EPHEMERIS NAPOCENSIS

XXIII
2013

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: Ioan Stanciu

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

© 2013 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

XXIII
2013

EDITURA ACADEMIEI ROMÂNE

SUMAR – SOMMAIRE – CONTENTS – INHALT

Academicianul Marius Porumb la 70 de ani.....7

Academician Marius Porumb at 70 Years.....9

STUDIES

ROBERT GINDELE
Die Problematik der barbarischen Siedlungen im Nord-Westen Rumäniens zwischen der Gründung der Provinz Dakien und den Markomannenkriegen.....11

VITALIE BÂRCĂ, SORIN COCIŞ
Sarmatian Graves Surrounded by Flat Circular Ditch Discovered at Nădlac (Arad County, Romania).....31

CORIOLAN HORAŢIU OPREANU
Burnished Pottery from the Settlement at Suceag (County of Cluj, Romania). Evolution, Chronology and Cultural Interferences.....51

CĂLIN COSMA
Early Medieval Spurs in Transylvania (7Th – 10Th Centuries AD).....79

ERWIN GÁLL
Dăbâca – das Gräberfeld um die Kirche aus Grădina lui Alexandru Tămaş. Einige Bemerkungen zur Entwicklung der Wohnsiedlung von Dăbâca.....103

ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND EPIGRAPHICAL NOTES

FLORIN CURTA
The Elephant in the Room. A Reply to Sebastian Brather.....165

CRISTIAN VIRAG
Archaeological Discoveries from Pecica Belonging to the Bodrogkeresztúr Culture.....177

ANDREEA DRĂGAN
Situla Shaped Pottery from the Fortified Settlement from Divici-Grad, Caraş-Severin County, Romania.....197

SORIN CLEŞIU, GEORGE TROHANI
Restitutio. La Céramique à décor peint de *Sarmizegetusa Regia* des dépots des Musées de Bucarest.....205

VITALIE BÂRCĂ
The Items in the Sarmatian Grave at Lehliu (Călăraşi County) and its Dating Issue.....243

DAN-AUGUSTIN DEAC
The Toponymy of *Dacia Porolissensis*. Recent Research and new Approaches..... 261

COSMIN ONOFREI
A Military Diploma regarding *Dacia Porolissensis* (14th of April 123)..... 271

IRINA NEMETI, RADU IUSTINIAN ZĂGREANU
Sculptural Monuments from *Dacia Porolissensis*..... 277

EUGENIA BEU-DACHIN, SORIN COCIŞ, VALENTIN VOIŞIAN
Epigraphica Napocensia. Epigraphic Discoveries from Victor Deleu Street in Cluj-Napoca... 297

DAN-AUGUSTIN DEAC
Negotiating with the Dacians. The Case of *M. Ulpius Celerinus, interpres Dacorum*..... 313

IOAN STANCIU, CORIOLAN HORAȚIU OPREANU,
VLAD-ANDREI LĂZĂRESCU, DAN ȘTEFAN
New Geophysical Surveys and Archaeological Research at Lazuri (Satu Mare County, Romania)..... 323

CORIOLAN HORAȚIU OPREANU, VLAD-ANDREI LĂZĂRESCU
New Geophysical Surveys and Archaeological Research at Suceag (Cluj County, Romania)..... 339

REVIEWS

Susanne Sievers, Otto H. Urban, Peter C. Ramsl (Hrsg.), *Lexikon zur keltischen Archäologie*, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Mitteilungen der Prähistorischen Kommission, two volumes (A-K, L-Z), Verlag ÖAW (Wien 2012), 2207 p., 24 x 15 cm format, hardcover, black-and-white and colour illustrations (Sándor Berecki)..... 355

Sven Rausch, *Bilder des Nordens. Vorstellungen vom Norden in der griechischen Literatur von Homer bis zum Ende des Hellenismus* [Archäologie in Eurasien 28], Mainz 2013, VIII + 444 Seiten mit 9 Abbildungen, englische und russische Zusammenfassung (Ligia Ruscu)..... 359

Alexander Falileyev, *The Celtic Balkans*, Aberystwyth, CMCS Publications, 2013, 182 p. (Aurel Rustoiu)..... 363

Miklós Szabó, Károly Tankó, Zoltán Czajlik (sous la direction de), *La nécropole celtique à Ludas – Varjú-dűlő.* Avec la participation de K. T. Bruder, L. Domboróczki, N. B. Fábry, K. Gherdán, J.-P. Guillaumet, F. Gyulai, S. Marion, A. Masse, P. Méniel, F. Molnár, G. Szakmány, É. Tankó, Budapest, L'Harmattan – Institut archéologique de l'université ELTE, 2012, 321 p. + LV pl. + 1 Plan (310 figures in text, drawings, graphs and black-and-white photographs). (Aurel Rustoiu)... 365

Sven Rausch, *Bilder des Nordens. Vorstellungen vom Norden in der griechischen Literatur von Homer bis zum Ende des Hellenismus* [Archäologie in Eurasien 28], Mainz 2013, VIII + 444 Seiten mit 9 Abbildungen, englische und russische Zusammenfassung (Ligia Ruscu)..... 369

Pantheon. Religionistický Časopis – Journal for the Study of Religions, Volume 7/1, 2012, 152 p. (Szabó Csaba)..... 369

Abbreviations that can not be found in Bericht der Römisch-Germanische Kommission..... 373

Guidelines for Ephemeris Napocensis..... 377

Susanne Sievers, Otto H. Urban, Peter C. Ramsl (Hrsg.), *Lexikon zur keltischen Archäologie*, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Mitteilungen der Prähistorischen Kommission, two volumes (A-K, L-Z), Verlag ÖAW (Wien 2012), 2207 p., 24 x 15 cm format, hardcover, black-and-white and colour illustrations.

The three editors, S. Sievers, O. H. Urban and P. C. Ramsl assumed an ambitious, large-scale work when they decided to accomplish the German language 'encyclopaedia' of Celtic archaeology. The two hardcover volumes were published in the *Mitteilungen der Prähistorischen Kommision* series of the Austrian Academy of Sciences (ÖAW) in 2012, in Vienna. The stylized chape ornament from Pottenbrunn can be seen on the simple and stylishly designed dark blue cover, under the name of the editors and the title, as well as on the spine of the book. A short presentation of the volume written by the editors is added on the back cover. Some maps were placed on the front and rear end-papers – as it is common in the case of lexicons – the distribution map of oppida at the beginning and the localization of Celtic tribes at the end of both volumes.

Taking into consideration the large area covered by the lexicon, the editors asked specialists from each country to select the relevant topics and their authors. Having regard to the extent of the work (2207 pages) and the complexity of the articles, the present review reflects only on the discoveries from the eastern parts of the Carpathian Basin, especially from Transylvania.

Regarding the structure of the work one can note that the contents and the foreword of the authors in the first volume (A–K, 1110 pages) is followed by the list of authors and the articles. While separate bibliographic lists can be found at the end of both volumes, including the references used in each of the respective volumes, the bibliographic abbreviations and the three indexes (list of place names, list of names and list of authors) were only added at the end of the second volume. The headwords are accompanied by colour or black-and-white illustrations: maps, photos and drawings of artefacts, features, archive pictures and aerial photos.

