

digkeit" und „makrolithische Entscheidungsfreiheit“ ist eine Wirklichkeit, aber -- was eine ganze kulturelle Tradition betrifft -- können wir in der anderen Extreme fallen, und damit gemeint ist Y die Verdünnung der archäologischen Einheiten über eine Relevanzschwelle (die auch eine theoretische Voraussetzung ist).

Alle diese Elemente röhren, wie gesagt, an den besonderen Wert der Arbeit von D. Mania und Th. Weber nicht. Im Ge-

genteil, es ist ein Buch welches zur Suchenach neuen Lösungen und Analysenketten mahnt; ein Beispiel für die aktive Position des Forschers den statistischen Methoden gegenüber. Im gleichen Masse, für den rumänischen Leser ist dieser Buch eine Einladung für die Neuberwertung des bis jetzt geleisteten Arbeit.

Carol Capid

MATHILDE GRÜNEWALD, Ausgrabungen im Legionslager von Carnuntum (Grabungen 1969–1977) Keramik und Kleinfunde 1976–1977, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienne, 1986, 20 p. + 15 Tafeln und ein Grundriß.

Dans la série des découvertes de Carnuntum, cet ouvrage, le 31^e cahier du « Limes Romain en Autriche », comprend, après un avant-propos de l'auteur, une brève présentation du matériel, la description des couches rencontrées dans la *praetentura orientale* du camp et la présentation proprement dite du matériel, par catégories. Une annexe rédigée par Günther Dembski à propos d'une bague en fer avec la représentation de *Bonus Eventus* (II^e s.) en pâte de verre, objet qui, malheureusement, n'est pas illustré.

Les couches identifiées dans le secteur dont les découvertes forment l'objet du cahier présent se rattachent aux sept périodes dont les dernières quatre (IV^e–V^e et, la dernière, IX^e–X^e s.) étaient déjà présentées par Mme Grünewald dans les cahiers n°s 29, 31 et 32 de la même série. Les trois couches plus anciennes de l'époque romaine sont datées entre I^{er} et III^e s. ap. J.C.

Le catalogue systématique des découvertes comprend quelques fragments de *terra sigillata* dont les plus anciens appartiennent à la première moitié du I^{er} s. ap. J. C., céramique jaune à glaçure rouge, de l'ainsi dite « céramique fine », des amphores, de la céramique jaune et de la céramique grise (la plus ancienne de cette catégorie appartenant au moins à part à la tradition La Tène locale), céramique pannonienne à glaçure, des lampes, objets divers en terre cuite, en os ou corne, pierre, métal et verre. En général, le matériel ne dépasse pas le IV^e s. ap. J. C.

Présentation et étude claires, découvertes très bien illustrées (seulement dessins) se rassemblent dans un cahier utile, qui se recommande par soi-même aux spécialistes.

Alexandru Barnea

J. C. COULSTON (ed.), Military Equipment and the Identity of Roman Soldiers. Proceedings of the Fourth Roman Military Equipment Conference, Oxford, BAR S 394, 1988, pp. XI + 341.

Mirroring the growth of specialization in archaeology, a group of young scholars led by M. Bishop have decided to organize annual meetings dedicated to the study of Roman Military Equipment. These seminars and their proceedings promptly issued with the aid of BAR publishing house have caused a spectacular raise of interest for this important field of research, which has been somewhat, neglected so far.

As my review of the papers of the second seminar has also appeared in *Dacia*¹, I shall continue to present the volumes of the next meetings in the same journal.

The proceedings of the 3rd seminar were rather unsubstantial in terms of academical research, as they concentrated on the reconstruction of weapons and their testing². Due to these circumstances, they are beyond both my concerns and the scope of *Dacia*.

Thus I shall resume the presentation with the 4th volume of papers edited by J. C. Coulston, one of the enthusiasts of the meetings. These proceedings contain the lectures held at the Newcastle Conference in 1986 as well as two monographs by M. C. Bishop and S. James. The contributions can be divided into several groups. First, there are four papers dealing with certain objects or types of military equipment belonging to different kinds of military units. Next, two lectures present the whole military equipment from a certain type of site or from a geographical area. The volume ends with James' monograph about the production of weapons during the late Empire.

