EPHEMERIS NAPOCENSIS

XXIV
2014

ROMANIAN ACADEMY
INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY AND HISTORY OF ART CLUJ-NAPOCA

EDITORIAL BOARD
Editor: Coriolan Horaţiu Opreanu
Members: Sorin Cociş, Vlad-Andrei Lăzărescu, Ioan Stanciu

ADVISORY BOARD
Alexandru Avram (Le Mans, France); Mihai Bărbulescu (Rome, Italy); Alexander Bursche (Warsaw, Poland); Falko Daim (Mainz, Germany); Andreas Lippert (Vienna, Austria); Bernd Päffgen (Munich, Germany); Marius Porumb (Cluj-Napoca, Romania); Alexander Rubel (Iaşi, Romania); Peter Scherrer (Graz, Austria); Alexandru Vulpe (Bucharest, Romania).

Responsible of the volume: Vlad-Andrei Lăzărescu

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

All responsability for the content, interpretations and opinions expressed in the volume belongs exclusively to the authors.

DTP şi tipar: MEGA PRINT
Coperta: Roxana Sfârlea

© 2014 EDITURA ACADEMIEI ROMÂNE
Calea 13 Septembrie nr. 13, Sector 5, Bucureşti 76117
Telefon 021–410.38.46; 021–410.32.00/2107, 2119

ACADEMIA ROMÂNĂ
INSTITUTUL DE ARHEOLOGIE ŞI ISTORIA ARTEI

EPHEMERIS NAPOCENSIS

XXIV
2014

EDITURA ACADEMIEI ROMÂNE

SUMAR – SOMMAIRE – CONTENTS – INHALT

STUDIES

FLORIN GOGÂLTAN, ALEXANDRA GĂVAN
Der bronzezeitliche Tell von Pecica „Şanţul Mare". Ein metallurgisches Zentrum des Karpatenbeckens (I)..... 7

ALFRED SCHÄFER
Deliberate Destruction and Ritual Deposition as Case Study in the Liber Pater-Sanctuary of Apulum..... 39

ZVEZDANA MODRIJAN
Imports from the Aegean Area to the Eastern Alpine Area and Northern Adriatic in Late Antiquity..... 51

CORIOLAN HORAŢIU OPREANU, VLAD-ANDREI LĂZĂRESCU, ANAMARIA ROMAN, TUDOR-MIHAI URSU, SORINA FĂRCAŞ
New Light on a Roman Fort Based on a LiDAR Survey in the Forested Landscape from *Porolissvm*..... 71

O. V. PETRAUSKAS
Komariv – ein Werkstattzentrum barbarischen Europas aus spätrömischer Zeit (Forschungsgeschichte, einige Ergebnisse und mögliche Perspektiven)..... 87

JOAN PINAR GIL
Coming Back Home? Rare Evidence for Contacts Between the Iberian Peninsula and the Carpathian Basin in the Late 5th – early 6th Century..... 117

ALEXANDRU AVRAM
Marginalien zu griechisch beschrifteten Schleudergeschossen (IV)..... 131

ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND EPIGRAPHICAL NOTES

LIGIA RUSCU
On Cult Associations at Istros and Tomis..... 139

ANDRÁS SZABÓ
Interprex Dacorum – Commentarioli Ad RIU 590..... 153

VITALIE BÂRCĂ, LAVINIA GRUMEZA
Sarmatian Burials in Coffins and Funerary Timber Features Recently Discovered in the Western Plain of Romania..... 157

CSABA SZABÓ
Roman Religious Studies in Romania. Historiography and New Perspectives..... 195

RADU ZĂGREANU, DAN DEAC
New Data on Roman Art and Sculpture in Porolissum..... 209

COSMIN ONOFREI
The Jews in Roman Dacia. A Review of the Epigraphic and Archaeological Data..... 221

ŞTEFAN-EMILIAN GAMUREAC
The Roman Common Pottery Discovered in an Archaeological Complex from the Middle of the 3rd Century at *Micia*..... 237

MONICA GUI, SORIN COCIŞ
Millefiori Inlaid Hilts, Strigil Handles, or What?..... 257

GÁBOR PINTYE
Hun Age Single Graves at the Track of Motorway M3..... 277

CLAUDIA RADU, VLAD-ANDREI LĂZĂRESCU, SZEREDAI NORBERT, CECILIA CHIRIAC, BOGDAN CIUPERCĂ
Paleoanthropological Inferences Regarding Four Skeletons from an Archaeological Contex at Gherăseni, Buzău County..... 299

CĂLIN COSMA
A 7Th Century Warrior House at Iernut/Sfântu Gheorghe (Mureş County)..... 315

REVIEWS

Ovidiu Ţentea, *Ex Oriente ad Danubium. The Syrian Units on the Danube Frontier of the Roman Empire*, 2012, 234 p. (Cosmin Onofrei)..... 339

