EPHEMERIS NAPOCENSIS

XXI
2011

În ţară revista se poate procura prin poştă, pe bază de abonament la: EDITURA ACADEMIEI ROMÂNE, Calea 13 Septembrie nr. 13, sector 5, P. O. Box 5–42, Bucureşti, România, RO–76117, Tel. 021–411.90.08, 021–410.32.00; fax. 021–410.39.83; RODIPET SA, Piaţa Presei Libere nr. 1, Sector 1, P. O. Box 33–57, Fax 021–222.64.07. Tel. 021–618.51.03, 021–222.41.26, Bucureşti, România; ORION PRESS IMPEX 2000, P. O. Box 77–19, Bucureşti 3 – România, Tel. 021–301.87.86, 021–335.02.96.

EPHEMERIS NAPOCENSIS

Any correspondence will be sent to the editor:
INSTITUTUL DE ARHEOLOGIE ŞI ISTORIA ARTEI
Str. M. Kogălniceanu nr. 12–14, 400084 Cluj-Napoca, RO
e-mail: choprean@yahoo.com

DTP şi tipar: MEGA PRINT
Coperta: Roxana Sfârlea

ACADEMIA ROMÂNĂ
INSTITUTUL DE ARHEOLOGIE ŞI ISTORIA ARTEI

EPHEMERIS NAPOCENSIS

XXI

2011

EDITURA ACADEMIEI ROMÂNE

SUMAR – SOMMAIRE – CONTENTS – INHALT

STUDIES

ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND EPIGRAPHICAL NOTES

REVIEWS

Aleksandr Simonenko, Ivan I. Marčenko, Natali'ja Ju. Limberis, *Römische Importe in sarmatischen und maiotischen Gräbern zwischen Unterer Donau und Kuban*, (Archäologie in Eurasien 25), Verlag Philipp von Zabern Mainz, 2008, 629 p., 57 fig., 14 maps, 390 pl., ISBN 978-3-8053-3954-4.

There are four decades since V. V. Kropotkin[1] published his monograph on Roman imports in eastern Europe, which, although more or less appreciated over time, remained until recent times the single major contribution for this region. Since then, except for works addressing certain categories of Roman and Roman provincial artifacts from north the Black Sea[2], our knowledge, especially that related to Roman imports in the Sarmatian environment, did not significantly improve. Therefore, this monograph on Roman imports in the Sarmatian and Meotian environments in the area between the Lower Danube and the Kuban region markedly adds to the evolution of knowledge concerning the Roman-Barbarian dynamics in eastern Europe. Concurrently, we hope it would encourage future research to bring new data and information regarding the Sarmatians.

From the very beginning we wish to mention that this paper is not only the result of a review obligation, but also the product of enjoyment for having read a complex archaeological monograph dedicated to Roman imports in the Sarmatian and Meotian environments. Beyond the fact that one of the authors is also one of Mr. Aleksandr Simonenko's collaborators, we are convinced that many scholars in the archaeology of Roman artifacts wished to draw up this work or to be among those who drafted it. We believe this is a complex monograph that would certainly be read and referenced for long time ahead.

The monograph *Römische Importe in sarmatischen und maiotischen Gräbern zwischen Unterer Donau und Kuban* authored by Aleksandr Simonenko, Ivan I. Marčenko and Natalija Ju. Limberis is the research result of Roman influences on the peoples in the European *barbaricum*, drafted within the German Archaeological Institute (Deutsches Archäologisches Institut) project financed by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft. In fact, we are dealing with two monographs. The first, titled *Römische Importe in sarmatischen Denkmälern des nördlichen Schwarzmeergebietes*, (p.1–224 and 168 pl.) was prepared by the Kievan scholar Aleksandr Simonenko, while the second, termed *Römische Importe in sarmatischen und maiotischen Denkmälern des* Kubangebietes (p. 265–624 and 222 pl.) is co-authored by Ivan I. Marčenko and Natal'ja. Ju. Limberis. The translation from Russian to German belongs to Ida Nagler. The monographs have abstracts in both Russian and English, those in English being translated by Valéria Kulcsár and Emily Schalk.

[1] KROPOTKIN 1970.

[2] See for instance RAEV 1986; RAEV 1994; RAEV/SIMONENKO/TREISTER 1991; SIMONENKO 2002; SIMONENKO 2003; BÂRCĂ 2001, BÂRCĂ 2004; BÂRCĂ 2006; BÂRCĂ 2009; MORDVINCEVA/TREJSTER 2007; MARČENKO 1996; etc.

The introduction (p. VII–X) was written by Professor Hermann Parzinger, chairman of Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz (Prussian Cultural Heritage Foundation), who presented and briefly discussed a series of aspects related to the work schedule as well as issues connected to the programme "*Formen und Wege der Akkulturation im östlichen Mittelmeerraum und Schwarzmeergebiet in der Antike*" ("*Acculturation means and forms in the eastern area of the Mediterranean basin and the Black Sea during Antiquity*") within project "*Römischer Einfluss auf Sachkultur und Grabritus der Sarmaten und Maioten im nördlichen und nordöstlichen Schwarzmeerraum*" ("*Roman influences in the material culture and funerary rite of the Sarmatians and Meotians in the northern and north-eastern basin of the Black Sea*").

The introduction emphasizes the importance of Roman imports for both the relative and absolute chronology of the Sarmatian period in the analysed area and for the research of main trading routes and imports distribution. Additionally, it underlines the contribution to elucidate historical issues related to intense changes brought by Roman imports in the material culture of the Sarmatians and Meotians. Last but not least, the authors' effort in drafting these monographs and a series of aspects related to the analysis of used artifact categories are mentioned.

The north Pontic area and the Kuban region were basic territories of Sarmatian inhabitancy. The Sarmatians played an important role in the ancient history of the region and the "Sarmatian factor" was significant in these territories, influencing the social-economic and political evolution of neighbouring regions and populations. This region is of special interest for it had contacts with the culture of the Greek cities in the circum-Pontic region six centuries prior the Roman civilisation reaching the area. Nevertheless, it is worth mentioning that similarly to Greek and Hellenistic products influencing the Scythian, Meotian and Sarmatian worlds, Roman products left their mark as well.

A. V. Simonenko underlines in the introductory chapter (p. 4–9) the importance of the study of Roman imports in the north-Pontic Sarmatian environment and specifies the categories of Roman artifacts to be examined. When naming the researchers who published certain Roman artifacts identified in Sarmatian graves, the author points out that the literature failed to provide a clear image on the Roman imports structure within the Sarmatian environment, their dissemination stages and Roman cultural influences over the Sarmatians. A last aspect worth mention is that the author calls attention to the fact analysis was made for objects that are definitely of Roman or Roman provincial origin. Hence, objects that might have been produced in ancient cities north the Black Sea were not object of analysis (beads, certain brooch types, mirrors or adornment objects as well as a series of pottery categories and amphorae).

The catalogue comprises *Terra Sigillata* wares and gems, however they are not historically evaluated. The author argues, including at note 312 in the Russian abstract, that the large quantity and the material specificity require separate examination.

The second chapter (p. 10–12) addresses the current state of Sarmatian culture chronology and periodization (*Forschungsstand zur chronologischen Gliederung der sarmatischen Kultur*). It includes a short review of the state of research on the chronology and periodization of Sarmatian antiquities in the entire space they inhabited over time. A supporter of the migration theory, beside other scholars (A. S. Skripkin, I. V. Sergackov, V. M. Klepikov, V. Ju. Zuev), A. V. Simonenko interprets changes in archaeological cultures as consequences of ethnical regrouping within the Sarmatian environment[3]. This theory is confirmed by archaeological finds[4].

[3] This view was expressed and supported for the first time by M. I. Rostovcev, who largely dealt with migration processes in the Sarmatians history. The migration theory is based on the rigid chronological relations between the Sarmatian culture and the historical events reported by literary sources. Is also pays special attention to boundaries among cultures, although a small transition period is recognized. In this case, it references the ethnic-historical components of two Sarmatian cultures as well the substitution character of one culture by another.

[4] See to this end BÂRCĂ 2006; BÂRCĂ/SYMONENKO 2009.

Following chronological statements, A. V. Simonenko argues (p. 11) that the periodization of the Sarmatian culture may be divided as follows: early Sarmatian culture dated to the 2nd – 1st century BC, the mid Sarmatian culture dated to the 1st – mid 2nd century AD and the late Sarmatian culture in the second half of the 2nd – 4th centuries AD[5].

Based on the analysis of Sarmatian antiquities north the Black Sea, the author proposes a new periodization of the Sarmatian culture in the analysed area[6]. It relies on the fact that a united Sarmatian culture existed north the Black Sea from the 2nd century BC until mid 2nd century AD (p.12). Thus, the Sarmatian culture in the north-pontic region during the 2nd century BC until mid 2nd century AD, which includes the early and mid Sarmatian periods, is defined as the first period, while the late Sarmatian period (second half of the 2nd century – 4th century AD) as the second period. Both periods were divided into stages.

First period: stage A1 – 2nd century BC; stage A2 – end of the 2nd century – 1st century BC; stage A3 – first half of the 1st century AD; stage B (including the horizon of vestiges with features specific to the new wave of Sarmatians coming from the east) – the second half of the 1st century – mid 2nd century AD.

Second period: stage C1 (early) – second half of the 2nd century – first half of the 3rd century AD; stage C2 (late): substage C2a – second half of the 3rd century AD – mid 4th century AD; substage C2b – second half of the 4th century AD.

The proposed periodization, reminiscent of the chronological systems used for antiquities in central and northern Europe, is based on the analysis of artifacts, historical facts, cultural influences and funerary traditions and, as previously mentioned on the author's study of 2004.

The third chapter (p. 13–46), entitled *Chronologie und Herkunft der römischen Importe in sarmatischen Denkmälern des nördlichen Schwarzmeergebietes* tackles the chronology and origin of Roman imports in the north-Pontic Sarmtian environment. The analysis is based on a vast bibliography (p. 86–94) and considers iron (p. 13–17) and bronze wares (p. 17–21), glass wares (p. 21–28), pottery (28–29), bone pyxides (p. 30), dress and embellishment objects (p. 30–38), military equipment/weaponry (p. 39–43), household items (p. 43–44) etc. This chapter also includes 31 figures with pictures and good quality drawings.

The conclusions chapter (p. 47), of which we shall speak later, is followed by the two abstracts drawn in Russian (p. 48–50) and English (p. 51–53) and the catalogue of Roman and Roman provincial imports in the north-Pontic Sarmatian environment on current Ukrainian territory (p. 54–85). Roman artifacts within Sarmatian complexes discovered on the territory of the Republic of Moldova were not taken into account. This is explainable if we bear in mind that approximately 1000 Sarmatian graves were investigated there, which accounts enough material for a separate study on Roman imports[7].

The most accurate and rigourous catalogue of finds (p. 54–85) contains 168 plates that include very good drawings of Roman artifacts and other objects discovered within complexes. All Roman artifacts analysed, benefit of good quality descriptions as well. General layouts of archaeological settings, indicative of objects find spots inside complexes, are also most often given. The catalogue and illustration furthermore prove both the author's efforts but also the difficulties in distinguishing between Roman provincial objects and those manufactured in the Greek cities in the Black Sea region, like for instance the adornment objects and dress items, whose production centre was hard to establish.

---

[5] This periodization based on the typological and chronological analysis of items among grave goods correlated with the peculiarities of funerary rites, mirrors best realities in this region. Moreover, such periodization coincides with that for the rest of the territories inhabited by the Sarmatians, which is indicative of the relation of the latter with vestiges west of Don river, representing the western part of the Sarmatin world.

[6] This periodization was drafted following the analysis of Sarmatian vestiges in the north-Pontic area of 2004 (SIMONENKO 2004, 134–173).

[7] For various categories of Roman artifacts see BÂRCĂ 2000, 295–312; BÂRCĂ 2001, 335–361; BÂRCĂ 2005, 119–148; BÂRCĂ 2006; BÂRCĂ 2009, 85–124; BÂRCĂ/SYMONENKO 2009.

We believe it would have been useful to include in the catalogue information on the year of discovery. In addition, any chronological inference would have been eased if the discovery context were more critically analysed. In our view, it would have been useful if the bibliography, including the study of Roman imports in the Kuban region, would have included, where applicable, all works that published the complex, the item/items and their proposed dating. It would have also been beneficial for each find if the proposed dating were mentioned within a column, which is also valid for Ivan I. Marčenko and Natali'ja Ju. Limberis's study. This would have furthermore emphasised the considerable effort of the authors, even though the more accurate dating of certain complexes and objects is provided within the text when tackling proper artifacts.

Following the catalogue analysis of A. V. Simonenko's work, one may notice that three quarters of the analysed Roman artifacts frame in the mid Sarmatian period (1st – mid 2nd century AD) of the traditional periodization or period I stages A3 and B in A. V. Simonenko periodization. Within the central-European chronological system, they frame in stages B1 and B2 of the Roman imperial period.

The first category of examined objects consists of silver wares represented by bowls (p. 13–15), cups (p. 15–16, cat. no. 99, 1, pl. 104, 1, 1a, 1b), *kantharoi* (p. 16–17, cat. no. 99, 2, pl. 105, 1, cat. 85, 5, pl. 73, 2b-c) and beakers (p. 17, cat. no. 70, 7, pl. 62, 1–4, cat. no. 102, 1, pl. 115, 2) whose distribution is illustrated on plate 167. Silver wares, also include beside Roman products, copies made by local workshops (north-Pontic), like for instance the Vesnjanoe cup. This problem is also found in the case of other artifacts types, like pyxides (p. 30), spoons (p. 44) and Egyptian faience pendants (p. 46). Regarding the bone pyxides, the author notes they mainly come from graves belonging to new Sarmatian waves penetrating this area starting with mid 1st century AD from east of Don.

Bronze wares are represented by casseroles (p. 17–18), strainers (p. 18), boilers (p. 18), situlae (p. 18), terrines (p. 19), *paterae* (p. 20), cups (p. 20) and bowls (p. 21). Amongst, most numerous are the terrines (8 ex.) followed by casseroles (6 ex.). The first are represented by Eggers type 99–100 terrines (cat. no. 49, 1, 70, 4, 95, 1, 114, 2, pl. 39, 2, 60, 97, 1, 125) and Eggers type 70 (cat. 36, 1, pl. 28, 2) and not 72. Regarding the terrines in the graves at Novofilippovka (T 1) and Ust'-Kamenka (T 38 G 1, T 45 G 1), cat. no. 62, 1, 63, 4, 123, 1, pl. 47, 1, 49, 1, 141, 2, assigned to Eggers type 70, we believe they may not be assigned to this type. We should mention that we known no analogies among Roman provincial items during the imperial period. Nonetheless, they might have been manufactured by a Roman provincial workshop from the eastern side of the Empire. Casseroles are represented by pieces belonging to Eggers types 137 (Cvetna), 140 (Trojany, Krasnopolka), 142 (Novo-Petrovka) and 144 (Čuguno-Krepinka).

The situlae from Mar'evka and Veseloja Dolina differentiate in shape from the *situlae* of Eggers types 18–20 or 21–23 by arched shoulders and more globular body. Moreover, they have neither attachments and orifices nor other prints indicative of their existence. *Situlae* of similar shape and proportions (everted rim, arched projecting shoulders, globular body, maximum diameter located in the upper part), with no bronze or iron attachments or other prints suggesting they were present, are known, beside those mentioned by A. V. Simonenko, also in the Sarmatian grave at Severnyj (T 1 G 9)[8], the cremation grave 1 at Zubowice (Polonia)[9] as well as among finds from Italy, Spain, France and former Yugoslavia[10]. 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 semicircles, attached between the ends with rivets,

[8] SKRIPKIN 1984, 223, fig. 3/III; MARČENKO 1996, 38.
[9] WIELOWIEJSKI 1985, 159, fig. 2; DĄBROWSKA 1988, 71, fig. 12/1.
[10] WIELOWIEJSKI 1985, 157; BOLLA/BOUBE/GUILLAUMENT 1991, 12–13.

which served as attachments for handles. In addition, it is worth mentioning that although these *situlae* are somewhat similar in shape to those of Eggers type 18–20, they firstly differ by the complicated attachment system of the handles, as well as by certain shape aspects. Thus, framing or assignment of these situlae to Eggers types 18–20 or 21–23, as well as their use as analogies seems rather incorrect[11]. In fact, J. Wielowiejski[12] and later other authors[13] expressed the same view in connection to this *situla* type.

