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Berenike Bids Farewell to Seuthes III: The Silver-Gilt Scallop Shell *Pyxis* from the Golyama Kosmatka Tumulus

Emil NANKOV

"... grave goods are not just elements of an identity kit but are culmination of a series of actions by the mourners to express something of their relationship to the deceased as well as to portray the identity of the deceased".

THE GOLYAMA KOSMATKA TUMULUS

The Golyama Kosmatka tumulus, 20 m high and 90 m in diameter, belongs to a tumular necropolis situated ca. 7-8 km north of the Thracian city of Seuthopolis and 2 km south of the modern town of Shipka, Kazanlak district, in south central Bulgaria (Kitov 2005, 41, fig. 1, 4-5; 2006, 69-83; Китов 2005, 67-98; 2008, 214-231). Immediately east of Golyama Kosmatka stands a smaller tumulus known as Malka Kosmatka (fig. 1), both of which together with four other tumuli have received the appellation "Kosmatkite" (Kitov 2005, 41). In the fall of 2004, archaeological excavations conducted by the late G. Kitov brought to light a monumental tomb situated in the southern periphery of the Golyama Kosmatka tumulus. The tomb (fig. 2), oriented on a N-S axis, consists of a monumental stone facade, a dromos (13 m x 1.60 m), a rectangular antechamber (2.5 m x 1.70 m), a circular chamber (3.35 m diameter) and a monolith sarcophagus (1.92 m x 3.30 m). The dromos, as well as the next two premises were built of solid dry masonry, with the ashlar blocks joined by iron clamps set in lead, whereas the sarcophagus was carved out of a single granite block with a gable cover placed on top. A two-leaved marble door fragments of which were found scattered on the floor separates the sarcophagus from the circular chamber (Стоянова 2008, 95-102). At the back of the sarcophagus a funerary bed was carved, adjoined by a smaller, rectangular trough on the east side (Kitov 2005, 42, 44).

The discovery of the tomb became a sensational event as soon as it was realized that it had been untouched since antiquity. Kitov’s discovery is particularly valuable not only because unlooted Thracian tombs from the Hellenistic period are difficult to come by (e.g. Sashova mogila near the town of Shipka, district of Kazanlak [Kitov 1996]; Mogila #1 near the village of Kralevo, Targovishte district [Гинев 2002]; Naip tumulus near Tekirdağ [Delemen 2006]); but more importantly, be-

---

1 An earlier draft of this article was presented within the Archaeological Theory seminar conducted at the American Research Center in Sofia on November 18, 2011. I take the opportunity to express my gratitude to all colleagues, Denver Graninger, Bogdan Atanassov, Chavdar Tirochev, Witney Sneed, John Gorczyk, who commented on the paper and suggested additional readings and directions for further research. Special thanks are due to Julij Emilov, who kindly agreed to serve as a primary respondent on the paper, and from whose critical comments I have benefitted greatly. I am also grateful to Bela Dimova, PhD student at the Institute of Archaeology at University College London, for allowing me to consult her MA thesis entitled, "Gender and Other Elusive Identities in the Funerary Record from Late Iron Age and Early Hellenistic Thrace", 2011.

2 Parker Pearson 1999, 84.

3 Traces of hearths have been documented in the SE periphery of the tumulus. A shallow oval pit, situated to the SW of the tumulus center, contained a gold necklace, consisting of 27 beads, an amphora-shaped pendant and a cylindrical terminal, as well as a pair of gold earrings. On account of the manufacturing technique, the jewelry items were dated to the fourth century BC (Китов 2005, 37-38, обр. 42).
Fig. 4. A silver-gilt pyxis from Golyama Kosmatka tumulus, Historical Museum Iskra, Kazanlak, Inv. 1731; flat valve, front (a) and back (b); convex valve, front (c) and back (d) (photos: author).
The Battle at Abritus in AD 251: Written Sources, Archaeological and Numismatic Data

