

vaguely represented (between 1 and 4 %, p. 91, Chart 3). In that which regards the functional aspect, most of the imported luxury vessel consists in drinking containers (p. 91, Chart 4) or, to be precise, pottery types destined for *Symposia*. The flow of the luxury ceramics points to a preferential cultural relationship between the local communities outside the Carpathians and the Greek centres of manufacture from the circum-Pontic regions. The imports of western ceramics appear more timidly, in the 1st century AD. The study presents once more the strange situation according to which, in many pre-Roman sites (excepting those on the Siret river: Poiana, Răcățiu, Brad), chronological indices specific to the 3-4 decades before Trajan's conquest are lacking.⁵

The study could have been completed by putting the studied objects in the general context of the Hellenistic and Roman imports in Dacia between the 1st century BC and the 1st century AD. The author could have also emphasized the difference between the penetration routes of the luxury ceramic crossing Moesia Inferior and those of the Roman coins or Italic bronze vessels imported from the west (through the Illyrian regions).⁶ It is highly probable that luxury ceramics and the imported coins were meant for distinct social categories and the way they are spread reflects cultural processes that took place almost at the same time although independently. However, such a thorough debate would have gone beyond the frame purposed in the monograph.

Daniel Spânu

Bibliographical abbreviations:

- Babeș 1975 – M. Babeș, *Problèmes de la chronologie de la culture geto-dace à la lumière des fouilles de Cîrlomănești*, Dacia 19, 1975, pp. 125-139.
- Beldiman 1988 – C. Beldiman, *Cu privire la difuziunea produselor de bronz italice în Dacia preromană (descoperirea de la Țigănești, jud. Teleorman)*, Thraco-Dacica 9, 1-2, 1988, pp. 75-82.
- Beldiman 1989 – C. Beldiman, *Plăcuțe de cuirasă (lorica squamata) din Dacia Preromană*, Carpica, 20, 1989, pp. 125-136.
- Bogdan Cătănicu 1975 – I. Bogdan Cătănicu, *Tezaurul monetar de la Poiana (jud. Teleorman). Unele aspecte ale circulației tetradrahmelor Macedoniei Prima și ale orașului Thasos în lumea traco-dacică*, Studii și Cercetări de Numismatică 6, 1975, pp. 177-188.
- Chițescu 1981 – M. Chițescu, *Numismatic Aspects of the History of the Dacian State: the Roman Republican Coinage*

in Dacia and Geto-Dacian Coins of Roman Type, British Archaeological Report, Suppl. Ser. 112, 1981.

- Conovici 1986 – N. Conovici, *Aspecte ale circulației drahmelor din Dyrrhachium și Apollonia în Peninsula Balcanică și în Dacia*, Buletinul Societății Numismatice Române 77-79, 1986, pp. 69-88.
- Glodariu 1976 – I. Glodariu, *Dacian Trade with the Hellenistic and Roman World*, British Archaeological Report, Suppl. Ser. 8, 1976.
- Horedt 1973 – K. Horedt, *Die dakische Siedelfunde*, Dacia 17, 1973, pp. 122-165.
- Popović 1987 – P. Popović, *Le monnayage des Scordisques*, Novi Sad, 1987.
- Preda 1998 – C. Preda, *Istoria monedei în Dacia Preromană*, București, 1998.
- Rustoiu 1995 – A. Rustoiu, *Le premier horizon de fibules romaines en Dacie préromaine*, Thraco-Dacica 16, 1-2, 1995, pp. 211-219.
- Rustoiu 2001 – A. Rustoiu, *Străcurători romane din perioada republicană târzie descoperite în cetatea dacică de la Divici (jud. Caraș-Severin)*, in: G. Florea, L. Suciu, (eds.), *Studii de Istorie Antică. Omagiu profesorului Ioan Glodariu*, Cluj-Napoca 2001, pp. 199-206.
- Teleaga 2008 – E. Teleaga, *Griechische Importe in den Nekropolen an der Unteren Donau, 6. Jh. – Anfang des 3. Jhs. v. Chr.*, Marburger Studien zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte, Band 23, Rahden 2008.

