

ACADÉMIE ROUMAINE
INSTITUT D'ARCHÉOLOGIE « V. PÂRVAN »

D A C I A

REVUE D'ARCHÉOLOGIE
ET D'HISTOIRE ANCIENNE

NOUVELLE SÉRIE

LVIII

2014



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)

Rédacteur en chef adjoint :

FLORIAN MATEI-POPESCU

Comité de rédaction :

CRISTINA ALEXANDRESCU, 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 ROMÂNE, 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. MANPRESS 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@manpress.ro, office@manpress.ro,
www.manpress.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



© 2015 , EDITURA ACADEMIEI ROMÂNE
www.ear.ro

ACADÉMIE ROUMAINE
INSTITUT D'ARCHÉOLOGIE «V. PÂRVAN»

DACIA LVIII, 2014

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

ALEXANDRU AVRAM, MIRCEA ANGELESCU, Le centenaire des fouilles d'Histria	5
---	---

ÉTUDES

LAURENT CAROZZA, CRISTIAN MICU, CONSTANTIN HAITĂ, SORIN AILINCĂI, ALBANE BURENS, FLORIAN MIHAIL, JEAN-MICHEL CAROZZA, Reconnaissance par carottages de la stratigraphie des habitats pluri-stratifiés de Taraschina dans le Delta du Danube	13
MONICA MĂRGĂRIT, VALENTIN PARNIC, ADRIAN BĂLĂŞESCU, L'industrie en matières dures animales de l'habitat Gumelnița de Măriuța (département de Călărași)	29
DANIEL SPÂNU, Une contribution archéologique à l'étude du trésor du III ^e siècle av. J.-C. d'Epureni (Roumanie)	65
CRISTIAN GĂZDAC, Did Charon read his obol? The message of coin offering in Roman graves from Pannonia	95
KARIN MAURER, Der Pontarch des westpontischen Koinons	141

NOTES ET DISCUSSIONS

SORIN COCIȘ, VITALIE BÂRCA, The "Sarmatian" brooches (headknob and full catchplate variant, Almgren Group VII, Series I) in the Dacia province and the Barbarian environment of the Tisza River Basin	189
FLORIN-GHEORGHE FODOREAN, The Danubian road from Viminacium to Durostorum in the Roman itineraries	215
SORIN NEMETI, FELIX MARCU, A funerary <i>aedicula</i> wall from Șoimeni (Cluj county)	231
IRINA NEMETI, SORIN NEMETI, <i>Heros equitans</i> in the funerary iconography of <i>Dacia Porolissensis</i> . Models and workshops	241

ÉPIGRAPHIE

CÉDRIC BRÉLAZ, Inscriptions de Macédoine Orientale dans la correspondance entre Fauvel et Barbié du Bocage	257
ALEXANDRU AVRAM, Inscriptions d'Istros	271
VALENTIN BOTTEZ, Three new inscriptions from Istros	285
CONSTANTIN C. PETOLESCU, Notes prosopographiques (VII)	293
LUCREȚIU MIHAILESCU-BÎRLIBA, Une nouvelle inscription de Topolog (Mésie Inférieure)	303

HISTOIRE D'ARCHÉOLOGIE

MIRCEA BABEȘ, CĂTĂLIN I. NICOLAE, Rival archaeological congresses in inter-war Europe	309
RADU-ALEXANDRU DRAGOMAN, SORIN OANȚĂ-MARGHITU, Romanian Archaeology in the Neoliberal era: fragments	325

COMPTE RENDUS

A. V. Simonenko, <i>Rimskij import u sarmatov Severnogo Prichernomor'ya [Roman Import for the Sarmatians of North Pontic Region]</i> , St. Petersburg State University, Faculty of Philology – Nestor Historia, St.-Petersburg, 2011, 271 p., 117 fig. (<i>Vitalie Bârcă</i>)	349
Mihai Bărbulescu, <i>Inscriptiile din castrul legionar de la Potaissa. The Inscriptions of the Legionary Fortress at Potaissa</i> , Editura Academiei Române, Bucharest, 2012, 288 p. (<i>Liviu Petculescu</i>)	358
Michel Sève et Patrick Weber, <i>Guide du forum de Philippes</i> , Sites et monuments 18, École française d'Athènes, Athènes - Paris, 2012, 91 p. avec 60 fig. (<i>Alexandru Avram</i>)	362

NÉCROLOGIE

Mircea Petrescu-Dâmbovița (<i>Alexandru Vulpe</i>)	363
Alexandru Suceveanu (<i>Alexandru Vulpe</i>)	365
Marin Dinu (<i>Nicolae Ursulescu</i>)	373

ERRATA	379
--------------	-----

ABRÉVIATIONS	381
--------------------	-----

NORMES POUR LA RÉDACTION DES ARTICLES DESTINÉS À LA REVUE DACIA N. S.	385
--	-----

A. V. Simonenko, *Rimskij import u sarmatov Severnogo Prichernomor'ya* [Roman Import for the Sarmatians of North Pontic Region], St. Petersburg State University, Faculty of Philology – Nestor-Historia, St. Petersburg, 2011, 271 p., 117 fig.

This book tackling Roman imports in the north-Pontic Sarmatian environment, authored by the best expert in the Sarmatian world of the north of the Black Sea, went out three years after the monograph *Römische Importe in sarmatischen und maiotischen Gräbern zwischen Unterer Donau und Kuban*, in fact two monographs, was published. The first, titled *Römische Importe in sarmatischen Denkmälern des nördlichen Schwarzmeergebietes*, (p. 1-224 and 168 pl.) belongs to A. V. Simonenko¹, while the second, *Römische Importe in sarmatischen und maiotischen Denkmälern des Kubangebietes* (p. 265-624 și 222 pl.) is co-authored by Ivan I. Marčenko and Natal'ja. Ju. Limberis².

Compared to the German version issued by A. V. Simonenko, the book *Rimskij import u sarmatov Severnogo Prichernomor'ya* (Roman Import for the Sarmatians of North Pontic Region) is a modified, completed and much more ample and complex version from the analysed artefacts viewpoint. The issue of the monograph mainly discussing the Roman imports in the Sarmatian environment of the current territory of Ukraine is a major contribution to the advance of knowledge regarding the dynamics of the Roman-Barbarian relations in this part of Europe.

Alike the above mentioned German version, that in Russian is the product of a research carried out over many years by A. V. Simonenko within the joint project of the German Archaeological Institute (Deutsches Archäologisches Institut) and the Institute of Archaeology of the Ukrainian National Academy (p. 7).

From the very start, we wish to mention that we took great pleasure in reading another complex monograph written by the reputable Kiev scholar. Beyond our stand of collaborator of Mr. A. V. Simonenko, firstly a good friend and teacher, we believe that many young specialists wished to have the opportunity to work and learn the mysteries of the Sarmatian world from him. Moreover, we are convinced that several other scholars in the field of the archaeology of Roman artefacts aspired to write such a work or to be among those writing it. We believe this a complex monograph that would be definitely read and used for a long time to come, like many other monographs drafted by A. V. Simonenko.

Concurrently, we hope it would impulse future research, which would bring new data and information concerning the relations between the Roman empire and the Sarmatians.

In the introductory pages (p. 5-8), the author mentions the importance of Roman imports for the relative and absolute chronology of the Sarmatian period from the north-Pontic area as well as for the research of the important commercial routes, their entrance and distribution ways. Furthermore, the importance of the approach for clarifying various historical issues is underlined, the author presenting his efforts in drawing this monograph as well as a series of aspects related to the analysed artefact categories. When mentioning the scholars who published a series of Roman artefacts from the Sarmatian graves, the author specifies that the speciality literature has no clear image on the structure of the Roman imports in the Sarmatian environment, on the dissemination stages and the influence of the Roman culture on the Sarmatians. The author also specifies that the examined chronological interval is different from that mentioned in the book title, stating that artefacts dating to the 2nd – 1st centuries BC, imports from regions under the cultural and political influence of Rome are also examined. As regards the effective Roman imports, A. V. Simonenko mentions that only artefacts of certain Roman or Roman provincial origin were analysed. Thus, objects that might have been produced in the ancient cities from the north of the Black Sea were not scrutinised (beads, certain brooch types, mirrors or jewellery items, as well as pottery made in the workshops at Olbia or the Bosporan kingdom). The author incorporated in the catalogue the fine red fabric wares covered with red slip, including the *Terra Sigillata*, without yet assessing their historical significance, which, according to the author, was due to the large quantity and specificity of the material, requiring separate investigation.

The first chapter (p. 9-148) deals with the classification and chronology of import objects (*Klasificatsiya i khronologiya importnykh izdelii*). Analysis in this chapter is based on a vast specialty bibliography (p. 245-263) and tackles each import artefact category from the north-Pontic Sarmatian environment: weaponry (p. 9-19), brooches

¹ Simonenko 2008.

² Marčenko, Limberis 2008.

(p. 19-24), mirrors (p. 24-28), buckles (p. 28-30), metal vessels (p. 30-70), glass vessels (p. 70-93), jewellery (94-109), pyxides (p. 109-111), bells (p. 111-113), faience objects (p. 114-116), gems (p. 116-126), varia (p. 126-135), figurative pottery vessels (p. 135-142), amphorae (p. 142-148). This analysis chapter also contains 89 good quality drawings and maps presenting the Roman artefacts and their distribution area in the north-Pontic Sarmatian environment. Alike the 2008 monograph, the Roman and Roman provincial origin artefacts within the Sarmatian archaeological features identified on the current territory of the Republic of Moldova were not considered by the author.