Galena RADOSLAVOVA / Georgi DZANEV / Nikolay NIKOLOV

Greek, Latin and Byzantine sources mention the battle between Romans and Goths at Abritus in AD 251, in which the Roman emperor Trajan Decius (AD 249-251) perished. In 1954, during archaeological excavations of the late Antique fortress east of the contemporary town of Razgrad an epigraphic monument was found. It was a limestone altar from the time of emperor Antoninus Pius (AD 138-161) and Verus Caesar, with a dedication to Hercules by veterans, Roman citizens and settlers in Abritus, made at canabae Aeliae (Иванов 1955). The identification of Abritus (now city of Razgrad, NE Bulgaria) with the ruins of the Razgrad “Hisarlık” locality was substantiated in 1980 by the discovery of a milestone column there, dating from the time of emperor Philip I the Arab and his son Philip Caesar (AD 244-247), which marks a distance of a mile on Abritus territory (Иванов 1981). The identification is supported by the discovery of a third epigraphic document discovered during archaeological excavation in 2008 – a limestone base dating from AD 221, with an inscription in honour of emperor Elagabalus made by the veterans and Roman citizens, settlers in Abrittus (Радославова / Дзанев 2009).

The only author, contemporary to these events, was the Greek historian Dexippos of Athens who lived in the second half of the 3rd century AD. In his “Historical chronicle” (Χρονικὴ ἱστορία), of which only a few fragments survive, Dexippos provides a detailed account of the siege of Philippopolis and Priscus’ surrender and mentions that Decius, together with his son were killed “… at Abrytus, in the so-called Forum Thembronium (… ἐν Ἀβρύτῳ τῷ λεγομένῳ Φόρῳ Θεμβρωνίῳ)” (Гръцки извори І, 3).

Describing the painful diseases and deaths of the emperors who persecuted the early Christians, in the first decades of the 4th century AD, the Christian writer Lucius Caecilius Firmianus lactantius also writes about the horrible death of Emperor Trajan Decius. In his work “On the deaths of the persecutors” (De mortibus persecutorum), preserved in only one manuscript from 11th century, he states (IV, 3): “... [Decius was] killed together with a great part of his army, nor could he be honoured with the rites of sepulture. Stripped and naked, he lay on the ground to be devoured by beasts and birds, a fit end for the enemy of God (cum magna exercitus parte deletus ne sepultura quidem potuit honorari, sed exatus ac nudus, ut hostem Dei oportebat, pabulum feris ac volucribus iacuit)” (Латински извори І, 47).

The fact that Emperor Trajan Decius deserved to be deified is stated by the Roman politician and historian Eutropius, who lived and worked in the 4th century AD. In book IX, section 4, a part of the preserved historical work in 10 short books “Short history since the founding of Rome” (Breviarium ab Urbe condita), he writes: “Having reigned for two years with his son, both were killed in the barbarian country. The father deserved to be deified (Cum imperassent biennio ipse et filius, uterque in Barbarico interfecti sunt. Senior meruit inter Divos referri)” (Латински извори I, 84). The evidence provided by Eutropius is used by all late Roman historians.

The Roman historian Sextus Aurelius Victor also writes about the glorious death of Decius and his son. In “Book of the Caesars” (Liber de Caesaribus), a continuation of Titus Livius’ history, he describes the events since the reign of Emperor...
Fig. 3. Aureus of Emperor Trajan Decius. Coin hoard from “Poleto” locality, near the village of Dryanovets (photo: Svilen Rizov).

Fig. 4. Aureus of Emperor Trajan Decius. Coin hoard from “Poleto” locality, near the village of Dryanovets (photo: Svilen Rizov).

Fig. 5. Aureus of Emperor Trajan Decius. Coin hoard from “Poleto” locality, near the village of Dryanovets (photo: Svilen Rizov).

Fig. 6. Aureus of Emperor Trajan Decius. Coin hoard from “Poleto” locality, near the village of Dryanovets (photo: Svilen Rizov).