Radu-Alexandru Dragoman, Sorin Oanță-Marghitu, *Arheologie și Politică în România,* Editura Eurotip Baia Mare, 2013, 297 p. (Paul Vădineanu)..... 343

Abbreviations that can not be found in Bericht der Römisch-Germanische Kommission..... 347

Guidelines for "Ephemeris Napocensis"..... 351

Reviste publicate la Editura Academiei Române..... 353

Ovidiu Ţentea, *Ex Oriente ad Danubium. The Syrian Units on the Danube Frontier of the Roman Empire*, 2012, 234 p.[1]

A recent addition, No. 6, to the series edited by the Centre of Roman Studies is *Ex Oriente ad Danubium. The Syrian Units on the Danube Frontier of the Roman Empire*, Bucharest: Mega, 2012 by Ovidiu Ţentea. The work extends on 234 pages, structured in five chapters, from page 1 to 100, and a series of annexes, the abbreviations list, indices and illustrations.

In the first chapter (p.1–7), the introduction, the author explains his choice not to restrict his research at the provincial level of Roman Dacia, by the limited amount of results that would have emerged and choses from the start to picture the data about the history and geography of the whole Roman Danubian border. Right from the beginning the researcher mentions that the work didn't focus on families of the soldiers, neither on the communities they came from, these being the subject of another study, unpublished yet. Also, this chapter features a short history of the research on this theme, mentioning both the Romanian and foreign literature on the matter.

The second chapter entitled *The background: Roman Near East* (p. 9–26), is designed as a short presentation of the initial areas of recruitment for the Syrian troops. Here are presented Roman Syria, Commagene and the Itureans' territoires, Oshroene, Canatha, Emesa, Antiochia, Palmyra and Arabia. The analysis for each of the recruitment areas is not equally extensive: Roman Syria, Commagene, Arabia and particularly Palmyra enjoyed special attention from the author. The chapter is well documented, older bibliography being amended with the latest contributions on the matter, and also, here and there, with ancient sources' study. Even if not extensive, the second chapter's purpose is to present the realities of the Ancient Orient and to familiarize the reader with the analysed area.

The third chapter, *The Syrian units deployed to the Danube provinces* (p. 27–78), is by far the most substantial both by extension and by quantity of bibliographical information used. It presents the evolution of no less than 23 auxiliary units, from their recruitment to the moment they are stationed on the Danube limes. The main sources used are the epigraphs: the military diplomas, stone inscriptions or brick stamps are analysed for each of the auxiliary units and, where was the case, with proper amendments. A special attention was given by the author to *Ala I Augusta Ituraeorum sagittaria* (p. 31–35), *Cohors I Flavia Commagenorum sagittaria equitata (?)* (p. 41–45), *Cohors II Flavia Commagenorum equitata sagittaria* (p. 45–48), *Cohors I Aurelia Antoniniana miliara Hemesenorum sagittaria equitata civium Romanorum* (p. 8–52) and *Palmyrenii sagittari* (*Numerus Palmyrenorum Tibiscensium, Numerus Palmyrenorum Porolissensium, Numerus Palmyrenorum O[…] (*p. 66–76). The researcher's focus on these units isn't grounded on preference but on the lack of hard evidence, as is the case of *Ala I Oshroenorum sagittaria* (p. 34), whose presence in Brigetio is based on only one stamped tile. Both in the

[1] This review is published in the framework of the project „MINERVA – Cooperare pentru cariera de elita in cercetarea doctorala si postdoctorala", cod contract: POSDRU 159/1.5/S/137832, financed by the European Social Fund through the Sectorial Operational Program for Human Resources Development 2007–2013.

analysis on epigraphic material and in the settling the issues, the author is cautious. Aware of the method's limits, Ovidiu Țentea limits presentation only to known data where the elements don't allow multiple interpretations. The researcher's experience is apparent in the extensive analysis of *Cohors I Augusta Ituraeorum sagittaria*, *Cohors I Ituraeorum sagittaria equitata (?) milliaria* and *Cohors I sagittaria* (p. 52–63), to take only one example, where a series of evidences are reinterpreted, like the brick stamps from Tibiscum with the abbreviation CIV (p.61), or even assigned to another military unit (p. 54). A prosopographical analysis of all known characters in the 23 auxiliary units is presented, sorted by rank (*centuriones, decuriones, principales etc.*), with all the bibliographical information to date.