The second chapter (p. 149-157), dealing with the chronology of the Sarmatian monuments (*Nekotorye voprosy khronologii sarmatskikh pamyatnikov*) is divided into two sub-chapters. The first (p. 149-151) presents the current state of the cultural-historical chronology of the Sarmatian community (*Sovremennoe sostoyanie khronologii sarmatskoj kul'turno-istoricheskoi obshchnosti*), while the second (p. 151-157), discusses the chronology of the Sarmatian monuments in the north of the Black Sea (*Khronologiya sarmatskikh pamyatnikov Severnogo Prichernomor'ya*).

The first sub-chapter (p. 149-151) makes a review of the state of research on the chronology and periodisation of the Sarmatian antiquities from the entire space they inhabited over time. A supporter of the migrationism among other scholars, A. V. Simonenko deems changes in the archaeological cultures the result of ethnical regrouping in the Sarmatian world³. This theory, as well mentioned also by the author, is confirmed by archaeological finds.

Following the short presentation of all periodisations and contributions by a series of scholars in the establishment of the chronology of the Sarmatian culture, A. V. Simonenko mentions (p. 151) that the cultural-historical periodisation of the Sarmatian community is as follows: the early Sarmatian culture (the 2nd – 1st centuries BC), mid culture (1st c. – mid 2nd. C. AD) and late culture (the second half of the 2nd c. – 4th c. AD).

In the second sub-chapter (p. 151-157), the author appraises the proposed periodisations for the Sarmatian antiquities in the north and north-west Pontic area, used by a series of specialists (M. I. Vyaz'mitina, V. I. Kostenko, A. N. Dzigovskij, V. I. Grosu).

Based on the analysis of the typological groups and the chronology of the Sarmatian antiquities in the north of the Black Sea, the author proposes a novel periodisation of the Sarmatian culture in this region⁴. It

³ This view was expressed and supported with arguments for the first time by M. I. Rostovtsev, whose works granted a great role to the migrationist processes in the Sarmatians history.

⁴ This periodisation was drafted in 2004 (Simonenko 2004, p. 134-173).

is based on the fact that during the 2nd c. BC to mid 2nd c. AD, in the north of the Black Sea there existed a unitary Sarmatian culture. Thus, the Sarmatian culture in the north-Pontic area in the 2nd c. BC – mid 2nd c. AD, which includes the early and mid Sarmatian periods in the traditional chronological divisions, is defined as period I, while the late Sarmatian period (second half of the 2nd c. – 4th c. AD) as period II. Both periods were divided into phases.

Period I: phase A1 – 2nd c. BC; phase A2 – end of the 2nd c. – 1st c. BC; phase A3 – first half of the 1st c. AD; phase B (with the horizon of the remains with features specific to the novel wave of Sarmatians arriving from the east) – the second half of the 1st c. – mid 2nd c. AD.

Period II: phase C1 (early) – the second half of the 2nd c. – first half of the 3rd c. AD; phase C2 (late): sub-phase C2a – the second half of the 3rd c. – mid 4th c. AD; sub-phase C2b – the second half of the 4th c. AD.

The proposed periodisation for the Sarmatian remains in the north-Pontic area drawn based on the artefacts, historical realities, cultural influences and funerary traditions is reminiscent of the chronological systems used for the antiquities in Central and Northern Europe. This chronology of the Sarmatian period in the north of the Black Sea is also illustrated by fig. 90 at p. 156.

The conclusions chapter (p. 158-160) dedicated to the entrance waves of imports with the Sarmatians in the north of the Black Sea (*Volny importa k sarmatam Severnogo Prichernomor'ya*), which we shall discuss later, is accompanied by 27 colour figures of a series of import artefacts coming from several Sarmatian graves, mainly from the north-Pontic area. They are followed by the English summary (p. 161-165), whose title (*Pre-Roman and Roman imports in the sarmatian graves of Ukraine*) is, yet, different from the book title! It summarizes all aspects analysed and mentioned within the book. The ample catalogue of finds follows (p. 166-244), titled Late Hellenistic and Roman imports in the Sarmatian monuments from the north of the Black Sea (*Pozdneellinisticheskie i rimskie izdeliya v sarmatskikh pamyatnikakh Severnogo Prichernomor'ya*).

The catalogue of finds (p. 166-244) is rather detailed, drafted with much accuracy, attention and rigour. Import artefacts, accompanied by drawings and good quality photos, are illustrated by 89 black-white and 27 colour figures. Compared to the 2008 monograph, where Roman artefacts were illustrated together with the other discovered objects, this monograph renders only import items. All analysed Roman artefacts also benefit by a very good quality description, while the other items discovered beside them are only mentioned. The catalogue and illustration of import artefacts furthermore highlights the author's effort, evidencing moreover the difficulty in differentiating Roman and Roman provincial objects from those produced in territories or centres under Rome's influence or control, like the Greek cities from the Black Sea region.

In connection to the catalogue organisation, we wish to mention it would have been useful if it had contained information of the find's year. Moreover, the find context might have been more critically analysed in order to ease chronological appreciations. In our view, it would have been worthwhile if the bibliography had included, where applicable, all works where the archaeological feature or item/items and also their proposed dating were published. Also, of great help for each find would have been a column with their dating proposed by the author. This might have furthermore underlined the considerable effort undertaken by the author of this monograph, even though the more accurate dating of certain archaeological features and objects is given within the first chapter, when the proper artefacts are discussed. It would have been beneficial if the catalogue had indicated the weight of the precious metal objects (especially in the case of certain jewellery items) so that the interested might have been able to make assessments and comparisons based on them.

Upon the analysis of the catalogue and the first chapter, one may note that three quarters of the examined Roman and Roman provincial artefacts frame in the mid Sarmatian period (1st c. – mid 2nd c. AD), in the traditional periodisation, or period I phases A3 and B in A. V. Simonenko's periodisation. Within the chronological central-European system, they frame in phases B1 and B2 of the Roman imperial period.

Of much help, especially for those less familiar, would have been the presence of a map exhibiting all points where import artefacts analysed in this book were identified. Such map would have been extremely useful for a better geographical orientation, especially if the number beside each point on the map corresponded with the numbering in the catalogue.

A first category of objects analysed in the first chapter are the helmets (p. 9-19) belonging to type Montefortino B, whose detailed analysis was carried once more in the more recent years by A. V. Simonenko⁵. Based on the closest analogies in Western Europe but also the fact that many of the north-Pontic specimens were discovered beside items dated to the end of the 2nd c. – 1st c. BC, A. V. Simonenko concludes that the north-Pontic specimens date no earlier than the 2nd c. BC and that their presence in Eastern Europe should be related to the Mithridatic wars⁶. The author does not exclude (p. 18-19), based on their typological unity, on one side, and their resemblance with those in the Iberian Peninsula on the other hand, that these helmets reached originally Mithridates's soldiers, following the rearmament of his army by Quintus Sertorius, and from them to the Sarmatians.

⁵ Simonenko 2010, p. 137-147, fig. 104, 110-119. See also Bărcă, Symonenko 2009, p. 288, 290-293, fig. 117-117a.

⁶ For all views expressed in relation to the emergence of the Montefortino helmets in the north-Pontic steppes see Bărcă 2006, p. 210-211; Bărcă, Symonenko 2009, p. 292-293; Simonenko 2010, p. 146-147 with complete bibliography.

The same sub-chapter dealing with weaponry, also analyses the tip of a gladius scabbard of Mainz type coming from a damaged grave (T 3 G 2) at Lenkovtsy (cat. no. 156.1, fig. 5/4). Interestingly, among the recovered items counts a mirror with round flat disk and golden seven-petalled rosette-shaped appliques, provided with attachment orifices and a projecting belled circle⁷ in the central part. In our view, this is indicative of the fact that the grave should date sometime in the second half of the 1st c. AD⁸, even though the scabbard belongs to the gladius type which dates to the end of the 1st c. BC – mid 1st c. AD.

The second sub-chapter (1.2) analysis the brooches (p. 19-24). Without discussing it lengthily, we wish to mention their accurate assignments and framings but also the existence of a map (fig. 11) with their distribution area in the analysed Sarmatian environment. The author expresses the conviction that for the Sarmatian environment (at least for that in the north-Pontic area) the dating of Aucissa brooches should not be limited to mid 1st c. AD. In A. V. Simonenko's view, these brooches reached the ancient cities by the north of the Black Sea and the Barbarian environment (including that Sarmatian) only after the emergence of the military contingents in the region. The author accurately notes that Aucissa brooches in the north-Pontic environment come from eastern features graves, which belonged to the novel wave of Sarmatians arriving from the east starting with mid 1st c. AD. Past the fact the brooches of the type were in use during the period between the last decade of the 1st c. BC and the third quarter of the 1st c. AD⁹, we wish to mention they were occasionally worn, even though out fashioned, also in the Roman provincial environment of the end of the 2nd c. AD¹⁰. The use of these brooches in the second half of the 1st c. – early 2nd c. AD is also recorded in other cultural environments¹¹.

Concerning the tube-shaped hinged brooches (cat. no. 46.1, 62.3, 98.1, fig. 10/3-5), we wish to mention there are certain similar specimens in the Roman military environment of the second half of the 1st c. AD, being catalogued as variants of Aucissa brooches¹², which furthermore evidences the popularity of the tube-

⁷ In I. I. Marchenko's classification such appliques are assigned to type 2.1 in group E and dated to the 1st c. AD (Marchenko 1996, p. 142, fig. 9/52, 11/52).

⁸ The specimens at Lenkovtsy have identical analogies in many Sarmatian graves dating mainly to the second half of the 1st c. – early 2nd c. AD.

⁹ Cf. Feugère 1985, p. 333; Riha 1979, p. 114-115.

¹⁰ Cf. Cociş 2004, p. 78.

¹¹ Litvinskij 1967, p. 31, 32; Oboldueva 1988, p. 166, fig. 4/11; Rustoiu 1997, p. 60; Puzdrovskij 2007, p. 174.