Fig. 7. Aureus of Emperor Trajan Decius. Coin hoard from “Poleto” locality, near the village of Dryanovets (photo: Svilen Rizov).

Fig. 8. Antoninianus of Emperor Trajan Decius. Coin hoard from the Roman settlement in the north part of the village of Ezerche (photo: Pavel Ganchev).

Fig. 9. Antoninianus of Herennia Etruscilla, wife of Emperor Trajan Decius. Coin hoard from the Roman settlement in the north part of the village of Ezerche (photo: Pavel Ganchev).

Fig. 10. Antoninianus of Herennius Etruscus as Caesar. Coin hoard from “Poleto” locality, near the village of Dryanovets (photo: Pavel Ganchev).

Fig. 11. Antoninianus of Hostilian as Caesar. Coin hoard from “Poleto” locality, near the village of Dryanovets (Photo: Pavel Ganchev).
Too Much Typology, Too Little History: A Critical Approach to the Classification and Interpretation of Cast Fibulae with Bent Stem

Florin CURTA / Andrei GÂNDILĂ

The last few decades have witnessed a remarkable interest in the early Byzantine hillforts in the Balkans. While earlier scholars dealt primarily with fortifications (Bošković 1970; Ivanov 1973; Ovcharov 1977; Biernacka-Lubańska 1982; Ovcharov 1982; Kondić 1984; Ciglenečki 1987; Pisarev 1990; Tomić 1993; Mikučič 1994; Petrović 1994-1995; Bojadžiev 2000; Mikučič 2002), more recent studies have instead raised the question of function for many sixth- to early seventh-century hillforts in the Balkans – whether military or civilian (Ciglenečki 1979; Mikučič 1986; Dinchev 2001; Kirilov 2007; Milinković 2007; Curta, forthcoming). So far, arguments have been drawn primarily from the evidence of housing (Mitova-Djono 1968; Kociacheva 1992; Dinchev 1997), and little, if any, systematic research on the material culture, especially dress accessories, has been driven by concerns with the function of hillforts, despite the relatively widespread interpretation of belt buckles of the Sucidava class, for example, as parts of military uniforms (e.g., Vinski 1967, 38; Varsik 1993, 208-209; Madgearu 1998, 219). Another dress accessory frequently associated with hilltop sites dated to the sixth century is the cast fibula with bent stem. First identified by Stefan Stefanov (Стефанов 1961, 349), who isolated five specimens found in Novae for his group VI, this type of fibula is often named “early Byzantine” (Mitrea 1973) or “Roman-Byzantine” (Teodor 1988) in reference to its association with sixth-century assemblages on fortified sites in the Balkans. The German archaeologist Syna Uenze called it “cast fibula with fake spiral” (gogossene Fibel mit Scheinumwicklung), because of her firm conviction that it was in fact a late variant of the fibula with bent stem, a dress accessory frequently found in assemblages of the third- to fourth-century Sântana de Mureș-Chernyakhov culture (Uenze 1974, 483; 1992, 157). In the first study devoted to cast fibulae with bent stem, Uenze noted that the majority of the 97 specimens known to her had no decoration whatsoever, even though she also observed that specimens with a rectangular section of the bow commonly had a cross-shaped foot, while those with a division of the stem into two unequal panels had an S-shaped ornament on the bow (Uenze 1974, 485 and 489). On the basis of a large number of specimens in the collection of the Banat Museum in Timișoara said to be from Orșova, Uenze believed that cast fibulae with bent stem had been produced in the sixth century in the Iron Gates region of the Danube River1. She pointed to several rings attached to the stems of a few specimens as an indication that those fibulae were worn with the stem pointing downwards, perhaps singly or in pairs (Uenze 1974, 490)2.