The lexicon includes entries in alphabetical order about sites and regions with Celtic discoveries, relevant individuals, names of Celtic tribes and of their neighbours, typical artefacts, fields of science, or administrative, religious and artistic terms. From Transylvania – except for the monetary discoveries – the following sites were included: Aiud (L.D.), Apahida (A.R.), Archiud (L.V.), Aţel, Band, Blaj, Blandiana (L.D.), Cepari (L.V.), Cluj-Napoca (A.R.), Cugir (L.D.), Dăbâca, Dezmir (A.R.), Dipşa (L.V.), Fântânele (A.R. and L.V.), Galaţii Bistriţei (L.V.), Gligoreşti, Haţeg, Jucul de Sus (A.R.), Lancrăm (L.D.), Luncani (A.R.), Mediaş (L.D.), Moreşti (M.B.), Ocna Sibiului (A.R.), Orosfaia (L.V.), Papiu Ilarian (L.D.), Piatra Roşie (M.B.), Prundu Bârgăului (L.V.), Sebeş, Şeica Mică (L.D.), Şeuşa, Sighişoara, Silivaş (A.R.), Sopteriu (correctly Şopteriu) (L.V.), Toarcla, Vetel (correctly Veţel) and Vurpăr (L.D.). The south-western Romanian sites are: Cicir, Pecica, Remetea Mare, Săvîrşin (Săvârşin in recent orthography) and Vladimirescu/Glogovăţ (L.D.). Entries for north-western Romania include Andrid, Berea,

Berveni, Carei, Ciumeşti, Curtuiuşeni, Dindeşti (A.R.), Diosig (L.D.), Foieni, Moftinu Mic (A.R.), Oradea (L.D.), Pişcolt, Săcuieni, Sanislău, Valea lui Mihai and Zăuan (A.R.).

In addition further sites from southern and eastern Romania were included in the lexicon, even if these territories produced scarce Celtic finds. In most cases a small number of artefacts connected to the Celts were found, or items which are more likely related in general to the La Tène period than to the populations and civilisation defined in the title of the lexicon.

Unfortunately there are also some entries without any connection to the archaeology of the Celts. One such headword presents the cemetery with a tumulus with a wagon grave located in the vicinity of the fortification from Cugir, which is dated to the Dacian period even according to the bibliography cited at the end of the article. On the other hand, while the settlement from Moreşti was included in the lexicon, the headword describing Mediaş mentions only the graves published by I. Nestor, lacking the information about the settlement features initially investigated by K. Horedt[1]. Two relatively important graves, the one from Dârloş discovered in 1973 and dated to LT B2[2] and the similarly dated isolated grave from Pruniş, which contains, among other artefacts, a Bölcske type brooch[3] were also left out. Among the Transylvanian isolated finds only the – otherwise important – belt from Veţel was included in the lexicon, while other important isolated finds, like the Transylvanian type belt from Turda[4], the two discs from Târgu Mureş[5] or the *Hohlbuckelring* from Uroi[6] were left out.

Finally it should be mentioned that the chariot grave from Cristuru Secuiesc was erroneously listed as coming from Timavalva (actually an urban district of the town). The grave was first mentioned by M. Roska in 1929 and later published in detail in 1933, then it was mentioned again in 1942 and 1944[7]; in all cases it is located in Székelykeresztúr (the Hungarian name of the town) or Cristuru Secuiesc, the discoveries coming from the findspot known as *Belső-Cserépcsűr* and *Csűrösoldal*. The grave was recently discussed in Ferencz 1997 and Schönfelder 2002, and in both cases it is correctly located in Cristuru Secuiesc. Furthermore, the discovery is generally dated to LT C1[8], but in the lexicon is earlier dated.

On the same topic of the Celtic chariot graves from the Carpathian Basin, one can observe that among the three chariot graves known from Hungary only the one from Hatvan–Boldog was described in the lexicon (p. 736), whereas the male chariot grave from Balsa–*Földhordó halom*, Szabolcs-Szatmár c.[9], and the one from Arnót, Borsod-Abauj-Zemplén c., unearthed in 1969 in the sand quarry[10], were not included.

One cannot ignore that some specialists whose work in the last decades was decisive for the research of the Celtic civilisation in Romania and especially in Transylvania were left out from the list of chosen authors. For example, I. V. Ferencz, the author of a doctoral thesis published in 2007 about the Celtic discoveries from the middle course of the Mureş River was left out[11], in fact not even his work was included in the bibliography of the headwords, while some of his illustrations (p. 16, 648) do appear.

Although the intensity of the volume of work and the organization required by the lexicon cannot be questioned, some minor editing and pagination errors occurred. For example,

[1] HOREDT 1965; BLĂJAN/TOGAN 1978.
[2] BLĂJAN/TOGAN 1978.
[3] CRIŞAN 1973; CRIŞAN/RUSTOIU/PALKÓ 1995.
[4] ZIRRA 1971.
[5] BERECKI 2010.
[6] FERENCZ 2007.
[7] ROSKA 1929; ROSKA 1933; ROSKA 1942; ROSKA 1944.
[8] More recently in SCHÖNFELDER 2002.
[9] ROSKA 1915.
[10] K.-VÉGH 1973.
[11] FERENCZ 2007.

right at the beginning one translator's name (p. IV) and then in the list of authors one Hungarian and one Romanian settlement name (p. IX) were misspelled. In the case of articles, in the bibliography or in the text itself the diacritics in some personal names (pages 389, 672, 859, 955, 1215, 1621, 1647, 1700, 1707, 1841, 1957), settlement names (pages 113, 543, 858, 861, 875, 955, 1120, 1126, 1202, 1264, 1267, 1405, 1447, 1511, 1660, 1696, 1752, 2002), institutions (page 1479), rivers (page 944) appear erroneously or are missing. In the case of Transylvanian and western Romanian sites the Hungarian name of the settlements appears inconsistently (mainly depending on the author of the entry) or is not listed at all. In other cases the information accompanying the illustrations is incorrect (pages 16, 70). Sometimes the bibliography of the article is wrong or misplaced, like in the case of Pişcolt. The names of the findspots are not used uniformly and there are several editing variants, with quotation marks, or dashes, bold, etc. The abbreviation of the La Tène periods was also left to the authors therefore several forms occur, like LT B2, LTB2, LT B 2 and Lt B2. In some cases the order of the headwords was reversed, e.g. Mörbisch and Mötschwil can be found after Moel y Gaer but before Moftinu Mic. Sometimes, when from one locality more sites are known they were listed under the same headword (for example Fântânele), while in other cases each site was given a separate entry (the sites from Sopron). The bibliography from both volumes also contains several editing errors.

All these minor mistakes, however, do not attenuate the significance and the need of the work, and the two-volume lexicon is undoubtedly a real handbook and manual, a must-have of scholars and amateurs interested in Celtic archaeology and the European Iron Age.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BERECKI 2010
S. BERECKI, Two La Tène Bronze Discs from Târgu Mureş, Transylvania. Marisia 30, 2010, 69–75.