¹² Ulbert 1959, p. 68, pl. 15/10, 50/11; Riha 1979, p. 118, type 5.2., variant 5.2.2, pl. 25/663-665; Riha 1994, p. 100, 102, 105, 107-108 type 5.2, variant 5.2.2, pl. 20/2289, type 5.3, pl. 22/2330-2331, 2336.

shaped hinged brooches „Hülsenscharnierfibeln“¹³. The “wolf teeth” incised decoration on the flattened bow of the three brooches is similar to that on some types of tube-shaped hinged brooches at Augst¹⁴. The author notes that also in the case of these brooches, they come from the inventory of graves belonging to the novel wave of Sarmatians arriving from the east by mid 1st c. AD.

The brooch with strongly curved bow and inner chord in M 2 at Ostrivec-Verteba (cat. no. 157.1, fig. 10/17) (type Glüsing A 2a; Völling A 2a¹⁵) is rather an import from the Przeworsk environment¹⁶, should we keep in mind the distribution area and the cultural environments where they were frequently used¹⁷. Concerning the golden “spoon” brooch in the Sokolova Mogila barrow (cat. no. 110.7a, fig. 10/6, fig. colour 1/1) we wish to complete A. V. Simonenko by mentioning that their period of maximum use is comprised between the last quarter/end of the 1st c. BC to the half/third quarter of the 1st c. AD¹⁸. The brooch in the Sokolova Mogila barrow, beside the other two bronze specimens in the settlement at Kozyrka, close to Olbia¹⁹ are in our view, most likely, imports from the Geto-Dacian environment, where such brooches were found in large numbers²⁰. The grave in the Sokolova Mogila barrow dates sometime to the second half of the 1st c. AD (likely the third quarter of even its last third), and is part of the group of graves belonging to the early Alani aristocracy from the north-west Pontic area.

Concerning the rhomb-shaped silver brooch (un-enamelled) from Ruzhichevka (cat. no. 91.2, fig. 10/7) we wish to add that items of the type are well recorded mainly in Britannia, Gallia, the Rhine region and the current territory of Switzerland²¹. E. Riha dated these brooches to the chronological interval comprised between the second quarter of the 1st c. AD and the end of this century²², while A. K. Ambroz dated the

specimens in this type from the north of the Black Sea to the second half of the 1st c. – first half of the 2nd c. AD²³. The item at Ruzhichevka was accurately dated by A. V. Simonenko to the second half of the 1st c. AD.

The strongly profiled iron brooch from T 2 G 1 at Chuguno-Krepinka (cat. no. 5, 8b), not mentioned within the pages analysing the brooches, belongs, in our view, to the type well spread especially in Moesia Superior. These brooches are of south Danube origin and emerged in the second half of the 1st c. AD, being extensively used in the first half of the 2nd c. AD too²⁴. In Dacia, they were fashionable only until early 2nd c. AD²⁵. The item at Chuguno-Krepinka may be assigned to type 6b2 in S. Cociş’s typological classification²⁶ and it is likely a product of a workshop in the *Barbaricum*.

With regards to the strongly profiled brooches at Gordeevka T 29 G 2 (cat. no. 151, 2, fig. 10/13) and Porogi T 2 G 2 (cat. no. 155, 2, fig. 10/14) it is noteworthy they formed in the area south and east the Alps, from where they distributed mainly in the Roman provinces of Noricum, Pannonia and Moesia²⁷, however also outside the borders of the Roman empire²⁸. The items belonging to this type are frequently found on the territory of pre-Roman Dacia, especially in the settlements in the Siret river basin²⁹. Their extremely large numbers in this part of the territory inhabited by the Geto-Dacians is explained by the existence of the workshop manufacturing them, during the second half of the 1st c. AD, in the settlement at Poiana³⁰. The dissemination of these brooches on vast territories allows them to be considered, beside other categories of items, as well mentioned by M. Babeş³¹, as “supranational” artefacts. Chronologically, the brooches of the type date to the 1st c. AD, being used extensively in its second part³². Rarely, certain specimens are found by early 2nd c. AD as well. Such brooch finds in the Trajanic archaeological levels from Roman Dacia stand proof³³. The workshop at Poiana and the extremely large number of the brooches of the type in the eastern Geto-Dacian environment make us believe that the brooches

¹³ Cf. for this brooch group Riha 1994, p. 100 sqq.

¹⁴ Riha 1994, pl. 30/2545, 2549, 31/2565-2569.

¹⁵ Völling 1994, p. 222-226.

¹⁶ See for the origin and distribution area of these brooches Bărcă 2006, p. 124; Bărcă 2011, p. 8-9 with complete bibliography.

¹⁷ The items of this type come from archaeological features dating to the chronological interval comprised between the end of the 1st c. BC – first quarter of the 1st c. AD, however some of the specimens might have remained fashionable even after this period.

¹⁸ Cf. Rustoiu 1997, p. 49-50.

¹⁹ Kovpanenko 1986, p. 37-38, fig. 35, 36/7-9.

²⁰ Rustoiu 1997, p. 48-50, with complete bibliography and finds.

²¹ Riha 1979, p. 181-182, type 7.4, pl. 58/1527-1536, pl. 78, type 7.4; Riha 1994, p. 154-155, type 7.4, pl. 39/2777, 40/2778-2782, pl. 51, type 7.4; Feugère 1985, p. 335 sqq., fig. 49, pl. 147/1836-1840, type 24b1.

²² Riha 1979, p. 182, type 7.4.1.; Riha 1994, p. 154, type 7.4.1.

²³ Ambroz 1966, p. 33.

²⁴ Böhme 1972, p. 13; Bojović 1983, p. 42.

²⁵ Cf. Cociş 2004, p. 42-44.

²⁶ Cf. Cociş 2004, p. 43.

²⁷ Cf. Almgren 1923, p. 37, 108; Patek 1942, p. 93-94; Košević 1980, p. 20-24, type 11; Bojović 1983, p. 34.

²⁸ Cf. Almgren 1923, p. 37, 108; Ambroz 1966, p. 36; Peškař 1972, p. 79; Rustoiu 1997, p. 52-53, type 19c.

²⁹ Cf. Rustoiu 1997, p. 52-53, fig. 58, 59/1-5; Teodor, Țau 1996, fig. 16/1, 3-15, 17/1-9, 11-15, 17, 18/1-5, 8, 16-19, 19/1, 5-7, 10-20.

³⁰ Rustoiu 1997, p. 20-21, 52-53.

³¹ Babeş 1999, p. 230.

³² Peškař 1972, p. 79-80; Bojović 1983, p. 34; Gugl 1995, p. 13-15.

³³ Cf. Cociş 2004, p. 49, types 8a1c1 and 8a1c2.

at Gordeevka and Porogi, beside those in the Sarmatian graves west the Dniester, are very likely imports from the respective environment. Concerning the small-sized strongly profiled brooches at Porogi T 2 G 1 (cat. no. 154/2, fig. 10/11), Chuguno-Krepinka T 2 G 1 (cat. no. 5, 8a, fig. 10/9), Semenovka T 11 G 1 (cat. no. 123, 1, fig. 10/10), Turlaki T 7 G 1 (cat. no. 127, 5), Pisarevka T 1 G 8 (cat. no. 153, 1, fig. 10/12), similar to those in the Sarmatian graves west the Dniester³⁴, they most likely belong to the group of strongly profiled brooches named by A. Rustoiu of eastern type³⁵ and may be, in our view, largely imports from the Siret river basin Geto-Dacian environment. In fact, in the settlements at Brad and Poiana workshops also functioned, producing such brooches³⁶. Brooches of the type emerged by mid/second half of the 1st c. AD and were fashionable until early 2nd c. AD. Evidence to the effect is their lack in the Sarmatian graves after this chronological interval.

The brooch in T 361 at Konstantinovo (cat. no. 85, 1, fig. 10/16) seems, according to the drawing, to belong to the brooch type specific to the provinces of Noricum and Pannonia from where the name of Norico-Pannonian brooches with two knobs on the bow³⁷. From these two Roman provinces, respective brooches, which have several variants³⁸, disseminated both in other provinces of Roman Empire³⁹ as well as the Barbarian environment⁴⁰. The brooch at Konstantinovo may be framed in the type dating by the end of the 1st c. BC – first half of the 1st c. AD⁴¹. However, taking into account there are many cases when Norico-Pannonian brooches belonging to early types were used, inclusively in the Roman provincial environment⁴², also in the second half of the 1st c. – early 2nd c. AD, it is very likely that the brooch in the female grave at Konstantinovo also dates to this chronological interval.

Within Roman and Roman provincial mirrors (p. 24-28) are analysed the circular specimens decorated with concentric circles (cat. no. 29.3, 35.1, 91.3, fig. 12/1-3) and the rectangular specimens (cat. no. 67.3, 68.1, 82.5, 135.2, 151.1, 158.1, fig. 12/4-6). Although their analysis is brief, the author accurately notes that circular mirrors are part of graves dating to the second half of the 1st c. – early 2nd c. AD. The author is right when arguing that most specimens in the Sarmatian environment are

artefacts produced in the Roman empire, however, misses, when mentioning other such mirror finds in the Sarmatian world, the items in the graves at Brăviceni (T 22 G 1) and Giurcani (G 3)⁴³. A. V. Simonenko underlines that one should not disregard the possibility that some of the mirrors reached the Sarmatian via the Greek cities like Olbia and Tyras. In connection to the rectangular mirrors, one should also mention that most come from graves dating to the second half of the 1st c. – early 2nd c. AD.

