

EPHEMERIS NAPOCENSIS

XXXV

2025

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

EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor: Coriolan Horațiu Opreanu

Members: Sorin Cociș, Vlad-Andrei Lăzărescu, Ioan Stanciu, Aurel Rustoiu

ADVISORY BOARD

Mihai Bărbulescu (Cluj-Napoca, Romania); Alexander Bursche (Warsaw, Poland); Falko Daim (Mainz, Germany); Andreas Lippert (Vienna, Austria); Bernd Päffgen (Munich, Germany); Marius Porumb (Cluj-Napoca, Romania); Alexander Rubel (Iași, Romania); Peter Scherrer (Graz, Austria).

Responsible of the volume: Coriolan Horațiu Opreanu

În țară revista se poate procura prin poștă, pe bază de abonament la: EDITURA ACADEMIEI ROMÂNE, Calea 13 Septembrie nr. 13, sector 5, P. O. Box 5–42, București, România, RO–76117, Tel. 021–411.90.08, 021–410.32.00; fax. 021–410.39.83; RODIPET SA, Piața 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, București, România; ORION PRESS IMPEX 2000, P. O. Box 77–19, București 3 – România, Tel. 021–301.87.86, 021–335.02.96.

EPHEMERIS NAPOCENSIS

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

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

DTP și tipar: MEGA PRINT
Coperta: Roxana Sfârlea



© 2025 EDITURA ACADEMIEI ROMÂNE
Calea 13 Septembrie nr. 13, Sector 5, București 76117
Telefon 021–410.38.46; 021–410.32.00/2107, 2119

ACADEMIA ROMÂNĂ
INSTITUTUL DE ARHEOLOGIE ȘI ISTORIA ARTEI



EPHEMERIS NAPOCENSIS

XXXV
2025



EDITURA ACADEMIEI ROMÂNE

SUMAR – SOMMAIRE – CONTENTS – INHALT

STUDIES

- ALEXANDRA PEDA, LIGIA RUSCU, IOAN MUNTEAN
And they shall beat their swords into ploughshares. Where did the veterans from the Eastern Balkan provinces settle?.....7
- SERGEY TORBATOV
Transmarisca. Stratigraphy, chronology, topography..... 89
- ONORIU-MIHAI RUS
Late Bronze Age hair rings of the Sântana-Şărmăşag type.....151

ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND EPIGRAPHICAL NOTES

- MAREK OLEŹDZKI
Participation of representatives of the Przeworsk and Wielbark cultures in the Marcomannic Wars: an examination of historical and archaeological evidence.....179
- VLAD-ANDREI LĂZĂRESCU, KATALIN VÁGÓ,
SERGIU-TRAIAN SOCACIU, SORIN ILIE COCIŞ
Tile-stamps of *Optatianal/Sutor*. An update.....201
- OANA TODA, GIANINA-DIANA VARGA
Burial grounds between ecclesiastical and lay administration in 16th – and early 17th-century Cluj: churchyard archaeology in Farkas Street and its historical context.....229

REVIEWS

- Zsolt Körösfői, *Marosszentanna. Sântana de Mureş. Late imperial cemetery at the Mureş. Nyíregyháza 2024*, 184 p., 129 Figs. and 11 Plates, ISBN 978–615–5619–30–4 (Vlad-Andrei Lăzărescu)..... 285
- Martina Pauli, *Die römischen Fibeln der frühen und mittleren Kaiserzeit aus Augsburg. Augsburger Beiträge zur Archäologie 10*, 2024, 387 pp., gegründet von Lothar Bakker, herausgegeben von Sebastian Gairhos und Michaela Hermann, Römisches Museum/Stadtarchäologie Augsburg, Wißner-Verlag, Augsburg, ISBN 978–3–95786–378–2 (Sorin Cociş).....305

