubian knights or Thracian Horseman, as well as for African deities.

Another criterium taken into account by the author is the analysis of dedications according to the type of the military units. For cavalry (*alae*) are prevailing Greco-Roman deities, 73%, among them Jupiter Optimus Maximus, Mars, Diana, Fortuna, Hercules, Silvanus and others with only one dedication. Oriental cults are represented by only four dedications and a single one for Thracian Horseman. There are instead more numerous dedications from cohorts: in the Greco-Roman pantheon data are similar between cohorts and *alae*, the difference appears in dedications to Oriental deities, representing about 15% of the total. Among the eastern deities Dolichenus is the first one worshiped as Jupiter Optimus Maximus Dolichenus; at Tibiscum it is Ierhabolus Deus Sol, Jupiter Turmazgades and Mithra at Micia and at Romula it is Placida Regina who has to be identified with Isis.

Dedications put by *numeri*: for the Greco-Roman deities are little more than half, many are dedications to the Genii and gods of nature: Silvanus Domesticus, Liber Pater (in Tibiscum a votive plaque is attesting the building of a temple of Liber Pater), Nymphs. But most of the dedications the *numeri* put for the Oriental deities.

Dedications are offered by commanders on behalf of the whole military unit. Much less is offered by other officers, not to mention the simple soldiers or veterans. It follows that most of them are for official state deities and emperor's health. This actually means that it was little known about the religion of ordinary soldiers. It is well known that the army was a tool of Romanization, the Dacian religion does not survive the conquest and the temples were destroyed. The new province became free space for the phenomenon of *interpretatio Romana* and the spreading of the religion of conquerors.

Eleonora Mancini (The Municipal evergetism in Roman Dacia) is interested in the phenomenon of evergetism in Dacia. The peculiar feature of it is its monumentality. The inscriptions mention only two oil distributions and a donation for annona.

The character of financed buildings is varied, both civil and religious; are financed temples, shrines, decoration for different buildings, statues. Most such inscriptions were found at Sarmizegetusa, Apulum, and a single one in Drobeta. Between inscriptions about temples 15 have evergetic character and are related to rebuilding or repair of such edifices. Priority given to buildings is also demonstrated by the lack of gladiatorial games (p. 336).

In Napoca is attested the only statue dedicated to the emperor by a private citizen; far more of them are made by urban communities and military units.

Families or people who could do such acts were a few, if we consider the lack of large landowners properties in Dacia and high costs for such construction. Many times more individuals are participating in a single donation. Most often are finance Aedes or

porticos. *Aedes* are rarely documented in the western provinces. Even so only in Apulum and Sarmizegetusa were identified those of Augustales and *collegium fabrum*, dated by two inscriptions.

Most benefactors have Italic names, are decurions or Augustales. Only three of them belong to a higher rank: one *vir clarissimus* and two cavalry men. Nine benefactors have jobs in the civil administration, of which six in Sarmizegetusa.

Another category of benefactors are the freedmans, most of them documented in Sarmizegetusa and one in Apulum. It was also a mechanism to promote children, but can be only assume in Dacia since there is only one case, a son of an Augustal became decurion (p. 338 footnote 59).

There is only one woman as benefactor confirmed for the civil space in Apulum. In the inscriptions regarding construction are certified twelve women in nine inscriptions; 3 of them are about religious buildings in other the woman are together with husband or family, which shows their weak economic autonomy.

All those who make donations are either in the exercise of magistracy or by its completion.

The freedman act more in the religious sphere, while members of the aristocracy are in charge of civil space.

The benefits were still exceptional. It is a phenomenon limited to big cities somewhat important, like Apulum and Sarmizegetusa, where several important families are represented in public and by donations. The inscriptions have the typical form, little information is provided; municipal authorities were rather used to rely on its own forces then wait for benefits from wealthy citizens. It was not observed a coincidence between evergetic acts and granting the *municipium status* to the local communities (p. 337).

Jacopo Ortalli (Notes on the sepulchral iconography of the Roman Dacia) deals with funerary iconography of Dacia and tries to identify some of its characteristics, with special reference to funerary monuments decoration: their characteristics and purpose, social and cultural self-representation.

Dacia represents a "closed complex", situated chronologically and stylistically between richly decorated tombs from the Early Roman time (Principate), and the time of the spreading of Christianity; it is a period characterized by simplicity, an intermediate stage with a strong accent on private life and family ties.

In Dacia funerary monuments are of small dimensions and one could notice a powerful influence from Noricum and Pannonia, but no influence from the north-italic area. Also iconography is schematic and repertoire is on basic level.

According to Bianchi's opinion (p. 378) in Dacia there is an "anthology of topics without coherent iconographic and symbolic program"; on the contrary, Ortalli believes that the simplifying decoration is actually the result of a semantic and ideological program, which he is trying to reconstruct.

Major types of representation are: the deceased with the family and the funerary banquet. The main features of the iconography are: the presence of apotropaic elements, an almost total lack of references to social status or public life of the deceased; representations in uniform or with reference to the army, or military confrontation are very rare; what really matters is the memory of the deceased, represented along with other family members. This type of representation expresses an insight vision.

