

is useless to speculate on the basis of the coins we have, which number only 284” (p. 251).

Most of the large denominations (staters and hemistaters) was meant – in K. L. opinion – for the foreign trade, such coins representing an valuable wares for export; because once they reached various eastern centres, they could be melted again in order to make up new coins or jewels (p. 252). The Ancient World knows also of other examples, which can come to support this hypothesis. At the same time one can notice that the large denominations “are almost entirely absent from the city that produced them and even from neighbouring areas” (p. 101). Consequently small denominations were produced only for home trade and for the one with the neighbouring territory.

Concerning the period of the silver coins’ issue two other remarks can be made. The first one regards the beginning of coinage in Argilos, which coincides with the extension of the Persian domination over the north of Greece. In this case the silver coins produced by the city could represent a φόρος, paid to the Persian authority (see also F. de Callataÿ, RBN, 157, 2006, p. 195). Otherwise, it is estimated that in the period 510-500 B. C. the relationships between Bisaltia and the Persians were peaceful (p. 114) and in the years of the fourth period (corresponding to Xerxes’ expeditions) recruitment of troops took place, roads, bridges and new ships were built, all these being accompanied by an intense activity of the Thracian and Chalkidian mints. During the years that followed the Greek-Persian wars, the production of coins drastically decreases in the whole area, including Argilos.

At last, we do not believe it to be just a simple coincidence the ceasing of the activity of Argilian mint round 460 – 455 B. C., when, as it is known, Clearchos’ decree forbade the producing of precious metal coins in the cities of the Athenian Alliance.

Since the first period (c. 520/515– c. 510 B. C., pl. 6, nr. 5, obv.) some coins show deep cuts or even cutt offs made with a sharp tool (chisel ?). Most coins of this kind are signaled in the fourth period where the obverses are usually affected. As those coins are only staters, one cannot exclude the intention of demonetization by such operations, in order to be accepted in the local circulation as bullion.

The second phase of Argilian coinage is represented only by one period, the 8th (c. second quarter of the 4th century B. C.) when only bronze coins, in a decreased number, are issued (4 ex., coming from archaeological diggings). They are small denominations, which have their iconography altered, in comparison with the previous periods. The same situation is also recorded in the rest of Bisaltia.

The third part of the study deals with the typology (iconography, symbols), the style, the legend (APKII[AIQN]), the metrology and the technique of manufacturing. The author’s qualities (method, thorough observations, erudite and complex analysis) are ample revealed in the pages of this chapter, many of them reflecting the years spent in the numismatic school at the Institut für Alte Geschichte of Saarbrücken (Prof. Dr. Peter Robert Franke). The detailed study of the incuse square, the attribution of the Pegasos type to Argilos, or the minute examination of some details – often neglected by numismatists – such as the border of dots or the ground line, can be convincing examples for the statement expressed above. Only one observation: the physical-chemical or atomic analyses of the alloy are missing. They could be of help in establishing the origin of the metal, or they could have provided other important numismatic information.

In the last part (4) of this interesting and instructive work (a part named “Numismatic circulation” and not “Monetary circulation”) K. L. reinforces many of her previous conclusions. I will mention only that in five of the six hoards, the coins are accompanied by silver ingots, which would justify their inclusion in the category “bullion hoard” (R. Ross Holloway, RBN, 146, 2000, p. 1-8) and that could be a serious argument in the favour of the hypothesis referring to the export of large silver coins (p. 259 -265).

After reading this work and noticing the huge expenditure of energy and intelligence I asked myself a natural but delicate question: is such an effort justified only for a better knowledge on a small monetary workshop of northern Greece ? Knowledge is a never-ending problem, and science makes progress due to such great efforts. In other words due to K. L., today we know the Greek coinage better, and at the same time we are given the possibility to know more about it tomorrow.

Virgil Mihailescu-Birliba

PAUL HOLDER, *Roman Military Diplomas V*, Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Study University of London, 2006 (BICS Supplement 88), XVI+310 p. (the page numbers follow the page numbers of the previous bands, from p. 677 to 987).

