

from the tombs of women and children. The 23 inscriptions – mainly in Greek language – are dedicated to female divinities or persons (Diogenes and Lavinia, as personifications of boys and girls or masculine and feminine attitudes). The decorations – vegetations, geometric forms – are related mainly to Venusian and Dionysian contexts or to astrologic symbolism, especially to Pisces, Cancer and Aquarius. They do not assist too much on the material of the objects, at least, in the recent historiography; the lead (*plumbum*) is considered exclusively a material for cheap, popular objects of everyday religiosity, mainly magic⁵. Similarly, a general discussion about the symbolic role of mirrors and the miniature objects in the Roman art could give a clue for different kind of interpretations⁶.

Summarizing the first chapter, the authors present a “definition” of the objects. After their opinion the 721 objects presented in the book has different functions, some of them being votive *ex votis*, others could be amulets with magical connotation and some rare pieces could be interpreted as toys, decorations or medallions. Few of the objects were used as real mirrors. The authors suggest also a terminological change, introducing the more neutral and less problematic “lead frame” instead of the deceptive “lead mirror” term.

Analyzing the forms and typology of the lead frames, Bózsza/Szabó conclude that even if the material of some provinces – such as Dacia, Moesia, Thracia – has very similar iconographic features, the presence of numerous workshops attested in this area (some of them in Apulum and Drobeta) shows a rich, local aspect of a universal form. The influence of Aquileia in the spread of some forms – and indirectly, the importance of the *Publicum Portorium Illyrici* – is obvious again. Some distinctive forms, such as the star-shaped frames, are present mainly in the Western provinces, which shows in the case of this object type too the influence of the costume system on economic and artistic networks⁷.

The second chapter presents the typology of the objects. In sixty pages (45 – 104) the authors presents very carefully, with drawings and numerous analogies all the types and subtypes identified by them. This typology was introduced and created mainly for the collection of the Hungarian National Museum, but some of the terminologies used existed already in the scholarship. The authors identify nine different types and, at the same time, discuss the variants of the *verso* of the objects. There are three main type: the rectangular, the round and the star-shaped forms. The rectangular form (21 examples) have twelve variations, mainly based on decorative elements. Most of the VTERE FELIX inscriptions came from this category. The round type has five subtypes: round, narrow frames without handle (nos. 22-40), round wide frames without handle (nos. 41-52), round frames with vertical handle (nos. 52-690), round frames with crossed pliers in the back (nos. 691-695) and decorated, round plates (nos. 696-699). The star shaped forms are very rare (found

mainly in the Western provinces: nos. 700-703). There are some examples for *verso* of the lead frames (nos. 704-718). Some pieces are so small and fragmentary, that they could not be identified by the authors (nos. 719 – 721.).

The third chapter is the massive catalogue of the corpus, presenting carefully all of the 721 pieces, presenting very shortly the inventory number, dimensions, material, and short description of the object and – in rare cases – the provenience of the object (105 – 226 pp.). All of the lead frames are photographed in black and white (retro and verso) in the next chapter (227 – 478 pp.). Some of the pieces are presented only by reproduces photographs, but great part of them are published the first time in this volume. The eighty-nine titles in the bibliography practically is the most complete summary of the historiography of research in the topic.

In conclusion, we can affirm, that the book of A. Bózsza and Á. Szabó is an extremely important contribution for the research, as the first and most comprehensive corpus of this type of objects. They not jut presented an extremely rich material – because of a successful collaboration with Hungarian and foreign scholars and authorities of heritage protection – but introduced a new and more accurate terminology and typology of this object type, which need to be used for the future research. The photographs – although are in black and white and not always in the best quality – serve a detailed corpus for researchers. The German version of the book is a great urge for such a valuable work.

References

- BARATTA 2012
Baratta, G., Il piombo e la magia: il rapporto tra l'oggetto e il material. A proposito degli specchi plumbei. In: Piranomonte, M./Simón, M.F. (eds.), *Contesti magici – contextos mágicos. Atti del convegno internazionale, Roma, Palazzo Massimo, 4-6 novembre 2009* (Roma: de Luca), 23-27.
- BARATTA 2014
Baratta, G., Gli specchietti votive in piombo dedicati alla Kuria Agorac. In: Martinez, Á.M./ Fernandez, G.T./Ortega-Villaro, B. (eds.), *Ágalma. Ofrenda desde la Filología Clásica a Manuel Garcia Teijeiro* (Valladolid: Ediciones Universidad de Valladolid), 709-713.
- BLÄNSDORF 2010
Blänsdorf, J., The *defixiones* from the sanctuary of Isis and Mater Magna in Mainz. In: Gordon, R.L./Simón, F.M. (eds.), *Magical Practice in the Latin West. Papers from the International Conference held at the University of Zaragoza, 30 Sept.-1 Oct. 2005* (Leiden-Boston: Brill), 141-191.
- BÓZSA/SZABÓ 2014
Bózsza, Á./Szabó, Á., Tükör vagy nem tükör? Ólomkeretek a Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum gyűjteményében. In: *Fiatall Római Koros Kutatók Konferenciája. FIRKÁK VII.* (Szombathely: -), 141-150.
- FACSÁDY 2013
Facsády, A., „*Forma bonum fragile est...*” *Szépítkezés a római korban (Beautifying in the Roman Age)* (Budapest: Archaeolingua).
- GOTTSCHALK 2012
Gottschalk, R., Miniaturen in Frauenhand – zu den sogenannten Mithrassymbolen, *Archäologische Korrespondenzblatt* 42/1, 83-93.
- HAVAS 2013
Havas, Z., A publicum vicesimae libertati bronz bélyegzője

5 About the magical function of lead objects, see: BARATTA 2012, 23-27.

6 GOTTSCHALK 2012, 83-93. On portable, miniature sundials – similar forms as these lead frames, see WRIGHT 2000, 177-187, TALBERT 2015.

7 ZACCARIA 2010, 53-78, HAVAS 2013, 66-68.

- Aquincumból, *Studia Epigraphica Pannonica* 5, 59-106.
- KREMER/HOLZNER 2012
Kremer, G/Holzner, M., *Do ut des: Bleivotive aus Carnuntum, Carnuntum Jahrbuch*, 31-69.
- NÉMETH-SZABÓ 2010
Németh, Gy./Szabó, Á., To a beautiful soul. Inscriptions on lead mirrors (Collection of Roman Antiquities, Hungarian National Museum), *Acta Classica Universitatis Scientiarum Debreceniensis* 46, 101-113.
- WRIGHT 2000
Wright, M.T., Greek and Roman Portable Sundials. An Ancient Essay in Approximation. *Archive for History of Exact Sciences* 55, 177-187.
- TALBERT 2015
Talbert, R., Roman portable sundials: the Empire in your hand. (forthcoming)
- ZACCARIA 2010
Zaccaria, C., Dall'Aquileiense portorium al publicum portorii Illyrici: revision e aggiornamento della documentazione epigrafica. In: Zerbini, L. (ed.), *Roma e le province del Danubio. Atti del I convegno internazionale, Ferrara, Cento, 15-17 ottobre 2009* (Soveria Mannelli: Rubbettino), 53-78.