Within the sub-chapter examining the metal pots (p. 30-70), a first analysed category consists of silver vessels represented by cups (p. 31-40, cat. no. 118.1, fig. 15/1-3; cat. no. 33.1-3, fig. 16/1-3, colour fig. 2; cat. no. 109.2, fig. 16/4; cat. no. 106.8; cat. 90.3, fig. 18), jugs (p. 40-43, cat. no. 110.1, fig. 19; cat. no. 109.1, fig. 20), *kantharoi* (p. 43-45, cat. no. 110.2, fig. 21/1; cat. 72.5, fig. 21/2-3) and beakers (p. 45-46, cat. no. 5.7, fig. 22/1-5; cat. no. 113.1, fig. 22/6) whose distribution is illustrated by figure no. 46.

Within the cups' analysis, special attention was given to the specimen at Velikoploskoe (cat. no. 118.1, fig. 15/1-3). Although the archaeological feature at Velikoploskoe was dated and interpreted differently over the recent decades, the author appropriately believes that alike other similar archaeological features, which he calls "curious archaeological features", it belongs to the Sarmatians no earlier than the end of the 2nd c. – 1st c. BC⁴⁴.

Based on the decoration on the jug body at Sokolova Mogla (cat. no. 110.1, fig. 19, colour fig. 4-5) the author considers it an artefact produced by a workshop from the Near East or Egypt. Nonetheless, it is noteworthy, considering all aspects, that it may also be a Roman provincial product copying rather a jug type made by a workshop in Asia Minor than in Italy. In the case of the jug at Vesnyanoe (cat. no. 109.1, fig. 20, colour fig. 3/1) we wish to mention that similar vessels are known neither on the territory of Italy, nor in the Roman provinces, which makes us believe it is not a product of the workshops in the Roman empire. The author does not exclude though that this unique jug might have been manufactured by a provincial Roman artisan using

³⁴ Cf. Bărcă 2006, p. 128-130; Bărcă 2011, p. 17.

³⁵ Cf. Rustoiu 1997, 53 sqq., types 20a and 20b, Fig. 61, 62, 63/1-7.

³⁶ Rustoiu 1997, p. 20-21.

³⁷ The one systemizing the brooches of the type was J. Garbsch (Garbsch 1965, p. 27 sqq.).

³⁸ Cf. Garbsch 1965, p. 27 sqq.

³⁹ Cf. Cociș 2004, p. 72-73, type 11a, 11b1.

⁴⁰ Cf. Rustoiu 1997, p. 57-58, type 24a; Pachkova 2006, fig. 31/12.

⁴¹ Garbsch 1965, p. 27 sqq.

⁴² For the province of Dacia see Cociș 2004, p. 73.

⁴³ Cf. Bărcă 2000, fig. 3/1-2; Bărcă 2006, p. 154-157, 296, fig. 35/6, 187/6, Bărcă, Symonenko 2009, 174-176, fig. 62/9.

⁴⁴ See a more detailed analysis in Simonenko 2001, p. 92-106; Simonenko 2005, p. 255-260; Redina, Simonenko 2002, p. 86. A very close view related to the territory from where the Sarmatians to whom these north-Pontic area archaeological features were assigned as well as to the period to which they belong, see our view in various papers (Bărcă 2002, p. 104-105; Bărcă 2002a, p. 215-230; Bărcă 2004, p. 35-63; Bărcă 2006, p. 61-64; Bărcă 2006a, p. 47-49; Bărcă, Symonenko 2009, p. 95-98).

details from several metal vessels from different chronological intervals⁴⁵.

Bronze vessels (p. 46-70) are represented by *situlae* (p. 46), casseroles (p. 49-57), strainers (p. 57), terrines (p. 57-60), paterae (p. 60-61), jugs (p. 62-66), bowls (p. 65-66), cauldrons (p. 66-67, 70) whose distribution is illustrated in figure no. 47.

Among them, the most numerous are the terrines (8 ex.) followed by casseroles (6 ex.). The first are represented, in the author's view, by terrines of type Eggers 99-100, 102 (cat. no. 1.2, fig. 33; cat. no. 107.1, fig. 34-35/1, cat. no. 5.4, fig. 36, colour fig. 6; cat. no. 32.1, fig. 37) and Eggers 70 (cat. no. 10.1, 58.1, fig. 38/2; cat. no. 59.4, fig. 38/1) and 72 (cat. no. 47.1, fig. 38/3). Unfortunately, the terrines in the graves at Novofilippovka (cat. no. 10.1) and Ust'-Kamenka (cat. no. 58.1, 59.4), do not belong to type Eggers 70 and have no analogies among the Roman provincial products from the imperial period. Still, it is not excluded they were manufactured by a Roman provincial workshop in the eastern part of the empire. Concerning the terrine in T 12 G 1 at Novo-Podcreazh, assigned to type Eggers 72, we believe it rather belongs to type 70. Such terrines also come from the Sarmatian graves in the north-west Pontic area at Cazaclia (T 10 G 1)⁴⁶ and Mocra (T 2 G 2)⁴⁷, dating sometime in the interval comprised between the end of the 1st c. AD and early 2nd c. AD.

Casseroles are represented according to the book author by specimens belonging to types Eggers 140 (Troyany, cat. no. 94.1, fig. 27; Tsvetna, cat. no. 90.2, fig. 28; Krasnopolka, cat. no. 68.2; Shchuchinka, cat. no. 67.1, fig. 29), 142 (Novo-Petrovka, cat. no. 111.1, fig. 30) and 144 (Chuguno-Krepinka, cat. no. 5.5, fig. 31). Without further details, in our view, the casserole at Tsvetna belongs to type Eggers 137 (type Petrovsky IV,1⁴⁸) and

that at Shchuchinka to type 138 (type Petrovsky IV,2⁴⁹). The outer part of the casserole handle at Shchuchinka still preserves a rectangular stamp with letters [C?]NGRANIPLOCA, whose likely restoration is in our view [C?]n(aei) Grani(i) Ploca[mi?], while the casserole handle at Novo-Petrovka (Eggers 142) preserves the stamp of artisan P. Cipius Polybius (PCIPOLYBI), active in Campania in AD 45/50-80/85⁵⁰.

Regarding the specimen at Chuguno-Krepinka (Eggers 144, type "Gödåker") we wish to mention it belongs to **group c** in R. Petrovsky's classification⁵¹, being produced in AD 60/70 - 100/120⁵². The author correctly notices that most of the Sarmatian archaeological features in the north of the Black Sea where casseroles were identified belong to the second half of the 1st c. – first third of the 2nd c. AD.

Only a single specimen (Chuguno-Krepinka, cat. no. 45.1, cat. no. 5.6 fig. 32) represents the strainers, pertaining to type Eggers 160, but also the *paterae* (Petriki, cat. no. 82.1, fig. 39, colour fig. 7/3) of type Eggers 155 or E (Millingen) in H. U. Nuber's typology.

In connection to the *situlae* at Mar'evka (cat. no. 108.1, fig. 23/2, 24/2) and Veseloja Dolina (cat. no. 134.1, fig. 23/1, 24/1) we wish to mention that their shape definitely differentiates from that of the *situlae* of type Eggers 18-20 or 21-23. *Situlae* with similar shapes, features and proportions, which have neither bronze or iron attachments nor orifices or other prints suggesting their existence, are known beside those mentioned by A. V. Simonenko, also in the Sarmatian grave at Severnyj (T 1 G 9)⁵³, the cremation grave no. 1 at Zubowice (Poland)⁵⁴ as well as the finds in Italy, Spain, France and former Yugoslavia⁵⁵. These *situlae*, alike those at Mar'evka and Veseloja Dolina, preserved the attachment system of the iron handles, consisting of an iron circle formed of two semi-circles fastened between the ends with rivets and serving as handle attachments. Furthermore, one must specify that, although these *situlae* are somewhat similar in shape with those of type Eggers 18-20, they are firstly different by the complicated handle attachment system, but also by certain aspects of the form⁵⁶. In fact, such view was expressed in connection to this situla type by

⁴⁵ A. V. Simonenko originally considered that the jug at Vesnyanoe belonged to the group of metal vessels from eastern Mediterranean (Simonenko 1997, p. 403), while later, he did not exclude the possibility it represented a unique item made in the Near East (Simonenko 2002, p. 95). V. Mordvintseva and M. Trejster deem the jug a product of a Roman provincial workshop, including from the north-Pontic area and date it by mid/third quarter of the 1st c. AD (Mordvintseva, Trejster 2007, I, p. 43-44).

⁴⁶ Cf. Grosu 1990, p. 48, fig. 15A/5; Grosu 1995, fig. 8A/4; Agul'nikov, Bubulici 1999, p. 12, fig. 2/1-5; Agulnicov, Bubulici 1999, p. 288, fig. 5/1/5; Bârcă 2001, p. 342-343, 351, fig. 4/1; Bârcă 2006, p. 174, 302, fig. 43/1, 189/2; Bârcă 2009, p. 106-107, fig. 7/1; Bârcă, Symonenko 2009, p. 190-191, fig. 70/1.

⁴⁷ Kashuba, Kurchatov, Shcherbakova 2001-2002, p. 210, 230, fig. 15/3; Bârcă 2006, p. 174, 333, fig. 81/3; Bârcă 2009, p. 106-107, fig. 7/2; Bârcă, Symonenko 2009, p. 190-191, fig. 70/2.

⁴⁸ Petrovsky 1993, p. 49-51, pl. 1/IV,1.

⁴⁹ Petrovsky 1993, p. 66-68, pl. 1/IV,2.

⁵⁰ Petrovsky 1993, p. 150.

⁵¹ Petrovsky 1993, p. 80-83.

⁵² Petrovsky 1993, p. 82.

⁵³ Skripkin 1984, p. 223, fig. 3/III; Marchenko 1996, p. 38.

⁵⁴ Wielowiejski 1985, p. 159, fig. 2; Dąbrowska 1988, p. 71, fig. 12/1.

⁵⁵ Wielowiejski 1985, p. 157; Bolla, Boube, Guillaumont 1991, p. 12-13.