The author grants special attention to glass recipients (p. 21–28) represented by *kantharoi*, cups, bowls, dishes, beakers, *balsamaria* etc., which is explainable for A. V. Simonenko authors an ample study on glass wares in the Sarmatian graves on the current territory of Ukraine[14].

With regards to pottery, the author discusses only the figurative pottery (p. 28–29), represented by the ram-shaped vessel from Balki (T 12 G 4) and *amphorae* (p. 29), not many in the north-Pontic Sarmatian environment. Even though ram-shaped vessels in the analysed Sarmatian environment are represented only by the item at Balki, it is worth pointing out, for those interested, that A. V. Simonenko published in 1998[15] a rather consistent study dedicated to these vessels in the Sarmatian environment.

The same chapter addresses in depth adornment and dress items (p. 30–38), with special focus on brooches (p. 30–32), certain earring types (p. 32–33), necklaces (p. 33–35), collars (p. 35–36), bracelets (p. 36–37) and rings (p. 37–38). Without going in too many details, we underline though their rather accurate framing and assignment. The author properly observes that Aucissa-type brooches in the north-Pontic Sarmatian environment come from eastern features graves that belong to new waves of Sarmatians coming from the east starting with mid 1st century AD. The author specifies that in the Sarmatian environment, the dating of Aucissa-type brooches should not be limited to the mid 1st century AD. Beyond the fact that brooches of the type were in use over the period between the last decade of the 1st century BC and the third quarter of the 1st century AD[16], they were occasionally worn, even though out-fashioned, also in the Roman provincial environment by the start of the 2nd century AD[17]. The brooch with strongly curved bow and inner chord of G 2 at Ostrivec-Verteba (type Glüsing A 2a; Völling A 2aI[18]) is, in our view, an import from the Przeworsk environment[19], if we take into account their distribution area and cultural environments where they were commonly used[20]. Regarding the golden "spoon" type brooch in the grave at Sokolova Mogila, we only wish to specify their maximum use period was comprised between the last quarter/end of the 1st century BC until mid/third quarter of the 1st century AD[21]. The brooch at Čuguno-Krepinka (cat. no. 70, 8b, pl. 63, 8) belongs to the type well distributed especially in Moesia Superior. These brooches come from south Danube and emerged in the second half of the 1st century AD and remained in use until the beginning of the 2nd century AD[22].

[11] See the analysis of this type *situlae* in the Sarmatian environment betwen the Don and Prut in BÂRCĂ 2006, 167–170; BÂRCĂ 2006a, 103–106; BÂRCĂ 2007, 92–94.

[12] WIELOWIEJSKI 1985, 157 defines them as *situlae* "*Profilierte Eimer mit eisemem Reifen*".

[13] BOLLA/BOUBE/GUILLAUMENT 1991, 12–13 defines them as "*Situle con cerchiatura in ferro*".

[14] SIMONENKO 2003.

[15] SIMONENKO 1998.

[16] See FEUGÈRE 1985, 333; RIHA 1979, 114–115.

[17] See COCIŞ 2004, 78.

[18] VÖLLING 1994, 222–226.

[19] See BÂRCĂ 2006, 124.

[20] Items of the type were used for a rather short period of time, being discovered in complexes dated to the chronological interval between the end of the 1st century BC – first quarter of the 1st century AD, however some could have remained in use subsequent this period.

[21] See RUSTOIU 1997, 49–50.

[22] See COCIS 2004, 42–44.

Regarding the strongly profiled brooches at Gordeevka T 29 G 2 (cat. no. 115, 2, pl. 126, 6), Porogi T 2 G 2 (cat. no. 119, 2, pl. 133, 12), Čuguno-Krepinka T 2 G 1 (cat. no. 70, 8a, pl. 63, 9) it is worth mentioning that they appeared in the south and east regions of the Alps, from where they were mainly disseminated in the Roman provinces of Noricum, Pannonia and Moesia[23], and outside the borders of the Roman Empire[24] as well. Items of the type are commonly found in pre-Roman Dacia, however especially in the settlements on Siret river basin (Brad, Răcătău, Poiana)[25]. Their high numbers in this part of the territory inhabited by the Geto-Dacians is explained by the workshop manufacturing such brooch type in the second half of the 1st century AD located in the settlement at Poiana[26]. Due to their distribution on vast areas, they may be deemed beside other categories of items, as well mentioned by M. Babeş[27], "supranational" artifacts.

Chronologically, they date to the 1st century AD, being intensely used in its second half[28]. Seldom, some of them are also found by the start of the 2nd century AD, as proven by the finds in Trajanic levels from Roman Dacia[29]. The workshop at Poiana and the rather high number of brooches of the type in the eastern Geto-Dacian environment make us believe that brooches at Gordeevka, Porogi and Čuguno-Krepinka together with those in the Sarmatian graves west the Dniester, are most likely imports from respective environment.

We consider the small-sized, stongly profiled brooches from Porogi T 2 G 1 (cat. no. 118, 2, pl. 132, 12), Semenovka T 11 G 1 (cat. no. 111, 1, pl. 122, 2b), Turlaki T 7 G 1 (cat. no. 109, 5, pl. 121, 8), Pisarevka T 1 G 8 (cat. no. 117, 1, pl. 128, 4), similar to those in the Sarmatian graves west the Dniester[30], are imports from the Geto-Dacian environment of Siret river basin[31]. In fact, in the settlements at Brad and Poiana, workshops producing such brooches were operational[32]. We also underline that, to our knowledge, brooches of the type are no longer found in the north-Pontic Sarmatian environment.

They emerged most likely by mid/second half of the 1st century AD and were in use until the end of the 2nd century AD, since they are missing from Sarmatian graves of the first half of the 2nd century AD in regions east the Carpathians.

Last but not least, it is worth taking into consideration that brooches with tall catch-plate in G 19 at Holmskoe (cat. no. 148, 1, pl. 153, 2d) are not Roman imports, but rather evidence contacts with other population groups (most likely Germanic peoples).

Less numerous are military equipment items and weaponry (p. 39–43). Beside the five Montefortino type helmets, of which three come from finds without any further burial traces, worth mentioning is the scabbard of a Mainz type *gladius* (cat. no. 29, 1, pl. 21, 3a)[33]. These helmets in the Sarmatian environment are related to Sarmatian mercenaries in the army of Mithridates VI Eupator as well as to the military campaigns of Pharnaces II, sovereign of the Bosporan kingdom (BCE 63–47).

---

[23] See ALMGREN 1923, 37, 108; PATEK 1942, 93–94; KOŠČEVIĆ 1980, 20–24, TYPE 11; BOJOVIĆ 1983, 34.

[24] See ALMGREN 1923, 37, 108; AMBROZ 1966, 36; PEŠKAŘ 1972, 79; RUSTOIU 1997, 52–53, type 19c.

[25] See RUSTOIU 1997, 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.

[26] RUSTOIU 1997, 20–21, 52–53.

[27] BABEŞ 1999, 230.

[28] PEŠKAŘ 1972, 79–80; BOJOVIĆ 1983, 34; GUGL 1995, 13–15.

[29] See COCIŞ 2004, 49, types 8a1c1 and 8a1c2.

[30] See BÂRCĂ 2006, 128–130.

[31] RUSTOIU 1997, 54.

[32] RUSTOIU 1997, 20–21.

[33] For the Sarmatian weaponry in the north-Pontic region, see RAEV/SIMONENKO/TREISTER 1991; SIMONENKO 2001; BÂRCĂ 2006, 179–215; BÂRCĂ 2006a, 106–137; BÂRCĂ/SYMONENKO 2009, 257–328.

The last part of the chapter presents synthetically the group of household objects including mirrors, fans, a toiletries box, a scale and two spoons (p. 43–44). The chronological analysis also includes Egyptian faience pendants presented rather briefly (p. 45–46), even though beads are not at all approached.

In the short chapter of conclusion (p. 47), the author establishes based on the analysed material, four dissemination waves of Roman imports in the Sarmatian environment, each wave being named according to a a historical event.

1. The Mithridatic wave – end of the 2nd century – first quarter of the 1st century BC.

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

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

4. The late Roman wave – stage C2 and C3 of the central European chronology.

Following the chronological and typological analysis of Roman imports in the Sarmatian environment in the north-Pontic area, A. V. Simonenko reaches the conclusion they constitute rather compact chronological groups. In addition, the author noticed very well that the massive dissemination of Roman artifacts is placed in the second wave and includes silver and bronze vessels of Eggers types 70, 99–100, 102, 124, 137, 140, 142, 144, 155, 160, 168, 169, silver cups of Syrian origin, *terra sigillata* produced in the workshops of Asia Minor, glass wares of Isings type 6, 14, 28b, 52c, brooches, mirrors, Egyptian faience objects and pyxides etc. According to the topography and complexes inventories, the author concludes that certain categories of Roman artifacts (early Roman hinged- brooches, bronze vessels of Eggers 70 type, silver cups, glass wares made in the millefiori technique, pyxides, Egyptian faience items) emerged north of the Black Sea once with their bearers – Sarmatians coming from Asian Sarmatia in the second half of the 1st century AD.

≈

In the introductory chapter (p. 268–270) of the second monograph titled *Römische Importe in sarmatischen und maiotischen Denkmälern des Kubangebietes* (p. 265–624 and 222 pl.) by Ivan. I. Marčenko and Natal'ja. Ju. Limberis, the authors make a brief review of the state of research of imports in this region. Page 269 provides a map (no. 1) of the Kuban region where all find spots of Roman artifacts to be analysed are marked. This map, well drawn up, facilitates the geographical positioning, especially since the number of each point on the map corresponds to a catalogue number. For easy separation of finds, those in the Sarmatian environment were assigned a geometrical sign, while those in the Meotian another. The authors specify that certain archaeological materials found during the archaeological digs of the last decades could not be analysed in this monograph.

The second chapter (p. 271–323), *Chronologie und Herkunft der römischen Importe in sarmatischen und maiotischen Denkmälern des Kubangebietes* approaches the chronology and origin of Roman imports in the Sarmatian and Meotian environments in Kuban region. The analysis is based on the vast bibliography (p. 391–400) and tackles silver ware (p. 271–275), bronze ware (p. 275–292), glass ware (p. 292–307), pottery (307–308), bone pyxides (p. 309), adornment and dress items (p. 310–318), military equipment and harness pieces (p. 318–319), household objects (p. 320–321) and *varia* in a small subchapter (p. 321–323), examining branch lights (Ust'-Labinskaja (cat. no. 53,5, fig. 18–19), Starokorsunskaja (cat. no. 150, 1–2, pl. 157, 1–2) and bells etc. The chapter also contains 13 maps and 19 figures with good quality pictures of Roman artifacts.

Map no. 2 presents the distribution of silver recipients and shows that in the Kuban region silver *kantharoi* were deposited only in funerary contexts subsequent a long period of use

(p. 272–273). The distribution of bronze vessels, represented by several categories, is illustrated on maps 3–5. Firstly examined are the boilers (p. 275–277), among which that of Debelt type from Tiflisskaja (cat. no. 48, 4, pl. 77, 2) which is similar to those of Novo-Podkrjaž (cat. no. 36, 2, pl. 28, 1) and Ševčenko (cat. no. 135, 1, pl. 144, 2) in the north-Pontic area (p. 18), referenced and analysed by A. V. Simonenko. It would have been useful to map their distribution in eastern Europe, given their Italian origin and common use in the Roman provincial environment. This chapter also briefly tackles *situlae* (p. 277–279). Special attention is given to the analysis of many terrines (p. 279–280) and casseroles (p. 287–288) belonging to a wide typological range, whose spread is illustrated on maps 4–5. The authors might have insisted more on the analysis of Eggers type 99–100 terrines, commonly found in the Barbarian environment of eastern Europe. Only two vessels (cat. no. 45,1, cat. no. 56,1, fig. 8, pl. 86) are represented by strainers, which belong to Eggers type 160 (p. 290–291). Regarding the strainer from the rich Sarmatian grave at Olăneşti (Republic of Moldova) which the authors include as analogy, it is worth mentioning that the grave is dated, in our view, most likely in the first quarter of the 2nd century AD, while the stamp applied on the outer part of the handle is **APRISAC** (*APRI·SAC[II]*) instead of **BRISAC**, as well noticed A. Popa[34].

Rather numerous in the Sarmatian and Moetian environments in the Kuban region are the trilobbed- rim cups of Eggers type 123–125 (p. 281–283), but also the other cup types (p. 283–285), whose distribution is illustrated on map 4.

Idria-type cups (p. 285, cat. 5, 4, pl. 8, 2, cat. 19, 1, pl. 34, 3) and Aylesford-type pans (p. 286–287) are analysed pertinently and in detail. This is also valid for the *paterae* analysis (p. 288–290).

Similarly to the first monograph, the authors also pay special attention to glass recipients (p. 293–307), discovered in large numbers in the Kuban region (see map 6). The chronology and typology of *skyphoi* and *kantharoi*, largely spread in the Kuban region (Map 7, fig. 9, 10, 20) are closely tackled as well. Beside various glass vessels mold and blown in shapes, the authors also present free- blown vessels. Amont the latter, *balsamaria* (p. 303–307) are approached in detail, being rather numerous in the Sarmatian and Meotian environments in the analysed region.

Within the pages dedicated to pottery, the authors present *terra sigillata* and common wares (p. 307–308), to which also add the figurative wares (p. 308 cat. no. 52, 1, pl. 80, 16, cat. no. 46, 2, pl. 72, 2). A brief analysys is made for bone pyxides (p. 309), not many in the region. Compared to the north-Pontic region, deposition of *terra sigillata* within graves of the Sarmatian and Meotian environments of the Kuban region, is scarce (only six closed complexes).

Within the subchapter addressing adornment objects, the Alesia-type brooch of T 1 at Zubovskij (cat. no. 5, 5, pl. 7, 5) is related to Pharnaces II campaign of BC 48–46 (p. 310). In our view, it is not excluded that the grave dated to a later period given the entire grave inventory and the use of Alesia-type brooches also in the 1st century AD. The 10 complexes including Aucissa-type brooches are placed in the first half of the 1st century AD. We believe that the dating of Aucissa-type brooches in the Kuban region should not be limited to mid 1st century AD, especially since they were in use, as above mentioned, also in the second half of the 1st century AD, while in the Roman provincial environment they are ocassionally found also by the start of the 2nd century AD[35]. In fact, in the case of complexes that include such brooch types (cat. no. 115, pl. 127, cat. no. 137, pl. 147, cat. no. 152, pl. 159) it is absolutely obvious they may be dated also in the second half of the 1st century AD[36].

[34] POPA 2008, 207–211.

[35] See COCIŞ 2004, 78.

[36] The disk-shaped mirror with thick rim, perforated lateral handle and cone protuberance by mid disk among the grave goods 228 at Krasnodar (cat. no. 115, pl. 127/3) belongs to the type dated to the 1st century – beginning of

Special attention is granted to the zoomorphic brooch at Ust-Labinskaja (p. 312, cat. no. 54, 5 pl. 84, 8), which is a variant specific to Gaul brooches by the end of the 1st century BC – 1st century AD[37].

Flat, unenamelled brooches are also analysed (p. 312–313), disk-shaped (cat. no. 79, 1, pl. 112, 3, cat. 149, 1, pl. 156, 7), *lunula*-shaped (cat. no. 119, 1, pl. 130, 2) or rhombic (cat. no. 156, 1, pl. 163, 2, cat. no. 32, 6, pl. 62, 4). The common feature of these brooches is the hinged fastening system. All these brooches were extensively used in the Roman Empire, but are also common in other cultural environments of the 1st century AD, including the Geto-Dacian[38].

Enamelled brooches with tall body (*Bügelfibeln*) (p. 314–315) as well as enamelled or glass brooches with flat bodies (5 pieces from 3 complexes) (p. 314–317) are much more numerous in the Kuban region than in graves inventories in the north-Pontic region. For geometric brooches, as well as for other brooch types, it would have been useful to draw on the most ample work on brooches from Gallia[39], but also that for brooches in Roman Dacia[40].