BLĂJAN–TOGAN 1978
M. BLĂJAN/G. TOGAN, Descoperiri celtice şi dacice inedite la Mediaş şi în împrejurimi. Acta Mus. Porolossensis 2, 1978, 39–51.

CRIŞAN 1973
I. H. CRIŞAN, Aşa numitul mormânt de la Silivaş şi problema celui mai vechi grup celtic din Transilvania. Sargetia 10, 1973, 45–76.

CRIŞAN/RUSTOIU/PALKÓ 1995
I. H. CRIŞAN/A. RUSTOIU/A. PALKÓ, Descoperiri celtice la Pruniş (judeţul Cluj). Ephemeris Napocensis 5, 1995, 27–46.

FERENCZ 1997
I. V. FERENCZ, Nouvelles considérations sur la tombe celtique à char de Cristurul Secuiesc. Ephemeris Napocensis 7, 1997, 5–10.

HOREDT 1965
K. HOREDT, Mittellatènezeitliche Siedlungen aus Siebenbürgen. Stud. aus Alteuropa 2, 1965, 54–75.

ROSKA 1915
M. ROSKA, Kelta sírok és egyéb emlékek Balsáról. Dolg. Erdélyi Nemzeti Múz. 6, 1915, 18–48.

ROSKA 1929
M. ROSKA, A Székelyföld őskora, 258–326. In: Emlékköny a Székely Nemzeti Múzeum 50 éves jubileumára (Sfântu Gheorghe 1929).

ROSKA 1933
M. ROSKA, Le tombeau celtique de Cristurul Săcuiesc dèp. d'Odorhei. Dacia 3–4, 1927–1932 [1933], 359–361.

ROSKA 1942
M. ROSKA, Erdély régészeti repertóriuma I – Őskor. (Kolozsvár 1942).

ROSKA 1944
M. ROSKA, A kelták Erdélyben. Közl. Erdélyi Nemzeti Múz. Éremtárából 4, 1944, 53–80.
SCHÖNFELDER 2002
M. SCHÖNFELDER, Das spätkeltische Wagengrab von Boé. Studien zu Wagen und Wagengräbern der jüngeren Latènezeit. *Römisch-Germanische Zentralmuseum* Mainz, Monographien 54 (Mainz 2002).
K.-VÉGH 1973
K. K.-VÉGH, Adatok a kelta kocsitemetkezések kérdéséhez, Arch. Ért. 2, 1973, 208– 219.
ZIRRA 1971
V. Zirra, Beiträge zur Kenntnis des keltischen Latène in Rumänien. Dacia 15, 1971, 171–238.

Sándor Berecki
(Mureş County Museum;
e-mail: sberecki@yahoo.com)

Sven Rausch, *Bilder des Nordens. Vorstellungen vom Norden in der griechischen Literatur von Homer bis zum Ende des Hellenismus* [Archäologie in Eurasien 28], Mainz 2013, VIII + 444 S. mit 9 Abbildungen, englische und russische Zusammenfassung, ISBN 9787-3-8053-4658-0.[1]

Das Buch setzt sich den Zweck, die Bilder des Nordens in der griechischen Literatur von ihren Anfängen bis zum Ende des Hellenismus zu untersuchen. Was dabei entstehen soll, sind nicht neue historische Erkenntnisse, sondern allein die Festhaltung der Entwicklung griechischer Vorstellungen vom Norden – was somit mehr über die Griechen aussagen soll als über den Norden. Die Untersuchung ist chronologisch strukturiert, die Kapitel werden je einer der großen Zeitspannen gewidmet: von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des 5. Jh.; das 4. Jh.; und das Zeitalter des Hellenismus. Der Verfasser untersucht eingehend die relevanten Stellen in Autoren wie Homer, Pindar, Herodot, Platon, Aristoteles, Pytheas, Polybios, Poseidonios, Kallimachos, Strabo, und betrachtet Sonderfragen wie: das Bild des Boreas; der Norden der Himmelskugel; Astrochorographie; (Proto-)Klimazonentheorie.

Die wichtigste Errungenschaft des Buches ist die Feststellung, dass es über den untersuchten Zeitraum kein einheitliches Bild des Nordens in der griechischen Literatur gab, sondern dieses eine erhebliche Entwicklung durchfuhr. Deswegen, unterstreicht der Verfasser, sei es nicht zulässig, aus Angaben in späteren Autoren auf die Deutung von Stellen in frühen Autoren zu schließen. Die frühe griechische Literatur unterteilte den Norden in drei deutlich voneinander abgesonderte Bereiche: den „nahen" Norden (Thrakien), den „fernen" Norden (Skythien), schließlich den „mythisch-jenseitigen" Norden (Hyperboreer). Die drei Bereiche weisen unterschiedliche, ja kontrastierende Kennzeichen auf; für Grenzüberschreitungen zwischen dem Zentrum und den drei Regionen des Nordens gibt es feste Regeln. Es wäre eigentlich zu erwarten, dass die griechische Literatur zum Zeitpunkt der Gründung der ersten Apoikien an den thrakischen und skythischen Küsten oder danach ein abgeändertes Bild des Nordens biete. Dies, wie der Verfasser zeigt, war aber nicht der Fall; keine Änderung im Bild des Nordens ist früher als das Ende des 5. Jh. feststellbar und auch diese hat mit einem wachsenden Grad ethnographischer oder geographischer Genauigkeit wenig zu tun: Der „ferne" Norden rückt nicht näher heran, der mythische wird nicht entmythisiert.

Im 4. Jh. beginnt allmählich die Abänderung des traditionellen Bildes des Nordens: diese Zeit bildet ein „Scharnier" zwischen dem traditionellen und dem „neuen" Bild des Nordens. Neue Züge treten auf, sowie solche, die potentiell vorhanden sind, jedoch erst in hellenistischer Zeit aktualisiert wurden. Manche der Eigenschaften des Nordens wurden durch neue, etwas positivere ersetzt: z. B. schreibt Platon den Menschen des Nordens Tapferkeit statt der Feigheit und Schwäche des traditionellen Bildes zu; die Übergänge werden fließender,

[1] Die vorliegende Besprechung wurde im Rahmen eines Forschungsprojekts ausgearbeitet, das vom Rumänischen Nationalamt für wissenschaftliche Forschung, CNCS – UEFISCDI, Projektnummer PN-II-ID-PCE-2011-3-0054, gefördert wird.

die drei Unterregionen sind nicht mehr so deutlich voneinander abgetrennt. Nicht alleine die Feldzüge Alexanders des Großen und die Fahrt des Pytheas in den Norden (die die bewohnbare Welt in der griechischen Auffassungen erheblich vergrößerten); insbesondere der Aufstieg Roms und die keltische Expansion führten zu einer tiefgreifenden Änderung des mentalen Bildes des Nordens. Einerseits wurde die griechische Welt, zusammen mit dem aufkommenden Römischen Reich, der europäischen Barbarenwelt als Einheit gegenübergestellt; andererseits rückten dadurch die Kelten – die bis in den Späthellenismus als ein Volk des Westens betrachtet wurden – allmählich nach Norden und wurden Teil dieses einheitlichen Nordens.