Klára P. Fischl (Ed.), <i>Bronze Age Landscape at Gelej. Archaeological researches at Gelej-Pincehát, Gelej-Kanális dűlő and Gelej-Beltelek dűlő</i> . Universitätsforschungen zur prähistorischen Archäologie, Band 391, Verlag Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH (Bonn 2023), 531 pagini, ISBN 978-3-7749-4408-4 (Florin Gogâltan).....	311
Svend Hansen, <i>Macht der Steine – Steine der Macht. Menhire, Stelen und Statuen zwischen dem 5. und 3. Jahrtausend v. Chr. Archäologie in Eurasien</i> , Band 43. Habelt Verlag (Bonn 2025), 466 Seiten mit 745 Abbildungen und 10 Tafeln, ISBN 978-3-7749-4472-5 (Florin Gogâltan).....	317
Robert Staniuk, <i>Tradition and Practice. Study on Pottery, Chronology and Social Dynamic of the Hungarian Bronze Age</i> , Dr. Rudolf Habelt, Bonn, 2020, 576 p., 351 fig., 22 tables, 116 pl., ISBN 978-3-7749-4258-5 (Miruna Ana Oana).....	323
Abbreviations that can not be found in Bericht der Römisch-Germanische Kommission.....	327
Guidelines for “Ephemeris Napocensis”	331
Reviste publicate la Editura Academiei Române.....	333

Martina Pauli, *Die römischen Fibeln der frühen und mittleren Kaiserzeit aus Augsburg, Augsburger Beiträge zur Archäologie 10*, 2024, 387 pp., gegründet von Lothar Bakker, herausgegeben von Sebastian Gairhos und Michaela Hermann, Römisches Museum/ Stadtarchäologie Augsburg, Wißner-Verlag, Augsburg, ISBN 978-3-95786-378-2

Alongside the brooch corpora from Augst and Colonia Ulpia Traiana, the monograph devoted to the brooches of the Raetian provincial capital, *Augusta Vindelicorum (Aelia Augusta)*, represents, with nearly 1,000 artefacts, the third-largest city-based corpus for the Roman Empire.

In the *Preface* (p. 7–27), the author sets out the aims of the research project that underpins the book, focusing on early and middle imperial brooches from the Roman settlement (925 items). M. Pauli notes an important limitation: although much of the material is stratified, it cannot always be evaluated against secure archaeological contexts, since Augsburg artefacts were in many instances treated as stray-finds. Particularly welcome is an extended discussion of the research history of Roman Augsburg, still rare in corpora of this type.

Chapter 2, *Zusammensetzung des Fundmaterials* (Composition of the assemblage) (p. 28–36), introduces the analysed material from early and middle imperial contexts within ancient Augsburg. The author deliberately restricts the corpus to brooches from the provincial capital and its adjacent cemeteries. Two components are highlighted as especially important for the ensuing analysis: the finds from the Kornhausgasse 4 complex and the substantial series of so-called “Prussian” eye brooches A57–61. By contrast, published material from the broader hinterland (including the Augustan site at Oberhausen) is not incorporated, nor are Late Roman brooches or those dating after the mid-3rd century AD.

Chapter 3, *Materialkundlich-technologische Analyse* (Materials and technological analysis) (p. 37–90), is among the most extensive continental European technological studies devoted to Roman brooches. The opening discussion addresses manufacturing technology at *Augusta Vindelicorum*, with a particular focus on the *Augenfibel* “eye brooches” A57–61. This emphasis is justified not only by their abundance in the Raetian capital but also by their remarkably wide circulation, especially in *Barbaricum*.

In the absence of archaeologically attested brooch workshops or unequivocal half-finished products, M. Pauli discusses the two principal manufacturing routes on the basis of extensive comparative literature: casting in moulds and forging. While both techniques are well attested in the Empire, the author argues, following the consulted bibliography, that mould-casting with “fully shaped” forms already achieved at the casting stage appears in *Germania Magna* only by the mid-3rd century AD (p. 37). This chronological claim should be adjusted in light of more recent discoveries indicating the use of such technology from the 2nd century AD onwards.¹ At the same time, the lack of tangible production evidence (miscasts, moulds etc.) still hampers a secure attribution of this technique that was used in the Roman,² Celtic³ or Dacian⁴ milieu starting from the 1st century as well as within Germanic contexts later on.