Representations with funerary banquet are characterized by the participation of few characters, including women; it is easily to recognize the family nucleus; there is not a public event, it is actually a funeral dinner and libations, with the deceased family members only involved. The role of libations is very important. The author speaks even of a local variation of the Pannonian banquet, with a crater on a table, showing the importance of wine to the ritual (p 385).

The link between the living and the dead is demonstrated on the one hand by some family values, on the other hand by the ceremonies, especially libations; related representations are vineyards, kantharoi, birds. According to the author there is a strong connection between these elements and the cult of Dionysos Liber Pater associated with the representation of a small vessel, which in his opinion is a Dionysian cist.

Two articles (Gian Paolo Marchi, Inscriptions of Transylvania annotated by Scipio Maffei in codex CCLXVII code in the Chapter Library of Verona and Alfredo Buonopane, Giuseppe Ariosti and the inscriptions from Transylvania. Some considerations on the margins of the code CCLXVII from the Library of Verona) have as main point of interest the inscriptions from Transylvania transcribed by Giuseppe Ariosti and annotated by Scipio Maffei in codex CCLXVII code in the Chapter Library of Verona.

Giuseppe Ariosti was officer in the service of the Habsburgs and has transcribed some inscriptions from Transylvania, before they were sent to Vienna. A copy of the manuscript containing the texts is preserved in the library of Verona. This manuscript in three parts it is important because contains also the text of the inscriptions lost in Szeged because the boat sunk. In Vienna inscriptions were walled up in the walls of the library. The study made by Alfredo Buonopane refers to those of Vienna's transcription. Ariosti's transcript does not respect the original punctuation and rows of inscriptions, groups of letters from different words are joined into one word and one word can be divided into several words, but however the transcription is largely correct. Also the drawings did not respect size and dimensions of the epigraphic monuments, or other specific elements breaks, cracks or even add decorative elements etc. The monument often has no connection with the monument itself.

The question is whether these drawings were made by him in a hurry without being subsequently checked or made by someone else at his command?



Lucietta Di Paola (Rome and Pannonia in the testimony of some late antique sources) is making and intrusting inquire on the relations between Rome and Pannonia during the late antique period in terms of center and periphery. The author is taking into account the information provided by some late sources in the center of which are governors. According to her conclusions the relationship between Rome and Pannonia is very complex and articulated, and records several episodes of opposition and bureaucratic and religious conflicts.

Eva M<sup>a</sup> Morales Rodriguez (Hispanic Temporary presence in the Danubian provinces) makes an inventory of attested Hispanic people in the Danubian provinces. According to it they are both officials and soldiers from all over Spain. Inscriptions are dated during Principate. The presence of Hispanic soldiers is due to military causes and for short periods of time.

Based on information from late antique sources (Notitia Dignitatum and Vegetius) the Vincenzo Aiello (The arms factories in the provinces along the Danube in Late Antiquity) analyzes the situation of weapons factories in the Danubian provinces. It is well known that during late antiquity production of weapons was a state monopoly. There factories were a single type of weapon was produced. Those were situated next to the roads and military camps. The quantity of weapons was not sufficient, there was also a craft weapons production, although Justinian's Novella 85 forbid both their production and commercialization by private. The author's opinion is that only factories with specialized production are represented in Notitia Dignitatum, not all of them across the Empire. On the Danube area there are only two shields factories in Sirmium and Marcianopolis. Why? There were really only shields? Vegetius said that the shields were richly decorated and it took five days for producing of a single one. The decoration itself was not only decorative, Vegetius said that on them it was engraved the name of the soldier, the military unit etc. Thus, such a shield was an element of cohesion, very important in the organization of the fight. Their manufacture was requiring a specialized personnel and that why only those factories were represented on Notitia Dignitatum.

In her article Claudia Neri (Martyrs, bishops and monks in the Danubian provinces: Christianity and Roman paganism) argues that the Christianity in the Danubian provinces in the path of migrating peoples was an element through identification with the world from here survived.

The new edition of CIL III for Pannonia presented by Ekkehard Weber (The works on the new edition of CIL III (Pannonia): problems and results) emphasizes the difficulties setting of an international research effort, however, represents a hope for the future. Next to the new identification of fakes, to the edition of texts already known and the reorganization of the data,

the new edition of CIL III will present very considerable novelty and many unpublished monuments.

Giovanni Di Stefano (Arthur Evans in the Balkans. Researches at Epidaurum) presents the activity of Arthur Evans in Dalmatia. Thanks to his researches at Epidaurum (located about 10 km from Dubrovnik) and based on latest research this town appears as an emblematic and quick example of romanization of the settlements located on the Dalmatian coast.