Im Laufe der hellenistischen Zeit verschwanden dann die Grenzen zwischen den drei Unterregionen, die Eigenschaften jeder davon wurden vereinheitlicht auf das „neue" Bild des Nordens übertragen. Dieses „neue" Bild besteht sowohl aus Elementen des traditionellen Bildes, aus solchen, die von den Kelten übernommen oder auf die Kelten übertragen wurden, als auch aus solchen, die für den gesamten Norden neu sind – mit anderen Worten, erst im Späthellenismus wurde der Norden endgültig als „maritim, gefährlich und als Heimat blondblauäugiger Hünen" (S. viii) betrachtet. Der Verfasser folgt der Auffassung von Fr. Hartog, dass das Bild des Anderen in der frühgriechischen Literatur nicht ethnographische Genauigkeit anstrebt, sondern als Spiegelbild zum eigenen Selbst konstruiert wird. Für die Frage des Nordens jedoch fügt der Verfasser hinzu: Der imaginäre Norden ist ein System von Spiegelungen, nicht nur zwischen den Griechen und den Anderen und zwischen dem Norden und dem Süden, sondern auch zwischen den drei Unterregionen des Nordens. Sobald der Norden einheitlich wurde, führte dies zur Betonung der Unterschiede zwischen Nord und Süd sowie zwischen dem Selbst und dem Anderen: Erst jetzt wird der Norden dunkel, bewaldet und bedrohlich, erst jetzt seine Bewohner kriegerisch und gefährlich. Dieses „neue" Bild vom Norden liegt jenem in der kaiserzeitlichen Literatur zugrunde und beeinflusste merklich auch die späteren.

Der Verfasser gewinnt auch Erkenntnisse zu mehreren Einzelfragen, als da wären: die Definierung einer „Nördlichkeit", mittels derer die Eigenschaften, die ursprünglich typisch für den Norden betrachtet wurden, auf Objekte übertragen werden, die keine Verbindung mehr mit dem geographischen oder astronomischen Norden haben (dies wird durch die Verlegung des Anfangs des Zodiaks vom Krebs auf den Widder, der sich zwar nicht im realen „Norden" des Zodiaks befindet, dem jedoch „nördliche" Eigenschaften zugeschrieben wurden, veranschaulicht); die Ripäischen Berge werden von griechischen Autoren erst Ende des 5. Jh., nicht früher, mit den Hyperboreern in Verbindung gebracht. Er bietet auch eine *counterfactual analysis* zur Frage, ob es Pytheas möglich gewesen wäre, sein Werk zu schreiben, auch wenn er tatsächlich nicht in den Norden gefahren wäre. Die Frage erhält eine bejahende Antwort; nicht jedoch, dass der Verfasser die Absicht hätte, die Wirklichkeit der Fahrt des Pytheas abzustreiten. Im Gegenteil, er zeigt, dass von den vier neuen Motiven, die er im Werk des Pytheas identifiziert, drei tatsächlich die persönliche Gegenwart des Autors an Ort und Stelle nicht erforderten. Zum vierten jedoch – dass je weiter man nach Norden vorstößt, je länger die Tage im Sommer werden – hätte Pytheas die nötigen Informationen in keinem früheren griechischen literarischen Werk finden können. Dies bedeutet seinerseits, dass Bion von Abdera, bei dem die Information zuerst vorkommt, und der in der Forschung allgemein ins 4. Jh. datiert wird, in die zweite Hälfte des 3. Jh. herabgesetzt werden muss; was der Verfasser dann auch tut. Zwar ist keines der Argumente für irgendeine der Datierungen zwingend; trotzdem konnt dies einem Zirkelschluss gefährlich nahe.

Als A. Demandt in einem Seminar des Jahres 1984/85 seine Studenten ersuchte, ein Bild der Welt für das Jahr 2000 aufzustellen, prognostizierten sie für die Geisteswissenschaften „eine fortschreitende Spezialisierung mit der Folge einer Selbstisolierung gegen die Gesellschaft

durch Insider-Jargon und marginale Themen...". Er kommentierte jedoch dazu: „... die Bücher der Historiker sind wieder lesbar"[2].

An der Lesbarkeit des vorliegenden Buches besteht kein Zweifel. Das Thema an und für sich wird zwar den interessierten Laien daran hindern, sich allzu tief darin vorzuwagen, aber jemandem, der wenn auch in geringem Maße mit griechischer Literatur bewandert ist, wird der Text keine Schwierigkeiten erheben: Die Sprache ist akademisch, aber deutlich, die Aufeinanderfolge der Argumente klar durchstrukturiert, auf jedes Kapitel folgt eine Zusammenfassung der Zwischenergebnisse, auf dass der Leser, Luft holend, sich auf die kommende Kette von Argumenten vorbereiten möge. Die dreifache Zusammenfassung der Endergebnisse, auf Deutsch, Englisch und Russisch verfasst (letzteres eine willkommene Neuerung), enthebt einen nicht von der Mühe, die Untersuchung selbst zu verfolgen, streicht aber deren Hauptergebnisse auf deutliche Weise hervor. Die Testimonien, fast ebenso umfangreich wie der Text selbst, umfassen die Stellen (im Original und deutscher Übersetzung) aus 54 Quellen, die sich auf den Norden beziehen und bieten dem Leser die Möglichkeit, mühelos die Beweisführung des Verfassers nachzuvollziehen.

Die Selbstisolierung ist jedoch ebenfalls vorhanden. Die seltenen Exkurse in die kaiserzeitliche Literatur und die viel häufigeren Bezugnahmen des Verfassers auf die zeitlichen und thematischen Grenzen seiner Untersuchung sind im Lichte des Umfanges des Buches und der ihm zugrundeliegenden Arbeitsmenge nur allzu verständlich. Weitere selbstauferlegte Grenzen sind es vielleicht minder. Das Buch ist eine Befragung der griechischen Literatur nach ihrem „Bild des Anderen" (S. 1); das Endergebnis gestaltet sich jedoch als eine „Untersuchung der griechischen Vorstellungen vom Norden" allgemein, nicht alleine jene der literarischen Quellen (S. 202). Auch sonst wird im Laufe des Buches keine deutliche Trennlinie zwischen dem Bild des Nordens in den Autoren und jenem der griechischen Gesellschaft allgemein gezogen; desöfteren wird die „mental map" der Griechen mit jener, die aus den behandelten Autoren hervorgeht, stillschweigend gleichgesetzt. Dies gilt aber nicht ohne Weiteres. Das Buch unterstreicht selbst zu wiederholten Malen, dass „empirisch gewonnene Kenntnisse nur eine mögliche Kategorie [waren], auf die man sich für eine Beschreibung des Nordens stützen könnte" (S. 176) (am auffallendsten dazu der bereits erwähnte Mangel jeder Rückwirkung der griechischen Kolonisation im Schwarzmeerbereich auf das literarische Bild des Nordens). Dass das Umgekehrte gelte (d. h., dass das von literarischen Quellen gezeichnete Bild auch ausserhalb der Literatur allgemeine Akzeptanz fand), müsste erst noch gezeigt werden.