To clarify production processes and alloy composition, microscopic, metallographic

¹ TEJRAL 2006; COCIȘ/ BÂRCĂ 2013; PIETA/ŠVIHUROVÁ 2019, 111, Fig. 3; COCIȘ 2019, 28–34.

² SEDLMAYER 2009, 97–99.

³ GUILLAUMET 1984, 11–13.

⁴ RUSTOIU 1997, 23–25.

and experimental analyses were carried out at the Bayerisches Landesamt für Denkmalpflege. Pauli's archaeometry approach is explicitly inspired by the model developed by J. Bayley and S. Butcher for Britain after studying over 3,500 artefacts. For compositional analysis, representative samples were selected from early spiral brooches, variants of "eye brooches" (Augsburg 1.7), strongly profiled brooches (Augsburg 1.8), and Aucissa type brooches (Augsburg 3.1–2). The measurements were conducted by J. Riederer at the Rathgen Research Laboratory (Berlin) using atomic absorption spectrometry (AAS; 102 samples) and at the Bayerisches Landesamt für Denkmalpflege using SEM-EDX (98 samples). The resulting dataset is sufficiently representative to support broader inferences. As expected, the analysed brooches consist predominantly of brass (a copper-zinc alloy), yet the eye brooches and strongly profiled brooches also show meaningful alloy variation between subtypes (Annex 7).

The reconstruction of manufacturing techniques is centred on the "eye brooches". Metallographic observations, experimental replication of an A61, and the comparative literature led M. Pauli to several conclusions: A45–49 (Augsburg 1.7.1–1.7.3) were probably cast; for A52 (Augsburg 1.7.4), A53 (Augsburg 1.7.5) and the transitional A53/A57–61 (Augsburg 1.7.6), the manufacturing method is difficult to diagnose; whereas A57–61 (Augsburg 1.7.7) were produced by forging (p. 62). This apparent shift, within the Roman world, from casting to forging may seem counter-intuitive, especially since casting is documented in all known brooch workshops contemporary with A57–61 (Flavian-Trajanic) and with the strongly profiled types A67–68.⁵ Pauli's suggestion that the forged Augsburg series may reflect the work of craftsmen of "barbarian" background is therefore plausible, but remains necessarily inferential without workshop evidence.

Chapter 4, *Antiquarisch-chronologische Analyse* (Antiquarian and chronological analysis) (p. 91–187), is the most substantial part of the volume. Although critical of E. Riha's typology, the author acknowledges its strengths, particularly the unambiguous naming of types and the extensible numerical system, and accepts that the Augsburg material can, to a certain extent, be effectively classified using Riha and other established typologies.

Nevertheless, M. Pauli adopts her own typological system, built on existing classifications and targeted studies of individual brooch types in specific regions and periods. The classification relies on technological, formal, and chronological criteria, as well as fastening mechanisms. The brooches are organised into nine groups. Each group is analysed according to these criteria, with particular emphasis on the "eye brooches" (292 items) and the strongly profiled brooches (109 items).

The discussion related to the "eye brooch" variants is meticulous: several variants are debated at the level of Raetia, and the A57–61 series (Augsburg 1.7.7) is treated within a broader European framework. While these sections mainly refine distribution patterns rather than introducing fundamentally new evidence, the absence of references to Eastern European and north-Pontic "eye brooches" is a noticeable gap.⁶

The analysis of strongly profiled brooches leads Pauli to the sound conclusion that the Cambodunum 1/A67c, Cambodunum 3, and the Raetian variant A83/84 are concentrated in the Alpine foothills and are thus best interpreted as local forms. A further argument for local attribution is provided by a semi-finished specimen of type A83/84a1 (cat. no. 420), which supports the existence of a workshop producing this variant in the provincial capital.

