

RECENZII / BOOK REVIEWS

Cristina-Georgeta Alexandrescu (ed.), *TROESMIS – A CHANGING LANDSCAPE. ROMANS AND THE OTHER IN THE LOWER DANUBE REGION IN THE FIRST CENTURY BC – THIRD CENTURY AD. PROCEEDINGS OF AN INTERNATIONAL COLLOQUIUM TULCEA, 7TH-10TH OF OCTOBER 2015*, Biblioteca Istro-Pontică, Seria Arheologie 12, Editura Mega, Cluj-Napoca, 2016, 274 p., ISBN 978-606-543-768-5.

The volume here under review collects the papers delivered at a small international colloquium held in Tulcea in October 2015.¹ Two thousand years before, *Troesmis* (nowadays Turcoaia village, Tulcea County) was for the very first time historically attested by Ovid.² Also in 2015, a five year joint project of the “Vasile Pârvan” Institute of Archaeology, Bucharest, the Institute for the Study of Ancient Culture, Austrian Academy, Vienna, and the Archaeological Institute of the Innsbruck University, in partnership with the “Gavrilă Simion” Eco-Museum Research Institute, Tulcea, was about to complete its first part.

Nevertheless, the volume is not only about *Troesmis* (C.-G. Alexandrescu, Chr. Gugl, *The Troesmis – project 2011–2015: Research Questions and Methodology*, pp. 9–22; G. Grabherr, B. Kainrath, *Geophysical Research at Troesmis 2011–2015*, pp. 23–32; W. Eck, *Die lex municipalis Troesmensium: Ihr rechtlicher und politisch-sozialer Kontext*, pp. 33–46; C.-G. Alexandrescu, *Not just Stone: Lithic Material from Troesmis – Local Resources and Imports*, pp. 47–62; Fl. Topoleanu, *Oil Lamps from Troesmis*, pp. 63–116; M. Zahariade, *Legio I Iovia Scythica and Legio II Herculia in Itinerarium Antonini 225.2.3; 226.1*, pp. 165–176), but also about *Troesmis* in the broader context of the Roman Lower Danube area, collecting a large variety of papers. Two of these deal with the Barbarian environment beyond the Danube during the Early Roman period (D. Spânu, *Barbaricum beyond Troesmis in Roman Imperial Period: A Changing Cultural Mosaic*, p. 117–128; L. Oța, *Beyond the Lower Danubian Limes – Sarmatians and Romans*, pp. 129–150).

¹ I myself took part in the colloquium, following the kind invitation of my colleague, Cristina-Georgeta Alexandrescu – to whom I use the opportunity to thank once again – with a speech on *The Lower Danube Limes from Augustus to Trajan*. Unfortunately, I was not able to prepare the paper for the forthcoming volume, but some of the ideas defended in Tulcea are already to be found in my previous paper on *The Roman Auxiliary Units of Moesia*, Matei-Popescu 2013.

² *Ex Pont.* IV 9, 79–80: *Hic (L. Pomponius Flaccus) raptam Troesmin celeri virtute recepit, / infecitque fero sanguine Danuvium.*

Another paper emphasizes the Roman road network of the Lower Moesia province (A. Panaite, *A Changing Landscape: The Organization of the Roman Road Network in Moesia Inferior*, pp. 151–164). The Polish colleagues, who excavated at *Novae*, together with their Bulgarian counterparts, publish overviews of the latest results of the archaeological excavations inside the legionary fortress and of the archaeological surveys in the area outside (T. Sarnowski, *Legionary fortress at Novae in Lower Moesia. Old and New Observations Made during the Recent work per lineam munitioinum*, pp. 175–188; A. Tomas, *Tracing Civilian Settlement in the Surroundings of Novae (Lower Moesia). Sources, Investigations, Results*, pp. 191–204). Other papers deal with new discoveries from *Noviodunum* (V. H. Baumann, *Noviodunum. Un document epigraphic din faza pre-municipală*, pp. 231–238) and *Ratiaria* (Z. Dimitrov, *Newly Found Architectural Elements from the Roman Baths Complexes in Ulpia Ratiaria*, pp. 205–230), or taking into account a special type of wares, typical for the Lower Danube area (P. Dyczek, *On the So-Called Legionary pottery and “Mysterious” Lower Danube Kaolin Wares (LDKW)*, pp. 239–256) and the ceramic lamps from *Sexaginta Prista* (N. Roussev, *Ceramic Lamps from Sexaginta Prista (the 1st – 3rd Century AD)*, pp. 257–270).