H. W. Müller, I. Piso, B. Schwaighofer, M. Benea, DER MARMOR IM RÖMISCHEN DAKIEN, Editura Mega, Cluj-Napoca, 2012, 114 pages, ISBN 978-606-543-282-6

The Dacian provinces are among the most interesting, puzzling and challenging for the scholars of the Roman period. One of the rarely asked questions concerns the provenance of the used lithic material. The volume to be presented here has been published three years ago, declared to be (p. 7-8) the end result of the long-term interdisciplinary project dedicated to the marble monuments of Dacia: *Petrographische und geochemische Untersuchungen der Marmorvorkommen in der römischen Provinz Dakien in Hinblick auf die Bedeutung in der Archäologie*, coordinated by Harald W. Müller and Ioan Piso, leading an international team, with financial support from Austrian and Romanian research funds.

In the introduction (pp. 9-16), after a short presentation of the history of the province (I. Piso), the geologists and mineralogists, co-authors of the volume, discuss the problem of marble quarries in Antiquity followed by the presentation of the status of interdisciplinary studies on marble. As known from several conferences and published contributions, selected marble monuments in Romanian collections, mostly found in the area between the Danube and the Black Sea,

⁵ Babeș 1975, pp. 136-138; Horedt 1973, pp. 151-152; cf. Preda 1998, pp. 319-323.

⁶ Popović 1987, pp. 105-113; Conovici 1986, pp. 71-78, fig. 1-3; Bogdan Cătănicu 1975 *et alii*.

have been the object of archaeometric investigations.¹ However those studies are not mentioned on p. 16, when dealing with the state of the research on this subject in Romania.

The second part (pp. 17-19), also signed by H. W. Müller, B. Schwaighofer and M. Benea describes the methodological approach of the task, from fieldwork through macroscopic evaluation to laboratory analyses.

The provenance of marble on the territory of the former Dacian provinces is discussed in the third part of the volume (pp. 19-22) by the same three authors, while the forth part (pp. 23-33) is dedicated to the local marble quarries in the area of Bucova, considered to be the only local marble source used during Roman times. Details on the documented traces of antique quarrying are not given.

These four main parts are followed by a bibliographical list (pp. 33-36) and a synthetic presentation of the results of the stable isotope analysis and end determination in form of three tables (Tables 8 to 10, pp. 38-40). After the enumeration of the collections in which the monuments are kept and the number of sampled items, Table 7 lists the used abbreviations for the provenance of the monuments and the number of objects from each site. Table 8 (pp. 38-39) presents the 69 monuments made of Bucova marble with their determined stable isotopes values, while Table 9 (pp. 39-40) introduces a further 37 samples for which the regions of provenance of imported marble were established within the project. Sixteen monuments made of marble of undetermined provenance are presented in Table 10 (p. 40). It is stated only in previous publications of the project² and at points in the conclusion of this book (pp. 110-114) that those undetermined sources could also be on the territory of Roman Dacia. This marks the separation, both within the volume and the investigation, between the technical and the archaeological/epigraphical part of the project.

The catalogue of the 119 investigated monuments is signed by I. Piso (pp. 41-106). The catalogue entries are using the abbreviations mentioned in Table 7 (p. 37) for their provenance, and are alphabetically organised accordingly. Each entry comprises a short description of the monument, its dimensions, the determined kind of marble, information on the context of discovery - when available -, the location of the monument, bibliography, and a description with a commentary, in some cases the text of the inscription, the dating (sometimes also with a commentary). A convention for giving dimensions (pointing out what is measured and in which order those measurements are given) within the records is missing, which causes confusion in some cases.

Due to the pioneering character of the project and its aims, the reader would expect more technical information, such as the documentation and registration protocol for the sampling, which should be a part of such a major publication, as well as mentioning the sampling place within the monument (*e.g.* for inscriptions SA 19 or PO3, preserved in fragments, the sampling spot is not identified). The explanation for the delay of the final publication (p. 8) and the fact that the basic documentation of the monuments was missing, makes it probable that the sampling campaign and the archaeological study were conducted independently and without following a previously established procedure.