The rings in the 6 complexes (p. 317–318) are deemed Roman imports. Roman artifacts in the rich female grave G 3 of Gorodoskoj (cat. no. 193), whose goods included two enamelled brooches (pl. 202, 10–11), a *balsamarium*, two golden collars, a bronze key (pl. 203, 5) etc. might have been dicussed in more detail. It would have been much better if the authors would have also paid attention to polychrome golden jewelry (like for instance those in cat. no. 12, 1.2, pl.18, cat. no. 48, 5, pl. 74, 1) or the faience items.

Similarly to the north-Pontic region, military equipment pieces, weaponry and harness pieces are few (p. 318–319). Beside the four helmets, of which three are of Montefortino type, the iron helmet at Bojko-Ponura (cat. no. 27, 2, pl. 50, 2) may be compared according to the cap shape and visor to western-Celtic Port- type helmets[41], while according to the cap shape and neck plate with the so-called eastern Celtic helmets[42]. The discussed helmet is similar to the latter also by figurative elements on cheek and back plates[43]. From the shape point of view, the closest analogy for the helmet at Bojko-Ponur is the item from T 2 at Cugir, which is dated to the 1st century BC[44], while from the decoration standpoint, it is similar to those in Slovenia. The helmet in the complex at Bojko-Ponur is dated in our view most likely in the 1st century BC.

The authors believe they reached the Sarmatians following their involvement, on Pharnaces I side, in the war against the states in Asia Minor in BC 183–179[45].

---

the 2nd century AD (see ABRAMOVA 1971, 124–125, 129–131; SKRIPKIN 1990, 153, TI6.10; MARČENKO 1996, 24, 27 type IX/1; BÂRCĂ/SYMONENKO 2009, 173–174), while the mirror in grave 63z at Krasnodar (cat. no. 137, pl. 147/3), which is decorated on the outer part, belong to the variant dated in the Sarmatian environment mainly in the 2nd – mid 3rd century AD (HAZANOV 1963, 65–66, type IX; ABRAMOVA 1971, 129–131; SKRIPKIN 1981, 80–81; BÂRCĂ/SYMONENKO 2009, 246–248). Decorated mirros in the Kuban region are dated only to the 2nd century AD (see MARČENKO 1996, 24, type IX/2). The brooch with returned foot wound to the bow and flat bow in the shape of a ovally extended plate from M 71 at Krasnodar (cat. no. 152, pl. 159/2) also dates over the entire 1st century AD (see AMBROZ 1966, 56).

37 See FEUGÈRE 1985, 282–285, fig. 29 (var.) type 18b2, type 18b4, pl. 102/1335.

38 See RUSTOIU 1997, 61–62.

39 FEUGÈRE 1985.

40 COCIȘ 2004.

41 See ROBINSON 1975, 53; SCHAAFF 1988, 307, fig. 1, 25, 26–28.

42 SCHAAFF 1988, 304 sqq., fig. 1, 24, 20–22.

43 SCHAAFF 1988, 304 sqq., fig. 20–23. The helmet at Bojko-Ponur is adorned with human faces and bull heads in relief made in Celtic-specific manner.

44 CRIȘAN 1980, 80 sqq.; CRIȘAN 1993, 123; BÂRCĂ 1997, 187; BÂRCĂ 1997a, 88, fig. 4/2.

45 This view was expressed by I. I. Marčenko in his work of 1996 (MARČENKO 1996, 71).

Based on the discovery of helmets beside well datable items over the entire area between the Pruth and Volga[46], one may argue they reached the region most likely as war spoil, following the Sarmatians involvement in Mithridates VI Eupator military campaigns[47] against the Roman provinces of Asia and Galatia[48], or by direct purchase from the Celts, when they were in the region[49]. To this end, it is relevant that Appian reports that a detachment of Galatians, led by Bitoites[50] joined Mithridates Eupator's army dispatched in BC 63 to Bosphorus.

It is true that most part of the Etruscan-Italian and Celtic helmets discovered in the area between the Caucasus and the Danube mouths come from much later complexes than their production period.

Beside helmets, the authors mention a *pilum* and a harness piece. The *pilum* comes from the rich complex at Vozdviženskaja (cat. no. 4, 1, pl. 5, 1), whose inventory also includes a silver *kantharos*, a glass *skyphos*, two golden bracelets, a golden oval disk- shaped brooch, a bronze *phalera*, but also a blade with ring-ended handle, three-winged arrowheads, armour scales etc. (pl. 4–6). The harness piece in *lunula* shape has close analogies in J. Oldenstein typology[51] and comes from T 41 at Ust'-Labinskaja (cat. 56, 2, pl. 87, 6), whose inventory also included golden dress appliques, a spear tip, fragments of a mail shirt as well as a bronze Eggers 160 type strainer.

Household objects (p. 320–321) represented by a spoon (cat. no. 33, 1, pl. 63, 1), ladles (cat. 19, 4, pl. 34, 2, cat. no. 67, 2, pl. 95, 2) and scales (cat. 92, 1, pl. 114, 2) are briefly examined. The list of Roman aritfacts ends with the analysis of branch lights (Ust'-Labinskaja (cat. no. 53,5, fig. 18–19), Starokorsunskaja (cat. no. 150, 1–2, pl. 157, 1–2)), bells and a glass loomweight (cat. no. 60, 2, pl. 89, 2).

In some cases, several artifacts, though manufactured in north-Pontic Greek cities or the Bosporan kingdom, are deemed of Roman origin without further explanations, which also seems to be the case of local copies.

The catalogue of finds (p. 334–380), very well drawn up, is divided in two parts. The first contains finds in the Sarmatian environment (cat. no. 1–75), while the second those in the Meotian environment (cat. no. 76–201). It is followed by a table (p. 381–390) containing the list of analysed finds, complying with the catalogue order and numbering, the proposed dating for each find, the number of plates illustrating the pieces to which adds a column listing all Roman artifacts within each find.

The authors' conclusions (p. 324–327) are extremely pertinent and focus on the chronological division of analysed Roman artifacts based on correlations with historical events. According to the analysed material and especially the chronology established for glass *kantharoi* and *skyphoi*, the authors arrange the dissemination waves of Roman imports in the Sarmatian and Meotian environments in the Kuban region as follows:

1. The first imports wave – mid/second half of the 2nd century BC. The authors believe that products in this period are rather trophies of Gatal's Sarmatians, who were involved on Pharnaces I side in the war with states in Asia Minor of BC 183–179.

---

[46] See to this end BÂRCĂ 2004, 35–63; BÂRCĂ 2006, 61–64; BÂRCĂ 2006a, 47–49.

[47] According to Appian (*Mithridates*, 15, 53), the Pontus monarch army included Scythians, Tauri, Bastarnae, Thracians, Sarmatians and other peoples in the Danube and north-Pontic area. The classical author also notes that for a somewhat later period (prior BC 74, when the third Mithridatic war commences), the alliance of the Pontic king included the Royal Sarmatians and the Iazyges (*Mithridates*, 69, 293).

[48] Appian, *Mithridates*, 18–21, 112.

[49] Concerning the view that part of these helmets reached the Sarmatians following clashes with Mithridates VI Eupator troops when they were north the Black Sea (see RAEV/SIMONENKO/TREJSTER 1990, 124; RAEV/SIMONENKO/TREISTER 1991, 470; TREJSTER 1992, 41), we believe it is valid only if those Sarmatians were other than Mithridates VI Eupator allies.

[50] Appian, *Mithridates*, 111.

[51] OLDENSTEIN 1977, 162–165, pl. 44–45.

2. The second imports wave – the first half of the 1st century BC. This wave is related to Mithridates VI Eupator reign. The authors believe that part of the Roman imports reached the Kuban region as trophies following the Sarmatians and Meotians involvement in the Mithridatic wars.

3. The third imports wave – the second half of the 1st century BC. This wave is related to the participation of the Barbarians in the Kuban region in Pharnaces II military campaigns of BC 48–47 in Asia Minor.

4. The fourth imports wave – the first half of the 1st century AD. This wave is related to the events of AD 35, when the Sarmatians were actively involved in the fight between the Iberians and the Parthians. The authors believe that Roman artifacts reached the Kuban region following Sarmatian campaigns in south Caucasus.

5. The fifth imports wave – the second half of the 1st century – mid 2nd century AD. Roman imports in the Kuban region are related to the Alani campaigns in south Caucasus in BC 72 and 114.

6. The last wave of imports – mid – end of the 2nd century AD/ most likely the start of the 3rd century AD. This dissemination wave of imports is related to the Alani invasions in south Caucasus in AD 135 and 197, but also to trade relations.

The authors also briefly discuss trade relations and diplomatic gifts identified among certain grave goods in the Sarmatian and Meotian worlds in the Kuban region. They also name the artifacts specific to a certain wave.

Based on the dating in table from pages 381–390, one may notice that approximately 54% of the total examined Roman artifacts come from the fourth and fifth waves of dissemination of Roman artifacts in the Kuban region, corresponding to the mid Sarmatian period (1st century – mid 2nd century AD).

Following the chronological and typological analysis of the Roman imports in the Sarmatian and Meotian environments in the Kuban region, the authors ascertain they entered the area randomly. Moreover, they also determined that the massive penetration of Roman artifacts (especially of glass wares) occurred in the fifth wave. Last but not least, it is worth considering that the dissemination of Roman imports in this region ceased by the end of the 2nd – start of the 3rd century due to weakened nomad military activity and gradual decline in trade relations. Trade relations came to an end by mid 3rd century for Meotian settlements were no longer inhabited and the nomad riders left Kuban region steppes.

It is certain that the analysis of Roman imports carried out by the authors of the two monographs encourages, in our view, the study of contacts between nomad and sedentary peoples in eastern and southeastern Europe, which led to the establishment of superior cultures, which do not resemble much those which they replaced. Given the inventories of analysed complexes and the diversity of artifacts in the Sarmatian environment over the vast regions they inhabited, we believe that the subject of both Romano-Barbarian and interbarbarian relations is as much as promising. In fact, the two monographs have set a good example to this end and confirmed it is possible.

Disregarding our few comments and the few, often unavoidable errors made by the authors, since he who does not work, makes no error, the material and performed analysis substantially and remarkably contribute to the knowledge on the Roman material culture in the *barbaricum.* Furthermore, the authors' efforts in order to draft these monographs, awaited with so much interest in the scientific environment, are commendable. Last but not least, we congratulate the authors for the great illustration and the editors, for the good editing and the flawless translation from Russian to German.

We must also congratulate the authors for having introduced the considerable archaeological material in the European scientific circuit and for their successful, highly scientific work that would undeniably encourage the study of Roman artifacts on the territory of eastern and southeastern Europe.

In the end, we wish to compliment Mr. Hermann Parzinger for the confidence, support and opportunities granted to researchers from eastern Europe to draw good quality, highly scientific works within the series Archäologie in Eurasien a Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Zentrale und Eurasien Abteilung.

Vitalie Bârcă, Sorin Cociş

REFERENCES

ABRAMOVA 1971
M. P. ABRAMOVA, Zerkala gornyh rajonov Severnogo Kavkaza v pervye veka našej ery. In Istorija i kul'tura Vostočnoj Evropy po arheologičeskim dannym (Moskva, 1971), 121–132.

ALMGREN 1923
O. ALMGREN, Studien ũber nord-europäische Fibelformen (Leipzig 1923).

AMBROZ 1966
A. M. AMBROZ, Fibuly Juga Evropeiskoij časti SSSR, Arheologija SSSR, SAI D1–30 (Moskva 1966).

BABEŞ 1999
M. BABEŞ, Ein tamga-zeichen aus der Dakischen siedlung von Ocnița (Buridava). In N. Boroffka, T. Soroceanu (Hrsg.), Transilvanica, Archäologische Untersuchungen zur Ältern Geschichte der südöstlichen Mitteleuropa. Gedenkschrift für Kurt Horedt. Internationale Archäologie. Studia honoraria – Band 7 (Rahden 1999), 223–239.

BÂRCĂ 1997
V. BÂRCĂ, Die defensive Austrüstung und Bewaffung der Geto-Daker und die dako-rõmische Krieger. In N. Gudea (Hrsg.), Contribuții la cunoaşterea armatei romane din provinciile dacice (ActaMN, 34/1) (Cluj-Napoca 1997), 181–191.

BÂRCĂ 1997a
V. BÂRCĂ, Echipamentul şi armamentul defensiv al geto-dacilor în preajma războaielor daco-romane, Istros VIII, 1997, 83–96.

BÂRCĂ 2000
V. BÂRCĂ, Oglinzile dreptunghiulare din mormintele sarmatice din spațiul carpato-nistrean, Istros X, 2000, 295–312.

BÂRCĂ 2001
V. BÂRCĂ, Vasele romane de bronz din mormintele sarmatice din spațiul pruto-nistrean. In G. Florea, G. Gheorghiu, E. Iaroslavschi (ed.), Studii de Istorie Antică, (Cluj-Napoca 2001), 335–361.

BÂRCĂ 2004
V. BÂRCĂ, Câteva observații cu privire la tezaurele şi depozitele sarmatice timpurii (sec. II–I a. Chr.) din spațiul dintre Don şi Prut. In Mariana Crînguș, Simona Regep-Vlascici, Atalia Ștefănescu (ed.), Studia Historica et Arhaeologica. In Honorem Magistrae Doina Benea, BHAUT, VI (Timişoara 2004), 35–63.

BÂRCĂ 2005
V. BÂRCĂ, Fibulele din mediul sarmatic est-carpatic (sec. I a. Chr. – începutul sec. II p. Chr.). Cronologie, origine, răspândire. In C. Cosma, A. Rustoiu (Hrsg.), Comerț şi civilizație. Transilvania în contextul schimburilor comerciale şi culturale în antichitate (Cluj-Napoca 2005), 119–148.

BÂRCĂ 2006
V. BÂRCĂ, Istorie şi civilizație. Sarmații în spațiul est-carpatic (sec. I a. Chr. – începutul sec. II p. Chr.) (Cluj-Napoca 2006).

BÂRCĂ 2006a
V. BÂRCĂ, Nomazi ai stepelor. Sarmații timpurii în spațiul nord-pontic (sec. II–I a. Chr.) (Cluj-Napoca 2006).

BÂRCĂ 2007
V. BÂRCĂ, Vase metalice de import din mediul sarmatic timpuriu (sec. II–I a. Chr.) din spațiul

dintre Don si Prut. In S. Nemeti, F. Fodorean, E. Nemeth, S. Cociş, Irina Nemeti, Mariana Pîslaru (ed.), Dacia Felix. Studia Michaeli Bărbulescu oblate (Cluj-Napoca 2007), 88–98.

BÂRCĂ 2009
V. BÂRCĂ, Câteva considerații privind vasele metalice de import din mediul sarmatic nord-pontic. In O. Țentea, I. C. Opriş (ed.), Near and Beyond the Roman Frontier. Proceedings of a colloquim held in Târgovişte, 16–17 october 2008, Supplementum Cercetări Arheologice XVI (Bucureşti 2009), 85–124.

BÂRCĂ/SYMONENKO 2009
V. BÂRCĂ, O. SYMONENKO, Călăreții stepelor. Sarmații în spațiul nord-pontic (Cluj-Napoca 2009).

BOJOVIĆ 1983
D. BOJOVIĆ, Rimske fibule Singidunuma (Beograd, 1983).

BOLLA/BOUBE/ GUILLAUMET 1991
M. BOLLA, C. BOUBE, J-P. GUILLAUMET, *Les situles*. In M. Feugère, C. Rolley (ed.), La vaisselle tardo-républicaine en bronze (Dijon 1991), 7–22.

COCIŞ 2004
S. COCIŞ, Fibulele din Dacia romană / The Brooches from Roman Dacia (Cluj-Napoca 2004).

CRIŞAN 1980
I. H. CRIŞAN, Necropola dacică de la Cugir, Apulum XVIII, 1980, 81–87.

CRIŞAN 1993
I. H. CRIŞAN, Civilizația geto-dacilor, I–II (Bucureşti 1993).

FEUGÈRE 1985
M. FEUGÈRE, Les fibules en Gaule Méridionale de la conquêre à la fin du V^e^ siècle après J.-C., Revue Arhéologique de Narbonnaise, Supplément 12, Paris, 1985.

DĄBROWSKA 1988
T. DĄBROWSKA, Bemerkungen zur Entstehung der Przeworsk-Kultur, PZ 63, 1988, 1, 53–80.