The first paper written by J. C. Coulston deals with a well-known relief from Croy Hill (Strathclyde), representing three militarymen. The author examines competently the equipment of the three soldiers in detail: *paculae*, *pila*, shields,

helmets, in comparison with both the real pieces and other figurative representations of the 2nd century. He finds convincing arguments in explaining why *lorica segmentata* is not represented on monument and taking into account both battlefield practices and garrisoning policies, he reaches the conclusion that the three soldiers should be considered as legionaries. As concerns another problem which has been lately subject to many debates, namely whether the auxiliaries have used *lorica segmentata*, Coulston's conclusion seems to be right and it is worth being cited here: "It is difficult to see the widespread supply of auxiliary troops with *lorica segmentata* as a practical explanation if these troops were to have maintained their battlefield support function".

The next paper, due to A. G. Poulter, deals with "Certain doubts and doubtful conclusions: the *lorica segmentata* from Newstead and the Antonine garrison". Half of the paper discussed the different reconstructions proposed so far for the fragments of *lorica* from Newstead, but the conclusions are really doubtful. Moreover, the fact the Poulter offers only two illustrations of reconstructed *loricae* but none of the original fragments, makes it even more difficult to follow the text. Unlike Coulston, Poulter feels inclined to believe that in the West of the Empire *lorica segmentata* was also used by auxiliaries, but he gives no evidence in support of this statement. He also states that, "there is equally a suspicion that auxiliaries in Dacia were being supplied with *lorica segmentata* during the 2nd century", yet the only evidence he brings forth is the discovery of some hooks and hinges at Buciumi. However, it is possible that a legionary *veritatio* was temporarily garrisoned in this fort, and might have been used even for the construction of the fortification itself. Anyway, an isolated case cannot provide sound evidence for general con-

¹ *Dacia*, 31, 1987, pp. 194–196. The first seminar has produced only a small number of papers which is also mentioned in *Dacia*, 31, 1987, p. 194, note 1.

² M. Dawson (ed.), *Roman Military Equipment: The Accountments of War*, BAR S 336, Oxford, 1987.

clusions. Therefore, we consider still valid the current opinion, supported by Coulston as well, according to which *lorica segmentata* should be considered a military equipment object characteristic for legionaries. Consequently, the opinions concerning the garrison of the Newstead fort, based on the assignment of *lorica segmentata* to auxiliaries, seem to be likewise doubtful. It is obvious that Poulter's opinion that "the flexibility of the military dispositions" is true; however, it could not have been restricted to the Antonine Wall as he believes, but on the contrary, it represented one of the principles of military organization in the 2nd century. However, this kind of assertions, no matter how well-founded they are, do not help much the research work. Besides, this is not an original conclusion of Poulter, but partly taken over from D. J. Breeze.

In the short article, "A fragmentary shield cover from Caerleon", C. van Driel-Murray gives an example of how a specialist can draw far-reaching conclusions even starting from a rather unspectacular object. So, for example, she points out that cloth was probably used as support for the pictorial decoration of the shields in the manner of Dura Europos examples. Another statement is that the Caerleon shield was oval in shape and identical in shape and size with those from Bonn. Next, that this may represent the legionary shield type and the auxiliary type in use on the Rhine and in Britain was also oval in shape but definitely smaller like those from Valkenburg. And unexpectedly, the rectangular shield known from Vindonissa and the pictorial evidence which was generally accepted as the legionary standard type is rather an exception.

We have only an observation of detail. If we accept the hypothesis of the author about the possible use of the rectangular shaped shield "only for specialist tactics such as the much-famed *testudo*", it means that one single legionary must have had more shields, one for every tactics to be used, and that is hard to believe.