The fifth volume of *Roman Military Diplomas*, published by Paul Holder, follows the same structure as the previous volumes: *Contents* (p. vii), *Foreword*

(p. ix), *List of Plates* (p. xi), *Bibliography* (p. xiii-xvi), *Tables of the Diploma in RMD V* (p. 677-679), *A Revised Chronology of the Published Diplomas* (p. 681-

698), *Further Notes on the Chronology* (p. 699-705), *Critical Signs* (p. 707), *Diplomas* (p. 711-916, nos. 323-476), *Appendix Ia: RMD I 40 Revised* (p. 917-918), *Appendix Ib: RMD IV 283 Revised* (p. 919-920), *Appendix II: Inner Face of the Tabella II: First line, 88-203* (p. 921-923), *Appendix III: Period 3 Witness list from 138 to 237 (924-925)*, *Appendix: Period 2 Witness lists: Multiple Copies* (p. 926-927), *Appendix V: A Fragmentary Text* (p. 928), *Appendix VI: Modern Fakes of Roman Military Diplomas* (by A. Pangerl, p. 929-933), *Indices* (p. 935-987).

In the volume were included 154 Roman military diplomas, among which, as the author notes, few were prepared by the late Margaret M. Roxan and omitted from RMD IV (RMD V 376, 437, 439, and 458). The volume includes two diplomas already published (RMD V 392 and 398) and three unpublished (RMD V 369, 370, and 445) which were found between Margaret M. Roxan's papers after further sorting of her archive. Apart from the mentioned diplomas the volume has collected the diplomas published until 2003.

Although as it can be seen from the above short presentation most of the diplomas were already known by the scholars, as they were previously published, the volume is more than a catalogue and it is an important starting point for further discussions and reinterpretations. Paul Holder has done an excellent work not only collecting the material, but having also very stimulating debates on many items. Therefore he proposed new readings, new assigns to different provinces, new dates and also new interpretations on different aspects. In the following lines I shall refer only to a small number of problems raised by this new publication.

Further notes on the chronology

4*41- P. Holder suggests that this diploma could have been issued for the auxiliary units for Moesia Superior. It is possible to have on this diploma, due to the fact that name of the governor appeared in the upper part of the *tabella II* a large number of units (see CIL XVI 46 with 21 cohorts and three alae and the name of the governor at the bottom of the *tabella I*). *Iulius Mar[...]* was hypothetically identified as *Ti. Iulius Candidus (A.) Marius Celsus (cos. suff. May-September 86)*.²⁹ As I tried to sustain recently, it is possible to restore this diploma as a copy after a constitution for the auxiliary units of Moesia superior and probably *Ti. Iulius Candidus Marius Celsus* was the governor of that province after *Cn. Pinarius Aemilius Cicatricula Longinus*. In the discussion, I included a very curious diploma (RMD IV 218) also for Moesia superior. The

unusual formula from this example let me to believe that it is possible to have also an unusual formula also on this fragment (unusual formula strong supported by the absence of an entire line from the formula on *intus*).³⁰

6*54- the discovery of RGZM 13 (and not 12 as it appeared by mistake) enables us also to correct the date 103/107 from CIL XVI in 103/106, before August 106 as it appears only: *IMP IIII* (I believe that the constitution dates probably from 103/105). Moreover, all the evidence suggests that all the copies available to us were made after the same constitution from 12 January 105 (CIL XVI 49, *tabella II*, from 12 January 105; this fragment RMD V 339; RGZM 13).

Diplomas

RMD 323- another fragment of this diploma was brought to Paul Holder's attention by E. Paunov. The new fragment was found in the near by of the ancient city of *Ratiaria*, an area where also other Dacian names are attested at the end of the second century as legionary soldiers in the VII Claudia p. f. legion stationed at *Viminacium*.³¹

RMD 325- I also sustained the possibility of the presence of *II C[halcidenorum]* on this diploma in my article.³² The presence of this cohort on this fragment is assured now by its presence on RGZM 1.