Further significant information that is missing from the publication is the minimal description of the samples and the grain size, although this is a standard procedure within specialised studies and their publications.³ This is also the case with the previous reports of the project, except the one⁴ giving technical data on nine of the other investigated quarries within Romania besides Bucova. This particular article is surprisingly not even mentioned in the bibliography of the present book! However one lapidary note in the article from 2001, stating that a few monuments investigated within the project might be made of marble that came "from some local quarry in the north-west of Dacia"⁵ finds no mention and no conclusion in this final publication and leaves open to discussion the use of local marble from other quarries besides Bucova. It is an argument for the continuation of research on this subject and for the imperious necessity of getting the full information from the available samples.

From p. 17 and previous publications⁶ one learns that significant drilling core samples (20-40 mm long and with a diameter of 9 mm!) for thin sections have been taken, *i.e.* the ideal case when investigating the provenance of marble. There is no comment and no illustration of these in this book, although this was expected of the final publication of the project. Also to be pointed out is a dramatic situation: for some of the monuments there is no future possible sampling for thin sections. Therefore it is important to know the whereabouts of the samples and their technical details that could be re-evaluated in the extended existing comparative database, expected to get wider as the research proceeds. For the time being the entire information is unusable for comparative studies, due to the fact that, besides the stable isotopes values, both grain size and texture description are necessary when aiming to determine the marble's provenance. Due to the importance of these missing details for research and for

¹ Alexandrescu Vianu 2000; Alexandrescu Vianu 2008-2009; Penția *et alii* 1999.

² Müller *et alii* 2001, p. 201.

³ *E.g.* Penția *et alii* 2002b; Cramer 2004; Lazzarini 2004.

⁴ Müller *et alii* 1999, pp. 133-134.

⁵ Müller *et alii* 2001, p. 201.

⁶ Especially Müller *et alii* 2001, p. 200.

single museums and collections, it is to be hoped that they are going to be provided in a future publication, even if as an addendum to this book.

The problem is already obvious when trying to fill the gaps, for a new system of identification (for samples and monuments) seems to have been used along the different phases of the project. Even the conventions for naming the sites have been changed: AQ (for Aquae) from the articles from 1997, 1999 and 2001 became CR (for Cioroiu Nou) in the present publication. The discrepancies between the previous publications and this are signalled on p. 8. But for the registration of samples the changed numbering can be fatal. The reorganisation of the catalogue is possible without changing the IDs of the samples. However it is not clear whether the new numbers, changed in the catalogue and in the tables, have been modified all the way back to the samples, nor if the samples are still available and, if so, where.

The determination of the source of the marble as stated in tables 8-10 needs clarification, for, within the given provenance (Proconessos / Marmara, Thasos, Paros, Naxos, Afyon), there is quite a lot of additional information available enabling more precise determination. After beautifully presenting the methodology to be used and the state of the research on an international level (pp. 15-19) it is not stated which database has been used for the determinations within the project. The literature used for the Mediterranean marble sites is mentioned in the 2001 publication. The long term project might have benefited from the progress of the research (for instance within the research and publications of the ASMOSIA - Association for the Study of Marble and other Stones in Antiquity; see also p. 7 in this book) but the reader has no information on this, except for the mention on p. 8, which states that the analyses were finalised in 1996. If there was no additional investigation of the results after 1996, according to this book, the provenance is to be taken as granted and cannot be re-evaluated without new sampling, which would contribute to further damaging the monuments.