The 130-page monograph by M. C. Bishop, "Cavalry equipment of the Roman Army in the first century A. D.", has a somewhat misleading title because it concentrates only on horse harness and leaves aside the horseman equipment. Even so, the evidence the author works with is extremely rich and scattered, and it is so much remarkable that he compiles a *corpus* of both the artefacts making up the horse harness and the monuments depicting its use.

This first monograph on the military horse harness in the first century A. D. succeeds to identify, describe and classify the elements of the horse harness. In the classification of different items, Bishop uses not only decorative criteria but, when ever possible, also functional characteristics, which is clearly superior to any other method of classification. Two other major results of Bishop's research are the graphical reconstruction of the typical harness with terminology and the reconstruction of Tiberio-Claudian, Flavian and Flavian parade harness.

In two useful appendices, he makes a pleading for the proper publication and especially the illustration of harness mounts, including also an example report of some items from Corbridge.

For such a monograph the illustration is an important element and both the photographs of the monuments and the drawings of the reconstructed harness are generally of a good quality. As for the small finds, taking into account their very large number, it goes without saying that only the types and not every object can be illustrated. However, I think it would have been preferable to produce an accurate drawing of a real object for each type of item than a sketch deliberately simplified, sometimes without scale, as Bishop gives us.

As a whole, Bishop's paper is a standard work which has been needed for a long time, and it is to be hoped that he will produce a similar monograph of the horse harness in the second and third centuries A.D.

In the next paper, L. Allason-Jones accomplishes the difficult task of gathering all the "small finds" of copper alloy, iron and bone from turrets on Hadrian's Wall. Then, starting from the analysis of this *corpus*, she reaches significant conclusions. First of all, she underlines the uncorrectness of the

current opinion according to which such sort of small finds are missing from turrets. Then she makes some important statements as for example that quernstones demonstrate "that those on duty were provided with basic provisions for several days at least". The author is also aware that the objects missing from the catalogue could be relevant for the real understanding of the rôle played by turrets in the Roman frontier policy. So, "the lack of nails from many turrets" is correctly interpreted as a mark against the theory according to which stone towers were provided with a timber gallery around them. The absence of harness equipment and locks or keys is also noted but no explanation is given for this situation. As the lack of harness obviously means that, the garrisons of towers consisted of infantrymen, Allason-Jones has probably considered it was worthless to insist upon it. However, it is not so easy to estimate the missing of keys or locks and I think it deserves to be explained. The keys and locks are very common finds in forts and it is to be supposed that every Roman soldier had his own chest for personal things, leaving aside the boxes containing the properties of the whole military unit or a group of soldiers. So, the absence of chests in turrets means that the group of soldiers, detached on duty there, was soon replaced, maybe after a few days, and therefore it was unnecessary to transport here anything else but the basic military equipment and a small quantity of food. The author also thinks that the small finds point out that the turrets from Hadrian's Wall were used only from the 120's to the 140's and from the 180's to the 180's. Nevertheless, if it is sure, as Allason-Jones rightly underlines, that nothing could be placed in the 4th century, for the 3rd century the situation is less clear. More military objects as, for example, the apron pendants nos. 50 b 2 and 52 a 9, the scabbard slide no. 50 b. 3 or scabbard shape no. 35 a. 3, are to be dated more largely, that is from approximately the 170's to the 250's. Hence, even if the chronology of the turrets suggested by Allason-Jones, could be correct, the military equipment objects found there are not an evidence for this.

Anyway, the Allason-Jones' paper is highly significant for how many conclusions could be reached by an examination of a *corpus* which though of small dimensions, is professionally made. .

N. P. Wickenden compiles another *corpus*, this time of military bronzes from the Trinovantian *civitas*. The catalogue is correctly drawn up but the number of objects is too small for allowing any statement. In fact, only at Chelmsford there are more pieces, namely 20, yet some are "civilian" like no. 11 and the most specific "military", nos. 1, 18–20, are to be dated approximately from the 170's to the 250's. So, if we are aware that most items left are harness mounts, we have nothing conclusive to ascertain the military character of the site in Trinovantian *civitas* during the 1st century.