Das Buch nimmt sich grundsätzlich vor, das Bild des Anderen zu behandeln; dies erklärt vermutlich, weshalb das Schwarzmeerbereich mit kaum einem Wort erwähnt wird; was in einem Werk über das Bild des Nordens etwas befremdend anmutet. Die Miteinbeziehung des Schwarzmeerbereiches hätte wohl die Kategorien, die der Verfasser ordentlich – vielleicht etwas zu ordentlich – voneinander abgrenzt, etwas durcheinandergebracht; denn von z. B. Olbia aus gesehen liegt Thrakien gewiss nicht im Norden, sei dieser auch nah. Übrigens gleiten dem Verfasser die Kategorien manchmal auch durcheinander, z. B. wenn er unterstreicht, dass Demosthenes keine der Nord-Stereotypen mit Philipp II. in Verbindung bringt; denn wenn der König der Makedonen den Griechen so fremd ist wie Thraker und Skythen, weshalb wird dann Makedonien hier nicht behandelt? und wenn er es nicht ist, weshalb werden die Schwarzmeergriechen ausgelassen? Es ist wahrscheinlich, dass letztere sich von Thrakern und Skythen ein unterschiedliches Bild gemalt haben werden als die Griechen des Mittelmeeres[3]; allerdings ist kaum etwas von der literarischen Produktion der Schwarzmeergriechen bis auf uns gekommen und das Gebiet zog nur gelegentlich die Aufmerksamkeit der griechischen Autoren des Mittelmeeres auf sich. Dass sich über das Bild des Schwarzen Meeres und seiner Einwohner

[2] DEMANDT 2011, 11.

[3] Siehe dazu z. B.: BRAUND 2001.

in der griechischen Literatur dennoch manche Einsichten für das Bild des Nordens insgesamt gewinnen ließen, zeigt eine kürzlich veröffentlichte Arbeit[4].

Keine dieser Bemerkungen soll jedoch die Tiefe, Gründlichkeit und die Bedeutung für die Forschung einer so unermüdlich eingehenden und so tief nachfragenden Untersuchung wie der vorliegenden beeinträchtigen. Die schiere Menge an Informationen, die der Verfasser zu einem umfassenden und überzeugenden Bild zu verarbeiten weiss, sprechen erneut und beredsam – verstummt, ihr Zweifler! – vom Wert der antiken literarischen Quellen für die Forschung der Antike insgesamt und davon, dass ihnen, trotz jahrhundertelanger intensiver Erforschung noch frische Einsichten abzugewinnen ist.

BIBLIOGRAPHIE

BRAUND 2001
D. BRAUND, L'impatto sui Greci di Traci e Sciti: immagini di sfarzo e austerità. In: S. Settis (Hrsg.), I Greci oltre la Grecia (Turin 2001), 5-38.

DANA 2011
M. DANA, Culture et mobilité dans le Pont-Euxin. Approche régionale de la vie culturelle des cités grecques. Scripta Antiqua 37 (Bordeaux 2011).

DEMANDT 2011
A. DEMANDT, Ungeschehene Geschichte. Ein Traktat über die Frage: Was wäre geschehen, wenn...? (Göttingen 2011).

Ligia Ruscu
("Babeş-Bolyai" Universität Cluj-Napoca;
e-mail: ligia.ruscu@ubbcluj.ro)

[4] DANA 2011, besonders 339-399.

Alexander Falileyev, *The Celtic Balkans*, Aberystwyth, CMCS Publications, 2013, 182 p. ISBN 978-0-9557182-4-3.

During the last decade Alexander Falileyev systematically investigated the Celtic "traces" in south-eastern Europe and the Balkans from the linguistic point of view, publishing a series of reference studies on this topic[1]. The present volume is synthesising the related information from the Balkans.

The structure of the volume includes an introduction (p. iii-vii), the list of linguistic abbreviations (p. vii), a series of maps (p. viii-xvii), the entries themselves listed in alphabetical order of the linguistic terms, starting with *Abudius* and ending with *Zeisodunum* (p. 1–156), the bibliographical abbreviations (p. 157–158), the bibliography (159–179) and an index (p. 180–182).

The information collected in the volume covers the territories of modern Albania, Bulgaria, Greece, Kosovo, Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and the European part of Turkey. The entries listed in alphabetical order consist of place names, rivers, ethnic names, divinities and personal names. The analysed sources are either epigraphic (Greek or Latin inscriptions) or ancient and medieval literary texts.

From the chronological point of view the linguistic data discussed in the volume can be divided in two periods. The first period can be historically related to the pre-Roman period, more precisely to the period in which the Celtic presence is attested in the Balkans: the kingdom having the centre at Tylis (localised in eastern Bulgaria), the Scordisci from the surroundings of modern Belgrade etc. Moreover, the concentration of the majority of linguistic terms identified as Celtic, and belonging to this period, in the two mentioned areas is relevant.

The second period comprises linguistic data mainly coming from epigraphic sources, but also from other areas (for example toponyms), belonging to the Roman period. It is quite clear that these terms appeared in the Balkans due to the individual and collective mobility (soldiers and colonists) or as a consequence of commercial networks, like in the case of the stamps on some vessels coming from Western European workshops.

The terms selected as entries and analysed in the volume cover a wide range. They include both names clearly or most probably identified as belonging to the Celtic linguistic pool, and terms which were considered as such by linguists or proposed by historians using circumstantial arguments, but were proved to have different origins upon detailed analysis. The latter entries are clearly marked in the volume.

The linguistic comments of each entry are based on a vast specialist bibliography, also including the opinions of different historians. In the case of controversial terms, which were considered either "Celtic" or as belonging to the linguistic substratum of the Balkans (Thracian, Illyrian etc.), the diverse opinions are comprehensively presented.

From the point of view of a specialist in the history and archaeology of the Late Iron Age, the comments of A. Falileyev regarding a series of terms belonging to the first mentioned period are relevant for understanding some aspects of the history of the Balkans. For example

[1] FALILEYEV 2005; 2006; 2007; 2010; 2012 etc.

the entries related to the names of some Celtic leaders (*Acichorius, Bathanattus, Bolgios/Belgios, Brennos, Cavarus* etc.) provide some important details about them and eliminate a series of interpretative stereotypes introduced by some historians. At the same time, the analysis of some toponyms from the "Scordiscian" area (for example *Singidunum*) or from eastern Bulgaria (*Tylis*), traditionally related to the presence of the Celts in the Balkans[2], indicates that many of them are of local origin or have a hybrid source, while the connection with the Celtic linguistic pool is absent. This fact confirms a series of recent observations which indicate that the arrival of the "Celts" in south-eastern Europe and the Balkans determined a cultural hybridisation and an amalgamation of the indigenous traditions with certain La Tène cultural features from Central-Western Europe[3]. These processes can be also observed in archaeological evidence[4].