1 Syna Uenze believed that the fibulae with trapezoidal-shaped section of the bow found in Golemanovo Kale and Sucidava (Сел) were from the same workshop (Uenze 1974, 489). According to Uenze 1992, 157, the cast fibulae with bent stem originated in the border region between the Late Roman provinces of Dacia Ripensis and Moesia Prima. A number of similar fibulae were found in Novae (Uenze 1974, 483; 1992, 157). In the first study devoted to cast fibulae with bent stem, Uenze noted that the majority of the 97 specimens known to her had no decoration whatsoever, even though she also observed that specimens with a rectangular section of the bow commonly had a cross-shaped foot, while those with a division of the stem into two unequal panels had an S-shaped ornament on the bow (Uenze 1974, 485 and 489). On the basis of a large number of specimens in the collection of the Banat Museum in Timișoara said to be from Orșova, Uenze believed that cast fibulae with bent stem had been produced in the sixth century in the Iron Gates region of the Danube River. She pointed to several rings attached to the stems of a few specimens as an indication that those fibulae were worn with the stem pointing downwards, perhaps singly or in pairs (Uenze 1974, 490).

2 Except the pair of fibulae from Piatra Frecătei, all other specimens known to Syna Uenze from burial assemblages (Donićevo Brdo, Hódmezovásárhely, and Sărata Monteoreu) were apparently single fibulae.
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Fig. 9. Davideni, house 51: plan and associated artifacts (fragment of a clay pan, cast fibula with bent stem, wheel-made pottery, and spindle whorl). After Mitrea 2001.

Fig. 10. Golemanovo kale: cast fibula with rings attached to the stem. After Uenze 1992.

Fig. 11. Kölked, grave 438: plan and selected grave goods. After Kiss 2001.

Fig. 12. Kölked, grave 85: plan and selected grave goods. After Kiss 2001.
Analysis of the statistical results for the archaeological surveys conducted in Bulgaria is offered for the fifth consecutive year. The bulk of the information is collected through an annual professional archaeologists' community electronic survey, and from the NIAM-BAS national “Archaeological surveys” report sessions. Analytical observations on the statistics for the preceding years have appeared in various publications (Cholakov / Chukalev 2008a; Cholakov / Chukalev 2008b; Vagalinski et al. 2008; Cholakov / Chukalev 2009; Чолаков / Чукалев 2010; Cholakov / Chukalev 2010a; Cholakov / Chukalev 2010b). All comparisons presented here are based on data already published and statistically analyzed for earlier excavation seasons. This article is a review of the statistical results for the 2006-2010 five-year period.

The criteria for the statistical processing include: date and type of the surveyed sites; type of excavations; accompanying interdisciplinary research, if any; institutional affiliation of the lead researcher; international collaboration, if any; duration and source of finance for the survey; and location of the studied sites (Cholakov / Chukalev 2008b, 89). The statistics for the 2006 surveys did not include the “accompanying interdisciplinary research” criterion, or the “source of finance”; those two criteria were added at a later date.

Figure 1 presents the total number of archaeological excavations conducted in Bulgaria during the 2006-2010 seasons and their relative percentage distribution during the period. 2007 has the highest number of excavated sites in this five-year period. The figures for the consecutive years are not considerably different, but a slight downward trend is noticeable. The 2010 season stands out with the lowest number of archaeological surveys for the entire period. The 2007 peak is a product primarily of the research commissioned by major national infrastructure development projects, and by the country-wide boom in residential and industrial construction. The drastic drop of the last year is chiefly the result of the world economic crisis, the effects of which reached Bulgaria slightly later. Distribution of sites according to their study period reveals that the highest number of archaeological surveys was launched on sites from Antiquity. This is to be expected, since those are also the most abundant sites on Bulgarian territory. Excavations on medieval sites are the second most common. The highest number of such sites was studied in 2007, with a clear downward trend afterwards. The number of excavated prehistoric sites is almost constant throughout the five-year period. It is to be noted that the 2010 drop in the curve is result mostly of the decline of the number of studied medieval and antiquity sites; the figures for the prehistoric ones are almost constant for the last three seasons. However, the number of newly-opened excavations on prehistoric sites is reduced, at the expense of engagement with long-term research projects. Few projects target “post-medieval” sites. In reality, however, structures and finds of the period have been studied on various multi-layer sites. Sites which have not produced distinct archaeological features, or sites of uncertain date are represented in the “Unclear chronology” chart.