GUGL 1995
Chr. GUGL, Die römischen Fibeln aus Virunum (Klagenfurt 1995).

KOŠČEVIĆ 1980
R. KOŠČEVIĆ, Antičke fibule s područja Šiška (Zagreb 1980).

KROPOTKIN 1970
V. V. KROPOTKIN, Rimskie importnye izdelija v Vostočnoj Evrope (II v. do n. e.- V v. n. e.), Arheologija SSSR, SAI D1–27 (Moskva 1970).

MARČENKO 1996
I. I. MARČENKO, Siraki Kubani (po materialam kurgannyh pogrebenij Nižnej Kubani) (Krasnodar 1996).

MORDVINCEVA/TREJSTER 2007
V. MORDVINCEVA, M. TREJSTER, Proizvedenija torevtiki i juvelirnogo iskusstva v Severnom Pričernomor'e 2 v. do n. e. – 2 v . n. e., Tom I–III (Simferopol'-Bonn 2007).

OLDENSTEIN 1977
J. OLDENSTEIN, Zur Ausrüstung römischer Auxiliareinheiten. Studien zu Beschlägen und Zierat an der Ausrüstung der römischen Auxiliareinheiten des obergermanisch-raetischen Limesgebietes aus dem yweiten und dritten Jahrhundert n. Chr., BerRGK 57, 1976, 49–284.

PATEK 1942
E. PATEK, Verbreitung und Herkfunt der römischen Fibeln in Pannonien, DissPann II, 19, 1942.

PEŠKAŘ 1972
I. PEŠKAŘ, Fibeln aus der römischen Kaiserzeit in Mähren (Praha 1972).

POPA 2008
A. POPA, *„APRI·SAC[II]" vs. "BRISAC":* Notă cu privire la ştampila producătorului strecurătorii de bronz de la Olăneşti, EphemNap XVIII, 2008, 207–211.

RAEV 1986
B. A. RAEV, Roman Imports in the Lower Don Basin, BAR Int. Ser. 278 (Oxford 1986).

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 1994), 347–353.
RAEV/SIMONENKO/TREJSTER 1990
B. A. RAEV, A. V. SIMONENKO, M. JU. TREJSTER, Etrussko-italijskie i kel'tskie šlemy v Vostočnoj Evrope. In Drevnie pamjatniki Kubani (Krasnodar 1990), 117–135, 215–222.
RAEV/SIMONENKO/TREISTER 1991
B. A. RAEV, A. V. SIMONENKO, M. JU. TREISTER, Etrusko-Italic and Celtic Helmetes in Eastern Europe, JahrbRGZM 38, 2, 1991 (1995), 465–496.
ROBINSON 1975
H. R. ROBINSON, The Armour of Imperial Rome (London 1975).
RUSTOIU 1997
A. RUSTOIU, Fibulele din Dacia preromană (sec. II î. e. n. – I e. n.) (Bucureşti 1997).
SCHAAFF 1988
U. SCHAAFF, Keltische Helme. In Antike Helme. Monographien RGZM 14 (Mainz 1988), 293–317.
SIMONENKO 1998
A. V. SIMONENKO, Figurnye sosudy v vide barana v sarmatskih pogrebenijah. In Antičnaja civilizacija i varvarskij mir, 1 (Krasnodar 1998), 67–75.
SIMONENKO 2001
A. V. SIMONENKO, Bewaffung und Kriegswesen der Sarmaten und späten Skythen im nördlichen Schwarzmeergebiet, Eurasia Antiqua 7, 2001, 187–327.
SIMONENKO 2002
A. V. SIMONENKO, Latenskij i rimskij import v sarmatskih pogrebenijah Severnogo Pričernomor'ja. In Antičnaja civilizacija i varvarskij mir. Materialy VIII arheologičeskogo seminara (Krasnodar 2002), 94–99.
SIMONENKO 2003
A. V. SIMONENKO, Glass and Faience Vessels from Sarmatian Graves of Ukraine, Journal of Glass Studies 45, 2003, 41–57.
SIMONENKO 2004
A. V. SIMONENKO, Hronologija i periodizacija sarmatskih pamjatnikov Severnogo Pričernomor'ja. In Sarmatskie kul'tury Evrazii: Problemy regional'noj hronologii (Krasnodar 2004), 134–173.
SKRIPKIN 1981
A. S. SKRIPKIN, K probleme hronologii arheologičeskih pamjatnikov Aziatskoj Sarmatii II–IV vv. In Drevnie i srednevekovye kul'tury Povolž'ja (Kujbyšev 1981), 73–87.
SKRIPKIN 1984
A. S. SKRIPKIN, Dva pogrebenija rannego železnogo veka iz Prikuban'ja. In Drevnosti Evrazii v skifo-sarmatskoe vremea (Moskva 1984), 218–224.
SKRIPKIN 1990
A. S. SKRIPKIN, Aziatskaja Sarmatija. Problemy hronologii i eë istoričeskij aspect (Saratov 1990).
TEODOR/ȚAU 1996
S. TEODOR, S. ȚAU, Obiecte de port şi podoabă din aşezarea geto-dacică de la Poiana, jud. Galați (I). Fibule, ArhMold XIX, 1996, 57–106.
TREJSTER 1992
M. Ju. TREJSTER, Kel'ty u Pyvničnomu Pryčornomor'i, Arheologija (Kiev), 2, 1992, 37–51.
VÖLLING 1994
T. VÖLLING, Studien zu Fibelformen der jüngeren vorrömischen Eisenzeit und ältestern römischen Kaiserzeit, BerRGK 75, 1994, 147–282.
WIELOWIEJSKI 1985
J. WIELOWIEJSKI, Die spätkeltischen und römischen Bronzegefäße in Polen, BerRGK 66, 1985, 123–320.

Rome's World: the Peutinger map reconsidered
Richard J. A. Talbert, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, In association with Tom Elliott, Assisted by Nora Harris, Gannon Hubbard, David O'Brien, and Graham Sheperd with a contribution by Martin Steinmann, Cambridge University Press, 2010. Hardback. ISBN: 978-0-521-76480-3, 376 pages, 33 b/w illus., 1 table.

This paper is not only a review of Talbert's book, but a reflection on some important issues related to the *Tabula Peutingeriana*.

Professor Talbert does not need anymore a presentation. But I will remember here some facts regarding his scientific activity, because it is important to see how much work and effort is behind these 376 pages of his book.

In 2000 *Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World*, edited and coordinated by J. A. Talbert, was published. The project won the 2000 Association of American Publishers Award for Best Professional/Scholarly Multivolume Reference Work in the Humanities. Why is this *Atlas* so important? Because with its accompanying *Map-by-Map Directory*, at last provides exact cartographic information regarding the entire classical world. I think is better if we let Talbert characterize the project in his own words: *"Moreover, before the appearance of the Barrington Atlas in 2000, there simply did not exist a set of scholarly modern maps that presented the entire classical world at a useful scale*" (R. J. A. Talbert, R. W. Unger (ed.), *Cartography in Antiquity and the Middle Ages. Fresh perspectives, new methods* (the series *Technology and Change in History*, volume 10), Leiden, Boston, 2008, p. 16).

Another big achievement of Professor Talbert is the book edited in 2008 with R. Unger concerning cartography in Antiquity and the Middle Ages. His article on Greek and Roman mapping is an important overview of the research within this area.

I mentioned these contributions for two reasons. First, the *Atlas* is the first monumental work which introduces historical data on digital maps. Second, Talbert is a very good connoisseur of ancient, medieval and modern cartography. So, in my opinion, the present book is a reflection of these statements.

Why Tabula? Why this interest in a document that has been investigated for more than 100 years? Well, Talbert has the right answer again. In the beginning of his article *Cartography and Taste in Peutinger's Roman Map* (volume *Space in the Roman World. Its Perception and Presentation*, Münster, 2004, p. 113), he confesses: "When colleagues ask what is now engaging my attention after the completion of the *Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World* (Princeton and Oxford, 2000), and I mention Peutinger's Roman map, it is clear that they are puzzled. They regard the map as a thoroughly studied document from which little more is unlikely to be learned. Their impression is understandable, but in fact misplaced. Rather, the Peutinger map belongs in that deceptive category of ancient texts or monuments so familiar to

everyone in our field that a satisfactory edition or presentation is generally assumed to exist, when really there is none". Nothing more true, I would say. So, after 10 years of hard work, finally the book was published.

Before this apparition, Talbert contributed with numerous articles to this topic: *Cartography and taste in Peutinger's Roman Map*, in *Space in the Roman World. Its Perception and Presentation*. Münster, 2004, 113–141; *Author, Audience and the Roman Empire in the Antonine Itinerary*, in *Herrschen und Verwalten. Der Alltag der Römischen Administration in der Hohen Kaiserzeit* (herausgegeben von Rudolf Haensch und Johannes Heinrichs), 2007, 256–270; *Konrad Miller, Roman Cartography, and the Lost Western End of the Peutinger Map*, in *Historische Geographie der alten Welt. Grundlagen, Erträge, Perspektiven. Festgabe für Eckart Olshausen aus Anlass seiner Emeritierung* (herausgegeben von U. Fellmeth, P. Guyot und H. Sonnabend). Zürich-New York, 2007, 353–366; *Peutinger's Roman Map: the Physical Landscape Framework*, in *Wahrnehmung und Erfassung geographischer Räume in der Antike* (herausgegeben von Michael Rathmann), 2007, 221–230; R. Talbert, T. Elliott, *New Windows on the Peutinger Map of the Roman World*, in *Placing History. How Maps, Spatial Data, and GIS are Changing Historical Scholarship* (ed. by A.K. Knowless; digital supplement edited by Amy Hillier). Esri Press, 2008, 200–218.

After a *Preface* and an *Introduction*, Talbert presents in the first chapter the history of the map, publication and scholarship (*The surviving copy: history, publication, scholarship*, 10–72). This is the first complete systematical presentation of the history of this map. It contributes to an understanding not only of the fate of such documents in the medieval and modern era, but of the changes in the perception of ancient documents. What I remarked in the end of this chapter is the capacity of the author to choose and present the most important contributions regarding the document, published after 1916. We have here a complete, concise, well documented description of the history of the map and the scholarship from the first publication until present.

The second chapter (*The surviving copy: the material object and its palaeography*, 73–85) represents the contribution of a specialist in paleography, Martin Steinmann. Talbert mentions this in the *Preface and acknowledgments* (p. XV): "Expertise of a different character has been offered by Martin Steinmann, who agreed to evaluate the map from a paleographer's perspective, thus illuminating an aspect of fundamental importance that has been woefully neglected and lies beyond the capacity of a historian; without Steinmann's exemplary and unselfish contribution, this book would not be complete". This is the first time when a specialist offers clear data on such an important item of the map. Steinmann also describes the "making-of" of the map. I agree with the order proposed by him: 1. First, the support was prepared, i.e. the full extent of the parchment base. Then, the map was copied layer by layer; 2. In this stage, rivers courses were drawn; 3. Next, as Steinmann says, mountains or larger cities were drawn. Special attention was given to the pictorials symbols of the figurative representations of Rome, Constantinople and Antioch and to other six cities, represented with vignettes type "enclosure walls": Aquileia, Ravenna, Thessalonica, Nicomedia, Nicaea and Ancyra. 4. In this stage, roads were drawn in red ink.

We must nuance a little an observation made by Steinmann. He affirms: "The symbols become more uniform in design, and less elaborate, toward the right of the map". Then he mentions here Weber, which assumed either that the map was simplified in its Eastern part, or drawn with less detail there because the copyist "began his work on the left and devoted less effort to it as he proceeded toward the right (p. 77)". The explanation regarding lack of data on the map in its Eastern part seems, in my opinion, a reflection not of the copyist's way of work, but rather of the geographical knowledge of these regions. Professor Talbert explains itself this aspect at pages 111–112. For him it is a surprise that the mapmaker drawn less detail from Asia Minor onward. And he is right, if we compare, as he did, with the Trajan's Column, where the sculptors improved their carving skill from the bottom to the top. They gained experience. But

things here are different. We talk about a map, not a sculpture. I think one explanation of the author is very appropriate for this problem: "the unfamiliarity of Persia and India as landmasses" (p. 112). Other reasons could determine the mapmaker to present less information here, perhaps a deadline which the mapmaker had for the finish of the map, but this, unfortunately, remains only a supposition which can not be proved. Further, Talbert emphasizes: "By this stage the mapmaker may have found himself under pressure to meet an inflexible deadline for delivery of the map. Completeness and accuracy had never been his primary concerns. Moreover, he sensed that the lands east of the Roman Empire and the routes there would receive the least attention or scrutiny from viewers. He may also have anticipated that these lands would in any case lie outside most viewers" range of vision in the context for which the map was intended. Altogether, therefore, at this end of the map he was prepared to lower his customary standard of work, shrewdly wagering that he would not be called to account for the lapses".

Personally, I believe that lack of information on the original maps used as sources by the mapmaker has led to this situation. The main role in geographical knowledge was played by the army. If we investigate the explorations and expeditions of the Roman Empire (see C. Nicolet, *Space, geography, and politics in the early Roman Empire* (Jerome Lectures, 19). Ann Arbor. Univ. of Michigan Press, 1991, p. 85–94, ch. IV: *Exploration and Expeditions during the Roman Empire*; R. Sherk, *Roman Geographical Exploration and Military Maps*, in ANRW II, 1, 1974, 534–562), we can see that the Romans did not know anything about the vast area of today Russia, or Northern Asia. Susan Mattern highlights these aspects (*Rome and the Enemy. Imperial Strategy in the Principate*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999, p. 24–80, ch. 2: *The Image of the World*). She observes very well this state of facts: "The tendency to truncate and flatten the northern regions continue as one progresses east. Roman ships had sailed only as far as the "promontory of the Cimbri", modern Denmark. The Romans did not know the nature of Scandinavia (which Pliny describes as a large island in the ocean, HN 4.96) or of the enormous territory that is now Russia. Even Europe north of the Danube tends to be flattened and compressed. Strabo writes that the river divides eastern Europe approximately in half 7.1.1), and Agrippa recorded that "this whole tract from the Ister to he [northern] ocean is 1,200 miles in length and 396 miles in width to he river Vistula from the deserts of Sarmatia" (HN 4.81). The territory farther east, in the region north of the Black Sea and around the Caspian Sea and beyond, was unexplored. It was populated with Amazons, Hyperboreans, and the mythical Rhipaean Mountains. A tendency existed-for example, in Ptolemy's work-to exaggerate the size of the Palus Maeotis, making it stretch far to the north; to place the ocean not very far beyond that; and to perceive the entire region north of the Black Sea as "eternally snowy, impossibly cold, barely habitable" (p. 54). So, this is what the Romans knew. Mattern points out again: "Huge tracts of Europe and Asia did not exist for them; others were considered wild and barely habitable. The same tendencies are evident in the Roman perception of Africa" (p. 55). Asia was perceived also in this way, as a vast, endless land, even if the Romans knew a part of India, but they did not anything about the size and extent of China.

So, in this way we can explain this lack of information, either geographical or related to the road infrastructure. Let's make an exercise and look very carefully to the Peutinger map. The first clues indicating lack of information appears for the first time in the segment XI (in Miller's division), East of Antiochia. These denominations are present in the map, in my opinion, for two reasons: 1. evidently, lack of geographical knowledge; 2. a sort of *horror vacui*. The mapmaker "protected" himself. What impression leads to a viewer a map of at least 7 meters in length with blank areas? Let's offer another example. In the medieval or modern era a huge amount of maps have blank areas. The difference is that in these periods the cartographers didn't write anymore in those areas "here the elephants were born" or "in this place scorpions are born". The mental mechanism is the same, only the period differs, and the period dictated the cartographic

habitudes: it was silly for modern mapmakers to write such puerile assumptions. But for the Roman cartographer things stood differently. He could do this in a period in which cartography, chorography, even mathematics, all were mixed a little bit with mysticism.