The first paper is indeed an overview of the main results of the *Troesmis – Project* (2011–2012), by Cristina-Georgeta Alexandrescu and Christian Gugl (pp. 9–22). Mentioning all previous preliminary reports, the authors state that “our interests in this region focus on the most significant settlement transformation processes, from the Roman imperial age to the late Antiquity and the Byzantine period” (p. 9). Previously the area was practically not investigated from an archaeological point of view.³ A small scale excavation, performed by Emil Coliu in 1939 at the northern rampart of the western fortification,⁴ whose results, with the exception of an important inscription, are unknown,⁵ and a rescue excavation near the two late Roman fortifications, with the occasion of the construction of an agro-industrial complex in 1977,⁶ were the only moments when the site was investigated. During the second half of the 19th century, a French archaeological expedition made a survey of the site and small scale excavation, bringing some inscriptions to light.⁷ Thereafter, the site was

³ See a short overview in ISM V, pp. 154–159.

⁴ ISM V, p. 157; Alexandrescu, Nicolae 2014.

⁵ Vulpe 1953, pp. 557–562, no. 1; ISM V 155.

⁶ Simion *et alii* 1980.

⁷ Alexandrescu 2013.

investigated by Gr. Tocilescu and P. Polonic in 1882.⁸

Without any hesitation the most important result of the *Troesmis* – Project is the clear localization, by geomagnetic prospection (see into this respect Gerald Grabherr and Barbara Kainrath's paper, pp. 23-32), of the legionary fortress of the *V Macedonica* legion. The legion garrisoned at Troesmis between Trajan's Dacian war and AD 162,⁹ when it was sent in Lucius Verus' Eastern campaign and was never returned to Troesmis, being settled at Potaissa, Dacia, in AD 168.¹⁰ Up to this moment, the exact location of the fortress was unknown. The *canabae legionis*, known also from the epigraphic material,¹¹ were also identified on the ground, laying to the east and west in the vicinity of the fortress. At the south-eastern corner, an *amphitheatrum castrense* was also identified. Two graveyards, east and south of the fortress, were also highlighted by means of geomagnetic prospection. Curiously, no traces of the civilian settlement, the *vicus*, epigraphically attested,¹² were found. It is likely that it lies outside the prospected area, perhaps a little bit further eastward. This area has only been surveyed by Airborne Laser Scanning (p. 17, fig. 10), being divided from the *canabae legionis* by the eastern and north-eastern graveyard of the fortress, although one could also expect to find the civilian *vicus* north of the fortress, also on the Danube, as is the case of the civilian *vicus* from Durostorum, at Ostrov¹³ (the future *municipium Aurelium Durostorum*) and the civilian *vicus* of Novae, at Ostrite Mogili (see Agnieszka Tomas' paper, pp. 191-204). Furthermore, the relations between the fortress, the *municipium* that certainly overlapped the former legionary fortress, and the two late antique fortifications – the so called eastern and western fortifications, are still unclear.

Moreover, since it is pretty clear that the *municipium's* structures must have overlapped the legionary fortress, one might ask what happened with the legionary fortress during the 15 years, between 162 and 177, when the legion was away and no *municipium* existed? The authors do not want to take into consideration the possible presence of a detachment of the *I Italica* legion from Novae (pp. 18-19), although a centurion of that legion set a monument, probably a statue base, in *Tib. Claudius Pompeianus'* honour, Marcus Aurelius' son in law.¹⁴ It is also possible that a detachment of the *V Macedonica* legion,

probably an entire *cohors*, had been left behind to defend the legionary fortress and to maintain its structures. When it was sent to the East, no one envisaged that the legion was never to return to its fortress. Therefore, in my opinion, the fortress was still functioning. The civil settlements, the *canabae* and the civilian *vicus*, continued their existence, as it has been proved by *T. Valerius Marcanus'* inscription, born *castris (canabae legionis)*, who came back to his *lares (reversus at (sic) lares suos)* after AD 170 (*missus honesta missione in Dacia, Cethego et Claro consulibus, sub Cornelio Clemente*),¹⁵ and by the inscriptions raised by *ordo Troesmensium* to honour the governors of Lower Moesia after AD 162.¹⁶

One should have expected, similar to the situation in Oescus and Novae, an enlargement of the *municipium* precinct in order to garrison the *legio I Iovia Scythica* (see, for the presence of this legion at Troesmis starting with the Tetrarchic period, Mihail Zahariade's paper, pp. 165-176) in the late 3rd century. No traces of such enlargement are to be found, only two completely separate fortifications, although their exact chronological frame is not entirely known. If one could think that the eastern fortification could be positively identified as the legionary fortress of the *I Iovia Scythica* legion, then the western fortification would most probably date from the Byzantine period (10th-12th century),¹⁷ but no direct evidence is available. Moreover, given its small dimensions, it is unclear whether the legionary fortress could also receive the civilians between its walls? And if not, where is the late Roman civilian settlement at Troesmis supposed to be located?