The last contribution due to S. James, "The *fabricae*: state arms factories of the Later Roman Empire", has no direct connection with the theme proposed for this volume. It was included here on account of its importance, being the first monograph on this subject since the fundamental article of O. Seeck in RE. James discusses all the problems involved from the sources of evidence, origins, chronology, to the administration, organization, ranks and the later history of the *fabricae*. The monograph contains hosts of original ideas, and succeeds in elucidating the way this essential institution of the Roman military organization has worked during the 4th–6th centuries. I have to make only two collateral remarks. First, that there is no proof for the author's contention that in some areas during the Principate the army itself produced all the necessary military equipment, and consequently for the hypothesis that *fabricenses* were *militia* because they originated in the late 3rd century "from the rank of the army". I think it is more probable that the administration has given the rank of *militia* to *fabricenses* just in order to provide them the privileges and to assure the discipline of a category of workers involved in an activity of extreme importance for the army. Second, that the setting up of state arms factories at the end of the 3rd century is reflected in a complete change-

over of all the military equipment and not only of the helmet design, as James points out.

Gathering so many valuable contributions, the book under review is one of the best we have on Roman military

equipment. It also witnesses how important the organization of periodical meetings of specialists can be for the progress of knowledge in every particular field of archaeology.

Liviu Petulescu

HELMUT HALFMAN, *Itinera principum. Geschichte und Typologie der Kaiserreisen im Römischen Reich* ; Franz Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden GmbH, Stuttgart, 1986 ; 272 p.

Paru sous le deuxième numéro de la série « Heidelberg Althistorische Beiträge und Epigraphische Studien », soignée par Géza Alföldy, ce livre présente un grand intérêt pour tout lecteur. Il nous réveille en même temps la nostalgie du projet de feu notre professeur Dumitru Tudor qui depuis longtemps nous avouait son idée d'écrire un ouvrage auprès des « empereurs voyageurs », pour le grand public et pour les spécialistes aussi. Et nous voilà maintenant devant une réalisation systématique de cette idée due à M. H. Halfman, au moins pour le Haut-Empire et, en résumé, pour le IV^e s.

Brièvement, le système adopté par l'auteur comprend le sommaire suivant : I. Motivation et base historique ; II. Plan et organisation ; III. Escorte ; IV. Visite impériale et ville provinciale ; V. Voyages impériaux comme politique ; VI. Itinéraires (par empereurs, jusqu'à Caracitus y compris). On y ajoute un appendix concernant la liste de *comites Augusti* jusqu'à la fin du III^e s., une bibliographie sélective et un index systématique (noms, géographie, notions diverses).

C'est justement dans cette systématisation qu'on peut constater les qualités du contenu du livre, même sans qu'on insiste maintenant auprès des titres sousdivisant ses chapitres. Pour en avoir quand même une idée de l'économie de l'ouvrage, rappelons que le premier chapitre est partagé en cinq sections chronologiques : l'époque d'Auguste, de Tibère à Néron, les Flaviens et Trajan, Hadrien et les Antonins et, enfin, le III^e et le IV^e s. On peut donc remarquer l'intention de l'auteur d'intégrer dans son système le premier siècle du Bas-Empire aussi, mais il en résulte seulement une sorte de résumé par rapport à l'attention accordée à l'époque précédente. Cette disproportion devient plus évidente dans le catalogue des itinéraires du dernier chapitre (pp. 157–214), où les dernières deux pages sont dédiées, avec le sous-titre « Bibliographie » (très sommaire) à l'intervalle de Dioclétien à Théodose. C'est peut-être une distance entre projet et sa réalisation mais, en partant du schéma du livre dont

les qualités sont déjà plus haut invoquées, il faut en voir aussi son ouverture vers le mieux. Du côté de l'auteur même ou de l'autre.

