

Harpocrate assis. L'article suivant, écrit par Ludivine Beaurin s'intéresse à la question de l'usage de l'eau du Nil dans les cérémonies isiaques, en se basant sur le contexte domestique de Pompéi. La pratique y serait attestée par l'usage d'amphores portant l'inscription « don de Sérapis » en grec. L'article est une véritable enquête policière, méthodique et argumentée, qui mobilise de nombreuses sources d'information et propose une origine crétoise et un usage vinicole à ces amphores. La rubrique *Varia* se conclut avec Gisèle Clerc qui traite d'une thématique peu abordée, celle de l'étude d'objets isiaques trouvés en contexte funéraire mérovingien. L'article propose un large tour d'horizon des objets qui ont pu avoir une valeur amuletique, emprunter l'iconographie isiaque ou encore être importés d'Égypte dans tous les domaines de la vie à cette époque. La troisième section, intitulée *Thesaurus iconographicus cultuum isiacorum* comprend quatre contributions, dont les deux premières sont des répertoires ayant pour vocation de servir de corpus de base à l'étude des objets répertoriés. La première contribution, de Jean-Louis Podvin, répertorie les représentations isiaques sur la sigillée, thème encore mal étudié. L'article est agrémenté d'un catalogue fourni, comportant de nombreuses photographies mais aussi plusieurs dessins dont l'auteur lui-même regrette le manque de précision. L'article suivant, de Kata Endreffy, répertorie les patères en pierre à motifs isiaques, en reprenant une centaine de pièces, pour la plupart inédites. Les deux articles de Richard Veymiers et Jean-Louis Podvin sont, quant à eux, des suppléments à de précédents articles, l'un portant sur les gemmes et bijoux figurant Sérapis, l'autre sur les luminaires isiaques, publiés dans les volumes antérieurs de la série. Enfin, Laurent Bricault propose un supplément au RICIS reprenant les inscriptions pour lesquelles de nouvelles lectures sont proposées. L'article clôture ainsi ce volume varié et richement illustré qui ne manquera pas d'intéresser les chercheurs spécialisés dans les cultes isiaques en Méditerranée. Clara DE PUTTER

Emilian TELEAGA (Ed.), *Funeralkultur der Thraker und Skythen des 7. bis 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. an der unteren Donau*. Rahden/Westf., Marie Leidorf, 2020. 1 vol., 21.5 x 30 cm, 382 p., ill. n./b. & coul. (STUDIEN ZUR EISENZEITLICHEN ARCHÄOLOGIE THRAKIENS, 5). Prix : 59,80 €. ISBN 978-3-86757-885-1.

The papers included in this volume were presented at an international conference that was organized, in 2017, by A. Müller-Karpe and E. Teleaga at Philipps-Universität in Marburg. Marking the culmination of a research project on *Late Hallstatt Burials and Funerary Practices in the Lower Danube Region*, which was directed by Teleaga, the conference was combined with the celebration of the 90<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Prehistoric Seminar of Philipps-Universität, one of the oldest in this field in Europe. Two short introductions by Müller-Karpe (director of the Marburg Seminar) and Teleaga, respectively, are followed by 17 papers that provide a great wealth of information on funerary evidence from the period between the 7<sup>th</sup> and the 5<sup>th</sup> c. BCE, covering a very broad region that extends, in modern terms, between Ukraine and Hungary. Discussing the finds from various sites in southwest Ukraine, the first two papers exemplify a shift of archaeological interest in the region from spectacular grave goods – which remained the main desideratum until the mid-20<sup>th</sup> c. – to funerary structures, their form, the