So, in this way we can explain this lack of information, either geographical or related to the road infrastructure. For example, on segment XI, in the part of the map showing regions of Eastern Turkey and Northern Syria and Iraq, is written (South to the road where is mentioned Autisparate (Theodosiopolis), today Erzurum, Turkey): *Campi deserti et inhabitabiles propter aque* (sic! – *aquae*) *inopiam* (*Deserted and uninhabited plains for lack of water*). Another example: South of the city Apammari, today Ar Raqqah area, Syria, it is writen *Are(a)e fines romanorum* (Weber published an article on this topic: E. Weber, *Areae Fines Romanorum*, in R. Rollinger, B. Truschnegg (Hg.), *Altertum und Mittelmeerraum: Die antike Welt diesseits und jenseits der Levante. Festschrift für Peter W. Haider zum 60. Geburtstag*, München, 2006).

Now let's return to the second chapter of the book, to the analysis of Steinmann. At pages 83–85 he discusses the date and place of production. Allow us to quote him: "On the basis of the scripts used, there is no cause to dispute the general consensus that our copy of the map was produced in the last quarter of the twelfth century or in the first quarter of the thirteenth". Where the map was produced? Well, some questions, unfortunately, can't receive an exact answer. I totally agree with Steinmann. For the location of the exemplar for this copy at Reichenau or at Murbach the arguments are not solid. More, it does not imply that the person, the copyist, was based there. Emily Albu affirmed 5 years ago: 1. the presence of *Silva Marciana* and *Silva Vosagus* meant a particular geographical knowledge of the mapmaker; 2. He copied the map somewhere in this area. Unfortunately, I think the arguments are not strong enough (E. Albu, *Imperial Geography and the Medieval Peutinger Map*, Imago Mundi 57, 2005, 136–148; E. Albu, *Rethinking the Peutinger Map*, in R. Talbert, R. Unger (eds.), *Cartography in Antiquity and the Middle Ages. Fresh perspectives, new methods* (series *Technology and Change in History*, vol. 10), Leiden, Boston, 2008, 111–119). We must not fall in the same trap in which others did before, i.e. the judgement of the whole map relying on a small, particular detail.

Another important observation of this chapter is related to the copyist. Steinmann affirms that the map was realized by one man. I found interesting the aspects he mentions here, the time needed to finish the map, which, obviously, depended on several conditions, such as the low temperature, the bad light and the halt of the work during winter (p. 83). So, given these data, we can now imagine the outstanding effort of the copyist. It took years, maybe, to finish the map.

The third chapter focuses on *The Design and Character of the Map* (86–122). All the main aspects relating to the map are classified, presented and described here: 1. Fundamentals of the Map's Design – a. Shape and Scope; b. Landscape Base. 2. Mapmaking Practice – a. Orientation; b. Scale; c. Color; d. Line Work; e. Lettering and Its Placement; f. Numerals. 3. Components of the Map – a. Coastlines; b. Rivers; c. Open Water (including Lakes); d. Islands; e. Mountains; f. Peoples and Regions. 4. Route Network – a. Content and Planning; b. Presentation; c. Pictorial Symbols. 5. The Integration of Cartography and Art. Talbert discusses all the important features of the *Tabula* in a concise manner. He is the first scholar who put forward strong arguments for the assumption that the Tabula's lefthand end has not only one segment, but more, maybe three. To accept his theory and arguments, we must start from a clear premise: the mapmaker wanted Rome in the centre of his work, i.e. the map had at least partly a propagandistic purpose. Talbert argues that the mapmaker would have put in these three segments a dedication, if the map was produced at the request of an official, and a list of total distances between principal settlements. This would have required at least one segment. Beginning with the second segment, the mapmaker could have started with the representations of Hispania, Western Britannia and North-West Africa.

Now let's do some maths. In the following calculations, we will present the position of Rome in a 12 segment's map, and then its position in 14 segments map, according to Talbert's opinion. If the map had 12 segments, then Rome is placed at 295 cm measured from the left side. The whole map, meaning those 12 segments, must have had a length of 693.6 cm (this represents the total width calculated by Talbert based on Weber's measurements: segm. I – 59.8 cm wide; segm. II – 62,8 cm; segm. III – 65.6 cm; segm. IV – 61.8 cm; segm. V – 62.8 cm; segm. VI – 60.6 cm; segm. VII – 64.3 cm; segm. VIII – 58 cm; segm. IX – 61.7 cm; segm. X – 70.2 cm; segm. XI – 66 cm) or 671.7 without margins. We will continue the calculations using the value 671.7 cm. If we add to this another 62 cm (the average length of a segment), we have 733.7 cm (ca.735 cm). So, from this value we subtract 295 cm we obtain 440 cm. So, according to Miller's reconstruction, Rome is positioned 295 cm from the left side and 440 cm from the right side. It makes no sense. Of course, Miller didn't have a Romanocentric vision. He thought that Mediterranean Sea was in the centre of the map. If we add three segments in the left side, as Talbert shows us, we add, in fact, another ca. 190 cm to the left. This plus 671.7 makes 861.7 cm. So, Rome would be positioned, in this case, at an approximate equal distance (ca. 430 cm) from both sides of the map. *Quod erat demonstandum*, I would add….

Miller reconstructed the Western part but without including several elements. First, he did not mention the distances. This would also have required more space. He drew only the vignettes the type "double tower". Bath symbols are large draws, but he represented only two, in Africa. Miller did not entirely respect the mapmaker's principle that roads segments are represented using chicanes that signifies the start of the next stretch. In the first surviving part of the Tabula, the distance between the letters from the word [AQV]ITANIA is 5 cm minimum. The letters AQV are too close in Miller's reconstruction. The same is likely for the word BRITANNIA, inserted by Miller in the missing part. More, he omitted to mark open-water names, other rivers in Britain beyond the Thames and names for regions and peoples in the Iberian Peninsula. Altogether, these would have required more space that only one segment. So, finally, the "map" could have 14 segments with Rome in the center, for propagandistic purposes, but I have argued elsewhere (F. Fodorean, *Drumurile din Dacia romană* (*The Roads of Roman Dacia*), Cluj-Napoca, 2006, 25–26) that. This propaganda is related to the importance of Rome as *umbilicus mundi*, the meeting point of all the roads, because this is an *itinerarium*, and the main elements were the roads.

A discussion regarding Miller's *Reconstruction of the Map's Western End* can be read in *Appendix five* (189–192, with notes at 330–331). The same aspects are discussed by Talbert in his study *Konrad Miller, Roman Cartography, and the Lost Western End of the Peutinger Map*, in Fellmeth, U. et al. (eds.), *Historische Geographie der Alten Welt: Grundlagen, Erträge, Perspektiven*. Hildesheim, 2007, 353–366.

In the fourth chapter, entitled *Recovery of the Original Map from the Surviving copy* (p. 123–132) Talbert tries to answer the difficult question of what happened with the map from the moment it was produced until ca. 1200, when the surviving copy was made. First, the author prepares the writer for what will be stated in chapter five: "Suffice is to state here my view that the lost original is most likely to have been produced for display in a ruler's public space during the Tetrarchic period around AD 300" (123). So, in a period of 900 years probably several copies were made. Then Talbert emphasizes the existence of chronological differences of the map, i.e. the mention of Pompeii (segment 5) and of Dacia (segments 6 and 7). Further, Talbert discusses the route line work, which was a huge task for the mapmaker, because of the numerous settlements and distances included in the map.

The work procedure used by the mapmaker seems clear enough. His first task was to gather documentation. But in this particular action he was not prepared to update it (this required a great level of historical and geographical knowledge), or, maybe, he was not interested in doing

so. It was impossible for one person to know all these details. Pompeii is included in the map. E. A. Stanco (*Ricerche sulla topografia dell'Etruria*, in *MEFRA* 108, 1, 1996, 83–104) observed that for the roads and the other features of central Italy reflected in Tabula the mapmaker used an *tinerarium* from Augustus" period.

As for Dacia, the mapmaker could use a regional map from the period in which Dacia was a Roman province (106–271 AD). I have analyzed elsewhere the information regarding Dacia included in Tabula and reached the conclusion that it refers to a very early period, maybe right after the Roman conquest in 106 AD (F. Fodorean, *Tabula Peutingeriana and the province of Dacia, in* Acta Musei Napocensis 39–40, 1, 2003, 51–58). There are several clues which can sustain this assumption. First, three roads are marked in Dacia: 1. the imperial road which started from the Danube and reached the Northern part of Dacia. This was the "highway" of Dacia, built rapidly between 102–110 AD. A Roman milestone found in Aiton (between *Potaissa* (today Turda) and *Napoca* (today Cluj-Napoca), dated to 108 A.D., shows that this road was built until here in a short period of time; 2. the road which connected, in the South, *Drobeta* (Drobeta Turnu-Severin) with *Romula* (Reşca, Olt county); 3. the road along the valley of the river Olt, between *Romula* and *Apulum* (Alba Iulia). The last road and the first one were the routes taken by the Roman army during the two military campaigns against the Dacians.

An important clue to sustain this is related to Ptolemy, Tabula and the Geography of the Anonymus from Ravenna. In the list of the settlements from Dacia, Ptolemy mentions *Tibiscum* twice, with different coordinates. In Tabula, the same settlement also appears twice, once on the road *Lederata-Sarmizegetusa* and the second time on the Eastern road *Dierna-Sarmizegetusa*. The geographer from Ravenna makes the same "mistake", also mentioning *Tibiscum* twice. First, he presents the settlements placed along the road *Dierna-Tibiscum* (text and translation after Peter Hügel, *Ultimele decenii ale stăpânirii romane în Dacia* (Traianus Decius-Aurelian), Cluj-Napoca, 2003, 87–88):

"*In quas Dacorum patrias antiquitus plurimas fuisse civitates legimus, ex quibus aliquantas designare volumus, id est Drubetis, Medilas, Pretorich, Panonin, Gazanam, Masclunis, Tibis, qui coniungitur cum civitate Agmonia patrie Missie*".

("In this Dacian regions I read that in former times numerous cities existed, of which we will present some of them, like *Drubetis, Medilas, Pretorich, Panonin, Gazanam, Masclunis, Tibis,* which connects with the city of *Agmonia* from Moesia").

Then he mentions the other *Tibiscum*, on the road *Lederata-Tibiscum*:

"*Item in aliam partem sunt civitates ipsas Datias, id est Tema, Tiviscum, Gubali, Zizis, Bersovia, Arcidaba, Canonia, Potula, Bacaucis*".

("Also in other part cities exist even in Dacia, like: *Tema, Tiviscum, Gubali, Zizis, Bersovia, Arcidaba, Canonia, Potula, Bacaucis*").

The geographer from Ravenna had as source for Dacia an *itinerarium* which can be dated after AD 168–170, because along the main road in Dacia the settlement *Macedonica* is mentioned. This name refers, obviously, to *legio V Macedonica*, which was present in Dacia from AD 168. Apart from that, he mentions other settlements, unknown to Tabula or Ptolemy, such as *Canonia, Potula, Bacaucis*. So, for Dacia the geographer used a document dated after AD 168 but which contained the same double mention of *Tibiscum*, information transmitted from an earlier document.

Chapter five is entitled *The Original Map* (p. 133–157). Three important aspects are presented here: authorship and date, sources and purpose. Talbert starts by saying that guessing a name for the author of the map is impossible. Miller's opinion that Castorius created the map, relies only on the fact the *Cosmographia* of the so-called Anonymus of Ravenna mentions this name several times. This affirmation should, of course, left aside.

Dating the original still remains an open matter. Talbert writes: "While fully acknowledging the absence of sufficient unequivocal indicators, I prefer to regard the production of the original map as a Roman initiative that postdates the organization of Dacia as a province in the early second century and predates Constantine's sole rule, his confident promotion of Christianity, and his foundation of Constantinople in 324. Within this span of two centuries, the map could be associated with, say, the emperor Philip's millennium celebrations at Rome in 247, or with Severan rule; but such linkages seem hardly compelling. Rather, in my estimation the map's design and presentation match best the preoccupations of Diocletian's Tetrarchy (c. AD 300); these are treated in the discussion of the map's context and purpose (142–157). Granted, the connections identified can be no more than subjective, and hence this dating of the original map deserves to be treated with as much caution as any other" (135–136). Indeed, it is very difficult to date this map. Talbert's version may be a solution, but in my opinion dating the document still remains an open issue.

In the subchapter regarding the sources (136–142), Talbert notices that the map "does seem to be a highly original creation" (136), and to "derive from the adaptation and mosaicing of an indeterminate number of detailed maps". Normally, the mapmaker would also have used written documents, i.e. *itineraria adnotata*. Then Talbert continues the argumentation by describing some of the main maps which could be used more or less as sources for the mapmaker's huge project. The map of Agrippa, only completed after his death in 12 BC, and lost, was considered by many scholars as the main source for Tabula. The earliest uncontroversial evidence for a large scale map is a Latin panegyric from AD 290s, displayed at the rhetorical school named Maeniana at *Augustodunum* (modern Autun) in Gaul. Talbert presents the Latin text and a good translation. The text refers to a map, but it remains unclear whether it reflected the realities of the Late Empire, and whether it was meant to be shown to the students or to act as a propagandistic document, showing the vast conquers of the Roman emperors. Even the text emphasizes this: "*Videat praeterea in illis porticibus iuventus et cotidie spectet omnes terras et cuncta maria et quidquid invictissimi pricipes urbium gentium nationum aut pietate restituunt aut virtute devincunt aut terrore devinciunt*" (137). It remains open whether this map also showed roads, and whether it continued a Greek or Hellenistic cartographic tradition. This opens an important question: did the Romans have a tradition of maps? If so, which are these maps? Does the Papyrus of Artemidorus present roads from Spain? In fact, how many examples of Roman maps we know? A key factor is the material on which these maps were drawn. The papyrus or the parchment can suffer hard damage or can be easily lost in time. Big maps, drawn on stone, as the marble plan of Rome or the Orange cadastre, survived easier. I think that Tabula Peutingeriana might be one *itinerarium* from many more others from the same category, created and used by the Romans. Because it seems plausible that such provincial / regional *itineraria* were among the first tasks realized during the conquest of a province and immediately after this moment. The example of Dacia is suggestive. During the two military campaigns (101–102 AD and 105–106 AD) Trajan was accompanied by surveyors whose main task was to measure the land and to register the distances.

The Roman surveyor Balbus wrote a book on topography and geometry. His text, entitled *Expositio et ratio omnium formarum*, was dedicated to Celsus, the famous mathematician from Alexandria, Egypt. Unfortunately only a part of his text survived. But the information is essential for one to understand the role played by surveyors in *clara* expedition against the Dacians (text and translation after D. S. Crișan, C. Timoc, *Inginerii împăratului Traian* (I). *Mensorul Balbus* (*Die Ingerniuere Kaisers Trajan (I). Balbus der Mensor*), in Analele Banatului 12–13, 2004–2005, 157–170):

"*At postquam primum hosticam terram intravimus, statim, Celse, Caesaris nostri opera mensurarum rationem exigere coeperunt. Erant dandi interveniente certo itineris spatio duo rigores*

ordinati, quibus in tutelam commeandi ingens vallorum adsurgeret molis: hos invento tuo operis decisa ad aciem parte ferramenti usus explicuit. Nam quod ad synopsim pontium pertinet, fluminum latitudines dicere, etiam si hostis infestare voluisset, ex proxima ripa poteramus. Expugnandorum deinde montium altitudines ut sciremus, venerabilis diis ratio monstrabat. Quam ego quasi in omnibus templis adoratam post magnarum rerum experimenta, quibus interveni, religiosius colere coepi, et ad consummandum hunc librum velut ad vota reddenda properavi. Postquam ergo maximus imperator victoria Daciam proxime reseravit, statim ut e septentrionali plaga annua vice transire permisit, ego ad studium meum tamquam ad otium sum reversus, et multa velut scripta foliis et sparsa artis ordini inlaturus recollegi."

"But as soon as we stepped into the enemy's land, Celsus, the operations of our emperor started to request the help of measurement sciences. It happened that along a certain sector of the road we needed to draw two straight regular lines, with the help of which we built the huge defense constructions necessary for the defense of routes. Thanks to your invention (the measurement instrument), this allowed the drawing of these (lines) in a big part of Dacia. For example, regarding the design of the bridges, even if the enemy wanted to attack us, we could calculate from our bank, which are the widths of the rivers. All this venerable science, gifted by gods, has showed me how to find out the heights of the mountains which needed to be conquered. After the experience of these great facts, at which we participated, I started to worship it (this science) even more, as it could be worshiped in all the temples, hurrying myself to finish this book, as if I should fulfill certain promises made to the gods. So, after the great emperor soon opened for us Dacia, with his victory, after one year he allowed me to leave this northern region, and I returned to my basic occupation as to a moment of peace, and I gathered together many things, as if they were written and spread on different papers, and I wanted to arrange them in a proper order which is useful for any science".