No traces of the settlement mentioned by Ovid were identified either (p. 18). In that time, Troesmis was almost surely the stronghold of a Thracian strategy – and not a Roman settlement – like in the epigraphically attested case of Axiopolis¹⁸ and Aegyssus, also mentioned by

⁸ ISM V, pp. 156-157.

⁹ In AD 162, the legion was still at Troesmis, CIL III 6169 = ISM V 159.

¹⁰ Matei-Popescu 2010, pp. 52-53.

¹¹ ISM V 134-135; 141; 154-156; 158.

¹² CIL III 6167 = ISM V 157; AE 1960, 337 = ISM V 158.

¹³ Mușețeanu 1990.

¹⁴ CIL III 6176 = ILS 1108 = ISM V 142; see also CIL III 6185 = ISM V 176, another *centurio legionis I Italicae*, buried at Troesmis; Doruțiu-Boilă 1972, p. 143.

¹⁵ ISM V 160.

¹⁶ ISM V 144-145.

¹⁷ Doruțiu-Boilă 1972, p. 139.

¹⁸ In a decree to honour *Mokaporis*, son of *Auluporis*, *strategos* of the king Rhoemetalces I (12 BC – AD 12), which was discovered in the archaeological excavations of the temple of the Pontic Mother of Gods in Dionysopolis (Ἐδοξε τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ ἄρχοντες εἶπαν ἐπειδὴ Μοκαπορις / Αὐλοπορεως στρατηγὸς καταστατεῖς ὑπὸ βασιλείως Ρομηταλκου / Ἀψιουπόλεως καὶ Δαοτικῆς), a military campaign beyond the Danube against the common enemy, the *Iazyges*, is mentioned (στρατευσάμενος δὲπέραν τοῦ / Ἰστρου ἐπὶ τοὺς κοινοὺς πολεμίους Ἰαζύγους). The *strategos* *Mokaporis*, the son of *Auluporis*, was praised for his military achievements as being the *strategos* of *Apsioupolis* and *Daotike*. The former is obviously Axiopolis, nowadays Cernavoda, while the latter still needs to be located, Sharankov 2015, pp. 62-64, no. 1.

Ovid in AD 12.¹⁹ It is highly possible that the legionary fortress and the *municipium* overlapped the Thracian period building structures, but we are still waiting for the decisive proof.

Werner Eck publishes two bronze tables, part of the *lex municipalis Troesmensium* (pp. 33-46), issued during Marcus Aurelius' and Commodus' joint reign (AD 177-180). Part of the text was already presented and commented by the author into several previous articles, cited here. I would only add the extended version published last year, where the reader is able to follow the entire discussion raised by the discovery of this highly important epigraphic source.²⁰

The section dedicated to Troesmis is closed by two articles, one on the provenience of the stone used for the monuments at Troesmis (Cristina-Georgeta Alexandrescu, pp. 47-62) and the other on the oil lamp discoveries (Florin Topoleanu, pp. 63-116). In my opinion, to the Troesmis section there must have also been added Mihail Zahariade's paper on the *legio I Iovia Scythica* (pp. 165-176), although the editor chooses to intercalate three other papers. Zahariade's paper is directly connected with Troesmis, as he succeeds in fully arguing that the *I Iovia Scythica* legion occupied the new legionary fortress at Troesmis during the Tetrarchic period.

Daniel Spănu's contribution on the barbaric milieu of the Lower Danube before and after the establishment of the Roman provinces, and after the abandonment of the Dacia province, is a synthetic and an up to date overview, wonderfully illustrated by three maps. The author emphasizes the so-called "cultural reconfiguration after the Roman conquest of Dacia", stressing that the input came from the Romans and not from the natives, as the Romanian historiography pointed out so far (pp. 117-128). Without being an expression of continuity, the archaeological cultures around the Dacia province are rather expressions of discontinuity with the late La Tène period.

Only generally tackled by Spănu, the Sarmatian presence on the Lower Danube is fully discussed by Liana Oța (pp. 129-150). To the discussion, the decree of the *strategos* Mokaporis, the son of Auluporis, already mentioned, must be added. This fully proves the presence of the *Iazyges* in the Lower Danube area during Augustus' reign.