RMD 332- the presence of a certain cohort *I milliaria sagittariorum* in Iudaea (assimilated by P. Holder with *cohors milliaria* from Syria in 88) could back up C. C. Petolescu's assumption that this unit is identical with the cohort *I sagittariorum milliaria* attested in Dacia Superior starting with the reign of Marcus Aurelius (or before?) at *Tibiscum* (in 165) and thereafter at *Drobeta* (but not on RMD II 123).³³ Unfortunately, I am not able to fill the gap of almost 70 years, but it is more logically to see it transferred from Syria in other province and then under Hadrian in Dacia superior (from where we do not have many constitutions). Other scholars sustained that this unit is identical with the one attested at Bingen (Germania inferior) in the time of Claudius-Nero.³⁴ I think that it is not impossible to envisage a transfer of this unit back in the Orient by the reign of Vespasian. If this assumption

³⁰ Fl. Matei-Popescu, *The Auxiliary Units from Moesia Superior in Domitian's time and the problem of CIL XVI 41*, *Ephemeris Napocensis* 16, 2006 (in print).

³¹ CIL III 14507 = IPD⁴ 649 = IMS II 53 = IDRE II 308, face a, l. 33-35: *M. Aur. Thiamarcus, T. Aur. Drigissa, T. Aur. Thithi*.

³² Fl. Matei-Popescu, *SCIVA* 52-53, 2001-2002 (2004), p. 198, no. 16.

³³ C. C. Petolescu, *Auxilia Daciae. Contribuție la istoria militară a Daciei romane*, București, 2002, p. 120-121, no. 55.

³⁴ D. Benea, *SCIVA* 27, 1976, I, p. 82.

²⁹ W. Eck, G. Paci, E. Percossi Serenelli, in *Picus. Studi e ricerche sulle Marche nell'antichità* 23, 2003, p. 80-82. On CIL XVI 33 appears as consul *Ti. Iulius Candidus*.

will be proved as correct, we can assumed that this unit was raised by Augustus, sent by Tiberius on the German frontier and sent thereafter by Vespasian in Syria-Iudaea in the connection with the war on the Jews. It would have stationed there until Hadrian's reign and it was transferred on the territory of Dacia Superior some time during his reign.

RMD 339- I am sure that B. Lőrincz was right in the supposition that this could be another copy from the same constitution as CIL XVI 49.³⁵ Moreover, as I sustained above, I think that it is possible to be the same constitution quoted above for Moesia Superior from 103/105 (probably 12 January 105), on which both *I Brittonum milliaria* and *I Britannica milliaria* appeared (also CIL XVI 49 and CIL XVI 54 were found in Hungary).

RMD 351- P. Holder is definitively right in assuming that *ala Hispanorum* is the unit from Moesia inferior and not *ala I Hispanorum Campagonum* (note 2);³⁶ the lack of the numeral is a decisive proof. In my article on the auxiliary units from Moesia inferior I wrote also *I Hispanorum* influenced by the modern bibliography and by the fact that appears in this way in Dacia inferior, but in Moesia inferior appeared always without the numeral.³⁷

RMD 367- difficult to tell for which province this constitution was issued: for Moesia superior or Dacia superior. A constitution for the auxiliary units of Moesia superior it is known from 125/126, but only for one *ala* and three *cohortes* and *cohors II Dacorum*.³⁸ Therefore there is still room for other constitution from the same year. As it seems from this fragment also on this constitution only few units were enlisted. The fragment attests only a *V Gallorum* cohort. In the review of Spaul's books on the auxiliary units I argued, together with O. Țentea, that the two attested cohorts *V Gallorum* and *V Gallorum et Pannoniorum* were one and the same and probably the cohort attested in Pannonia was moved in Britannia.³⁹ C. C. Petolescu instead has sustained that the cohorts from Dacia Superior and Moesia Superior were different.⁴⁰ Just like other units (for example *III Campestris*) this unit stationed on the Danube bank (even on the north side), therefore it is possible to have been enlisted between the

auxiliary units from Moesia Superior from Hadrian to Marcus Aurelius and thereafter, due to the administrative and military changes from the Dacian provinces, the Danube bank was put under the control of the new *legatus Augusti pro praetore trium Daciarum*.