Settlement sites are the most frequently excavated type during 2006-2010 seasons. Settlement sites are the most frequently excavated type during 2006-2010 seasons (fig. 5). However, elements of the other kinds of archaeological sites have also been studied on settlement sites. Cult sites, burial sites, production centres, etc.,
Fig. 1. Total number of archaeological excavations in Bulgaria 2006-2010.

Fig. 2. Total number of investigated antiquity sites in Bulgaria 2006-2010.

Fig. 3. Total number of investigated medieval sites in Bulgaria 2006-2010.

Fig. 4. Total number of investigated prehistoric sites in Bulgaria 2006-2010.

Im Vorwort legt die Autorin eine kurze, jedoch ausführliche Übersicht über das Forschungsvorhaben zu den Grabdenkmälern aus der Provinz *Thracia* vor. Gleichzeitig wird in Kurzfassung auch das zusammenfassende Konzept für die Erkundung einer solchen Denkmälerkategorie entwickelt, das neben der rein ikonographischen, chronologischen und typologischen Forschung durch die Eingliederung der Grabdenkmäler in dem ihnen zeitgenössischen sozialhistorischen Kontext immer mehr bereichert wird. Im Rahmen desselnen Kapitels wird korrekt die in der Forschung angewendete Terminologie präzisiert.

Aufgrund der verhältnismäßig begrenzten Anzahl der Denkmäler (251) und der Vielzahl der typologischen Formvarianten betrachtet die Autorin die Erarbeitung eines detaillierten typologischen Schemas für *Thracia* als unbegründet und stützt sich auf jene, die für andere Provinzen erarbeitet wurden. Trotz der Richtigkeit dieser Feststellung bin ich der Meinung, dass die Erarbeitung eines typologischen Schemas für die Denkmäler aus *Thracia* ihren Platz in solchen Untersuchungen findet und nicht ignoriert werden soll. Die Anwendung einer für andere Regionen ausgearbeiteten Typologie ist nicht für alle Denkmäler anwendbar, da sie die formale Spezifik des Materials nicht ausreichend beschreibt. Gleichzeitig existieren Stelenformen, die nur für *Thracia* typisch sind, sowie solche, bei denen die Bestimmung als zu dem einen oder anderen Typ gehörend nicht eindeutig ist. Die Beilage einer Verbreitungskarte der entsprechenden Typen und Varianten würde ebenfalls die Orientierung in der Spezifik der Denkmäler, ihrer Verbreitung und der ausgeübten Einflüsse unterstützen.

In territorialer Hinsicht liegt die Forschung in den von B. Gerov bestimmten Provinzgrenzen von *Thracia*, wobei als Nordgrenze der Grenzverlauf der severischen Zeit, bzw. die Südgrenze der Untersuchung der untermösischen Grabsteine angenommen wird.

In Betracht der o.g. Argumentation und des Fehlens einer gesonderten typologischen Erforschung der Denkmäler, akzeptiert die Autorin das Analyseprinzip einer nach Regionen getrennten Untersuchung der Stelen und Grabaltäre, die die ausgeprägte Gliederung der Provinz in geographischer und demographischer Hinsicht widerspiegelt.


Im Ganzen gesehen ist das Kapitel informativ und gibt eine gute Gesamtvorstellung über den Zustand und die Dynamik der historischen und kulturellen Entwicklung der Provinz. In Bezug auf einzelne Teile des Gesamtbildes können kleine, doch wesentliche Ergänzungen gemacht werden. Trotz der Darstellung der wichtigsten Verkehrsadern in der Provinz sind einige wichtige nicht angegeben, und zwar: von *Novae* nach *Augusta Traiana, Durostorum – Anchialos, Philippopolis – Nicopolis ad Nestum, von Philippopolis...