The criteria for the selection of the monuments by the epigraphist (I. Piso) and by the archaeologist (Al. Diaconescu) remain unclear. There seems to have been a selection considering the different kinds of available types of monuments and shapes (p. 109: "9 architectural elements, 32 altars, statue bases, stelai and slabs bearing honorary, funerary or building inscriptions, 17 votive reliefs, 61 statues of different dimensions"). But there is no statement regarding the selection within a site or whether the type of settlement was taken into consideration (fortress, town, village, necropolis etc.) or the location of the 25 sites within the province. On p. 8 one learns about the regrettable dysfunction within the project team and the explanation for the unbalanced archaeological

commentary. The documentation of the monuments, within the catalogue segment, intended to be quite detailed, is limited to the monuments with inscriptions while the other (architectural elements, sculpture) are either incomplete (*e.g.* AP1; AP2; RA3) or erroneous (there is no difference made between basis and plinth! – *e.g.* AP14 and AP 18). For the Mithras relief from Slăveni (SV1) the context is stated as unknown despite the well-documented provenance and the additional monuments (also of marble) found on the same spot. The situation is the same with relief SA 35: the main publication of the discovery and the other marble finds are not mentioned, although after old excavations from the 19th century both objects have been accordingly published. The most puzzling is AP16: "Mercurius statue, not investigated" (the reader can assume based on the ID only that it is a statue from Apulum).

The reader has to wonder about the existence of some parts of the text. On one hand, in a publication on the marble in Dacia the historical introduction could have been resumed to a chronological table. The monuments with prior publications (like epigraphic studies or corpora) could have been reduced to their archaeological and technical documentation. The full quote of the inscriptions and the details on the size of the letters etc. are misplaced in the economy of the intended study on marble. On the other hand, the researches of B. Csérni in Apulum should have been mentioned in order to understand catalogue entries such as AP 17 and AP 19.

The conclusion (pp. 109 sqq.) misses considerations on the results of the investigation, differentiating the information on architectural elements, blocks bearing inscriptions, reliefs, free standing sculptures, eventually on the shapes and sizes of monuments, as well as a comparative approach in relation to other Roman provinces. This would have been suitable especially when working with an international team with previous experience on the field. Also, since among the sampled monuments those from Apulum and Ulpia Traiana Sarmizegetusa form the majority, and due to the long research history of both sites, more comments on the used lithic material (including local and imported marble) would have been desirable.⁷

The editing of the volume is unfortunately quite faulty and there are several cases of discordance between the used language (German) and the used characters or numbers (one finds both "himation" and "Himation"; "II. Jh." and "III. Jh." instead of "2. Jh." etc.). Inconsistencies in the used literature and in the editing are surprising to say the least. Such an example is the stated number of investigated monuments: on p. 7-115 samples from 15 quarries, 119 monuments from 19 museums; on p. 16 and p. 109-115 samples from 11 quarries. In the previous

⁷ See for instance Benea *et alii* 1997.

publications of the project 17 respectively 18 investigated marble quarries from Romania are mentioned.⁸ The two bibliographical lists (pp. 33-36 and pp. 106-107) are not unitary, neither in the used guidelines nor in their content. For the sake of the reader it would have been easier to have one list only. A most unfortunate mistake is the misspelling of the name of one of the pioneers in the field, Norman Herz, including in the list on p. 34.

The layout and printing quality of the present book are very good. This necessary analysis of the monuments of Dacia is salutary and had to face, as all first steps do, difficulties and challenges of various kinds. Despite the amended points and mentioned problems, this publication offers new insights on a category of important archaeological finds from the Roman provinces. It is hoped that future projects and investigations will learn from the experience of this project and aim and plan to integrate their work and results within a broader frame of interdisciplinary research, enabling discussion and exchange, while bearing in mind the responsibility towards monuments and the destructive character of sampling.

Cristina Georgeta Alexandrescu

Bibliographical abbreviations:

- Alexandrescu Vianu 2000 – M. Alexandrescu Vianu, *Histria IX. Les statues et les reliefs en pierre*, Bucarest–Paris, [2000].
- Alexandrescu Vianu 2008-2009 – M. Alexandrescu Vianu, *Ateliere de sculptură în Moesia Inferior. 2. Relațiile cu Bithynia*, SCIVA 59-60, 2008-2009, pp. 53-80.
- Benea et alii 1997 – M. Benea, H. W. Müller, B. Schwaighofer, *Die Gesteine des Forums von Sarmizegetusa*, AMN 34/1, 1997, pp. 837-865.
- Cramer 2004 – T. Cramer, *Multivariate Herkunftsanalyse von Marmor auf petrographischer und geochemischer Basis*, Doctoral Thesis, Technical University Berlin, Berlin, 2004.
- Lazzarini 2004 – L. Lazzarini, *Archaeometric aspects of white and coloured marbles used in antiquity: the state of the art*, Periodico di Mineralogia, 73, 2004, pp. 113-125.
- Müller, Schwaighofer 1999 – H. W. Müller, B. Schwaighofer, *Die römischen Marmorsteinbrüche in Kärnten*, Carinthia II, 109, 1999, pp. 549-572.
- Müller et alii 1997 – H. W. Müller, B. Schwaighofer, M. Benea, I. Piso, A. Diaconescu, *Provenance of marble objects from the Roman province of Dacia*, JÖAI 66, 1997, pp. 432-454.
- Müller et alii 1999 – H. W. Müller, B. Schwaighofer, M. Benea, I. Piso, A. Diaconescu, *Marbles in the Roman province Dacia*, in: Schvoerer (ed.) 1999, pp. 131-140.
- Müller et alii 2001 – H. W. Müller, B. Schwaighofer, M. Benea, I. Piso, A. Diaconescu, *Greek marbles in the Roman province of Dacia*, in: Y. Bassiakos, E. Aloupi, Y. Facorellis (eds.), *Archaeometry Issues in Greek Prehistory and Antiquity*, Athens, 2001, pp. 199-211.
- Penția et alii 1999 – M. Penția, N. Herz, M. Șeclăman, *Marble provenance study of some Roman and Byzantine artifacts discovered in northern Dobruja – Romania*, in: Schvoerer (ed.) 1999, pp. 157-164.
- Penția et alii 2002a – M. Penția, R.H. Tykot, L. Nedelcu, A. Barnea, *Thracian horsemen: a provenance study of marble sculptures from Dobruja, Romania*, in: J.J.Herrmann, N. Herz, R. Newmann (eds.), *Interdisciplinary Studies on Ancient Stone. ASMOSLA 5*, London, 2002, pp. 256-262.
- Penția et alii 2002b – M. Penția, N. Herz, B. Turi, *Provenance determination of classical marbles: a statistical test based on 87Sr/86Sr, 18O/16O and 13C/12C isotopic ratios*, in: L. Lazzarini (ed.), *Interdisciplinary studies on ancient stone*, Padova, 2002, pp. 219-226.
- Schvoerer (ed.) 1999 – M. Schvoerer (ed.), *Archéomatériaux. Marbres et autres roches. Actes du IV^{ème} conférence internationale ASMOSLA IV, France, Bordeaux-Talence, 9-13 octobre 1995*, Bordeaux, 1999.
- Nicolae Lascu, BULEVARDELE BUCUREȘTENE PÂNĂ LA PRIMUL RĂZBOI MONDIAL, Editura Simetria, București, 2011, 213 pages, ISBN: 978-973-1872-18-6**

Boulevards are the most appropriate synecdoche for Bucharest's development as a modern metropolis: their history testifies not only to the first modern urban regulations, the organisation of modern traffic and the introduction of modern facilities, but also to the restructuring of the entire urban territory, the appearance of complex urban functions and policies, and the shaping of a coherent urban space, worthy of an European capital.

This is why a monograph such as Nicolae Lascu's 2011 book, devoted to the boulevards of Bucharest, can be regarded as a true history of the modern city for the studied period (i.e. the second half of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century). Out of a rich, but heterogeneous collection of data, archive documents and bibliographical references, the book reconstitutes the complete and detailed narrative of planning and constructing Bucharest's boulevards.

As the author remarks in his foreword, modern arteries defined as boulevards successively appeared in several Romanian towns (Giurgiu, Brăila, Ploiești, Constanța, Craiova, Câmpulung Muscel etc.), but the capital is the only locality in Romania where the boulevards were conceived/planned and [partially] built as a network, and "consequently have generated a

⁸ Müller et alii 1997, p. 432; Müller et alii 2001, p. 199.