In conclusion the volume authored by A. Falileyev represents an important contribution to the linguistic study of the toponyms, personal names etc. from the northern Balkan Peninsula. His study is very useful for the historians investigating the mentioned regions and the historical periods in question.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

DŽINO 2007
D. DŽINO, The Celts in Illyricum – whoever they may be: the hybridization and construction of identities in Southeastern Europe in the fourth and third centuries BC. Opuscula Arch. (Zagreb) 31, 2007, 49–68.

FALILEYEV 2005
A. FALILEYEV, In search of Celtic Tylis: onomastic evidence. In: J. De Hoz/E. R. Lujan/P. Sims-Williams (eds.), New approaches to Celtic place names in Ptolemy's Geography (Madrid 2005), 107–133.

FALILEYEV 2006
A. FALILEYEV, The Celtic presence in the Central Balkans: evidence of the place-names. Orpheus 16, 2006, 27–32.

FALILEYEV 2007
A. FALILEYEV, Celtic Dacia. Personal names, place-names and ethnic names of Celtic origin in Dacia and Scythia Minor (Aberystwyth 2007).

FALILEYEV 2010
A. FALILEYEV, Ancient place-names of the Eastern Balkans: defining Celtic areas. In: L. F. Vagalinski (ed.), In search of Celtic Tylis in Thrace (III c BC) (Sofia 2010), 121–129.

FALILEYEV 2012
A. FALILEYEV, Selecta Celto-Balcanica (Sankt Peterburg 2012).

RUSTOIU 2012
A. RUSTOIU, The Celts and indigenous populations from the southern Carpathian Basin. Inter-community communication strategies. In: S. Berecki (ed.), Iron Age rites and rituals in the Carpathian Basin. Proceedings of the International Colloquium from Târgu Mureş, 7–9 October 2011 (Cluj-Napoca/Târgu Mureş), 357–390.

VAGALINSKI 2010
L. F. VAGALINSKI (ed.), In search of Celtic Tylis in Thrace (III c BC) (Sofia 2010).

Aurel Rustoiu
(Institute of Archaeology and History of Art
Cluj-Napoca, Romanian Academy Cluj Branch;
e-mail: aurelrustoiu@yahoo.com)

[2] For the problems regarding the Celtic kingdom having the centre in P Tylis, see recently VAGALINSKI 2010.
[3] DŽINO 2007.
[4] RUSTOIU 2012.

Miklós Szabó (sous la direction de), Károly Tankó, Zoltán Czajlik, *La nécropole celtique à Ludas – Varjú-dűlő*. Avec la participation de K. T. Bruder, L. Domboróczki, N. B. Fábry, K. Gherdán, J.-P. Guillaumet, F. Gyulai, S. Marion, A. Masse, P. Méniel, F. Molnár, G. Szakmány, É. Tankó, Budapest, L'Harmattan – Institut archéologique de l'université ELTE, 2012, 321 p. + LV pl. + 1 Plan (310 figures in text, drawings, graphs and black-and-white photographs). ISBN 978–963–236–583–1.

The cemetery from Ludas – Varjú-dűlő, in north-eastern Hungary, contains 82 graves, the majority being cremation. The site was initially investigated in 1998 during some rescue excavations, the archaeological research being expanded in 2001–2002. A series of preliminary studies published earlier or concomitantly with the monograph sought to provide information regarding the general chronology of the cemetery, the characteristics of animal offerings or certain aspects of the funerary ritual[1].

The book is structured in two parts. The first part (p. 9–152), written by M. Szabó and K. Tankó, focuses on the general presentation of the cemetery. The second part (p. 153–298), edited by Z. Czajlik, consists of a series of interdisciplinary studies and analyses regarding particular features (relevant categories of grave-goods or elements of the funerary ritual etc.). The two parts are followed by the bibliographic list (p. 299–320) and the illustration (55 plates including drawings of the funerary inventories and the cemetery's plan).

The first part begins with a short chapter presenting the history of research (p. 11), including the investigation phases and the actual conditions in which the two aforementioned research periods were carried out.

The catalogue of graves (p. 13–86) is structured according to the following principles: the excavation date of each burial; the description of the pit; the funerary rite (inhumation or cremation); the location of the grave-goods in the pit; the description of the inventory. The catalogue is accompanied by drawings of the burials' plans and black-and-white photographs (141 figures).

The following chapter (p. 87–90) provides important data regarding the funerary rite and ritual. Thus, it has been noted that the only five identified inhumation graves have the head oriented to the south – south-east. The rectangular pits of the cremation burials are oriented towards the three main peaks of the Mátra Mountains arising northward the cemetery, which might suggest that the landscape played an important role in the design of the funerary ritual.

The chapters presenting the funerary inventory occupy an extended space. The detailed analysis brings into discussion the jewellery and garment accessories (brooches, annular ornaments, jewellery having pseudo-filigree and granulated decoration, sword chains – which could have been more appropriately included in the chapter discussing the weaponry and military equipment – and female belts, buckles and pendants) (p. 91–114), weaponry (swords,

[1] SZABÓ/TANKÓ 2006; MÉNIEL 2006; TANKÓ/TANKÓ 2012.

spear heads, shields, the ritual destruction of the weapons) (p. 115–125), iron tools (knifes, shears, sickles etc.) (p. 126–130) and pottery (p. 131–140).

The jewellery and garment accessories include items characteristic to a wider Central and Eastern European area during the LT B2 – LT C1. Amongst them can be noted the presence of some pieces specific to the Carpathian Basin, for example the brooches of the middle LT scheme having the foot decorated with spirals (*fibule à brandenbourg*) or the anklets with large hollow knobs. The bronze open-work bracelet with pseudo-filigree decoration, found in grave 686, is an outstanding artistic product.

The weaponry consists in general of swords and shield-bosses specific to an evolved phase of the LT B2 and to the LT C1. Numerous spear heads have also been found. They are present in burials containing complete panoplies of arms, and also in those that produced no other weapons, sometimes being laid in pairs in the pit.

Amongst the iron tools are knifes having a curved blade and the cutting edge on the inside part, these items being specific to the local populations of the end of the Early Iron Age.

The pottery consists of sets of wheelmade LT vessels, whereas the number of indigenous handmade ones is reduced, unlike the situation from other cemeteries in the eastern Carpathian Basin, in which the latter category is well attested, reflecting the cohabitation between the newcomers and the local populations. Amongst the ceramic forms can be mentioned an *oenochoe* produced in a local workshop and imitating a Greek vessel. At the same time, a local *kantharos* having boar-shaped handles has been found in grave 726. Lastly, it has to be also noted the relatively large number of *situla*-shaped vessels containing graphite in their fabric. These vessels are frequent in the inventories of the settlements, being probably used as kitchenware. They are rarely found in cemeteries. For example, a single example was found in the cemetery from Pişcolt, in grave 45[2]. Thus, it might be presumed that in Ludas such vessels could have been used in a particular way, specific to the local community.