The forth chapter, *Deities chosen for worship* (p. 79–86) is aimed at the religious preferences of the soldiers in the Syrian troops. From the start it is apparent that we have evidence of dedicatory epigraphs for deities from only some of the 23 auxiliary units: *Ala I Augusta Ituraeorum sagittaria*, *Cohors quingenaria Canatheorum et Trachonitarum, Cohors I Aelia milliaria sagittaria equitata*, *Cohors I milliaria nova Severiana Surorum sagittaria equitata cR*, *Cohors I Aurelia Antoniniana milliaria Hemesenorum sagittaria equitata cR*, *Cohors II Flavia Commagenorum sagittaria equitata*, *Cohors I sagittaria*, *Numerus Palmyrenorum Tibiscensium*, *Numerus Palmyrenorum Porolissensium*, *Numerus Surorum sagittaria* (p. 79–81).

The author notices that, among the religious preferences of the soldiers one can find deities from the official pantheon, Jupiter, Minerva or Liber Pater, deities particularly worshipped in the military environment, like Mithras or Dolichenus, but also their homeland gods, simply mentioned as Dii Patri (*Numerus Palmyrenorum Tibiscensium*), or by their names: Manaphus şi Theandrius (*Cohors quingenaria Canatheorum et Trachonitarum*), Bel (*Numerus Palmyrenorum Porolissensium*), Heliogabal (*Cohors I Aurelia Antoniniana milliaria Hemesenorum sagittaria equitata cR*).

Among the latter, we would have also included Malakbel (*Numerus Palmyrenorum Tibiscensium*) and Turmasgades (*Cohors II Flavia Commagenorum sagittaria equitata*). Even if he recognizes the important part of the army in promoting the oriental cults, the author doesn't fall in the trap of exclusively linking certain oriental deities with specific units recruited from the east, as is the case of *Cohors II Flavia Commagenorum* from Micia (p. 83). Taking all these into account, and noting the author's prudence, we think that at Micia the case is similar with the situation from Porolissum (where Bel is worshipped by the palmyrenians as Deus Patrius Belus). Even if Dolichenus and Turmazgades are not called *dii patrii* in the inscriptions, they should be associated with the commagenian auxiliary unit and were most likely venerated in the same temple at Micia.

We consider accurate the closing phrase of the chapter, which pleads for prudence in drawing radical conclusions and exacerbate the importance of the troops recruited in Syria in promoting oriental cults.

The last chapter, *Fighting style and military equipment*, is dedicated to the fighting style of the archers. The vast majority of documented troops bear the name sagitarii in their nomenclature: 3 Ala (No. II, IV, V in text), 10 Cohors (No. VII, VIII, X, XII, XIII, XIV, XV, XVII, XVII), *Palmyrenii sagittari* and *Numerus Surorum sagittaria*. The weapons disclosed in this chapter are re-curved bow, trilobite arrows and Levantine equipment.

The conclusions do not extend on an important number of pages (p. 97–100), because every chapter has its own conclusions section at the end. We do not consider necessary repeating them. The annexes play an essential part in the book. Annex A (p. 103–156) is a catalog of Inscriptions and Annex B (157–162) a repertoire of the brick and tile stamps. Annex C features I. *The Military diplomas from Moesia, Dacia and Pannonia (163–190)* and *II. The Records in military diplomas, inscriptions and tile stamps (191–200).* These annexes play an important part in complementing and adding to the data from chapter 3 and 4, easing reader's access

to information. The last pages contain the Bibliography (201–223), Indicies (225–228) and plates (229–234).

In the end we would like to conclude that the work of Ovidiu Țentea is very well documented and thoroughly grounded (having also as proof the 20 pages of cited works), and the polemic, where there was the case, is written with competence and elegance. Last but not least, the book gains its place among the publications that have major implications on our knowledge about the auxiliary troops in the Empire and becomes a useful instrument both for those interested in Danube limes' research and also for those studying the Roman Army.

Cosmin Onofrei

Radu-Alexandru Dragoman, Sorin Oanță-Marghitu, *Arheologie și Politică în România*, Editura Eurotip Baia Mare, 2013, 297 p.

One of the single greatest challenges facing any student of archaeology is learning how to understand and correctly employ the use of critical assessment tools, ones should not only be directed at the books one works with (which is a matter of some emphasis in any given university course), but also of data, methods, the field, interpretative processes and perhaps most importantly, oneself. This sort of toolbox cannot be made sense of and put to good use without a vertical and a horizontal frame of reference, where the vertical is represented by the historical tradition of archaeology in one's country and the horizontal, a solid understanding of the way it is perceived and practiced elsewhere in the present. This sort of contextual appreciation of the discipline is not something that is taught or even encouraged. The university curriculum is lacking in courses on the history and theory of archaeology, and as such it is difficult for the undergraduate and in many cases, even for the seasoned field practitioner to relate their subject to any 'bigger picture'. Indeed, upon seeing me peruse that book that is up for examination here, one of my colleagues was intrigued by the title and asked me what the connection between archaeology and politics is, if any. This really is a valid question, albeit one that is testament to the perceived apolitical implicitness symptomatic of Romanian archaeology. An understanding of this connection would however require some knowledge of theoretical backbone of the discipline, but this sort of knowledge is hard to come by. Even for one particularly interested in the matter, acquiring information on the topic can prove challenging. Having no standardized way of approaching it, one can easily get lost in a sea of names, concepts and currents and the task at hand could become daunting enough to discourage its pursuer. Unlike other publications on the topic of the mutual interactions between archaeology and politics[1], this book makes for a comfortable read even without such in-depth knowledge, and as such, it provides a good starting point for any archaeologist seeking to deepen his understanding of his place in the wider world.