Balbus established, using geometric methods, the width of the rivers, even if one bank was controlled by enemies. He also mentions that he managed to establish the position of the future military fortresses in Dacia. And the most important thing is his presence in Dacia for a year. Trajan also spent one year in Dacia, after the Roman conquest in 106 AD. It seems possible that Balbus was in Dacia together with the emperor. This signifies an important aspect. Trajan was really very concerned about the rapid administrative and military organization of his newly conquered territory. Two things were always realized by the Romans when they penetrated a foreign region: they built roads necessary for the advance of the troops and fortresses to accommodate the soldiers from legions and auxiliary troops. So, Balbus and other surveyors (*mensores* from legions) participated at this huge effort. The soldiers from legions worked hard to accomplish that, as the reliefs of Trajan's Column show. They cut the forests, built bridges and roads, they penetrated constantly the enemy's territory, showing the two qualities of the Roman soldiers: *labor et disciplina* (J. Coulston, *Transport and Travel on the Column of Trajan*, in C. Adams, R. Laurence (ed.), *Travel and geography in the Roman Empire*, Routledge, London/ New York, 2001, 130). After 106 A.D. two legions were in Dacia: *legio XIII Gemina* at *Apulum* (today Alba Iulia) and *legio IV Flavia Felix* at *Berzobis* (today Berzovia, in Banat). Both of them were strategically placed on the main Roman road of Dacia, and exactly at 72 Roman miles South and North of the Dacian capital, Ulpia Traiana Sarmizegetusa. This shows again that such precise, accurate measurements along roads were made from the beginning of the Roman presence in Dacia. And then these data were grouped into written or painted *itineraria*, first used by the army. C. Nicolet (*Space, Geography, and Politics in the Early Roman Empire*. Jerome Lectures 19. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1991, 86 and 89–90, note 9) mentions among his examples a notorious one, concerning an exploratory and cartographic expedition made in AD 61–63 under Nero by a praetorian detachment, which surveyed the route between

Syene and Meroë. Trying to prove the importance of the army in the geographical expeditions, like me here, Nicolet writes: "This episode is particularly interesting for our purposes here because it demonstrates the use of the army for scientific surveys and the type of documents that followed". In book 12.19 Pliny provides and interesting observation: after the expedition, a ***forma*** *Aethiopiae* was drawn and it was given (*allata*) to Nero, and which showed (*docuit*) that there were few trees from Syene to Meroë, over 996 miles.

Even Trajan wrote, as his predecessor Caesar did, a "book" concerning the military campaigns in Dacia: *De bello Dacico.* Only one sentence survived: *"inde Berzobim, deinde Aizi processimus"* (*'from there we advanced to Berzobis, and then to Aizis*'). This sentence describes the advancement of the Roman army lead by Trajan himself on a road constructed during the first military campaign in the Western part of Banat. In fact, at *Berzobis* (today Berzovia) and *Aizis* (today Fârliug) two fortresses were built by the Roman army. The most important aspect here is the sentence in itself. It matters that Trajan presented *ad modum simpliciter et militariter* all the settlements, and maybe the distances between them, in the form of a written *itinerarium* (M. Bărbulescu, *Traian şi descoperirea Daciei (Trajan et la découverte de la Dacie)*, in D. Protase, D. Brudaşcu (ed.), *Napoca. 1880 de ani de la începutul vieţii urbane*, Cluj-Napoca, 1999, 34). This knowledge could be easily transformed in an *itinerarium pictum*.

Talbert continues with the presentation of the map commissioned by emperor Theodosius II in AD 435 at Constantinople and now lost. These verses convinced Weber that the original map was ordered by Theodosius, so he dated it in 435 AD (E. Weber, *Tabula Peutingeriana. Codex Vindobonensis 324. Kommentar / Vollständige Faksimil-Ausgabe im Originalformat*, Akademische Druck und Verlagsanstalt, Graz, 1976, p. 40). Talbert refers to the mapmaker's work of documentation: "If his incorporation of the complex network of land routes in particular was original work, as seems credible, he must have needed extensive data that was unlikely to be already available in the required form" (139). The mapmaker used for this written and painted regional itineraries.

Subchapter 3 is entitled *Context and Purpose* (142–157). Is the Tabula only a map of route network, an *itinerarium pictum*? How was it displayed? Where and in what form? Had it a practical use, i.e. did anyone use it in a travel? These are questions Talbert tries to answer here. First, it is clear that the map was not created to be used in journeys. Nobody needed to visualize the entire Roman world, from Spain to India, because no one travelled over such a huge distance (ca. 8000 kilometres in straight line). On the other hand, as Talbert observed, some of the names displayed in capital letters for regions, people or waters stretch on more than one segment (ca. 60 cm) of the map. Here are some examples: AQVUITANIA (segm. I / at Miller, segm. II (the first preserved) and the left part of segm. III); PROVINCIA AFRICA (which spans three and a half segments).

Regarding the moment when this map was produced, and the place where it was exposed, Talbert thinks that the map was created during the Tetrarchy and was set down in Diocletian's palace from Split (Croatia). The main argument for this theory is that the Tetrarchs wanted to reinforce, to demonstrate "the special importance that they attached to the city of Rome itself" (149). Further, Talbert affirms: "The central placement of Rome on the map asserts the city's symbolic value in the eyes of the Tetrarchs. So, too, by extension, the symbolic importance of Italy, Rome's heartland, is promoted by the generous amount of space it occupies on the map, while in reality under the Tetrarchy it, in turn, lost its privileged status and was divided into "regions" (*regiones*)" (150). The same idea is argued again later: "Rome's importance is upheld, and the unity of the empire's rule reinforced, by the map's giving no special proeminence to the new Tetrarchic capitals. Equally, the bewildering proliferation of names for the new array of smaller provincial units is ignored in favor of retaining the fewer, more familiar, and more reassuring old names for provinces" (153).

Several aspects must be discussed here. If the map was created to fulfil a propagandistic purpose, with Rome at its center, I am not sure that this served to reinforce the unity of the Empire. After all, the new reorganization of the Empire was a success. Diocletian created the Tetrarchy and Constantine continued the reforms initiated by him. During the reign of Constantine, 117 provinces existed in the Roman Empire. The monetary reform (the creation of the gold *solidus*) was also a success. The Empire was full of soldiers: 500.000 grouped in 60 legions and other auxiliary troops. New cities appeared, the commerce, the circulation of products and people were stimulated, the *cursus publicus* continued to function. So, after all these achievements, why create a map which presents realities from a former, though glorious, period? And why considers it necessary to include former provinces, like Dacia? Only for propagandistic purposes? Dacia was no longer an "issue" for the Roman emperors. Its problem was solved in AD 271 by Aurelian. When he abandoned Dacia, Aurelian took care to create two new provinces with the same name South of the Danube: *Dacia Ripensis* and *Dacia Mediterranea.* The reason was simple: he did not want to be perceived by his contemporaries as an emperor who abandoned such an important territory as Dacia.

Dating the map still remains a problem. If the Tabula was created during Tetrarchy, at 300 AD, how can we explain the presence of the name Constantinople on it? Constantinople was built over six years, and consecrated on 11th May 330. Commemorative coins that were issued during the 330s already refer to the city as *Constantinopolis* (see, e.g., Michael Grant, *The climax of Rome*, London 1968, 133). Old St. Peter's Basilica was the fourth-century church whose construction was initiated by Constantine between 326 and 333 AD. If the map focused on showing Rome's importance, why to expose it at Split (Roman *Spalatum*) and not in Rome? Or Constantinople? Constantine restored the unity of the Empire. Involved in major governmental reforms as well as the consolidation of the Christian Church, he was well aware that Rome was an unsatisfactory capital. Obviously, Rome was too far from the frontiers, or, more precise, from the armies and the Imperial courts. Rome became in those years the playground for obscure, unknown, disaffected politicians. Constantine was aware that he could not move the capital to a different location. After all, Rome had been the capital of the Empire for over a thousand years. So, he identified the site of Byzantium as the right place. This was the perfect place where an emperor could have easy access to the Danube or the Euphrates frontiers. Byzantium was also easy to defend, thanks to its position.

I think further questions appear, but this *itinerarium pictum* was designated to present, as a main element, the roads of the Roman Empire, and a better date for it seems 435 AD, as Weber suggested, or, in any case, the fifth century AD.

The problem of context, purpose and date of this map remains an open issue, however, as Talbert himself states (155–157): "Ultimately there can be no proof of the Peutinger map's context or its purpose; for lack of evidence, both must remain matters of conjecture. Even so, in my estimation the long established view that regards the map as little more than a route diagram for use in making or planning journeys unduly reflects modern preoccupations rather than Roman ones".

In the *Conclusion* (162–172) Talbert presents the map's place in classical and medieval cartography. An interesting discussion concerns the *Cosmographia* of an unnamed cleric claiming to be from Ravenna. It is clear that he had various sources when he realized his work, and among them, of course, was a map like Tabula. A map produced around 1050 at the abbey of Saint-Sever in Gascony (southwestern France) seems to have a clear relation with the Peutinger map, mainly because of its two notices *In his locis scorpions nascuntur* and *In his locis elefanti nascuntur* (p. 165–166). The third example is a sketch made in 1495 by Pellegrino Prisciani (ca. 1435–1518). In 2003 Gautier Dalché first drew attention to the fact that it can be related with Tabula. Talbert presents this document (plate 24, p. 168–169) in detail. The last

example concerns a map from mediaeval time (ca. 1350–1360). Also this map had as source a map like Tabula.

Talbert presents eight appendices, all of them very useful in understanding some issued discussed in the book: Appendix 1. Latin Text Appended to the 1598 Engraving of the Map (173–174); Appendix 2. English Translation of J. Kastelic, "Vodnikova kopija Tabule Peutingeriane" (trans. Gerald Stone) (175–178); Appendix 3. Reflections on Vodnik's Copy of von Scheyb's Engraving (179–180); Appendix 4. Vodnik's Latin Summary Heyrenbach's Essay (National Library of Slovenia, Ljubljana, MS 1443) (181–188); Appendix 5. Miller's Reconstruction of the Map's Western End (189–192); Appendix 6. Wyttenbach's Claim: A Lost Piece of the Map Discovered (193–195); Appendix 7: User's Guide to the Database and Commentary (196–200); Appendix 8: User's Guide to the Map (A) and Overlaid Layers (201–202); Appendix 9: User's Guide to the Outlining of Rivers and Routes on *Barrington Atlas* Bases (C-F), with Associated Texts: (a) Antonine Itinerary: Text with Journeys Numbered as on Map E, and (b) Bordeaux Itinerary: Text with Journeys Lettered as on Map F (203–286). At the end of the book there are notes, bibliography and an index and gazetteer.

At http://cambridge.org/us/talbert/index.html a big part of the information from the book: the maps, the plates, and the entire database can be accessed. This database succeeds in reducing once more the distance between archaeology, history and cartography. It is very useful and easy to consult, with all the distances, settlements, physical elements from ancient sources overlaid on current maps.

I look forward for other contributions of Talbert. Two of them are mentioned in the book in the bibliographical list: R. J. A. Talbert (ed.), *Ancient Perspectives: Maps and Their Place in Mesopotamia, Egypt, Greece, and Rome* (Chicago, forthcoming); *Idem*, *Roads Not Featured: A Roman Failure to Communicate?* In *Idem*, J. Bodel, and S. Alcock (eds.), *Highways, Byways and Road Systems in the Pre-Modern World* (forthcoming).

This book represents an important "building stone" in the reconstruction of the history of this outstanding document of the Roman world, so complex, unique and hard to understand. So I salute the hard work and the publication of this honest, well written, well documented book of Talbert.

Florin Fodorean

Szabó Ádám, *Dáciai papság*, Budapest, Opitz Publisher, 2007, 270 p. (I sacerdozi nella Dacia ms.)

Szabó Ádám (1973) is a historian and archaeologist, lecturer at the Department of Ancient History, University of Pécs, researcher at the National Museum from Budapest (Magyar Nemzeti Muzeum) and member of several scientific forums. A former student of Tóth István, his field of research inevitably became religion and Roman epigraphy.

The present paper is the result of long research that, just as the author mentions in the *Introduction*, began in 2000, in the program of the School for History Doctoral Studies from Budapest. The first result was a monograph about the priests from Pannonia (*Pannoniciani sacerdotes. A szervezett papság principátuskori vezetői*. Spec. Nova Suppl. VI., Pécs, 2006, 297 p.) and the doctoral thesis published in 2007, anticipating this work.

The book about the priests in Dacia is part of a series of monographs designed to present the religious and sacerdotal life in the Illyrian provinces (the planed ones are Noricum, Raetia, Dalmatia and Moesia). This ample series, conceived as volumes in Hungarian, to be translated in an international language, are based on the volume written about priests from Pannonia.

The main sources are represented by epigraphic and archive material and a vast bibliography (over 250 titles: pp. 250–270), starting with the work of Luigi Ferdinando Marsigli (*Danubius Pannonico – Mysicus, Observationibus geographicis, astronomicis, hydrographicis, historicis, physicis perlustratus,* 1726) until the most recent publications.

The structure of the book is identical to that of the first volume in this sery. This model is very logical, easy to follow, having the aspect of a both useful and practical catalogue, for the use of both scientists in this filed as well as students and ordinary readers. Still, by stressing the catalogue aspect, the main idea of the book is not to present the dynamics of the priestly functions from a historical-religious context. The interpretative part is located in the later chapters, where the information is resumed, the book becoming thus much easier to be read.

The monograph has six chapters. The first chapter is the *Introduction* of the book, where the author presents the purpose, the structure and the methodology.

The second chapter entitled *"Known priests"* (*Ismert papok*) is the central part of this work (pages 9–132). Using a catalogue-like aspect the author lists here all characters known from epigraphic sources who, between 106–270 AD had an important role in the official religious life of the province. Each priest is marked by a letter and a number from D1 to D93, and the 3 uncertain epigraphic sources (pages 132–136) are marked Da, Db and Dc.

The characters are presented alphabetically, according to their *nomen*, the first one being the Syrian *Adde bar Semei* from *Ampelum* and the series ends with those with unknown or fragmentary names.

Each catalogue entry has a strict structure, found for every element, thus the data is easy to follow and verify. After the inventory number (D1-D93) the name of the priest is written, just as it appears in the epigraphic source (for example: D 20 – *P(ublius) Ael(ius) P(ubli) fil(ius) P(apiria tribu) Strenuus.* p. 38.). This is followed by the type of the piece on which the inscription was found, ranging from votive altars to sarcophaguses (D46). In some cases where the respective character is mentioned by several epigraphic sources (or the object has several inscriptions) the author distinguishes between them like this D46a, D46b etc. (pages 70–74). The type of the piece is followed by the place of discovery. The information relating to the nine cities are treated in a separate chapter.

For every catalogue entry the author gives a generous bibliography which we also find in the final bibliography of the book. Inscriptions are in Greek or Latin (D37), the text being transcribed and reproduced in whole. The inscriptions are analyzed, with many comments including the dating (if possible), the travels of the character, different relations; often the author tries to decipher the historic and religious background of the characters. Each comment reflects a fragment from an ancient destiny, thus this descriptions rich with footnotes become small prosopographies. The analysis is based mainly on information gathered from that inscription and –if necessary- it is related to epigraphic and literary analogies.

This chapter closes with an important *Addendum* (pages 136–146) where the author collects the main antique sources regarding ancient priesthood. In the six fragments we find quotes from *Lex coloniae Genetivae Iuliae seu Ursoniensis, Lex Narbonensis de flamino provinciae* or from *Lex Arae Iovis Salonitanae*. We find out the type of the object the text is written on, the place of discovery and dating and the text is also given in the original language, Latin, followed by a short, concise comment. Each source is followed by a special bibliography. In this chapter the lack of literary sources, that are just as important in analyzing religious functions, is felt.