process of their construction and their functions. The first paper, by M. N. Daragan and S. V. Polin, concentrates on kurgans and associated feasting deposits, the second, by M. N. Daragan, on the form of wooden chamber tombs that appear under such mounds. In the third paper, A. Corobcean and S. Matveev review, and eventually they reject, the ways in which earlier scholarship relied on funerary evidence from the territory of modern Moldavia in order to address the question of the origins of the Getae, as well as that of Scythian presence in the region. The next five papers are directly related to the aforementioned research project led by Teleaga, which was concentrated on the necropolis of Bârsești, in Romania, at about 170 km northeast of Bucharest. V. Istrate, A. Mișu-Pintilie, A. Lupașcu and Teleaga examine climate and vegetation in the eastern Romanian Subcarpathian region during the Hallstatt period, on the basis of palynological data. T. Riese presents the results of the geophysical survey of the Bârsești necropolis and Teleaga considers the history of research at this site and the attested funerary practices. In a separate paper, the same scholar further publishes the finds from earlier excavations at the site, which took place in the 1950s. The Bârsești section closes with a brief but enlightening report on archaeozoological evidence by A. Bălășescu. Remaining at the Romanian part of Moldavia, A. László tackles the issues of the status and ethnic identity of women who were buried with weapons in this particular region. Moving to southeast Romania, the next two chapters are devoted to the necropolis of Celic-Dere. V. Sîrbu, M.-M. Ștefan, D. Ștefan and T. Bochnak offer a fine synthesis on graves and their inventories, whereas A. Soficaru and M. Culea analyze the anthropological evidence. Focusing on the Greek colonies of the northwest shore of the Black Sea, which were established not far from indigenous sites, such as the one at Celic-Dere, M. Damyanov examines the funerary record of these colonies with relation to East Greek, Thracian and Scythian funerary practices. Using as a starting point the finds from the necropolis at Valea Stâinii, D. Măndescu reassesses the so-called “Ferigile archaeological group”, which is placed across mid-southern Romania. Similarly, C. Cristescu and I. A. Bărbat outline the characteristics of a group of burials that are known from southwest Transylvania and which the authors designate as belonging to the “Ciurbrud cultural group” or simply as “Scythian”. In the same vein, M. Ljuština elaborates on the funerary practices evinced at sites of the “Srem/Syrmia group” in northern Serbia. K. Dmitrović revisits the two well-known mounds that were investigated in the 1950s at Atenica, in central Serbia. Lastly, K. Tankó provides an overview of burial practices within the “Alföld group of Scythian culture”, also dubbed “Vekerzug culture”, in Hungary. Given that almost all the aforementioned papers stem from fieldwork projects that were initiated over the last couple of decades, any scholar interested in the regions along the Lower Danube during the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium BCE will need to consult the volume. It is noteworthy that several among these projects involve the re-examination of old finds in the light of more recent discoveries and, most importantly, with the aid of more advanced research methods, also taking into account additional lines of evidence. Although the task of accessing and making sense of old archives and finds may be admittedly daunting (as shown, for example, in the papers on Bârsești and Celic-Dere), such endeavors are more than necessary. In the case of the Atenica tumuli, for instance, they have revealed that, unlike what was previously thought, the occupiers of the two tombs were not some local chief and his wife but an adolescent boy and a child. While the compilation of a plethora of

new information forms the great strength of the volume, it is of no lesser importance that this information is provided in two broadly accessible languages, namely, in English and German. This language choice serves well the pressing need for more systematic exchange among specialists who work on different parts of Europe, as well as on adjacent regions. Connecting the eastern part of the Eurasian Steppe with the Balkans and central Europe, the Lower Danube crosses a heterogeneous archaeological landscape that is linked, throughout the volume, to various “archaeological groups” and “archaeological cultures”. Often conceptualized on the mere basis of funerary evidence, these “groups” and “cultures” appear to signify different things for different authors. In some cases, they are overtly associated with specific ethnic groups (e.g. by Tankó). In others, the perceived relationship between archaeological and ethnic groups is more ambiguous. László, for example, states that archaeological evidence can tell little of ethnic identities, but he repeatedly refers to specific material forms as ethnic markers. The same scholar goes as far as citing craniometric evidence as indicative of race, which he seems to consider as a constituent element of ethnic identity. Finally, a few authors (e.g. Teleaga) maintain the use of already established denominations as classificatory tools, but they explicitly reject the equation of these denominations to specific past populations. However, even in the latter cases, there is no discussion of the problems inherent in the concept of “archaeological culture”, as there are no references to the vast bibliography that exists on this subject (e.g. B. Trigger, *A History of Archaeological Thought*, Cambridge, 2006<sup>2</sup>, p. 211-313). It must be stressed that, if the culture-historical paradigm still largely prevails among scholars in these parts of Europe, this is not solely due to the history of the discipline in these parts, where, as anywhere else in the world, the past has often been marshaled for nationalist purposes (e.g. with regard to Romania, cf. C. N. Popa, “Late Iron Age Archaeology in Romania and the Politics of the Past”, *Dacia* 59, 2015, p. 337-361). The perseverance of the culture-historical approach in the archaeology of the Lower Danube region is further related to the fact that the local communities of the Hallstatt period produced no written records. Thus, scholars are left to deal, on the one hand, with a highly diverse archaeological record, which is reflected in the numerous different, but often partly overlapping, “archaeological cultures”; on the other hand, with a few – probably highly essentializing – exonyms, such as “Thracians” and “Scythians”, which were attributed to the local populations by ancient Greek authors. Of course, the messiness of artefact distributions clearly defies the establishment of archaeological, let alone of social, entities with clear-cut boundaries and the precise ethnonyms under which the local populations defined themselves may remain forever unknown. Even so, archaeological research on the region has still a great deal to offer. As remarked several times in the volume, the local chronologies mostly depend on Greek imports, which – whenever they are present – only offer a *terminus post quem*. At the same time, on account of the so-called “Hallstatt plateau”, radiocarbon dating is highly problematic. Further typological studies of local material culture are, therefore, indispensable for the establishment of finer chronological frameworks. Yet, aside from providing dates, the study of material remains also holds an enormous potential to throw light on myriad aspects of the social, political, economic and cultural life of the communities that lived along the Lower Danube. For this aim to be achieved, the extant material evidence needs to be submitted to fine-grained contextual and comparative analyses and this, at multiple