In the introduction to this volume we are presented with a programmatic approach to the history of archaeology in Romania (a vertical referencing). The authors explicitly reject the common view that the discipline followed a linear evolution from it's beginnings in 19th century antiquarianism to the current state of affairs (p. 13), and identify four distinct periods in its existence, each with its own specific set of quirks and practices. Some of these transcend temporal barriers are adopted by subsequent generations of researchers while others are rejected in favour of trending values. Thus, it is difficult to conceive it as a unitary, continually ascending discipline, but rather one marred in equal parts by stagnation and abrupt changes in orientation.

The first period falls roughly in the decades between the two world wars and is viewed as an organic continuation of the work that began with the institutionalization of Romanian scientific practice (pp. 17–20). The discipline grew and defined itself along side others as the young nation struggled for affirmation. It had it's own plethora of founding father figures, its own methods firmly grounded in the virtues of positivism and had already proven its mettle having

[1] MCGUIRE 2008 and HAMILAKIS/DUKE 2007 to name just two

provided a set of unifying concepts that helped construct the idea of national specificity (p. 19), thus shaping the dominant national ideology. The second and third periods span the time from the reorganization of the Romanian educational system in 1948 to the end of Ceaușescu's regime in 1989 (pp. 20–29, 89–94). Regarded generally as a time of intellectual oppression and aggressive censorship, they both had their own sets of adaptations to the new socio-political realities, such as a reassertion of 'hard-scientific' approaches, adoption and integration of specific Marxist phrasings (without, however, considering Marxism's theoretical implications in the interpretation of material culture), an emphasis on economic factors and, in the later years, a rehashing of nationalist discourse. Lastly, the fourth period debuts with the collapse of communist rule and traverses the much-discussed transition period, leading to present times (pp. 29–37, 94–98). This period is not one of revolutionary ideas and paradigm shifts, but rather one that provides a new stage on which archaeologist's old adaptations play out new roles.

Following this introduction that doubles as the authors' contextual framework, the book presents itself as made up of a number of articles, treated here as individual chapters. They have been loosely grouped in two parts, the first concerning itself with the exploration of the distant past (neolithic and eneolithic ages in particular) while second proposes an archaeological treatment of the recent past and contemporary times, discussing the steps that have already been taken down this path. The chapters differ greatly in scope and tone: some are comprehensive case studies built around some of the complaints or critiques of the authors, others nigh-philosophical musings on the values proposed by neo-liberal capitalism or the way the force of a specific political discourse can shape perceptions of space. Although they make for interesting reads separately, taken together they offer the reader an insight into some of the major theoretical issues archaeology is confronted by (a horizontal referencing).

Although not specifically expressing a preference for one theoretical camp over another, the book nonetheless leans towards a post-processual approach (and quotes heavily from some of its major proponents: Michael Shanks, Christopher Tilley, Ian Hodder, etc.) For instance, in the chapter dedicated to the Pietrele archaeological project (pp. 101–138), the authors condemn the separation between data collection and its subsequent interpretation (pp. 108–110), as this reaffirms the erroneous view that archaeological evidence speaks for itself. As each individual interpretation material culture is subjective, it is the authors' belief that any 'truth' derived from the study of any past culture's material remains should stem from a process of critically contrasting and comparing each researcher's take on the matter (pp. 111–112). They embrace the innate theory-ladenness of data (p. 137) and accept that "facts are selected and that research must be problem orientated; facts only answer the questions the archaeologist asks of them"[2]. The authors consider that the Pietrele project provides a prime example of this, as the research goals set before its debut in 2002 informed the outcome of it's results (p. 102). The chapter also condemns the naïve trust in western methodological superiority and the belief that the mere superficial adoption of practices and technologies is a safeguard against interpretative errors (p. 107). The authors advocate a firm theoretical grounding for the use of technology before it can be a useful to the archaeologist. Without one, it can easily become an end in itself rather than a valuable tool to be used in the production of knowledge. Another recurring undertone is the belief that an archaeological investigation of the past and the present should be mutually informed (p. 37, 160, 171, 172) . In connection to this, the chapters that speak about the archaeological research done at Roșia Montană (pp. 172–174, 199–212, 213–223) remark the fact that as they dug up the material evidence of changes in past peoples' lives, the archaeologists working there did not seem to notice important changes taking place in the communities around them (pp. 172–173). Thus, the authors look at the material culture of a town in the

[2] SHANKS/TILLEY 1987

process of abandonment and see it as "evocative of an absent human presence" (p. 207). These remains do not, however, fit into the generalizing functionalist categories that such finds would be grouped in if they were taken out of he trench. This should be cause for reflecting on what truths one can actually discern from these objects (pp. 210–211). An archaeology of the present and recent past one could also bring researches face to face with examples of otherness and highlight the unfairness of imposing authoritarian interpretations that deny it.