⁵⁶ See for the analysis of the *situlae* of the type in the Sarmatian environment between Don and Prut rivers in Bârcă 2006, p. 167-170; Bârcă 2006a, p. 103-106; Bârcă 2007, p. 92-94.

J. Wielowiejski⁵⁷, and later, by other authors as well⁵⁸. Concerning the dating of the *situlae* in the north of the Black Sea, the author accurately noted that they cannot be dated earlier than the second half of the 2nd c. – 1st c. BC. Given the dating of the other items by which they were discovered, we believe that the find at Veseloja Dolina dates to the first half of the 1st c. BC, and that at Mar'evka, most likely, sometime in the second half of the 2nd c. BC – early/first half of the 1st c. BC.

A short, yet good analysis is performed by the author for the six jugs (p. 62-65, fig. 41-43), which are of three types (*Blechkanne* (group "Straldzha"), "gegliederte Henkelkrüge" and Eggers 124 - D (Hagenow) in the typology established by H. U. Nuber) and come from the graves at Tsvetna (cat. no. 90.1, fig. 40, colour fig. 7/1-2), Chuguno-Krepinka (cat. no. 5.2, fig. 41, colour fig. 8, cat. no. 5.3, fig. 42/1, colour fig. 9), Pavlovka (cat. no. 1.2, fig. 43/1), Konstantinovka (cat. no. 107.1, fig. 35/2, 42/2) and Kotlovina (cat. no. 145.2, fig. 43/2).

Special attention is granted to the glass recipients (p. 70-93, fig. 48-55), which is explainable given that A. V. Simonenko is the author of an ample study dedicated to the glass wares in the Sarmatian graves on the current territory of Ukraine⁵⁹. These are represented by *kantharoi*, jugs, bowls, terrines, plates, beakers, balsamaria etc., and their distribution in the analysed north-Pontic Sarmatian environment is illustrated on the map in figure 56.

In sub-chapter 1.7 the author analyses in detail the jewellery (p. 94-109, fig. 57-66, colour fig. 13-23). Special attention is granted to certain earring types (p. 94-96), necklaces (p. 96-102), collars (p. 102-104), bracelets (p. 104-107) and rings (p. 107-108). In this sub-chapter, the author mentions the differences in style, shape etc. existent between the jewellery in the Black Sea area and those in Central and Western Europe from the Roman period, yet also specifies the lack of evidence on the existence in the ancient centres from the north of the Black Sea of workshops making them. The author pinpoints correctly that the style of the Pontic jewellery in the Roman period continues the polychrome tradition of the late Hellenistic period, disappearing from Western Europe by the eve between the 1st c. BC – 1st c. AD.

Among the analysed toiletries count the pyxides (p. 109-111, fig. 67), noting that beside the Roman products also count the copies made by local workshops (north-Pontic). In connection to the bone pyxides, the author notices they mainly come from the graves of the novel wave of Sarmatians arriving to this area starting with mid 1st c. AD from the region east of Don, but also

that during the second half of the 1st c. – early 2nd c. AD, these graves form a local cultural-chronological horizon. Beside the above mentioned, we wish though to state that similar bone pyxides also come from several Sarmatian graves in the north-west Pontic area (T 20 G 1 and T 27 G 1 at Bădragii Vechi, T 9 G 13 at Dumeni, T 4 G 4 at Olănești⁶⁰) dating to the second half of the 1st c. – first quarter of the 2nd c. AD.

The pyxides analysis is followed by that of the bells (p. 111-113, cat. no. 50.1, 69.2, 94.2, 151.3, fig. 68), faience objects (p. 114-116, fig. 69, colour fig. 24), gems (p. 116-126) to which adds the sub-chapter for varia (p. 126-135, fig. 76-81, colour fig. 25-26) examining the fans, vessel legs, spoons, scales, toiletry boxes, bone objects but also the three human bronze masks (cat. no. 5.9a-v, fig. 79/1-3). Within the pages dedicated to these artefacts one may note that beside Roman products there also count the copies made by the Pontic workshops but also the lack of the fans' analysis from a series of Sarmatian graves from the first phase of the last Sarmatian period⁶¹.

Concerning the pottery, the author discusses only the figurative pottery (p. 135-142, fig. 82-84, colour fig. 27) and the amphorae (p. 142-148, fig. 85-89), not many in the north-Pontic Sarmatian environment. Even though the ram-shaped vessels in the Sarmatian environment analysed by the author are represented only by the specimen at Balki (cat. no. 24.1, fig. 82), we wish to underline the rather ample analysis made for the vessels of the type in the north of the Black Sea, but also the author's relevant conclusions related to a series of aspects. Completing those mentioned by A. V. Simonenko, we only wish to mention that the ram-shaped vessels, composed of two halves pressed in the mould, continue the tradition of the zoomorphic vessels from the Mediterranean basin, being produced in the workshops on the territory of the Roman empire from where they distributed also in the Barbarian environment. The presence of a rather significant number of such vessels in Sarmatian graves represents a certain evidence of the special interest that the Sarmatians had for the sheep motif⁶².

In the conclusions chapter (p. 158-160), whose technical details we mentioned above, the author establishes, based on the analysed material, four distribution waves of the Roman imports into the

⁵⁷ Wielowiejski 1985, p. 157 defines them as *situlae* "profilierter Eimer mit eisernem Reifen".

⁵⁸ Bolla, Boube, Guillaumont 1991, p. 12-13 defines them as "*Situle con cerchiatura in ferro*".

⁵⁹ Simonenko 2003.

⁶⁰ See Bărcă 2006, p. 161, fig. 7/3-5, 17/5, 51/1; Bărcă, Symonenko 2009, p. 178.

⁶¹ The analysis of Roman fans in the European *Barbaricum* was recently made by Al. Popa (Popa 2009). For finds in the north and north-Pontic Sarmatian environment see also Bărcă, Symonenko 2009, p. 248-249, fig. 99/1-6.

⁶² For the complex analysis of these vessels as well for the complete list of finds see Popa 2010, p. 60-69, pl. 6-11.

Sarmatian environment. For each wave, the author sets up a term related to a certain historical event.

1. the Mithridatic wave – end of the 2nd c. BC – first third of the 1st c. BC.

2. the Romano-Bosporan wave – the second half of the 1st c. AD – mid 2nd c. AD.

3. the Marcomannic wave – the second half of the 2nd c. AD – first half of the 3rd c. AD.

4. the late Roman wave – phase C2 and C3 of the Central European chronology.

Following the chronological and typological analysis of the Roman imports in the Sarmatian environment in the north-Pontic area, A. V. Simonenko reaches the conclusion they form rather compact chronological groups. Moreover, the author well notes that the massive dissemination of the Roman artefacts occurs during the second wave and is represented by the silver and bronze wares of type Eggers 70, 99-100, 102, 124, 137, 140, 142, 144, 155, 160, 168, 169, silver jugs, fine red fabric pottery wares covered with red slips produced in Asia Minor workshops, glass wares of type Isings 6, 14, 28b, 52c, brooches, mirrors, Egyptian faience objects, pyxides etc. According to the topography and composition of the inventories of the archaeological features, the author concludes that some categories of Roman artefacts (early hinged Roman brooches, bronze wares of type Eggers 70, silver jugs, glass wares made in the millefiori technique, pyxides, the Egyptian faience objects) emerged in the north of the Black Sea once with their holders – the Sarmatians arriving from Asian Sarmatia in the second half of the 1st c. AD. The author also notes the presence of earlier artefacts in certain graves with second wave imports.

The analysis of the Roman imports performed by A. V. Simonenko is, in our view, a significant contribution to the study of contacts between the nomad and sedentary peoples in this part of the European continent, contacts which lead to the emergence of superior cultures, with no resemblance to those which they replace. Given the inventories of the analysed archaeological features, but also the diversity of the artefacts in the Sarmatian environment from the immense space the Sarmatians inhabited, we believe this work has fulfilled its goal. Furthermore, we believe it is a good example of how Roman artefacts in the barbarian environment may contribute in explaining certain aspects of the Roman-barbarian relations. It may also be a good example for the accomplishment of similarly promising studies for the inter-barbarian relations.

Without taking into consideration our few comments as well as the not many errors, which are most often inevitable in the case of such works, we wish to mention that the material and analysis carried out by the author represent a substantial and remarkable contribution to the knowledge of the Roman material culture from the Sarmatian environment especially, and the *Barbaricum* in general. Furthermore, A. V. Simonenko's effort to

accomplish this monograph, much improved compared to that of 2008 and expected with much interest in the specialty scientific environment is admirable and commendable. Last but not least, we congratulate the authors for the very good illustration and the editors for the good text editorship.

We wish to thank once more the author for introducing in the European scientific circuit the numerous archaeological materials as well as their pertinent analysis. Last but not least, we congratulate the author for succeeding to issue a high scientific standing work representing a significant impulse for the study of the Roman artefacts on the territory of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe.