En suivant les itinéraires, nous avons constaté que l'auteur a préféré, peu à peu et en ordre chronologique, les situations les plus sûres et mieux documentées. C'est ainsi que s'expliquent, à ce qu'il paraît, d'un côté les discussions de plus en plus rares (dans le même ordre) auprès des cas où la source épigraphique n'est pas confirmée exactement par celle littéraire et, de l'autre, l'absence même des inscriptions ou des autres documents (art officiel par exemple) qui, en tant que pièces d'un programme impérial, peuvent indiquer tel trajet ou telle présence. Sans insister, nous allons nous arrêter seulement sur quelques exemples et questions qui nous en sont plus proches et qui n'apparaissent pas chez H. Halfman : la présence de Trajan dans la Mésie Inférieure, et, là-bas, aussi, dans la zone du futur monument triomphal *Tropaeum Traiani* (a. 102 ; v. R. Vulpe, St. Cl., VI, 1964, pp. 211–223 ; idem en DID II, 1968, p. 90 et suiv. etc.), la visite possible d'Hadrien en Dacie (a. 118, v. CIL III, 1445 = IDR III/2, 70 et CIL III 1447 = IDR III/2, 71); un des autres repères concernant la présence de Caracalla en Dacie (CII. III, 1453 = IDR III/2, 77); données concernant la présence de Valens en Scythie Mineure chez Thémistios (v. aussi, I. Barnea, SCIV, XVIII, 1967, 4, pp. 563–574 ; idem, en DID II, pp. 393 et suiv. etc.).

Sans aller plus loin et en reprenant un des sous-titres utilisés par l'auteur il faut dire qu'il s'est chargé d'une *prosecutio* difficile, dont les résultats sont dignes de l'éloge de tout lecteur. Au moins pour ce que M. H. Halfman a réussi dans l'histoire et dans la typologie des *itinera principum*, d'une manière remarquable et qui laisse toujours place au renouvellement.

Alexandru Barnea

DUMITRU TUDOR, *Călătoriile împăraților Hadrian și Caracalla* [Les voyages des empereurs Hadrien et Caracalla], Bucarest, 1987, 168 p., XIII dessins en texte, 31 fig. et une carte.

Vers la fin d'une activité riche et productive de professeur, archéologue et épigraphiste, de recherches et d'auteur de nombreux ouvrages bien connus, Dumitru Tudor (1908–1982) aimait parler aussi d'un projet concernant les voyages des empereurs romains. C'est de ce projet qu'il a laissé, peu avant sa mort trop précipitée, ce livre regardant les voyages d'Hadrien et de Caracalla.

L'avant-propos chaleureux dû au professeur Emil Condurciu, collègue de plus d'un demi-siècle de l'auteur, comprend en quelques mots l'essence du livre, en tant que pure action historique liée aux réalités – politiques, militaires, économiques – de l'époque.

Les deux parties du livre sont, par conception, parallèles, d'une forme classique et claire : sources, vie et développement historique, conclusions. En laissant au lecteur de découvrir les détails, nous allons lui en recommander un livre attractif et intéressant. Résultat d'une très riche documentation, cette-ci peut être trouvée, du point de vue du spécialiste, dans les deux introductions de chaque grande section du livre.

Ce sont plutôt des commentaires des sources antiques ; dans la première introduction sont évoqués aussi quelques travaux modernes plus importants concernant la vie et l'activité d'Hadrien.

Toutefois, il faut expliquer l'absence d'un appareil critique ou d'une bibliographie avec laquelle D. Tudor nous avait habitué. Mais son éditeur, le rédacteur A. Aricescu qui a beaucoup aidé dans les dernières années la littérature historique, n'avait pas le pouvoir d'expliquer une situation liée aux conditions générales d'une économie restrictive dirigée envers le livre scientifique (v. par exemple notre „Dacia“ en commençant de 1982). Donc, il a réussi de faire publier ce très intéressant livre aussi, au prix (qu'on va racheter, nous l'espérons, par une nouvelle édition) de l'élimination de l'appareil bibliographique. Et ce n'est la seule restitution qu'on doit faire.

Alexandru Barnea