But what of the title? On the topic of the role played by archaeological writing in political discourse, I considered a parallel between the situation that the two authors describe and the preamble to the David Clarke's article Archaeology, the loss of innocence. Here he states that "the politics and sociology of the disciplinary environment increasingly develop this 'authoritarian' state in which each expert has a specialist territory such that criticisms of territorial observations are treated as attacks upon personalities. This gradually becomes a seriously counterproductive vestige of a formerly valuable disciplinary adaptation by means of which authorities mutually repelled one another into dispersed territories, thus effectively deploying the few specialists over the growing body of data. […] each group [of archaeologists] deepens their specialist cells by concentrated research, thereby unconsciously raising barriers to communication between archaeologists within the expanding mass of period, regional, topic, methodology and paradigm cells"[3] Basically what this does is isolate the researcher in his ivory tower not only from the public at large but also from his peers. Critical review of one's work is discouraged while communication between the different 'paradigm cells' is near impossible to achieve as they drift further apart through the direction of their research. The same state of things is what the authors of Archaeology and Politics recognize as being a staple of the Romanian archaeological tradition (pp. 13–17). It is this characteristic that the authors call a "feudal treatment of history" (pp. 14–15), according to which it is broken apart and reserved to the investigation of only a select few. They also apply the analogy to the way a certain field of expertise is "passed on" from master to pupil through specific rights of passage (pp. 14–15), with the right of interpretation and criticism of writing reserved only for the ones who successfully get through all of them. This 'formerly valuable disciplinary adaptation' also proved successful in a number of other ways: it is an effective means of accumulating, transmitting and exchanging what the authors call "capital" (of the cultural, social or political kind) (p. 16), it provides the archaeologist with an aura of scientific respectability (pp. 50–58), and, perhaps most importantly, it forms a closed system that can safeguard generations of researchers against having their writing used and abused by the dominant political discourse (p. 27, 37). Although the latter part sounds good in theory, it has proven thoroughly ineffectual in practice as this isolation, coupled with a hard-science approach and culture-history common-sense assumptions gave archaeological data and texts a useful malleability that could be exploited for political goals (p. 38). This was particularly true for the two periods that the discipline traverses during the years of communist rule but still holds true today, with any alterations in methods, discourse, theory and praxis being only skin-deep (pp. 29–37, 94–98). Even the way archaeology is brought from the trench to the exhibition for the non-specialist to observe and enjoy, is politically informed. (pp. 88–98) In accepting that the museum aesthetic should be questioned as they are "not neutral vehicles for an ideal presence of the past"[4] the authors also call for a critical examination of what the political message of an exhibition may be and in what way that message deforms our knowledge of the past.

Last but not least, I also found it enlightening to address Clarke's expression of his belief that "it is as unrealistic to ignore this contemporary context of debate as it is to portray these changes as painless moves from historic ignorance to archaeological enlightenment; each archaeology is of its time but since many deplore the time they will certainly be unhappy with its

[3] CLARKE 1973, 6–18

[4] SHANKS/TILLEY 1987

archaeology. The disciplinary system is after all an adaptive one, related internally to its changing content and externally to the spirit of the times. Past archaeological states were appropriate for past archaeological contexts, and past explanations were very much related to past archaeological states of knowledge".[5] '"Each archaeology is of its time" is mirrored by the authors' statement that "discourses regarding the past are produced by people in certain historical contexts". To separate the discipline from its historical context is to propagate a deformed view that ultimately serves to undermine future efforts (pp. 33–35). It is this view that preserves the status-quo and that prevents natural growth and expansion of knowledge from occurring, all the while enforcing the unfounded but firmly accepted belief that the discipline has indeed experienced an evolutionary process that brought us from then (the murky, methodologically unenlightened past) to now (the crowning achievements of present scientific refinement). The truth as the authors' see it is that, in fact, the "past explanations" are not onfined to the "past archaeological states of knowledge" but through closed systems that rewarded obedience (p. 16, 37, 38), have found a way to seep into the present. It is these closed systems that have preserved the view that archaeology is implicitly apolitical. It operates with lofty scientific truths and as such it has very little to do with day-to-day disreputable political squalor. Thus, my colleague's question is, as said, a valid one. It is the authors' hope that this state of things will not last indefinitely and that the archaeological field will become a valid place for the production of knowledge (p. 38), where the archaeologist uses his toolbox of critical assessment tools not just to produce valid interpretations of the past but also to a deep understanding of the present and one's place in it (p. 38, 137, 160, 175, 212) So does this volume bring us closer to a time when Romanian archaeology will discard its own romantic innocence in favour of a fundamental renewal of the way it approaches the field? The loosely connected articles provide more than enough food for thought for anyone interested in what archaeology is and does outside the trench, as well as challenge assumptions concerning what is the acceptable and what is 'unchangeable' in present day archaeological practice. Perhaps one day this book and others like it will form the cornerstone for the development of a new, "critically self-aware"[6] archaeology.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