In the next chapter entitled *"Sacerdotal functions"* (*Papi hivatalok)* the seven sacerdotal functions are presented (pages 147–179). Each term is presented separately, based on the sources from the previous catalogue. The first function is that of *antistes*. Known in Dacia through 3 characters (D29, 40, 59), the function is defined by definition, dating, location in the province, analysis object-support, general summary and motivations of the dedications, the way the function appears in inscriptions, its specific character in Dacia, the place where the priest performed his duties and finally, the duration of the function. Following this detailed pattern the other sacerdotal functions are presented: *augur (10 persons), flamen (33 persons), haruspex (1 personaj), pontifex (16 persons), sacerdos (35 persons)* and *laurentes lavinates (3 persons)*.

The fourth chapter ("*Priests in the cities*" "*– Települések papsága*") presents the distribution of priests in cities (pages 180–221). The places where sacerdotal functions have been attested are presented alphabetically: *Ampelum, Apulum, Dierna, Drobeta, Napoca, Porolissum, Potaissa, Sarmizegetusa and Tibiscum*. The analysis of the priests is done in parallel with a short description of the city. The author also describes those cities where priests are not mentioned but their existence is possible (*Romula, Malva).* In the last subchapter he presents those that served as priests in military units (D9, 13, 26, 30, 31, 48) – most of them being priests of *Iuppiter Dolichenus* or of other gods from Palmyra.

The next chapter (*"Provincial councils and supreme priests" – Tartománygyűlések és főpapok*", pp. 222–235) presents two very important aspects of religious life in Dacia. Provincial councils represented political, administrative, religious and spiritual unity in Dacia. It was an institution reflecting Augustus' politics as well as provincial autonomy. The author briefly presents the municipal situation in Dacia then he presents the epigraphic and numismatic sources (p. 229) that prove the existence and dynamic of this institution. The constant change reflects the political and administrative situation of the province, highlighted by the variety in names (*Provincia Dacia Superior, concilium provinciarum Daciarum III, Provincia Dacia).* The supreme

priest of the province was an important character who led the provincial council for one year and represented the spiritual and political unity of the province. We know of eight priests who held this high office (D5, 15, 20, 27, 39, 46, 83 and 85). They came from western provinces and were members of *ordo equester*. The title varied: *sacerdos provinciae, sacerdos Daciae, sacerdos Arae Augusti, sacerdos Arae Augusti nostri coronatus Daciarum III*. Mostly by analyzing the epigraphic sources the author resumes the role and functions of this important person.

In the last chapter ("*Summary*" – *Összefoglalás*": pp. 236–249) the author gives us a useful summary for each theme presented in the book. The sacerdotal functions are again analyzed, this time contextually, stressing the dating, the itinerary and the ethnic origin of the persons. This chapter is very useful not only for better navigation in the book but it also fulfils the role of a dictionary of special terms.

Szabó Ádám's work stands out thanks to the clarity and precision of information, by a logical and easy presentation of information, thus becoming necessary to anybody who is interested in spirituality and religion in Roman time Dacia. The linguistic barrier that is due to the absence of an abstract in an international language is the only negative trait of this book.

Szabó Csaba

N. Gudea, *Castrul roman de la Feldioara. Încercare de monografie arheologică/Das Römerkastell von Feldioara. Versuch einer archäologischen Monographie*. Interferenţe etnice şi culturale în mileniile I a. Chr. – I p. Chr./Ethnische und Kulturelle Interferenzen in 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr. – 1. Jahrtausend n. Chr., Vol./Bd. 11, Ed. Mega (Cluj-Napoca 2008), 367 S., 28 + LXXIII Taf., 36 Abb.*

In demselben Jahr 2008, in dem er als Mitverfasser der Mikromonographie des Kastells von Gherla[1] erschien, erlebte N. Gudea eine weitere bedeutende Veröffentlichung. Es handelt sich um die wissenschaftliche Bearbeitung der Forschungen im Kastell von Feldioara, die er in den 1970er Jahren durchführte. Dies kann nur erfreuen und zur schriftlichen Verwertung auch anderer älterer archäologischer Forschungen in Römerlagern auffordern. Denn genügende solcher Forschungen erwarten seit zu langer Zeit ihne Verwandlung in veröffentlichte wissenschaftliche Information.

Das Erscheinen der Monographie des Kastells von Feldioara (Kreis Braşov) beseitigt also einen weiteren Rückstand der rumänischen Kastellforschung. In den folgenden Zeilen versuchen wir zu zeigen, wie der Verfasser es verstand, den Inhalt des Bandes zu organisieren und die archäologischen Angaben aufzubauen, um sich der Aufgabe ihrer Einführung in die Fachliteratur zu entledigen. Wir sind persönlich überzeugt, dass jedwelche Veröffentlichung, die unedierte archäologische Objekten und archäologisches Material bietet, einen sicheren Wert innehat, unabhängig von deren Deutung und den daraus hervorgehenden Schlussfolgerungen. Und da die besprochene Monographie zu gutem Teil unveröffentlichte Angaben bringt, äußert sich ihr Wert schon allein dadurch. Die kritischen Bemerkungen, die wir im Folgenden äußern werde, beziehen sich sowohl auf das Aussehen des monographischen Endproduktes als auch auf Detailfragen. Wir schlossen die Aufzählung der kleinen Druckfehler aus, die auch vom bescheidensten der Leser überwurden werden können und die bei einem solchen Unternehmen unausweichlich sind und beharrten auf jenen Aspekten, die wir als wirklich aufschlussreich betrachteten.

Die Titel, die den Band eröffnen, geben ein zweisprachiges rumänisch-deutsches Werk an, auf S. 4 erfährt man aber, dass die „deutsche Übersetzung der Zusammenfassung" von Ligia Ruscu verfasst wurde. Es handelt sich eigentlich nicht um eine Zusammenfassung, sondern die rumänische Fassung der Arbeit wurde insgesamt und ohne Veränderungen ins Deutsche übertragen, mit der Ausnahme des umfangreichen Kapitels VI und der drei Tabellen, die darauf folgen.

---

* Ich bedanke mich auch hier beim Verfasser dafür, dass er mir freundlicherweise ein Exemplar des Bandes anbot, der das Thema der folgenden Zeilen bildet. Außerdem danke ich Frau Dr. Ligia Ruscu für die Übersetzung des Textes aus dem Rumänischen ins Deutschen.

[1] PROTASE/GUDEA/ARDEVAN 2008.

Die Arbeit beginnt mit einem gut aufgebauten *Inhaltsverzeichnis* (S. [9 f.]), das das rasche Wiederfinden jedwelcher Information im Bande erlaubt. Es ist jedoch nicht zu verstehen, weshalb das Inhaltsverzeichnis der deutschen Fassung nicht auch hier, wie zu erwarten, zu finden ist.

Es folgt das *Vorwort* (S. 11–13), wo gezeigt wird, dass der Band „monographisch die Ergebnisse der Forschungen im Römerkastell darzustellen und auf dieser Grundlage die gesamte Problematik der Römerzeit im Fogarascher Land neu und besser zu diskutieren oder zu überblicken" versucht. Die archäologische Information ist das Ergebnis von sieben Grabungskampagnen zwischen 1973–1979, die als Rettungsgrabung begannen und dann einen anderen Verlauf nahmen. Diese Neuigkeiten werden „für Vergleiche mit der gesamten Problematik der römischen Befestigungen in Dakien und besonders jener im Südosten ihres Verteidigungssystems verwendet werden. Gleichzeitig erlaubt und ermöglicht das erhaltene archäologische Material, das sehr vielfältig hinsichtlich der Gattungen von Artefakten und sehr interessant in archäologisch-historischer Hinsicht ist, eine Neuaufnahme der Diskussion bezüglich aller Fragen zur Römerzeit in diesem Teil der Provinz Dacia Malvensis (Inferior)". Hierin besteht auch der Grund, weshalb „die Darstellung des erhaltenen archäologischen Materials detailliert" und „ein sehr knappes Repertorium der römerzeitlichen Funde und Siedlungen im Fogarascher Land aufgestellt" wurde (S. 11). In enger Verbindung mit der Sicht des Verfassers und teilweise weiter oben wiedergegeben stand auch der Entschluss, diese Arbeit als den zweiten Band einer Reihen mit dem Titel „Beiträge zur Geschichte des Fogarascher Landes" zu betrachten (S. 12), obwohl ihre Eingliederung hier durch nichts anderes gestützt wird. Sicherlich störte die Tatsache, dass die Arbeit zu einer anderen Reihe gehört, die Betonung ihrer Zugehörigkeit zu jener, die den erwähnten Fogarascher Raum behandelt.

Das erste Kapitel des Bandes, mit dem Titel *Das Fogarascher Land* (S. 15–19), verfolgt die zusammenfassende Darstellung der historischen Bedeutung dieses Begriffs, die räumliche Gliederung dieses „Landes", die Kennzeichen seines Reliefs, den Zugang nach außen, sowie eine knappe Diskussion aus archäologischer Sicht des vorrömischen Lebens in diesem Gebiet.

Das Römerkastell von Feldioara (S. 20–68) bildet das zweite Kapitel der Arbeit und, wie auch der Titel suggeriert, deren Hauptbestandteil. Es wurde seinerseits in drei eingeteilt.

Der erste dieser Teile ist, natürlich, eine *Einführung* des Lesers in die Problematik dieser Fundstelle (S. 20–26). Es werden hier die Art und Weise mitgeteilt, in der die Geländeforschung und Aspekte der Ausarbeitung der Monographie stattfanden; es wird gezeigt, dass man, „obwohl wir über eine beträchtliche Menge an archäologischem Material verfügen, das 80 % (wenn nicht mehr) des römerzeitlichen Materials aus dem Fogarascher Land darstellt, nicht behaupten kann, dies sei ein besonderer Erfolg, denn in Ermangelung der Herkunft, des Herstellungsortes der Produkte, ihrer lokalen oder regionalen Eigenheiten, ist der konkrete Fortschritt bezüglich der Kenntnis des Römerlebens fast null" (S. 20). Dies widerspricht aber dem, was auf S. 11 bzw. 65 f. behauptet wurde. Was ist die Wirklichkeit? In Verbindung mit diesem archäologischen Material ist man verpflichtet, auf die exzellente Entscheidung des Verfassers hinzuweisen, es nach der Methode des *CSIR* (*Corpus Signorum Imperii Romani*) darzustellen, was die bestmögliche Kenntnisnahme ermöglicht.

Aus den Zeilen zur Entwicklung und dem Niveau der Forschung in diesem Kastell erfährt man, dass sein Dasein erst 1973 als sicher erwiesen wurde. Auf die archäologischen Forschungen, die noch über die sechs darauffolgenden Jahre vom Verfasser und seinen Kollegen durchgeführt wurden, folgten in einiger Entfernung jene, die von einem anderen Forschungsteam unternommen wurden. Für diese letzteren Ausgrabungen und ihre Ergebnisse siehe aber S. 11 f. des *Vorwortes*. Sehr nützlich ist die gebotene Literatur zum Kastell (S. 22 f.). Sowohl in der Darstellung der Literatur als auch in den bibliographischen Abkürzungen (23–25) befinden sich kleine Auslassungen oder Unachtsamkeitfehler (darunter z. B.: es wurden die Herausgeber

der Inschriftencorpora *IDR* und *IDRE* ausgelassen; *IstRom* wird bei den Abkürzungen zweimal aufgelöst, einmal als „Istoria României. Bucureşti." auf S. 24, das ander Mal als „Istoria României. Tratat, Bucureşti 1960." auf S. 25). Wir mussen betonen, dass auch die Zitierweise inkonsequent ist: z. B. Gudea 1997, aber Wagner Dislokation (S. 24).

Der zweite Teil des Kapitels behandelt *Technische Betrachtungen zum Kastell* (S. 27–49). Es wird hier die schwer erklärliche Lage der Befestigung in der Gesamtheit der dakischen (oder moesischen) Provinzverteidigung besprochen und es werden die möglichen Gründe für ihr Vorhandensein an dieser Stelle dargestellt. So war sie entweder eine nach Süden ausgerichtete befestigte Stelle des eroberten dakischen Gebietes – das den Bereich südlich des Kastells noch nicht umfasste, oder aber ein nach Norden ausgerichteter Punkt der Provinz Niedermoesien – in der Zeit, als das Gebiet nördlich des Kastells noch nicht von den Römern erobert worden war. Der Verfasser zieht auch die Hypothese in Betracht, dass diese Befestigung ein Teil der Sicherung des Straßennetzes bildete, das den pontischen mit dem dakischen Raum verband und den letzteren bei Breţcu betrat (S. 27, siehe auch S. 50, 66 f.). Weiter wird die Lage des Kastelle im Gelände des Dorfes Feldioara und weitere damit verbundene Aspekte besprochen.

Auf die Aufzählung der Schnitte mit ihren Ausmaßen, ihrer topographischen Lage in Bezug auf die Fläche des Kastells und aufeinander und auf den Zweck ihrer Durchführung (S. 28–31) folgt die Darstellung der primären archäologischen Information, die aus diesen Schnitten hervorging (S. 32–41). Dies ist natürlich für einen Grabungsbericht; wir sind uns aber nicht sicher, ob eine solche betont technische Darstellung in den Rahmen dieser Monographie gehört, die eben diese primäre Information hinsichtlich der Erlangung historischer Schlüsse verwerten müßte. Es ist dies ein Beschluss des Verfassers, der aus dem Wunsch stammt, seine Forschungen so gut wie möglich vorzustellen und seine Interpretierungen zu stützen, ein Wunsch, den man zu respektieren hat.

Die Seiten 41–49 wurden der Behandlung der beiden Bauphasen der Befestigung aufgrund der vorhandenen technischen und archäologischen Angaben gewidmet, wobei sowohl die Verteidigungselemente als auch der innere Raum in Betracht gezogen wurden. Das Kastell in der Holz-Erde-Phase wird als in den Jahren 101–102 n. Chr. gegründet betrachtet, was eine „Möglichkeit" bleibt (S. 43, siehe ebenfalls S. 50 f., 75 f.), es wird auch das Jahr 106 in Betracht gezogen (S. 48, Anm. 5, siehe auch S. 50 f.) und selbst eine breitere Zeitspanne „in der Zeit des Traianus oder zu Beginn der Regierungszeit des Hadrianus" (S. 50) geboten. Bezüglich der Elemente der Umwehrungsmauer in der Steinphase frage wir uns, ob darunter einerseits der äußere Wehrgraben und die hypothetischen Holzbrücken über den Wehrgraben vor den Toren, eingeschlossen werden mussten, andererseits der *via sagularis* und der Abflussgraben neben der Innenseite des Walls (S. 43 f.). Jene in der ersten Kategorie sind eher äußere Verteidigungselemente, während die *via sagularis* und der Abflussgraben bereits zum Inneren des Kastells gehören.

Die Zinnenscharten sind nicht die vertikalen Abschnitte, wie der Verfasser fälschlich annimmt (S. 44), sondern die mauerlosen; die Mauerteile heißen Schartenzeilen.

Als Zeit des Umbaus der Steinbefestigung wurden folgende Zeitspannen vorgeschlagen: die Regierung Hadrians (S. 76), „um die Mitte des 2. Jh. n. Chr. (das Ende der Regierung Hadrians oder der Anfang der Regierung des Antoninus Pius)" (S. 43, 50), die Zeitspanne 140–150 n. Chr. (S. 51). Gleichzeitig aber wurden die Türme der Tore *praetoria* und *principalis sinistra*, „aufgrund der Grundrissanalogien", als möglicherweise unter Hadrian errichtet betrachtet; der Mittelwallturm auf der Nordwestseite wurde „aufgrund der Angaben zur Bauweise, in enger Verbindung mit der Umfassungsmauer, während oder zu Beginn der Regierung des Antoninus Pius" datiert (S. 47). Im gegenwärtigen Forschungsstadium sind wir der Ansicht, dass der Umbau in Stein der Umwehrungsmauer des Kastells zeitlich einheitlich war. Ein stufenweiser Umbau in Stein sowohl unter Hadrian als auch unter Antoninus Pius ist nicht auszuschließen, müsste aber bewiesen werden. Sodann kann in Ermangelung genau

datierter epigraphischer Funde oder glücklicher numismatischer Umstände der Umbau der Umwehrung oder von Elementen davon ohnehin zeitlich nur breiter eingegliedert werden[2]. Planimetrische Analogien sind nur mit der Gefahr, in Spekulation zu verfallen, auf enge Datierungen anwendbar.