Chapter 5, *Archäologisch-historische Auswertung* (Archaeological-historical evaluation) (p. 188–219), aims to interpret the full brooch spectrum in relation to the settlement history and demographic development of Augsburg. For chronological evaluation, the brooches are

⁵ SEDLMAYER 2009, 97–99; KNAUSEDER 2014, 157.

⁶ RUSTOIU 1997, 56–57, typ 23, fig. 67/1–8; HARALAMBIEVA 2002, 31–42; KROPOTOV 2010, 329–330.

grouped into three periods: the Julio-Claudian dynasty; the Flavian dynasty to the mid-2nd century AD; and the mid-2nd to the mid-3rd century AD.

On the basis of percentage distribution across these three periods, a decline in brooch numbers is evident in the third phase (mid-2nd to mid-3rd century AD; Fig. 59). This trend is explained as part of a broader reduction in brooch use, supported by comparison with Kempten and Burghöfe. The decline is attributed to the adoption of an urban Roman fashion style that did not require brooch fastening. A further section addresses modes of wearing and the likely wearers (women, men, and children), again structured by the three chronological segments.

The subsequent discussion concerns the origins of the Augsburg brooches. Here Pauli offers a careful analysis, concluding that Augsburg brooches largely derive from the Danube area, similarly to those from Bregenz, Kempten and Burghöfe, while also revealing a distinct regional trajectory that includes Raetian variants of strongly profiled brooches, double-knob brooches, and animal-head brooches. A further line of argument for regional Raetian production is provided by comparison with evidence for manufacture in Raetia (tab. 34). A comparative analysis of the Augsburg type groups against brooches from nine sites in Raetia, Germania Superior and Noricum, as expected, identifies chronologically and regionally related clusters.

The Kornhausgasse 4 assemblage (129 items) leads the author to interpret the complex as the stock of a merchant. The arguments are persuasive: the absence of typical heavy wear on the fastening system, a higher proportion of almost completely preserved brooches relative to the overall spectrum, the presence of identical brooches, and close analogies with finds from Magdalensberg, *Apollonia* (Albania) and Mainz (p. 211).

The final section offers a detailed treatment of the “eye brooches” A57–61 (Augsburg 1.7.7), revisiting the thesis that they were forged from a single piece of metal (Chapter 3.5.2), as supported by metallographic analyses. The very large number of closely similar items – 258 items (195 broken pins and 63 brooch bodies) – in the absence of a clearly identified workshop nonetheless suggests production in the Raetian provincial capital. The analysis of the finds based on the stratigraphic sequences suggests that such brooches were manufactured from the Flavian to the Trajanic period. On distribution grounds, Pauli convincingly assigns type A57–61 to the Germanic cultural milieu. She further supports her argument by comparing technological and material characteristics between the Augsburg brooches and those from *Barbaricum* (tab. 39), concluding that Germanic brooch-makers were probably responsible for producing such artefacts in Augsburg.

Chapter 6 (Summary) (p. 220–222) presents a set of well-founded conclusions. The author observes that Augsburg “lies at the intersection of local Celtic and Gallo-Roman dress habits”. On the basis of the brooch types, Pauli imagines a mixed population in the Augsburg garrison and provincial capital, with a segment that, compared to Kempten and Bregenz, appears less Romanised and more strongly anchored in local Raetian-Vindelician traditions. Individuals from neighbouring, and even more distant, provinces are identified through distinctive brooch types. A potentially “Germanic group” within Augsburg is suggested as early as the second decade of the 1st century AD, on the basis of “eye brooch” evidence.

Chapter 9 (Appendices) (p. 223–244) includes: (1) the compositional results for 200 brooches (tab. 40); (2) a list of strongly profiled brooches, north-Raetian variant 83/84; (3) a list of strongly profiled brooches, south-Raetian variant 83/84; and (4) an overview of the Augsburg typology and dating (tab. 41).