MCGUIRE 2008
R.H. MCGUIRE, Archaeology as Political Action (London, 2008)

HAMILAKIS/DUKE 2007
Y. HAMILAKIS / P. DUKE, Archaeology and Capitalism: From Ethics to Politics (Walnut Creek 2007)

SHANKS/TILLEY 1987
M. SHANKS / C. TILLEY, Social theory and Archaeology (Albuquerque 1987)

CLARKE 1973, 6–18
D. CLARKE, Archaeology: the loss of innocence, Antiquity 47, 1973, 6–18

Paul Vădineanu
("Babeș-Bolyai" University of Cluj-Napoca
email: paul.vadineanu@yahoo.com)

[5] CLARKE 1973, 6–18
[6] CLARKE 1973, 6–18

ABBREVIATIONS THAT CAN NOT BE FOUND IN BERICHT DER RÖMISCH-GERMANISCHE KOMMISSION

Abhandlungen der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin	= AKAWB
Acta Classica Universitatis Scientiarum Debrecensis, Debrecen	= ACD
Acta Ethnographica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae (Budapesta)	= Acta Ethnogr Acad Scien Hungaricae
Analele Academiei Române. Memoriile secţiunii istorice	= An. Acad. Române. Mem. Sec. Istor.
Analele Banatului (Timişoara)	= An. Banatului
Analele Dobrogei (Constanţa)	= An. Dobrogei
Analele Universităţii Bucureşti	= An. Univ. Bucureşti
Analele Universităţii Iaşi	= An. Univ. Iaşi
Analele Universităţii „Dimitrie Cantemir" (Constanţa)	= An. Univ. Constanţa
Annales: économies, sociétés, civilisations (Paris)	= Ann. Écon. Soc. Civil.
Annales Universitatis Apulensis (Alba Iulia)	= AUA
Annali di scienze religiose, Milano	= Annali di scienze religiose
Anuarul Institutului pentru Studii Politice, de Apărare şi Istorie Militară	= Anu. Instit. Stud. Pol. Apăr. şi Istor. Milit.
Archaeologisch-epigraphische Mitteilungen aus Österreich (-Ungarn), Wien	= AEM
Archiv des Vereines für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde, Hermannstadt – Kronstadt (Sibiu – Braşov)	= AVSL
Archaeologia Baltica Polonia = Peregrinatio Gotica (Łódz)	= Arh Baltica
Arheologia Medievală (Iaşi)	= Arh. Medievală
Antigüedad, religiones y sociedades, Huelva	= ARYS
Az alsófehérmegyei történelmi régészeti és természettudomány évkönyve (Alba Iulia)	= AlsóTermÉvkönyve
Balcanica Posnanensia. Acta et Studia. Czasopismo wydawane przez UAM w Poznaniu	= Balcanica Posnaniensia
Buletinul cercurilor ştiinţifice studenţeşti (Alba Iulia)	= BCŞS Alba Iulia
Buletinul Monumentelor Istorice (Bucureşti)	= BMI
Instrumentum Bulletin du Groupe de travail européen sur l´artisanat et les productions manufacturées dans l´Antiquité (Montagnac)	= Bull Instrumentum
Bulletin antieke beschaving Annual Papers on Classical Archaeology	= BABesch