Arbia Hilali (Men and Gods of the Danube in the legion III Augusta. The worship of Jupiter Depulsor) is referring to the worship of Jupiter Depulsor. Her main idea is that, despite Pflaume opinion – according to it was a local deity, in fact, the cult of Jupiter Depulsor has widespread especially among the soldiers and became in the broad sense the defender of the borders (p. 442). Initially the cult-center was Pannonia and Noricum, but the worshiping is increasing during the Marcomanic wars. This is the explanation for the three dedication-inscriptions to this god discovered in Africa at Segermes, Arsacal and Lambesis (the latest one was also the headquarter for legio III Augusta).

Mattia Vitelli Casella (The Argonautica routes along the Danube: some notes on A. R. 4304-4. 595) tries to reconstruct the back road followed by Argonauts. The author assumes that the poem written by Apollonius of Rhodes contains topographical indications which could help her to shape their journey along the Danube towards the Adriatic Sea.

The present volume contains 31 articles covering a variety of topics on the Danubian provinces. Most of them can be considered like mini-monographs on a specific theme, archival and historiography researches, too. They cover the entire Roman times, being arranged in chronological order. Most of them, as results from the above presentation, bring into discussion the most new ideas and updated bibliography and thus represents an indispensable working instrument. Unfortunately Romanian literature is less present, which can constitute a warning and also an incentive to try to raise awareness of our research results, especially since some of the authors have explicitly mentioned this. If the province of Dacia is well represented by a significant group of articles, instead Moesia Inferior is almost nonexistent!

Articles included in this volume present the results of interdisciplinary researches, the results of archeological excavations are interpreted in close relation to the information from literary sources, epigraphic, numismatic, etc.

This volume is a proof of increased interest in the recent years of the scientific world for the Danubian provinces. Its content is also a starting point for the new directions which should be investigated in the future.

*Adriana Panaite*



## ABRÉVIATIONS

- ARMSI – *Academia Română. Memoriile Secțiunii istorice*, București.
- ActaMN – *Acta Musei Napocensis*, Cluj-Napoca.
- AÉ – *Année Épigraphique*, Paris.
- ANRW – *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt. Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*, H. Temporini, W. Haase (eds.), Berlin - New York.
- Archeologia – *Archeologia*, Varșovia.
- Britannia – *A Journal of Roman-British and Kindred Studies*, London.
- BJ – *Bonner Jahrbücher des Rheinischen Landmuseums in Bonn und des Vereins von Altertumsfreunden im Rheinlande*, Bonn.
- CCA – *Cronica cercetărilor arheologice din România* (valable à <http://www.cimec.ro>), București
- CCARB – *Corso di cultura sull'arte ravennate e bizantina*, Ravenna.
- Chiron – *Chiron. Mitteilungen der Kommission für alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts*, München.
- CIG – *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*, Berlin.
- CIL – *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, Berlin.
- CRAI – *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, Paris.
- Dacia – *Dacia. Revue d'archéologie et d'histoire ancienne*, București.
- EphemNap – *Ephemeris Napocensis*, Cluj-Napoca.
- ESA – *Eurasia Septentrionalis Antiqua*, Helsinki.
- FgHist – *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*, ed. F. Jacoby, Berlin-Leida, 1923.
- HSCPh IDR II – *Inscripțiile Daciei romane, II, Oltenia și Muntenia*, culese, însoțite de comentarii și indice, traduse în românește de G. Florescu și C.C. Petolescu, București, 1977.
- IGBulg – *Inscriptiones Graecae in Bulgaria Repertae*, G. Mihailov (ed.) I, *Inscriptiones orae Ponti Euxini*2, Sofia, 1970; II, *Inscriptiones inter Danubium et Haemum repertae*, Sofia, 1958; III/2, *Inscriptiones inter Haemum et Rhodopem repertae. A territorio philippopolitano usque ad oram Ponticam*, Sofia, 1964.
- IGLNovae – *Inscriptions grecques et latines de Novae (Mésie Inférieure)*, V. Božilova, J. Kolendo, (eds.), Bordeaux, 1997.
- ILBulg – *Inscriptiones Latinae in Bulgaria Repertae*, B. Gerov (ed.), Sofia, 1989.
- ILS – *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, H. Dessau (ed.), ed. a IV-a, 1974.
- ISM V – *Inscripțiile din Scythia Minor, grecești și latine. V. Capidava-Troesmis-Noviodunum*, reunite, însoțite de comentarii și index, traduse în română de E. Doruțiu-Boilă, București, 1980.
- JDAI – *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts*, Berlin.
- PAS – *Prähistorische Archäologie Südost europas*, Berlin.
- REB – *Revue des Études Byzantines*, Paris.
- RÉSEE – *Revue des Études Sud-Est Européennes*, București.
- RMM.MIA – *Revista muzeelor și monumentelor. Monumente istorice și de artă*, București.
- RIB – *The Roman Inscriptions of Britain*, R.G. Collingwood, R.P. Wright (eds.), Oxford, 1965.
- SEG – *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*.
- ZPE – *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, Bonn.





**PROIECT EDITORIAL FINANȚAT DE  
ADMINISTRAȚIA FONDULUI CULTURAL NAȚIONAL**