In the end, we wish to congratulate all those who supported, by various means, the preparation and issue of this good quality book and of high scientific standing.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agulnicov, Bubulici 1999 – S. Agulnicov, V. Bubulici, *Tumulul sarmatic din sec. I p. Chr. de lângă satul Cazaclia*, Thraco-Dacica 20, 1-2, p. 287–307.
- Agul'nikov, Bubulici 1999 – S. M. Agul'nikov, V. G. Bubulici, *Sarmatskij kurgan I v. n. e. u s. Kazaklia*, in *Problemy skifo-sarmatskoj arkheologii Severnogo Prichernomor'ya. K 100-letiyu B. N. Grakova*, Zaporzhe, p. 10-15.
- Almgren 1923 – O. Almgren, *Studien über nordeuropäische Fibelformen der ersten nachchristlichen Jahrhunderte, mit Berücksichtigung der provinzialrömischen und südrussischen Formen*. Mannus Bibliothek 32, Leipzig.
- Ambroz 1966 – A. K. Ambroz, *Fibuly yuga evropejskoj chasti SSSR*, SAI D1-30, Moskva.
- Babeş 1999 – M. Babeş, *Ein Tamga-zeichen aus der dakischen Siedlung von Ocnița (Buridava)*, in N. Boroffka, T. Soroceanu (eds.), *Transilvanica, Archäologische Untersuchungen zur älteren Geschichte des südöstlichen Mitteleuropa. Gedenkschrift für Kurt Horedt* (Internationale Archäologie.Studia honoraria) – Band 7, Rahden, p. 223-239.
- Bârcă 2000 – V. Bârcă, *Oglinzile dreptunghiulare din mormintele sarmatice din spațiul carpato-nistean*, Istros 10, p. 295-312.
- Bârcă 2001 – V. Bârcă, *Vasele romane de bronz din mormintele sarmatice din spațiul pruto-nistean*, in G. Florea, G. Gheorghiu, E. Iaroslavschi (eds.), *Studii de Istorie Antică*, Cluj-Napoca, p. 335-361.
- Bârcă 2002 – V. Bârcă, *Das Eindringen der Sarmaten an der unteren und mittleren Donau und ihre Beziehungen zu den Geto-Daker (I. Jh. v. Chr. – I. Jh. n. Chr.)*, in A. Rustoiu, A. Ursuțiu (eds.), *Interregionale und kulturelle Beziehungen im Karpatenraum (2. Jahrtausend v. Chr. - I. Jahrtausend n. Chr.)*, Cluj-Napoca, p. 103-150.

- Bârcă 2002a – V. Bârcă, *Einige Betrachtungen Betreffend das Fundkomplex von Bubueci / (Fundumstände, Forschungsgeschichte, Datierung und ethnische Zuschreibung)*, *Thraco-Dacica* 22/1-2, p. 215-230.
- Bârcă 2004 – V. Bârcă, *Câteva observații cu privire la tezaurile și depozitele sarmatice timpurii (sec. II-I a. chr.) din spațiul dintre Don și Prut*, in Mariana Crînguș, Simona Regep-Vlascici, Atalia Ștefănescu (eds.), *Studia Historica et Arhaeologica. In Honorem Magistrae Doina Benea*, Timișoara, p. 35-63.
- Bârcă 2005 – V. Bârcă, *Brooches din environmentul sarmatic est-carpatic (sec. I a. Chr. – începutul sec. II p. Chr.)*, *Cronologie, origine*, in C. Cosma, A. Rustoiu (eds.), *Comerț și civilizație. Transilvania în contextul schimburilor comerciale și culturale în antichitate*, Cluj-Napoca, p. 119-148.
- Bârcă 2006 – V. Bârcă, *Istorie și civilizație. Sarmatii în spațiul est-carpatic (sec. I a. Chr. – începutul sec. II p. Chr.)*, Cluj-Napoca.
- Bârcă 2006a – V. Bârcă, *Nomazi ai stepelor. Sarmatii timpurii în spațiul nord-pontic (sec. II-I a. Chr.)*, Cluj-Napoca.
- Bârcă 2007 – V. Bârcă, *Vase metalice de import din mediul sarmatic timpuriu (sec. II-I a. Chr.) din spațiul dintre Don și Prut*, in S. Nemeti, F. Fodorean, E. Nemeth, S. Cociș, Irina Nemeti, Mariana Pîslaru (eds.), *Dacia Felix. Studia Michaeli Bărbulescu oblata*, Cluj-Napoca, p. 88-98.
- Bârcă 2009 – V. Bârcă, *Câteva considerații privind vasele metalice de import din mediul sarmatic nord-pontic*, in O. Țentea, I. C. Oprea (eds.), *Near and Beyond the Roman Frontier. Proceedings of a colloquium held in Târgoviște, 16-17 october 2008*, *Supplementum Cercetări Arheologice* 16, București, p. 85-124.
- Bârcă 2011 – V. Bârcă, *The brooches in the North-Pontic Sarmatian Environment (1st C – first half of the 2nd C CE)*, *EphemNap* 21, p. 7-35.
- Bârcă, Symonenko 2009 – V. Bârcă, O. Symonenko, *Călăreții stepelor. Sarmatii în spațiul nord-pontic*, Cluj-Napoca.
- Bojović 1983 – D. Bojović, *Rimske brooches Singidunuma*, Beograd.
- Bolla, Boube, Guillaumet 1991 – M. Bolla, C. Boube, J-P. Guillaumet, *Les situles*, in M. Feugère, C. Rolley (eds.), *La vaisselle tardo-républicaine en bronze*, Dijon, p. 7-22.
- Böhme 1972 – A. Böhme, *Die Fibeln der Kastelle Saalburg und Zugmantel*, Saalburg 29.
- Cociș 2004 – S. Cociș, *Brooches din Dacia romană / The Brooches from Roman Dacia*, Cluj-Napoca.
- Dąbrowska 1988 – T. Dąbrowska, *Bemerkungen zur Entstehung der Przeworsk-Kultur*, *PZ* 63, 1, p. 53-80.
- Eggers 1951 – H. J. Eggers, *Der römische Import im Freien Germanien*, Hamburg.
- Garbsch 1965 – J. Garbsch, *Die norisch-pannonische Frauentracht im 1. und 2. Jahrhundert*, Münchener Beiträge zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte 11, München.
- Grosu 1990 – V. I. Grosu, *Khronologiya pamyatnikov sarmatskoj kul'tury Dnestrovsko-Prut'skogo mezhdurech'ya*, Kishinev.
- Grosu 1995 – V. Grosu, *Sarmatii în spațiul geto-dacic răsăritean*, *ArhMold* 18, p. 133-186.
- Gugl 1995 – Chr. Gugl, *Die römischen Fibeln aus Virunum*, Klagenfurt.
- Kashuba, Kurchatov, Shcherbakova 2001-2002 – M. T. Kashuba, S. I. Kurchatov, T. A. Shcherbakova, *Kochevniki na zapodnoj granitse Velikoj stepi (po materialam kurganov u s. Mokra)*, *Stratum plus* 4, p. 180-252.
- Košćević 1980 – R. Koščević, *Antičke brooches s područja Šiška*, Zagreb.
- Kovpanenko 1986 – G. T. Kovpanenko, *Sarmatskoe pogrebenie I v. n. e. na Yuzhnom Buge*, Kiev.
- Litvinskij 1967 – B. A. Litvinskij, *Dzhunskij mogil'nik i nekotorye aspekty kangyujskoj problemy*, *SA* 2, p. 29-37.
- Marčenko 1996 – I. I. Marchenko, *Siraki Kubani (po materialam kurgannykh pogrebenij Nizhnej Kubani)*, Krasnodar.
- Marčenko, Limberis 2008 – I. I. Marčenko, N. Ju. Limberis, *Römische Importe in sarmatischen und maiotischen Denkmälern des Kubangebietes*, p. 265-400, pl. 1-222, in A. Simonenko, I. I. Marčenko, N. Ju. Limberis, *Römische Importe in sarmatischen und maiotischen Gräbern zwischen Unterer Donau und Kuban*, Mainz.
- Mordvintseva, Trejster 2007 – V. Mordvintseva, M. Trejster, *Proizvedeniya torevniki i yuvelirnogo iskustva v Severnom Prichernomor'e 2 v. do n. e. – 2 v. n. e., I-III*, Simferopol'-Bonn.
- Oboldueva 1988 – T. G. Oboldueva, *Kurgany na aryke Dzhun*, *SA* 4, p. 157-168.
- Oldenstein 1976 – J. Oldenstein, *Zur Ausrüstung römischer Auxiliareinheiten. Studien zu Beschlägen und Zierat an der Ausrüstung der römischen Auxiliareinheiten des obergermanisch-raetischen Limesgebietes aus dem zweiten und dritten Jahrhundert n. Chr.*, 57. BerRGK, 1976, p. 49-284.
- Pachkova 2006 – S. P. Pachkova, *Zarubinskaya kul'tura i latenezirovannyye kul'tury Evropy*, Kiev.
- Patek 1942 – E. Patek, *Verbreitung und Herkunft der römischen Fibeln in Pannonien* (*DissPann* 2, 19), Budapest.
- Peškař 1972 – I. Peškař, *Fibeln aus der römischen Kaiserzeit in Mähren*, Praha.
- Petrovsky 1993 – R. Petrovsky, *Studien zu römischen Bronzegefäßen mit Meisterstempeln*, KSARP 1, Buch am Erlbach.
- Popa 2007 – Al. Popa, *Flabella im Barbaricum? Überlegungen zu einer Fundgruppe bronzenen Gegenstände aus dem Gebiet jenseits der Provinzen Dacia und Moesia inferior*, *Germania* 85, p. 329-347.
- Popa 2009 – Al. Popa, *Consemnări asupra mormântului de la Talmaza și a inventarului lui. Notă despre*