Bulletin de l´Institut historique belge de Rome (Rome)	= BullInst Hist Belge (Rome)
Cahiers du Centre Gustave Glotz, Sorbonne (Paris)	= Cahiers Centre Gustave Glotz
Classical Philology (Chicago)	= Class. Philol.
Cronica Cercetărilor Arheologice din România (Bucureşti)	= CCA
Cronica Numismatică şi Arheologică (Bucureşti)	= Cron. Numis. Arh.
Dialogues d´Histoire Ancienne, París-Besançon	= DHA
Dicţionarul limbii romîne moderne (Bucureşti 1958)	= DRLM
Documenta Romaniae Historica (Bucureşti)	= DRH
Les Dossiers d'archeologie, París	= DossPar
Ethnic and Racial Studies (London)	= Ethnic and Racial Studies
File de Istorie = Revista Bistriţei (Bistriţa)	= FI (Rev. Bistriţei)
Greek-English Lexicon (Oxford 1966)	= Greek-English 1966
Harvard Studies in Classical Philology	= Harvard Stud. Class. Studia Philol.
Historica. Historia Antigua (Salamanca)	= Stud. Hist. Hist. Antigua
Il Mar Nero Annali di archeologia e storia (Roma)	= Il Mar Nero
Izvestija Russkogo Arheologičeskogo Instituta v Konstantinopole	= Izv. Ross. Arch. Inst. Konstantinopole
Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts in Wien	= ÖJh
Journal of Indo-European Studies (Washington DC)	= JIES
Journal of the Society for Ancient Numismatists	= Journal Soc. Ancient Numism.
Könyv és könyvtár, Budapest	= Könyv és könyvtár
Labeo Rassegna di Diritto Romano (Napoli)	= Labeo
Lateinisch-Deutsch Schulwörterbuch (Leipzig 1891)	= Lateinisch-Deutsch 1891
Lateinisch-Deutsch Handwörterbuch (Hannover-Leipzig 1918)	= Lateinisch-Deutsch 1918
Litua. Studii şi comunicări. Muzeul Judeţean Gorj, Târgu Jiu	= Litua
M. M. Roxan, P. Holder, Roman Military Diplomas, London	= RMD
Mélanges de l´École roumaine en France (Paris)	= Mél École roumaine en France
Mélanges de l´Univ St Ioseph (Beiruth)	= Mél Univ St Ioseph (Beiruth)
Mémoires de la Société Historique et Archéologique de Langres (Langres)	= Mém Soc Hist et Arch Langres
Memoria antiquitatis Acta Musei Petrodavensis Revista Muzeului arheologic (Piatra Neamţ)	= Memoria Antiquitatis
Monumenta Germaniae Historica (München)	= MGH
Mousaios Anuarul muzeului judeţean Buzău	= Mousaios
A Nyíregyházi Jósa András Múzeum Évkönyve (Nyíregyháza)	= Josa Andras Múz Évk
Norba Revista de arte, geografía e historia (Cáceres)	= Norba
Numismatische Zeitschrift	= NZ
O Arqueólogo Português, Lisboa	= Arque. Português
Opţiuni istoriografice, Iaşi	= Opţiuni istoriografice
Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica, Lovaina (Leuven)	= OLP
Ostraka Rivista di antichità (Napoli)	= Ostraka
Patrimonium Apulense, Alba Iulia	= Patrim. Apulense
RepArAb Repertoriul arheologic al judeţului Alba, Alba Iulia,	= RepArAb

1995 [= Bibliotheca Musei Apulensis, II]	
Res Antiquae (Bruxelles)	= Res Antiquae
Revista de etnografie și folclor (București)	= Rev Etnogr și Folclor
Revista Bistriţei	= Rev. Bistriţei
Revista de Istorie (Bucureşti)	= Rev. de Istor.
Revista Facultăţilor de teologie din Patriarhia Română (Bucureşti)	= Stud Teologice
Revista Muzeelor, Bucureşti	= Rev. Muzeelor
Revue archéologique de l'Est et du Centre-Est (Paris)	= RAEst
Revue des Études Sud-Est Européennes (Bucharest)	= Rev. Études SE Européennes
Revue Historique (Paris)	= Rev. Historique
Revue Historique du Sud-Est Européen (Bucharest)	= RHSEE
Revista Storica dell'Antichita (Roma)	= Riv. Stor. Antichita
Strabon (Iaşi)	= Strabon
Studia Archaeologica, Roma	= StArch
Studia Antiqua et Archaeologica (Iaşi)	= SAA
Studia Universitatis „Babeş-Bolyai", seria Historia, Cluj-Napoca	= Stud. Historia UBB
Studia historica. Historia Antigua (Salamanca)	= Stud.Hist. Histor. Antig.
Studia Thracologica (Bucureşti)	= Stud. Thracologica
Studii şi Comunicări Câmpulung	= Stud. Com. Câmpulung
Studium, Debrecen	= Studium
Symposia Thracologica (Bucureşti)	= Symp. Thracologica
Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association, Atlanta	= TAPA
Transsilvania. Ein Beiblatt zum Siebenbürger Boten, Hermannstadt (Sibiu)	= TranssilvBB
Uniwersytet Im Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu, Seria Historia (Poznań)	= Uniw Adama Mickiewicza Poznan
Vestigia. Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte (München)	= Vestigia
Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins	= ZDPV
Zeitschrift für Geschichte	= Zeitschr. Gesch.