Adriana Panaite's paper deals with the Roman road system of Lower Moesia (pp. 151-164). She follows the development of the network from the pre-Roman period, when such network was missing ("The proper roads are absent from the pre-roman landscape of the lower Danube area, they were rather some access routes", p. 154) until

the late Roman period (p. 153, fig. 1), focusing on the large roads, built for military purposes (*Via Egnatia*, the so-called central or diagonal road, and the road along the Danube, p. 155, fig. 2), but also emphasizing the roads connecting the most important Roman centres on the Danube with the Thracia province. By means of roads the entire Lower Danube landscape was changing, step by step, from Augustus to the end of the 3rd century. Speaking about the natives in the Lower Moesia, one should be surprised not to find any mention of the Thracian kingdom and its strategies, attested also on the Danube, the *ripa Thraciae* (*Abrittus*, *Axiopolis*, *Troesmis* and *Aegyssus*), or the Thracian people colonized in Scythia minor (*Ausdecenses*, *Bessi* and *Lai* – in my opinion, despite the fact that they are only attested in the 2nd century, they were colonized by the Thracian kings during the first half of the 1st century). The surprising omission of the archaeological sites of the *Getae* (pp. 154-157, although one should also have expected more emphasis on the Enisala *necropolis*, dated to the first half of the 1st century AD) could only be explained through the impact of the Thracian kingdom before AD 46.

Next, two papers on the legionary centre at Novae are published. The first focuses on the legionary fortress of the *I Italica* legion and the new results of the recently excavated areas, especially the precinct, the earth-and-timber one from the Claudian-Neronian period, and the stone one built during Domitian and Trajan, and slightly rebuilt during the 2nd, 3rd and 4th century (Tadeusz Sarnowski, pp. 175-188). The second deals with the area outside the legionary fortress, presenting the results of a three year project (2012-2014) carried out mostly in the *canabae* area, near the fortress, and in the civilian *vicus* from the Ostrite Mogili site (Agnieszka Tomas, pp. 191-204).

Zdravko Dimitrov publishes the architectural elements (bases, column shafts, capitals, cornices and pediment), discovered in the new archaeological excavations at the two bathhouses of *Ulpia Ratiaria* (pp. 205-230).

Victor Heinrich Baumann publishes in Romanian (with French abstract) a fragmentary funerary monument discovered at Noviodunum (pp. 231-238). Setting aside the curious attempt to explain the name of the settlement otherwise as commonly accepted (Celtic: "New-Town"),²¹ the reading of the inscription could also be improved. Stressing the fact that the first line should be without any question read as *dec(urio) c[ob(ortis)]*, the text could be reconstructed as follows: [- - -] / [- - -] *dec(urio) c[ob(ortis) II Matt(iacorum)?]* / [- - -] *Ael(ius) I[- - -] / [- - -] c[ob(ortis) II] Mat[t(iacorum)]* / [*b(ene) m(erenti) p(osuit) vel -osuerunt*]. Therefore the name of the deceased *decurio cohortis* should have been found in the missing part

¹⁹ *Ex Pont.* IV 6, 21-22; 7, 53-54. See also I 8, 11-14.

²⁰ Eck 2016.

²¹ Falileyev 2007, pp. 8-9. See also *s. v.* Aliobrix, the stronghold beyond the Danube, in the front of Noviodunum, bearing also a Celtic name, pp. 4-5.

of the inscription, while *Ael(ius) I[- -]* could have been his fellow soldier, or one of the fellow soldiers, that set the funerary monument. Since the *cohors II Mattiacorum milliaria equitata* was transferred to Thracia sometime before AD 155,²² the funerary monument should be dated during Hadrian's or at beginning of Antoninus Pius' reign.

As I already mentioned, the two last papers, closing the volume, deal with ceramic materials: the so-called Lower Danubian Kaolin Wares, a type of vessels to be found mostly in the military milieu of the Lower Moesia province (P. Dyczek, pp. 239-256), and the oil lamps discovered at Sexaginta Prista, kept in the storage rooms of the Regional Museum of History in Rousse (N. Roussev, pp. 257-270).

To sum up, the volume provides us with wonderful new insights on the Lower Danube area during the Early Roman period, focusing not only on the important legionary centres from Troesmis and Novae, but also on different aspects of the Roman presence in the area. The editor should be praised for organizing the colloquium and for editing and publishing the volume in one year's time. Thus, it allows us to access the results of several still ongoing successful projects, which bring the scientific research on Lower Moesia at a new level.