The last two chapters of the first part discuss the relative chronology of the cemetery (p. 141–149) and present the conclusions (p. 150–152) respectively. The relative chronology of the cemetery was established using the combinatory analysis of the inventories recovered from about 25% of the total number of graves, on the basis of the horizons defined by R. Gebhardt in Central Europe[3]. The analysis identified three chronological horizons (corresponding to the horizons 4–6 defined by Gebhardt) covering the LT B2a, LT B2b and LT C1 respectively. However, it has to be noted that a series of pieces (brooches and other garment accessories) attested in the early burials from Pişcolt[4] or Muhi[5] are missing from the funerary inventories discovered in Ludas, which might suggest that the cemetery in question began slightly later, in an advanced phase of the LT B2a. Regarding the spatial evolution of the cemetery, a gradual occupation of the area from the east to the west has to be noted. At the same time, the burials containing swords seem to concentrate in the central area in the late horizon (LT C1), while the female burials are concentrated in the western area; the two areas are separated by a zone in which graves containing spear heads are present. This pattern might suggest the division of the burial ground in the LT C1 according to some gender criteria, and also on the basis of a warrior hierarchy that is visible in the structure of the panoply of arms.

The second part of the volume, edited by Z. Czajlik, contains a series of supplementary studies and the interdisciplinary analyses.

Thus L. Domboróczki, the author of the first excavations in Ludas – Varjú-dűlő, presents extensively the history of research and the finds of the main historical periods identified on site

[2] NÉMETI 1992, 65, Fig. 4/6.
[3] GEBHARD 1989, 74–127.
[4] NÉMETI 1988.
[5] HELLEBRANDT 1999, 215–239.

(p. 155–169). Z. Czajlik, K. Tankó and K. Gherdán provide an account of the micro-regional investigations from the area of the cemetery (geological and geographic conditions, and the LT sites identified in the region through aero-photography, field surveys etc.) (p. 171–180). N. B. Fábry analyses the anklets with large hollow knobs found in Ludas from the morphological, chronological and functional point of view (p. 181–187). S. Marion and J.-P. Guillaumet discuss the offering of knifes, shears and tool kits in burials and their significance, as the latter artefacts might have belonged to some "doctors" or artisans (p. 189–196).

The interdisciplinary investigations include anthropological (chapter authored by Éva Tanko, p. 197–217) and archaeozoological analyses (P. Méniel, p. 219–247). Some archaeometallurgical analyses of the bronze bracelets and anklets have also been performed (F. Molnár, Z. Czajlik and A. Masse, p. 249–265). Other investigations include the technological observations related to the manufacturing technique of the open-work bracelet having a pseudo-filigree decoration (K. T. Bruder, p. 267–268), the petrographic analysis of pottery (K. Gherdán, Z. Czajlik, G. Szakmány and K. Tankó, p. 269–278) and the archaeobotanical analysis (F. Gyulai, p. 279–297).

In conclusion, the monograph of the La Tène cemetery from Ludas – Varjú-dűlő, coordinated by M. Szabó, represents an important contribution to the archaeology of the funerary practices and the evolution of the Celtic horizon in the eastern Carpathian Basin. The volume will be a reference point for the future publication of other cemeteries investigated in the aforementioned region.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

GEBHARD 1989
R. GEBHARD, Der Glasschmuck aus dem Oppidum von Manching, Die Ausgrabungen in Manching 11 (Stuttgart 1989).

HELLEBRANDT 1999
M. HELLEBRANDT, Celtic finds from northern Hungary. Corpus of Celtic Finds in Hungary III (Budapest 1999).

MÉNIEL 2006
P. MÉNIEL, Les offrandes animales de la nécropole celtique de Ludas – Varjú-dűlő. Acta Arch. Acad. Scien. Hungaricae 57, 2006, 345–366.

NÉMETI 1988
I. NÉMETI, Necropola Latène de la Pişcolt, jud. Satu Mare, I. Thraco-Dacica 9, 1988, 49–74.

NÉMETI 1992
I. NÉMETI, Necropola Latène de la Pişcolt, jud. Satu Mare, III. Thraco-Dacica 13, 1992, 59–112.

SZABÓ/TANKÓ 2006
M. SZABÓ/K. TANKÓ, Nécropole laténienne à Ludas – Varjú-dűlő. Acta Arch. Acad. Scien. Hungaricae 57, 2006, 325–343.

TANKÓ/TANKÓ 2012
É. TANKÓ/K. TANKÓ, Cremation and deposition in the Late Iron Age cemetery at Ludas. In S. Berecki (ed.), Iron Age rites and rituals in the Carpathian Basin. Proceedings of the International Colloquium from Târgu Mureş, 7–9 October 2011 (Cluj-Napoca – Târgu Mureş 2012), 249–258.

Aurel Rustoiu
(Institute of Archaeology and History of Art
Cluj-Napoca, Romanian Academy Cluj Branch;
e-mail: aurelrustoiu@yahoo.com)

***Pantheon. Religionistický Časopis – Journal for the Study of Religions.* Volume 7/1, 2012, 152 p.**

The 2012 spring release of the *Pantheon* journal was focused almost homogenously on Roman Mithraism, publishing the papers presented as contributions to a panel on Roger Beck's 2006 monography *The Religion of the Mithras Cult in the Roman Empire: Mysteries of the Unconquered Sun*, considered unanimously as the most controversial, but fundamental work that appeared in the field of Mithraic studies in the last years. The event took place in Budapest as part of the X$^{th.}$ Conference of the European Association for the Study of Religions (18–22 September, 2011) and sprung from the idea of Aleš Chalupa from the Department for the Study of Religions at Masaryk University in Brno. The six papers and Roger Beck`s response represent not only the proceedings of a conference, but also an important review and resumé of the actual state of the Mithraic studies.

The Pantheon is the most important Czech peer – reviewed journal focused on Religious studies. Founded in 2006 by Tomáš Bubik from the University of Pardubice, it appears two times per academic year. Since 2010 the journal has been enlisted in the International Index of Peer – reviewed Scholarly Periodicals (?) from the Czech Republic. The editorial board consists mainly of notable Czech and a few important Polish and American scholars. The journal, its thematic issues and its dynamic editorial board show the new historiographic tendencies and currents of Czech Religious studies. In a country where atheism is popular, Religious studies (*Religionswissenschaft*) became a very competitive academic field with important centres and scholars, thus making itself distinguishable not only regionally, but also internationally. The journal – and the issue presented here – shows this tendency of the Czech scholars.

In a very short and descriptive introduction (3–4 pp.), Donald Wiebe, from the University of Toronto, not only presents the topic and this special edition of the journal dedicated to his friends' Roger Beck's book and work, but also suggests the main topic of the journal and of Roger Beck's work. Following this point of view is Wiebe`s introduction, who, as an important scholar of cognitive religious studies, writes not only a dedication for a friend, but also a symbolic mark, the editorial board of the Pantheon (the Czech scholarship in fact) and many of the authors featured in this issue being students and followers of cognitive religious studies.