- răspândirea evantaielor romane în Barbaricum-ul European, *EphemNap* 19, p. 79-108
- Popa 2010 – Al. Popa, *Einige Bemerkungen zu den provinzial-römischen Gefäßen aus dem kaiserzeitlichen Grabkomplex von Olăneşti in der Republik Moldau*, in S. Mustăţă, Al. Popa, J.-P. Abraham (eds.), *Arheologia între ştiinţă, politică şi economia de piaţă*, Chişinău, 2010, p. 58-84
- Puzdrovskij 2007 – A. E. Puzdrovskij, *Krymskaya Skifiya II v. do n. e. – III v. n. e. Pogrebal'nye pamyatniki*, Simferopol.
- Raev 1986 – B. A. Raev, *Roman Imports in the Lower Don Basin*, BAR Int. Ser. 278, Oxford.
- Raev 1994 – B. A. Raev, *Bronze vessels of the late La Tène period from Sarmatia*, in *Akten des 10. Internationalen Tagung über antike Bronzen*, Freiburg, 18-22 Juli 1988, Stuttgart, p. 347-353.
- Redina, Simonenko 2002 – E. F. Redina, A. V. Simonenko, „Klad” kontsa II-I v. do n. e. iz Veseloy Doliny v krugu analogichnyh drevnostej Vostochnoj Evropy, *MIAK* 2, p. 78-96.
- Riha 1979 – E. Riha, *Die römischen Fibelen aus Augst und Kaiseraugst*, Augst.
- Riha 1994 – E. Riha, *Die römischen Fibelen aus Augst und Kaiseraugst. Die Neufunde seit 1975*, Augst.
- Rustoiu 1997 – A. Rustoiu, *Fibulele din Dacia preromană (sec. II î. e. n. – I e. n.)*, Bucureşti.
- Simonenko 1997 – A. V. Simonenko, *Eine sarmatische Bestattung vom südlichen Bug*, *Eurasia Antiqua* 3, p. 389-407.
- Simonenko 1998 – A. V. Simonenko, *Figurnye sosudy v vide barana v sarmatskih pogrebeniyakh*, in *Antichnaya tsivilizatsiya i varvaskij mir* 1, Krasnodar, p. 67-75.
- Simonenko 2001 – A. V. Simonenko, *Pogrebenie u s. Chisten'koe i „strannye” komplekсы poslednikh vekov do n. e.*, *NAV* 4, p. 92-106.
- Simonenko 2003 – A. V. Simonenko, *Glass and Faience Vessels from Sarmatian Graves of Ukraine*, *JGS* 45, p. 41-57.
- Simonenko 2004 – A. V. Simonenko, *Khronologiya i periodizatsiya sarmatskih pamyatnikov Severnogo Prichernomor'ya*, in *Sarmatskie kul'tury Evrazii: Problemy regional'noj khronologii*, Krasnodar, p. 134-173.
- Simonenko 2005 – A. V. Simonenko, *Tiraspol'skie kurgany, „strannye komplekсы” i siraki na Dnestre*, in *Chetvertaya Kubanskaya arkheologicheskaya konferentsiya*, Krasnodar, p. 255-260.
- Simonenko 2008 – A. V. Simonenko, *Römische Importe in sarmatischen Denkmälern des nördlichen Schwarzmeergebietes*, p. 1-94, pl. 1-168, in A. Simonenko, I. I. Marčenko, Natal'ja Ju. Limberis, *Römische Importe in sarmatischen und maiotischen Gräbern zwischen Unterer Donau und Kuban*, Mainz.
- Simonenko 2010 – A. V. Simonenko, *Sarmatskie vsadniki Severnogo Prichernomor'ya*, St. Petersburg.
- Skripkin 1984 – A. S. Skripkin, *Dva pogrebeniya rannego zheleznogo veka iz Prikuban'ya*, in *Drevnosti Evrazii v skifo-sarmatskoe vremea*, Moskva, p. 218-224.
- Teodor, Țau 1996 – S. Teodor, S. Țau, *Obiecte de port și podoabă din așezarea geto-dacică de la Poiana, jud. Galați (I). Brooches*, *ArhMold* 19, p. 57-106.
- Ulbert 1959 – G. Ulbert, *Die römischen Donaukastelle Aislingen und Burghöfe*, *Limesforschungen* 1, Berlin.
- Völling 1994 – T. Völling, *Studien zu Fibelformen der jüngeren vorrömischen Eisenzeit und ältesten römischen Kaiserzeit*, 75. *BerRGK*, p. 147-282.
- Wielowiejski 1985 – J. Wielowiejski, *Die spätkeltischen und römischen Bronzegefäße in Polen*, 66. *BerRGK*, p. 123-320.

Vitalie Bărcă

Mihai Bărbulescu, *Inscripțiile din castrul legionar de la Potaissa. The Inscriptions of the Legionary Fortress at Potaissa*, Editura Academiei Române, Bucharest, 2012, 288 p.

Between 1971 and 2010, Professor M. Bărbulescu led 40 seasons of archaeological excavations in the fortress of *legio V Macedonica* at Potaissa, which produced a rich amount of discoveries. Some results were published in several books (Bărbulescu 1987, Bărbulescu 1994, Bărbulescu 1997, Bărbulescu 2004, Bărbulescu 2008, Pîslaru 2009) and numerous papers.

In this bilingual English-Romanian volume, B. gathers all the epigraphic evidence originating in Potaissa fortress from its foundation c. AD 170 until c. AD 270, when it was abandoned. Before coming to the proper

contents of the book, i. e. the dealing with the inscriptions, B. discusses in an extensive introduction the epigraphic research carried out at Potaissa from the medieval times until 2003. Originating in his interest toward the history of archaeology, this chapter represents a debt of gratitude to the many researchers whose works constitute major advances in the study of the epigraphic evidence relating to the history of the legion and its fortress.

Among the 67 inscriptions included in the book some were already published in CIL, others by different researchers or by B. himself and the rest, many of which

ABRÉVIATIONS

- ActaArchCarp – Acta Archaeologica Carpathica, Cracovia
ActaArchHung – Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, Budapest
ArchRozhledy – Archeologické rozhledy, Praga
ACMIT – Anuarul Comisiunii Monumentelor Istorice, București
ActaMN (AMN) – Acta Musei Napocensis, Cluj
ActaMP – Acta Musei Porolissensis, Zalău
AD – Ἀρχαιολογικὸν Δελτίον. Μελέτες. Athina : Tameio Archaiologikon Poron kai Apallotrioseon.
AÉ – Année Épigraphique, Paris
AEM – Archäologisch-Epigraphische Mitteilungen aus Österreich-Ungarn, Wien
AEMTh – Το Αρχαιολογικό Έργο στη Μακεδονία και Θράκη
AIIA – Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie, Iași
AION Annali dell'Istituto Orientale di Napoli, Napoli
AISC – Anuarul Institutului de Studii Clasice, Cluj
AJA – American Journal of Archaeology, Boston
AJPH – American Journal of Philology, Baltimore
AMNG I.1 – B. Pick, *Die Antiken Münzen Nord-Griechenlands I.1. Die Antiken Münzen von Dacien und Moesien*, Berlin, 1898.
AMNG I.2 – B. Pick, K. Regling, *Die antiken Münzen Nord-Griechenlands I.2. Die antiken Münzen von Dacien und Moesien*, Berlin, 1910.
Anali – Anali. Spisania za istorija, clasičeska kultura i iskustvoznania, Sofia
AncWestEast – Ancient West & East, Leiden
AnnBolland – Annalecta Bollandiana, Bruxelles
ANRW – *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*, Berlin – New York, 1972–1998
Apulum – Acta Musei Apulensis, Alba Iulia
ArchWarszawa – Archeologia. Rocznik Instytutu Historii Kultury Materialnej Polskiej Akademii Nauk, Warszawa
ArchAnz – Archäologischer Anzeiger, Berlin
ArchBulgarica – Archaeologia Bulgarica, Sofia
ArchÉrt – Archaeologiai Értesítő, Budapest
ArchKorr – Archäologisches Korrespondenzblatt, Mainz
ArhMold – Archeologia Moldovei, Iași
Arkheologiya (Kyiv) – Arkheologiya. Natsional'na akademiya nauk Ukraini. Institut Arkheologii, Kyiv.
ArhPregled – Arheološki Pregled, Belgrad
ArheologijaSofia – Arheologija. Organ na Arheologičeskija i Muzej, Sofia
ASGE – Arheologičeskij sbornik Gosudarstvennogo Ermitazha, Leningrad.
AÚSNitra – Archeologický ústav SAV, Nitra
Balcanica – Balcanica. Annuaire de l'Institut des Études Balkaniques, Bucarest
BAR Int. Ser. – British Archaeological Reports, International Series, Oxford.
BBKL – *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon*, 20 vols., Herzberg, 1975–2002
BCH – Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique, Athènes, Paris
BCMI – Buletinul Comisiunii Monumentelor Istorice, București
BerRGK – Bericht der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Frankfurt am Main
BHAUT – Bibliotheca Historica et Archaeologica Universitatis Timisiensis, Timișoara