spatial and temporal scales. By offering accurate reconstructions of the patterns of consumption of material culture and not just impressionistic assessments of those, such analyses may elucidate a wide array of social practices and, to some extent, the social structures and the cultural norms of the local societies, as these evolved over time. Moreover, the comparative study of the evidence on the different local communities at the level of practices and the underlying ideological aspects (and not at the level of the typology of artifacts and structures) may offer a much more nuanced understanding of the relationship of these communities with each other and their interactions with their immediate or more distanced neighbors. Mainly focused on the presentation of primary evidence, the volume under review does not fully capitalize on this potential. Nevertheless, it clearly testifies to a dynamic turn in the archaeology of the lands along the Lower Danube and it lays the groundwork for more synthetic studies, which are bound to change our perception of the societies that inhabited these lands in the first half of the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium BCE.

Vivi SARIPANIDI

Fikret K. YEGÜL, *The Temple of Artemis at Sardis*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 2020. 2 vol. reliés sous coffret, 24 x 31 cm, XLVIII-285 p., 7 plans, 442 fig., 24 planches hors-texte, 5 tables (ARCHAEOLOGICAL EXPLORATION OF SARDIS, Report 7). Prix : 150 \$. ISBN 9780674248564.

Le temple d'Artémis à Sardes, situé sur le versant occidental de l'acropole, est l'un des principaux monuments de la ville antique et le quatrième plus grand temple ionique. C'est dire d'emblée l'importance de la publication précise et superbement documentée que nous en livre ici Fikret K. Yegül. Si de nombreux voyageurs, de Cyriaque d'Ancône (1444) au peintre danois Harald Jerichau (1873-1878), en passant par Robert Wood (1750), Richard Chandler (1765) ou encore le célèbre architecte néo-classique anglais Charles R. Cockerell (1812), avaient visité le site et souvent réalisé ou fait réaliser des dessins du monument (ici reproduits), on doit à Howard Crosby Butler, premier directeur des fouilles de Sardes, d'avoir dégagé, entre 1910 et 1914, le sanctuaire, qui, jusque-là, se distinguait essentiellement par deux colonnes à moitié ensevelies sous un important colluvionnement dont l'enlèvement nécessita l'intervention d'une équipe qui compta jusqu'à 250 ouvriers. En dépit d'une brève campagne menée en 1922, la fouille demeura inachevée, mais Butler en publia rapidement les résultats (1922 et 1925). Lors de la reprise du programme d'exploration par George Hanfmann, en 1958, la fouille fut poursuivie et donna lieu à de nouvelles publications, complétées (et révisées) par les observations de Gottfried Gruben (1961) et par les relevés de l'architecte de la mission, Thomas Howe (1999). Enfin, entre 1996 et 2010, N. D. Cahill, l'actuel directeur de la mission archéologique de Sardes, mena une série de sondages complémentaires qui permirent de clarifier le plan et l'histoire du monument et offrirent à l'examen des structures par l'architecte F. Yegül une base archéologique qui avait parfois fait défaut dans la reconstitution des phases de construction du temple d'Artémis de Sardes. Tourné vers l'Ouest, comme les Artemisia d'Éphèse ou de Magnésie, le temple d'Artémis à Sardes présente un plan pseudo-diptère de 8 colonnes sur 20 (44,60 m x 97,60 m), qui doit son originalité à la succession d'au moins deux grandes phases de construction. Le temple initial fut probablement conçu pour être diptère, avec une *cella*