The article written by Aleš Chalupa entitled "*Paradigm lost, paradigm found? – larger theoretical assumptions behind Roger Beck's The Religion of the Mithras Cult in the Roman Empire*" (5 – 17 pp.) presents Beck`s book from a historiographic perspective. After a very short, but highly critical review on the history of Mithraic research, Chalupa – who is one of the issue's editors – highlights Beck's theory of "Gateway text", based on the 6$^{th}$ chapter of Porphyry`s *De antro nypharum,* which appears in Beck's monumental work almost as a "dogmatic", expression quoted everywhere. The Czech scholar argued – and Roger Beck later admitted it (120–121. pp.) – that neo – platonist ideas and some philosophical messages and symbols (such as the

seven grades, the representation of Amor and Psyche) are not so obvious as Beck interpreted. He also stated that the work of the Canadian scholar will remain "a valuable starting point" for every scholar in the future.

The article of Darius Frackowiak from the University of Heidelberg, entitled "*Star – talk" and the archaeological evidence: critical aspects and new perspectives*" (18–36 pp.) is remarkable not only because of its very concise and articulate language, but also because of the rich and rare bibliography employed. He enrolls almost every review appeared after the publication of Roger Beck's book and presents the different reactions and critics that arise either from cognitive scholars or from archaeologists. His article emphasizes four main topics from the book of Beck, suggesting new, sometimes very unusual ideas. Firstly, like Chalupa, he notices the subjectivity of the Porphyry chapter as a basic text for the Mithraic star talk, especially the Zoroastrian roots of Mithras, which appear – indirectly – only once in the huge archaeological heritage of the cult (CIMRM 827). Secondly, Frackowiak criticizes Roger Beck`s affirmation regarding the astronomical knowledge of ordinary people and Mithraist adepts. Arguing with the sociological studies of Manfred Clauss, he affirms that the star talk reconstructed by Beck and noticed in some rare Italian cases was too difficult to understand by the lower classes, or without some special instructions and teachings, about which we don't have any direct proof. In his response Beck argued (122 p.) that we underestimate the astronomical knowledge of the ancient man. Even if not everybody was a studiosus astrologiae (CIMRM 708) or a specialist in neo – platonism, a sun – disc could also be used by an ordinary man, as Tim Hegedus showed in his 2007 monograph quoted also by Panayotis Pachis (88–89 pp.). However, I agree with Roger Beck's short and creative response: some notable examples of the provincial art of Mithraism (CIMRM 1919) clearly show the existence of non – canonical representations and local, special interpretations of the star – talk, which must be interpreted and examined in micro – regional, and not imperial context. Thirdly, Frackowiak argues that some new sanctuaries – such as the second mithraeum in Güglinen and the one from Gelduba – have their orientation to the West, and not North- East. Beck`s response was very elegant: the sanctuary represents the "cosmos" by way of being a "nowhere" in the phisical, in the real world's topography. The orientation and external appearance of the sanctuary have no importance. In the last two subchapters of the article the author presents a very interesting, rarely covered topic: the "mithraeum" shaped structures beyond Mithraism, especially regarding the cult of Iupiter Dolichenus. Employing some notable examples (the Aventine dolichenum, the Vetus Salina dolichenum, Balaklava dolichenum), he argues very genuinely that the biclinium, triclinium and cenatorium, as architectural elements, are much more widely spread in the so called eastern cults, being present not only in the case of Mithras.

Nagy Levente's article entitled "*The short history of Time in the mysteries of Mithras: the order of Chaos, the City of Darkness and the iconography of Beginings*" (37–58 pp.) presents the relationship between the astronomical message of some notable iconographical programs (tauroctony, Fons Perennis, Transitus Dei, Petrogenitus) and the Time notion in the myth of Mithras. Using the results of Roger Beck and László Levente, combined with his personal research, the Hungarian scholar argued that these main personifications of Mithras do not represent the successive events in the life story of the God. He also presents the Orphic elements in the myth of Mithras by using a few paneled reliefs as analogies for the iconographical program of the representations of the main elements in the Mithraic myth (appendix 2). In the second part of his article, he gives a new interpretation of the famous "City of Darkness" iconography from the Hawarte mithraeum, interpreted as a representation of the *apokatastasis*. Roger Beck, in his response to Nagy Levente (123–24 pp.), highlighted the importance of the Hungarian expertise in the Mithraic studies, but criticizes Nagy's theory regarding the "doctrinal" and omnipresent message and contents of an Orphic theogony in Mithraic iconography.

Luther H. Martin from the University of Vermont contributed to the proceedings with a short, but very interesting cognitive study entitled "*Star talk: native competence, initiatory comprehension*" (59–69 pp.). Using some linguistic studies (the theory of Dan Sperber and Deirdre Wilson), he argued that such imagery languages, as the Mithraic "star talk", just help focus the attention of the audience in certain directions, but the so called "mutual – knowledge hypothesis", that gap between the semantic and the thoughts remains unsolved in the case of Mithraism. In his conclusion, Martin presents very concise and with extremely logical arguments what Frackowiak questioned: he said that there must be different levels of star talks, but even if the adepts of the Cult were less erudite than a studiosus astrologiae or (?) a pater, they knew a kind of 'street smarts' star – talk" (66 p.).

Olympia Panagiotidou from the University of Thesaloniki in her article "*The cognitive route of "Star talk": the scene of the Tauroctony as a System of Signs*" (70–78 pp.) talk about the tauroctony, interpreted from/through the theory of Charles Peirce and Terrence Deacon not only as an icon, but also as an index and symbol.

Her colleague Panayotis Pachis in the article entitled "Induction into the Mystery of "star – talk" presents the case of the Isis Cult During the Graeco – Roman Age" (79–118 pp.), being the most voluminous article of the journal. The author focused on the 11th chapter of Apulienus "Metamorphosis" and other literary sources regarding the cult of Isis in the greaco – roman world. By using the cognitive approach of Beck's star – talk in the mysteries of Isis, he interpreted the goddess as an "*elementorum omnia domina",* a cosmic deity (*Urania Panthea thea, bathykeros,Isis – Sothis, epithelestai*), confirming the theory of Jonathan Z. Smith regarding the ecumenical context of that era.

The last "article" on Mithraism is the "*Response*" of Roger Beck (119–124 pp.), where the great scholar answers every article in a short and very stringent way.

The last article is not related to the thematic issue, but it could be seen as a "promotion" of the Czech expertise in religious studies. David Vaclavik from the Masaryk University presents in his article ("*Academic study of Religion in the Czech Republic in the first decade of the 21th century: a short bibliographic overview*", 125–132 pp.) a short history of the Czech *Religionswissenschaft* and some new books which appeared in Czech language. On the last pages of the issue we can peruse five book – reviews (133–149) exclusively presenting new books published in the Czech Republic.

This special issue of the Pantheon journal dedicated to Roger Beck's work is a very important contribution to the Mithraic studies, because it highlights and analyzes the most important aspects and lacunas of Beck's book, showing the current research state of paradigms. It is also very important that some articles – especially Chalupa's – observed the "chaos of paradigms" which now dominate the Mithraic studies. In the journal we can also observe this in the difference of methodologies used (cognitive religious studies, archaeological approaches, historical – phenomenological ideas). The importance of the journal consists also in the promotion of the Czech religious studies, which became significant not only regionally, but also internationally.

Szabó Csaba
(University of Pécs, Hungary;
e-mail: Szabo.csaba.pte@gmail.com)