RMD 369- probably another copy after RMD IV 241 (unfortunately *intus* not available); one problem: there it was *I Lusitanorum* without *Cyrenaica*. In the second preserved line it is almost sure *I BRA[carorum]*. In the last preserved line, it is difficult to tell if indeed we can restore *II Lucensium*. If we admit such restoration, then it is sure that the diploma belonged to Moesia inferior, before 136 when this unit was moved on the territory of Thracia province.⁴¹

RMD 372- P. Holder is absolutely right in pointing out that *cohortes Ulpiae* appeared very quickly on the diplomas; but for *cohors I Ulpia Dacorum*, having in regard the fact that all known soldiers were Dacians, I sustained in the article with Dan Dana that it is almost certain the unit was created in 103/104 and these Dacians were the first generation of recruits to whom *honesta missio* was given.⁴² For *cohortes Petraeorum*, it is possible to have soldiers recruited in other units before 106/107. Still remains the question when they (*Daci*) received the citizenship, at the beginning of their service as a proof of Trajan goodwill towards the Dacians who already submitted to him at the final of the first war or, perhaps, later one in the *expeditio Parthica*.

RMD 388- probably another copy from the same constitution as the one dated to 22 March 129. It is possible to identify here another *Dacus*.

RMD 389- *TARA* could be a Dacian name.⁴³ The reading [*et---*] *ttarae f. ei[us et---*] is meaning less. Looking again at the picture from the original publication,⁴⁴ we can envisage a simple solution: [*e*] *Tarae f. eiu[s]*, as the upper part of the letter *V* is visible on the photo.

RMD 396- the cohort could be identified with *I Hispanorum veterana* from Dacia Inferior, as RMD I 39 from 13 December 140 was discovered also on the territory of Bulgaria.

RMD 402- from some discussions with Dan Dana we were agreed that the reading of the first name of the recipient is *TIOI*, as it can be seen very clear on the photo; *D* from *CLAVDIVS* was constructed different.

RMD 446- definitively is no room for a certain cohort *III Aurelia Dacorum* (see RMD 447) and is a mistake for *II Aurelia Dacorum*.

Florian Matei-Popescu

³⁵ B. Lőrincz, *ActaAntHung* 39, 1999, p. 197-202.

³⁶ See also P. Holder, *Dacia*, N. S. 50, 2006, p. 142.

³⁷ Fl. Matei-Popescu, *SCIVA* 52-53, 2001-2002 (2004), p. 188-189, no. 8.

³⁸ W. Eck, A. Pangerl, *Dacia*, N. S. 50, 2006, p. 102-104, no. 4.

³⁹ O. Țentea, Fl. Matei-Popescu, *ActaMN* 39-40/I, 2002-2003 (2004), p. 283-284. See also Fl. Matei-Popescu, O. Țentea, *Dacia*, N. S. 50, 2006, p. 137-138.

⁴⁰ C. C. Petolescu, *op. cit.*, București, 2002, p. 107-109, no. 42. See also *idem*, *SCIVA* 22, 1971, 3, p. 416, note 61. Into a still unpublished ph. D. thesis, O. Țentea tried to put some order in the attestations of this cohort, but he did not reach at any strong conclusion.

⁴¹ Fl. Matei-Popescu, *SCIVA* 52-53, 2001-2002 (2004), p. 215-217, no. 28.

⁴² D. Dana, Fl. Matei-Popescu, *Dacia*, N. S. 50, 2006, p. 202.

⁴³ *Ibidem*, p. 198, note 22.

⁴⁴ P. Weiss, *ZPE* 141, 2002, p. 246-248, Taf. II, no. 4.