Dacia N.S., tome LVIII, Bucarest, 2014, p. 381-384

- BMC – H. Mattingly, *Coins of Roman Empire in the British Museum*, London, 6 vol., 1923–1962
- BMI – Buletinul Monumentelor Istorice, București
- BNSR – Buletinul Societății Numismatice Române, București
- BNF – Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris
- Broughton, *Magistrates* – T. Robert S. Broughton, *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*, I-II, New York, 1952; *Supplement*, New York, 1960
- BSNR – Buletinul Societății Numismatice Române, București
- BS – *Bibliotheca Sanctorum*, 12 vol., Roma, 1961–1970
- BSAcad. – Buletin Științific al Academiei Republicii Populare Române. Seria Științe istorice, filologice și economico-juridice, București
- BullÉp (BÉ) – Bulletin Épigraphique, Paris
- ByzZ – Byzantinische Zeitschrift, München
- CAB – Cercetări Arheologice în București, Muzeul Municipiului București, București
- CArch – Cahiers Archéologiques, Paris
- CCG – Cahiers du Centre Gustav-Glotz, Publications de la Sorbonne, Paris
- Cercetări Arheologice – Cercetări Arheologice. Muzeul Național de Istorie a României, București
- CIL – *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, Berlin
- CIMRM – J. M. Vermaseren, *Corpus Inscriptionum et Monumentorum Religionis Mithriacae*, 2. vol., 1956–1960.
- CIRB – V. V. Struve et al., *Corpus Inscriptionum Regni Bosporani*, Leningrad, 1965
- CJ – The Classical Journal, Athens
- CN – Cercetări numismatice, Muzeul Național de Istorie a României, București
- ClAnt – Classical Antiquity, Berkeley, California
- CRAI – Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, Paris
- CRR (Grueber) – H. A. Grueber, *Coins of the Roman Republic in the British Museum*, 3 vol., London, 1910
- Dacia – Dacia. Fouilles et recherches archéologiques en Roumanie, București
- Dacia N.S. – Dacia (Nouvelle Série). Revue d'archéologie et d'histoire ancienne, București
- DACL – *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie*, 15 vols., Paris, 1899
- DECA – *Dictionnaire Encyclopédique du Christianisme Ancien*, Paris, 1990
- DHA – Dialogues d'Histoire ancienne, Université de Franche-Comté, Paris
- DNP – Der neue Pauli, Stuttgart
- DID – *Din Istoria Dobrogei*, București, 1965–1971
- DissPann – Dissertationes Pannonicae. Ex Instituto Numismatico et Archaeologico Universitatis de Petro Pázmány nominatae Budapestensis provenienties, Budapest
- DIVR – D.M. Pippidi (ed.), *Dicționar de istorie veche a României (Paleolitic – sec. X)*, București, 1976
- DHGE – *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques*, 29 vols, Paris, 1912–2008
- Dolgozatok – Régészeti Dolgozatok Dissertationes Archaeologicae, Budapest
- EDR – *Ephemeris Dacoromana*. Annuario della Scuola Romana di Roma
- Epigr.-Travaux – *Epigraphica. Travaux dédiés au VIIe Congrès international d'épigraphie grecque et latine (Constantza, 9-15 septembre 1977)*, recueillis et publiés par D. M. Pippidi et Em. Popescu, București, 1977
- EphemNap (EN) – Ephemeris Napocensis, Cluj-Napoca
- FHDR I – II – *Fontes ad historiam Dacoromaniae pertinentes*, I-II, București, 1964–1970
- File de Istorie – File de Istorie, Muzeul Județean Bistrița Năsăud, Bistrița
- EAIVR – Enciclopedia Arheologiei și Istoriei Vechi a României (ed. C. Preda), București, 1994
- ED – Ephemeris Daco-Romana, Annuario della Scuola Romana di Roma, București–Roma
- ÉPRO – Études préliminaires aux religion orientales dans l'Empire romain, Leiden
- FHG – C. Müller (ed.), *Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum*, 6 vol., Paris, 1855–1878
- File de Istorie – File de Istorie, Muzeul Județean Bistrița Năsăud, Bistrița
- FÖ – Fundberichte aus Österreich, Wien.
- GGM – C. Müller (ed.), *Geographi Graeci minores*, Paris, 1882
- GRBS – Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies, Duke.
- IDR – *Inscripțiile Daciei romane*, 1977–2001
- IDRE – C. C. Petolescu, *Inscriptiones Daciae Romanae. Inscriptions externes concernant l'histoire de la Dacie*, I-II, București, 1996–2000

- IGB – G. Mihailov, *Inscriptiones Graecae in Bulgaria Repertae*, 5 vol., Sofia, 1958–2001.
- IG VII – W. Dittenberger (éd.), *Inscriptiones Graecae VII : Megaridis, Oropiae, Boeotiae*, Berlin 1892.
- IGR – *Inscriptiones Graecae ad Res Romanas Pertinentes*, Paris
- IGUR – *Inscriptiones Graecae Urbis Romae*, Rom
- IK – *Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien*, Bonn
- ILB – B. Gerov, *Inscriptiones Latinae in Bulgaria Repertae*, Sofia, 1989
- ILD – C. C. Petolescu, *Inscripții Latine din Dacia*, București, 2010
- ILS – H. Dessau, *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, Berlin, I (1892), II (1902), III (1916)
- INHA – Institut national d'histoire de l'art, Paris
- ISM – *Inscripțiile din Scythia Minor*, București, I (1983), II (1987), III (1999), V (1980)
- ISTA – Institut des Sciences et Techniques de l'Antiquité, Université de Franche-Comté, Besançon
- IzvestijaSofia – Izvestija na Arheologičeskija Institut, Sofia
- IzvestijaŠumen – Izvestija na Narodnija Muzej, Šumen
- JAMÉ – A nyíregyházi Jósza András Múzeums von Nyíregyháza, Nyíregyháza
- JGZM – Jahrbuch des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums, Mainz
- JÖAI (ÖJh) – Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Institutes in Wien, Wien
- JHS – Journal of Hellenic Studies, London
- JRS – Journal of Roman Studies, London
- KSIIMK – Kraskie Soobščeniija Instituta Istorii Material'noj Kul'tury Akademii Nauk SSSR, Moskva – St. Petersburg
- KSIAU – Kraskie Soobščeniija Instituta Arheologii Ukrainy, Kyiv
- LEC – *Les Études Classiques*, Bruxelles
- LGPN – *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, Oxford
- MAN – Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institut, London
- MCA – Materiale și Cercetari Arheologice, București
- MitrArd – *Mitropolia Ardealului*, Sibiu
- MRR – E. Babelon, *Description historique et chronologique des monnaies de la république romaine vulgairement appelées monnaies consulaires*, 2 vols., Paris, 1885–1886.
- Mühlhäuser Beiträge – Mühlhäuser Beiträge, Mühlhausen
- NK – Numizmatikai Közlöny, Budapest
- ODB – *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, 3 vols., New York–Oxford, 1991
- OPEL – *Onomasticon Provinciarum Europae Latinarum*, Wien
- OrChrPer – *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, Roma
- QS – Quaderni di storia, Roma
- QTNAC – Quaderni Ticinesi di Numismatica e Antichità classiche, Lugano
- PamArch – Památky Archeologické, Praha
- Pest Megyei múzeumi füzetek, Szentendre
- Peuce – Peuce, Tulcea
- PME – H. Devijver, *Prosopographia militiarum equestrium quae fuerunt ab Augusto ad Gallienum*, 5 vol., Louvain, 1976–1993.
- PIR – *Prosopographia Imperii Romani, saec. I-III*, ed. II, Berlin-Leipzig.
- RB – Revista Bistriței, Bistrița Năsăud
- RA – Revue archéologique, Paris
- RE – Realencyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft, Stuttgart, 1893 sqq.
- REG – Revue des Études Grecques, Paris
- REL – Revue des Études Latines, Paris
- RevBistriței – Revista Bistriței, Bistrița
- RIB – Roman Inscriptions of Britain, London
- RIR – Revista istorică română, București
- RIU – Römische Inschriften Ungarns, Budapest
- RMD – M.M. Roxan, P. Holder, *Roman Military Diplomas*, 5 vol., London, 1978–2006.
- RN – Revue Numismatique, Paris
- RPAN – Revista de preistorie și antichități naționale, București
- RRC (Crawford) – M. H. Crawford, *The Roman Republican Coinage*, 2 vol., Cambridge, 1974
Amsterdam 1979–2005, Boston 2006–

- SAI – Studii și Articole de Istorie, București
 Sargetia – Acta Musei Devensis, Deva
 SCIV(A) – Studii și cercetări de istorie vecie (și arheologie), București
 SCN – Studii și Cercetări de Numismatică, București
 SCȘ Cluj – Studii și cercetări științifice, Cluj
 SEG – *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, Leiden 1923–1971, Alphen aan den Rijn 1979–1980, Amsterdam 1979–2005, Boston 2006–.
 SNR – Schweizerische Numismatische Rundschau, Lausanne
 SP – Studii de Preistorie București
 Specimina Nova – Specimina Nova. Dissertationes ex Instituto Historico Universitatis Quinqueecclesiensis de Ianno Pannonio nominatae, Pécs
 SNGCop – *Sylloge nummorum Graecorum*, Copenhagen 1944–2000.
 SNR – Schweizerische Numismatische Rundschau, Lausanne
 Studia Antiqua et Archaeologica, Iași
 StCl – Studii Clasice, București
 StComPitești – Studii și Comunicări, Pitești
 StComSibiu – Studii și Comunicări, Sibiu
 StTeol – Studii Teologice, București
 Studien und Forschungen – Studien und Forschungen, Offenbach am Main
 TAM – Tituli Asiae Minoris, Wien
 TD – Thraco-Dacica, Institutul de Tracologie, București
 TGF – A. Nauck (ed.), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, editio secunda, Teubner, Leipzig, 1926
 TIB – *Tabula Imperii Byzantini*, Wien, 1976; 1991, 2008
 TIR – *Tabula Imperii Romani*
 TLG – *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*
 TRE – *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, Berlin-New York, 1977-2002
 Tyragetia – Tyragetia. Anuarul Muzeului Național de Istorie a Moldovei, Chișinău
 VDI – Vestnik Drevnej Istorii, Moskva
 VigChr – Vigiliae Christianae, Leiden
 Xenia – Xenia. Konstanzer althistorische Vorträge und Forschungen, Konstanz am Bodensee
 Zeitschrift des Vereins für das Museum schlesischer Altertümer, Breslau
 Zamosius (*Analecta*) – Stephanus Zamosius, *Analecta lapidum vetustorum et nonnularum in Dacia antiquitatum*, Patavii, 1593 (Istvan Szamosközy (Stephanus Zamosius), *Analecta lapidum vetustorum et nonnularum in Dacia antiquitatum*, Patavii, 1593. Inscriptiones Romanae in lapidibus antiquis Albae Iuliae et circa locorum 1598. Classé pour la publication par M. Balázs, I. Monok. Préface par M. Bărbulescu, A. Kovács, Szeged, 1992)
 ZPE – Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik, Bonn
 WiadArch – Wiadomości Archeologiczne, Warszawa
 WN – Wiadomości Numizmatyczne, Warszawa