GUIDELINES FOR "EPHEMERIS NAPOCENSIS"

Colleagues who wish to publish in this journal are kindly asked to respect the following guidelines:

The text of the article must be typed at 1.5 lines, using the font Times New Roman 12.

The footnotes will be typed at single line with the same font, but size 10.

For special fonts the authors are kindly asked to send as separate file the font they have used (format *.ttf).

The title of the article will be typed with capital letters, font Times New Roman 14, bold and centered.

The author(s)'s name(s) shall be typed in capital letters, font Times New Roman 12, bold, centered, two lines spacing under the title.

At the end of the article the author will type his name, his place of actitivity and his e-mail address.

The articles published in Romanian language must have an abstract written in one of the following foreign languages: English, French, Italian and German.

Each article must have keywords which should be placed after the title and the author's name.

Quotations:

The notes are placed at the bottom of each page, no matter if there is one work cited or there are some comments, too.

The quotation system is the one used by the Bericht der Römisch-Germanische Kommission.

Models of quotations

Books:

DAICOVICIU 1972, 45–78

H. DAICOVICIU, Dacia de la Burebista la cucerirea romană (Cluj-Napoca 1972).

Articles in journals:

FINK 1958, 107–110

R. O. FINK, Hunt's pridianum: British Museum Papyrus 2851, Journal Roman Stud. 48, 1958, 102–116.

Articles published in the proceedings of conferences or anniversary volumes:

DVORSKI 1996, 217–220

T. DVORSKI, Archaeological Investigations on Limes Alutanus in 1980–1984 (*Dacia Inferior – Malvensis*). In P. Petrovič (ed.), Roman Limes on the Middle and Lower Danube (Belgrade 1996), 215–222.

For two or more authors:

VÁGÓ/BÓNA 1976

E. B. VÁGÓ/I. BÓNA, Die Gräberfelder von Intercisa (Budapest 1976).

The list of periodical abbreviations can be found accessing the following link:

http://www.dainst.org/medien/de/richtlinien_abkuerzungen.html

For those periodicals which are not to be found in the list of abbreviations from the Bericht der Römisch-Germanische Kommission, please, make yourself the abbreviations following the example below:

Studia historica. Historia Antigua (Salamanca) = Stud. Hist. Histor. Antig.

Illustration

All plates will be sent in a *.cdr format (Corel Draw).

The size of page will be B5 (ISO) (176 x 250 mm)

The plate mirror: 22 de mm from each side of page.

The explanation of plate will be placed below the plate, font Times New Roman 12 (e.g. Pl. 1. Map of Roman Dacia)

The editorial board reserves the right to reject those articles which do not follow the guidelines mentioned above.

REVISTE PUBLICATE LA EDITURA ACADEMIEI ROMÂNE

ANUARUL INSTITUTULUI DE ISTORIE DIN CLUJ-NAPOCA
ANUARUL INSTITUTULUI DE ISTORIE „A. D. XENOPOL" IAŞI
ARHEOLOGIA MOLDOVEI
ARHIVA GENEALOGICĂ
ARHIVELE OLTENIEI
ARS TRANSSILVANIAE
DACIA. REVUE D'ARCHÉOLOGIE ET D'HISTOIRE ANCIENNE
EPHEMERIS NAPOCENSIS
REVISTA ISTORICĂ
REVUE DES ÉTUDES SUD-EST EUROPÉENNES
REVUE ROUMAINE D'HISTOIRE
REVUE ROUMAINE D'HISTOIRE DE L'ART
– SÉRIE BEAUX-ARTS
– SÉRIE THÉÂTRE-MUSIQUE-CINÉMA
STUDII ŞI CERCETĂRI DE ISTORIA ARTEI
– SERIA ARTĂ PLASTICĂ
– SERIA TEATRU-MUZICĂ-CINEMATOGRAFIE
STUDII ŞI CERCETĂRI DE ISTORIE VECHE ŞI ARHEOLOGIE
THRACO-DACICA

La publication "Ephemeris Napocensis" paraît 1 fois par an. Toute commande de l'étranger sera addressee à:
EDITURA ACADEMIEI ROMÂNE, Calea 13 Septembrie nr. 13, Sector 5, P.O. Box 5–42, Bucureşti,
Romania, RO–76117, tel. 40 21 – 411 90 08, tel./fax 40 21 – 410 39 83; 40 21 – 410 34 48;
RODIPET S. A. Piaţa Presei Libere nr. 1, Sector 1, P. O. Box 33–57, fax 40 21– 222 64 07,
tel. 40 21–618 51 03; 40 21– 222 41 26, Bucureşti, România; ORION PRESS IMPEX 2000,
P. O. Box 77–19, tel. 40 21 653 79 85; fax. 40 21–324 06 38, Bucureşti 3-Romania