Chapter 10 (Bibliography) (p. 245–260) contains, with the minor exception noted above (“eye brooches” from the East), the updated literature at the level of 2016, when the manuscript was finalised.

Chapter 11 (Image credits) (p. 261) provides a detailed listing of figures reproduced from other authors, alongside attribution for photographs and drawings.

Chapter 12 (Catalogue) (p. 262–322) is organised according to the nine “Augsburg” type groups (nos. 1–965). Finds from the Kornhausgasse 4 complex are marked separately (letter K). The entries are exceptionally detailed, including, among other, the weight of each object. Chapter 12 (Plates) (p. 323–387) illustrates the entire corpus through drawings and photographs and concludes with a drawn presentation of the typology of the nine groups.

Overall, the volume will be of considerable value to specialists in brooch studies, as well as to scholars concerned with casting and forging technologies in Roman and non-Roman material culture, and with the cultural and economic networks that structured interaction between these two spheres.

Sorin Cociş

BIBLIOGRAPHY

COCIŞ/BÂRCĂ 2013

S. COCIŞ/V. BÂRCĂ, The workshops and production of “Sarmatian” brooches (Almgren Group VII, Series I). *Dacia NS* 57, 2013, 161–175.

COCIŞ 2019

S. COCIŞ, The Brooch Workshops from Dacia and the other Danubian Provinces of the Roman Empire (1st c. bc – 3rd c. ad) (Cluj-Napoca 2019).

GUILLAUMET 1984

J. P. GUILLAUMET, *Les fibules de Bibracte. Technique et typologie* (Dijon 1984).

KNAUSEDER 2014

D. KNAUSEDER, *Fibelproduktion in Iuvavum-Salzburg*. In: F. Lang, R. Kastler, W. K. Kovasovics, S. Traxler (eds.), *Colloquium Iuvavum 2012, Das municipium Claudium Iuvavum und sein Umland, Bestandsaufnahme und Forschungsstrategien, Tagung im Salzburg Museum, 15–17 März 2012, Archäologie in Salzburg 8, Jahresschrift des Salzburg Museums* 56 (Salzburg 2014), 141–176.

HARALAMBIEVA 2002

A. HARALAMBIEVA, *Fibuli s 'očički' (Augenfibeln), Almgren III, tipove 44–64 južno ot Dolnija Dunav (Augenfibeln vom Typ III 44–64 nach Almgren südlich der Unteren Donau)*. *Izvestiia na Narodniia muzei-Varna / Bulletin du Musee National de Varna* 32–33 (47–48), 1996–1997 (2002), 31–42.

KROPOTOV 2010

V. V. KROPOTOV, *Fibuly Sarmatskoy Epokhi* (Kiev 2010).

PIETA/ŠVIHUROVÁ 2019

K. PIETA/M. ŠVIHUROVÁ, *Influence of the Przeworsk culture in the Púchov culture milieu*. *Acta Archaeologica Carpathica* LIV, 2019, 107–128.

RUSTOIU 1997

A. RUSTOIU, *Fibulele din Dacia preromană (sec. II î. e. n – I e. n)* (Bucureşti 1997).

SEDLMAYER 2009

H. SELDMAYER, *Die Fibeln vom Magdalensberg, Funde der Grabungsjahre 1948–2002*

und Altfunde des 19. Jahrhunderts, Archäologische Forschungen zu den Grabungen auf dem Magdalensberg 16 (Klagenfurt 2009).

TEJRAL 2006

J. TEJRAL, Die germanischen Gießereiwerkstatt in Pasohlávky (Bez. Břeclav). Ein Beitrag zur Frage der Fernhandels- und Kulturbeziehungen nach den Markomannenkriegen. *Památky Archeologické* 97, 2006, 133–170.