Es gibt auf S. 45–48 Hinweise auf bestimmte Artefakte aus dem Repertorium, mit Verweisen von der Art: G. Nr..., A.1 Nr..., A.d. Nr..., C.b. (Nr.)..., jedoch eine Organisierung des Katalogs nach diesen Verweisen gibt es nicht. Sie gehörte wahrscheinlich zu einer bestimmten Phase der Ausarbeitung der Monographie und mit einer neuen Ordnung wurden Veränderungen der Querverweise nicht mehr durchgeführt.

Schließlich umfasst der dritte Teil dieses zweiten Kapitels *Historische Betrachtungen zum Kastell* (S. 50–68). Hier findet eine Diskussion der Zeitpunkte des Baus und Umbaus des Kastells in seinen beiden Phasen statt, die ich eben vorwegnahm. Man erfährt gleichzeitig, dass es „archäologisches Material gibt, das sich auch noch in die letzten Jahrzehnte des 3. Jh. n. Chr. datieren und eine Verlängerung des Lebens im Kastell auch nach dem römischen Rückzug durchscheinen lässt. Diese Beweise sind jedoch gering und nicht genügend sicher" (S. 51). Von den Materialen, auf die sich der Verfasser bezieht, werden an anderer Stelle (S. 48) nur zwei fragmentarische Fibeln genannt, von denen behauptet wird, dass sie in der Baracke Nr. 1. gefunden wurden. Der Verweis auf das Repertorium für ihr Wiederfinden geschieht in der Form „C.b. 4, 7", sie befinden sich jedoch in der Unterteilung VI.3.2 des Katalogs, auf S. 222 f. Jene unter Nr. 4 wird aber hier zu Beginn des 2. Jh. datiert, jene unter der Nr. 7 im ersten Teil desselben Jahrhunderts. Mit diesen Datierungen für beide Stücke, für die im Repertorium wiederholt wird, dass sie aus der Baracke Nr. 1 stammen, wird die Behauptung des Verfassers sinnlos: „wenn man die Datierung der beiden Fibelfragmente in die zweite Hälfte des 3. Jh. und sogar später akzeptiert, kann man, schein es, selbst vom Vorhandensein einer nachaurelianischen Bewohnung sprechen" (S. 48). Es ist also fast sicher, dass N. Gudea an andere Fibeln gedacht haben muss, als er die Möglichkeit einer nachrömischen Bewohnung des Kastells postulierte. Aber an welche? Keine der Fibeln im Katalog, und dabei denke ich in erster Reihe an jene *mit umgeschlagenem Fuß*[3], muss zwingend nach 271–275 datiert werden[4]. In Ermangelung weiterer archäologischer Angaben ist ihre spätere Datierung nach diesen Jahren nicht zu rechtfertigen, was vorläufig eine solche nachrömische Bewohnung ausschließt.

Ein *Archäologisches und historisches Kommentar zum archäologischen Material aus dem Kastell* befindet sich auf S. 51–65. Nach unserer Meinung wurden zu wenige historische Betrachtungen aufgrund des recht zahlreichen archäologischen Materials gezogen, das eine viel eingehendere Untersuchung erlaubt. Es wird zunächst angegeben dass „ich aus bloßer Neugierde die oben behandelten Waffen mit jenen verglich, die für die Numider daheim typisch sind, um zu sehen, in welchem Maße sie ihren nationalen Charakter beibehalten haben. Ich stellte fest, dass man vorläufig nicht behaupten kann, dass sie eine spezifisch nationale Bewaffnung mit sich brachten und bewahrten. Die Waffen, die sie benutzten, waren die römischen" (S. 55). Andernorts wird widersprüchlich behauptet, dass „die Analogien mit einigen Waffen aus der Provinz Numidia die Behauptung erlauben, dass die von dort gebrachte ursprüngliche Bewaffnung (besonders die Pfeilspitzen) im Rahmen der Einheit beibehalten wurden" (S. 70). Welche der beiden Behauptungen darf als korrekt gelten? Wir entscheiden uns für die erste Variante. Die sowohl schriftliche als auch figürliche Darstellung von eisernem Baumaterial ist willkommen. Dies geschah nicht oft in der Literatur, so als ob es zu wenig bedeutend wäre, um die Mühe zu lohnen; eben deshalb ist N. Gudeas Unternehmen löblich. Einige

[2] Siehe auch MARCU 2009, 202.

[3] Eine davon, Nr. 10 in der Liste der Fibeln, auf S. 233 des Repertoriums, erscheint als in der Baracke Nr. 1 entdeckt, auf S. 48 wird aber erwähnt, dass sie in der Baracke Nr. 2 gefunden wurde.

[4] Siehe COCIŞ 2004, 147.

Unachtsamkeitsfehler sind aber auch hier zu finden: von den Ringen wird behauptet, dass „ihre Ausmaße zwischen 4,5–12 cm schwanken. Die meisten messen zwischen 4,5–12 cm. Die meisten messen zwischen 4,5–6 cm, nur Nr. 14 misst 12 cm", und in der angesagten Klassifizierung gibt es nur einen Punkt „a." (S. 60), obwohl es offensichtlich ist, welche Ringe zum darauffolgenden Punkt gehören. Die undeutliche Ausdrucksweise in diesen Zeilen ist identisch auch in der deutschen Fassung des Textes wiederzufinden (S. 138). Endfolgerungen zum Kastell (S. 65–67), von denen wir manche mit weiter oben behandelten Fragen verband, beschließen dieses Unterkapitel und damit das zweite Kapitel des Buches.

Das dritte Kapitel behandelt *Die Militäreinheit im Kastell: die cohors II Numidarum (Flavia; Antoniniana)* (S. 69–71). Es sind hier einige Versehen hervorzuheben: da es „unmöglich ist, zu präzisieren, welcher der drei flavischen Kaiser die Einheit bildete" (d. h. in der Zeitspanne 69–96), kann man noch behaupten, dass „von der Zeit ihrer Bildung bis zur Zeit ihrer Stationierung in Dakien fast ein halbes Jahrhundert verstrich"? (S. 69); die Zeitspanne, in der die Einheit das Epithet *Antoniniana* führte, ist nicht 210–218, sondern sicher 212–217 und theoretisch 212–222[5]; da „die Einheit zumindest zu Beginn der Herrschaft des Traianus in Feldioara stehen konnte" (S. 70), ist es möglich, dass sie schon vor der Regierungszeit dieses Kaisers hier stand? Wir sind nicht der Ansicht, dass zu diesem Kapitel eine eigene bibliographische Beilage (S. 70 f.) gehört, da viele der hier aufgezählten Arbeiten in den *Bibliographischen und technischen Abkürzungen* in Kapitel II wiederzufinden sind.

Die Zivilsiedlung des Kastells wurde in Kapitel IV (S. 72 f.) behandelt. Es wurde ihr ein einziger Schnitt zuteil, es wurden aber Oberflächenforschungen durchgeführt. Es wird hier gezeigt, dass es „im Dorfe noch Münzen gibt, die in der Zivilsiedlung gefunden wurden. Eine davon ist ein *sestertius* von Traianus" (S. 72). Abgesehen davon, dass es ungewiss bleibt, genau woher die Münzen im Besitz von Privatleuten stammen, kann man auf keinen Fall „die Münze von Traianus als chronologischen Anhaltspunkt" betrachten, so dass man „die Hypothese akzeptiert, dass das römische Leben hier unter Traianus begann" (S. 73). Die Münzen sichern bloß *termini post quem* und können jahrhundertelang im Umlauf bleiben. Es ist sehr wahrscheinlich, dass der Militärvicus unter Trajan entstand, aber nicht die besprochene Münze vergewissert dies.

Das nächste Kapitel der Arbeit, das fünfte, erlaubte N. Gudea eine kurze Diskussion zum *Fogarascher Land in römischer Zeit (106–275 n. Chr.)* (S. 74–79). Wir glauben nicht, dass es nötig war, die Liste der Ortschaften mit römerzeitlichen Funden wiederzugeben, da darauf das *Repertorium der Siedlungen und archäologischen Funde in Verbindung mit der Römerzeit im Fogarascher Land* folgt, das genau die 24 Ortschaften aus der Liste umfaßt. Wenn auch in wenigen Zeilen, ist die Eingliederung der Ergebnisse der Forschungen von Feldioara in die römerzeitliche Geschichte des Fogarascher Landes willkommen.

Auf S. 81 beginnt die deutsche Fassung des Textes, die dem bisher gebotenen rumänischen Text entspricht. Die Literatur zum Kastell, mit den Abkürzungen der verschiedenen Arbeiten und Periodika, wiederholt sich auch hier (S. 98–100), was eine Verschwendung von typographischem Raum darstellt. Dieser Abschnitt konnte für beide Fassungen des Textes gemein bleiben, ohne den Lesern in den beiden Sprachen Schwierigkeiten zu bieten.

Nach dem deutschen Text folgt das Kapitel VI der Arbeit, das *Repertorium des archäologischen Materials* (S. 158–237). Obwohl der Titel und die Unterteilungen dieses Katalogs zweisprachig rumänisch-deutsch gehalten werden, wird der Inhalt nur auf Rumänisch geboten. Ist dieser Katalog etwa von so geringem wissenschaftlichem Wert, dass er nicht auch die Übersetzung in eine Fremdsprache verdient? Sicherlich nicht. Eine Übersetzung hätte die Möglichkeit des Aufstellens von Analogien, von Nachprüfungen oder anderer Verfahren auch für Nichtkenner unserer Sprache geboten. Oder, falls der Katalog tatsächlich nur für Leute ist,

[5] FITZ 1983, 74, 76, 82–85, 87–89, 278 f.

die Rumänisch verstehen, warum sind Titel und Unterteilungen doch zweisprachig? Wurde etwa angenommen, dass wegen der standardisierten und stereotypen Sprache das Verstehen des Inhalts seitens fremder Leser leichter sei? Dies ist vielleicht teilweise möglich. Wir glauben nicht, dass die Auflösung der Abkürzungen für Determinatoren von *terra sigillata*-Gefäßen in das Repertorium (S. 162 f.) gehört, sondern dort, wo auch die anderen Abkürzungen der Monographie aufgelöst wurden. Die Organisierung des Katalogs der Artefakte in gleicher Weise auch auf den Tafeln ist nicht völlig wirksam. Der Inhalt der Tafeln entspricht nicht immer der Beschreibung unter der entsprechenden Nummer oder den Titeln der bereits bestehenden Unterteilungen des Repertoriums, die ebenfalls nach Gattungen von Artefakten strukturiert wurden (wie auf S. 174, 191 f., 194 f., 217, 224–227). Es wäre vielleicht besser gewesen, im Falle eines jeden Stückes anzugeben, wo es sich in den Abbildungen befindet. Es gibt sodann in diesem Repertorium kleine Eingliederungsfehler: die Kettenglieder sind nicht Ausrüstungszubehör (S. 218), sondern bilden selbst den Panzer; Anhänger sind nicht Ausrüstungszubehör (S. 219); Beschläge sind nicht Ausrüstungszubehör (S. 219), sondern Beilagen davon, wie übrigens ein Teil von ihnen auch betrachtet wurde (S. 218).

Im selben Kapitel des Repertoriums wurde auch die Analyse der *Eisenbearbeitungsschlacken im Kastell* (S. 236 f.) unpassend angebracht, die vom verstorbenen E. Stoicovici durchgeführt wurde. Leider erhielt auch diese Analyse keine Übersetzung.

Auf die drei Tabellen mit der Verteilung von Artefakten in den untersuchten Strukturen des Kastells, für die nur der Titel zweisprachig geboten wird (S. 238–240), folgen 28 Tafeln, die als Abbildungen benannt wurden (S. 241–261) und in beiden sprachlichen Fassungen des Textes werden sie als „Grabungsfotos" benannt (S. [10], [84]). Zwischen S. 263–334 befinden sich weitere Tafeln. Kleine Fehler sind auch in der Entsprechung zwischen deren Inhalt und Beschreibungen zu finden: in Taf. XLII (S. 303) werden nicht nur Schlüssel abgebildet; die Phalerae und Beschläge sind nicht Bewaffnungs-, sondern Ausrüstungszubehör (Taf. LXV, S. 326); Die Beschreibungen für Taf. LXXII und LXIII (S. 333 f.) müssen ausgetauscht werden, ebenso jene in deutscher Sprache für Taf. LVII und LVIII (S. 318 f.).

Auf S. 335–360 befinden sich die 35 Abbildungen der Arbeit, die unerklärlich in beiden sprachlichen Fassungen des Inhaltsverzeichnisses (S. [10] bzw. [84]) als im Text befindlich bezeichnet werden, was nicht der Fall ist. Die Abbildung 1 hebt auf keine Weise den Ort hervor, wo sich die Befestigung von Feldioara befindet, unterstreicht jedoch jenen, wo sich das Kastell von *Largiana* (Românaşi, Kreis Sălaj) befindet; die Abbildung wurde wahrscheinlich ohne die nötigen Veränderungen aus einer anderen Arbeit des Verfassers übernommen. Ebenfalls steht die Legende nur in deutscher Sprache. Der Abbildung 3 (S. 337) fehlt die Legende, auch wenn diese leicht zu begreifen ist; bei Abbildung 35 (S. 359) steht *Dacia Apulum* anstelle von *Dacia Apulensis*.

Nirgends erscheint irgend eine Erklärung zur Abbildung auf Umschlag I und dies wäre nötig gewesen, damit nicht hervorgeht, dass es sich um einen Versuch der Rekonstruktion der erforschten Fläche des Kastells handelt. In diesem Falle wäre die Rekonstruktion – wenn auch stark vereinfacht – unrichtig, denn es fehlt der *agger*, der die Umwehrungsmauer stützt; die bloße Simulierung könnte nicht sachkundige Leser verwirren. Außer den bereits erwähnten Fehlern und Versehen kommen im rumänische Text noch verfehlte Ausdrücke vor, so: „hinter der Hintermauer des Turmes" (S. 37), „entweder archäologisches Material oder Fragmente von Handmühlen" (S. 39), „vor der Vorderseite der Mauer" (S. 45 f.), „ein *sestertius* von Antoninus Pius (durch Faustina)" (S. 50), „Weidenförmige Lanzenspitze" (S. 184). Die meisten unglücklichen Ausdrücke, Unrichtigkeiten oder verschiedenen anderen Fehler sind zweifellos darauf zurückzuführen, dass der Text vor dem Druck nicht überprüft wurde, was bedauerlich ist, da, wie man sieht, diese Mängel weder gering, noch, manche davon, unbedeutend sind.

Das Namen-, Länder-, Ortschaften- und Ortsregister wie auch für die lateinischen Militärbegriffe (S. 361–365), worauf eine Liste der Arbeiten folgt, die in derselben Reihe wie die

hier besprochene Monographie erschienen, bilden die letzten Seiten des Bandes von N. Gudea. Insgesamt wurde er unter guten typographischen Bedingungen gedruckt.

Im Laufe der vorliegenden Besprechung haben wir unsere Ansichten zu manchen der im Buche behandelten Aspekte und erhobenen Fragestellungen geäußert, ohne aber den Anspruch zu erheben, die alle berührt zu haben. Wir beenden diese Zeilen mit dem Wunsch, der Leser möge möglichst großen Nutzen aus der Lektüre des Buches ziehen.

Dan Matei

LITERATUR

COCIȘ 2004
S. COCIȘ, Fibulele din Dacia romană/The brooches from Roman Dacia. Bibliotheca Ephemeris Napocensis 3 (Cluj-Napoca 2004).

FITZ 1978
J. FITZ, Honorific titles of Roman military units in the 3rd century (Budapest/Bonn 1983).

MARCU 2009
F. MARCU, The internal planning of Roman forts of Dacia. Bibliotheca Musei Napocensis XXX (Cluj-Napoca 2009).

PROTASE/GUDEA/ARDEVAN 2008
D. PROTASE/N. GUDEA/R. ARDEVAN, Din istoria militară a Daciei romane. Castrul roman de interior de la Gherla/Aus der Militärgeschichte des römischen Dakien. Das römische Binnenkastell von Gherla. Bibliotheca Historica et Archaeologica Banatica, Seria A. Monografii, XLVI (Timișoara 2008).