Bibliography

- ISM V – Em. Doruțiu-Boilă, *Inscripțiile din Scythia Minor. Volumul V. Capidava – Troesmis – Noviodunum / Inscriptiones Scythiae minoris. Volumen V. Capidava – Troesmis – Noviodunum*, București, 1980.
- Alexandrescu 2013 – C.-G. Alexandrescu, *Napoléon III et les fortifications romaines du Bas-Danube – le cas de Troesmis*, Caiete ARA 4, 2013, pp. 57-68.
- Alexandrescu, Nicolae 2013 – C. G. Alexandrescu, C. I. Nicolae, *Destine intrerupte: arheologul Emil Coliu și cercetările de la Troesmis*, in V. Iliescu, D. Nedu, A. R. Barboș (eds.), *Graecia*, Roma, Barbaricum. In memoriam V. Lica, Galați, 2013, pp. 415-426.
- Doruțiu-Boilă 1972 – Em. Doruțiu-Boilă, *Castra legionis V Macedonicae und municipium Troesmense*, Dacia, N. S. 16, 1972, pp. 133-144.
- Eck 2016 – W. Eck, *Die lex Troesmensium: ein Stadtgesetz für ein municipium civium Romanorum*, ZPE 200, 2016, pp. 565-606.
- Falileyev 2007 – Al. Falileyev, *Celtic Dacia. Personal Names, Place-names, and Ethnic Names of Celtic Origin in Dacia and Scythia Minor*, Aberystwyth, 2007.
- Matei-Popescu 2010 – Fl. Matei-Popescu, *The Roman Army in Moesia Inferior*, Bucharest, 2010.

Matei-Popescu 2013 – Fl. Matei-Popescu, *The Roman Auxiliary Units of Moesia*, II Mar Nero 8, 2010/2011 (2013), pp. 207-230.

Mușețeanu 1990. – C. Mușețeanu, *Contribuții la privind topografia Durostorului*, SCIVA 41, 1990, 3-4, pp. 293-299.

Sharankov 2015 – N. Sharankov, *Novi dannii za trakiyskite stratezi*, Archeologija Sofia 56, 2015, 1-2, pp. 62-78.

Simion *et alii* 1980 – G. Simion, V.H. Baumann, A. Opaț, I. Vasiliu, Gh. Mănucu-Adameșteanu, E. Oberländer-Târnoveanu, *Săpăturile de salvare de la Troesmis – 1977 – Raport preliminar*, Peuce 8, 1980, pp. 153-288.

Vulpe 1953 – R. Vulpe, *Canabenses și Troesmensens. Două inscripții inedite din Troesmis*, SCIV 4, 1953, 3-4, pp. 557-582.

Matei Florian Popescu

Arthur Muller, Ergün Lafli (dir.), Stéphanie Huysecom-Haxhi (coll.), FIGURINES DE TERRE CUITE EN MÉDITERRANÉE GRECQUE ET ROMAINE. VOL. 2. ICONOGRAPHIE ET CONTEXTES, Collection Archaiologia, Presses Universitaires du Septentrion, Villeneuve d'Ascq, 2015, 699 p.

The book is the second volume of the collected papers that were presented at the Colloquium on terracotta figurines held at Izmir in 2007, which has gathered more than 150 researchers. It contains 58 from a total of 90 articles published in two volumes (the first volume has been published one year after the second). The Colloquium has been organised by Ergün Lafli on behalf of Dokuz Eylül University (coordinator of the series *Colloquia Anatolica* and *Aegaea Antiqua*), and by Arthur Muller and Stéphanie Huysecom-Haxhi on behalf of the French School of Athens and of the research centre HALMA UMR of University Lille 3 SHS.

A major progress has been made in the study of terracotta in the last three decades, an important role having the works of two organizers of the colloquium, Arthur Muller and Stéphanie Huysecom-Haxhi, both beginning with the research on terracotta from Thasos.

The main goals of the colloquium from Izmir were to publish the discoveries of recent excavations, and to bring forward new approaches on the production, distribution, iconography and functionality of terracotta figurines. In the first volume²³ there are grouped the

²³ Arthur Muller, Ergün Lafli (dir.), Stéphanie Huysecom-Haxhi (coll.), *Figurines de terre cuite en Méditerranée grecque et romaine. Vol. 1. Production, diffusion, étude*, BCH Suppl. 54, École Française d'Athènes, Athènes, 2016.

²² Matei-Popescu 2010, pp. 222-224, no. 33.