

first paper, it is after all the feminine *II (secunda)*, *VI (sexta)*, *IX (nona)*, etc. that must be supplied in the texts. For the readers' sake, it is perhaps a pity that they are not alerted to this change of opinion before beginning to absorb the first paper.

It may seem like a prime case of hairsplitting whether one reads *sexta* or *sextus*. In Speidel's second paper on the topic it however becomes clear that more is at stake. He argues that we should read not *sexta (cohorte)*, as the reviewer thought, but *sexta (centuria)*, for which there is some other evidence, and that the disappearance of references to the cohort in fact indicates a considerable change in the battle order of the Roman legion: "the battle line mattered now more than the cohort. The reason for this change must have been the increasing specialization of the lines as each came to wield weapons different from those of the others" (p. 42).

This paper is as good an illustration as any of Speidel's work, which again and again shows that by paying attention to even one single letter (while sometimes using pictures and other evidence), one can produce startlingly wide-ranging results. The reviewer looks greatly forward to reading Speidel's Roman Army Studies vol. III sometime around the year 2000, if not before.

*Christer Bruun*

EDWARD DABROWA: *Legio X Fretensis. A Prosopographical Study of its Officers (I-III c. A.D.)*. Historia Einzelschriften 66, Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 1993. 128 p. DEM 58.

In this study of the officers – legates, tribunes and centurions – of the Legio X Fretensis, stationed from AD 66 onwards in Judaea and closely connected with events in that province (there in "An Outline of History" of the legion, pp. 11-21), the question is asked whether "the circumstances under which this legion arrived in Jerusalem, as well as the role it played in the life of the province had any effect upon the selection of its officers" and whether it is "possible to see the effects of political history reflected in specific cadres of officers during various periods of its history" (p. 9). The subject and the questions asked do not seem very promising (I had thought that studies of this type had already gone out of fashion), because for such a study there is the problem of the dearth of source material and of its interpretation, and I must confess that the historical conclusions arrived at in this book (p. 107f.) do not seem very impressive.

On the other hand, it can certainly be of some use to have the information on the officers collected. The individual prosopographical articles are of some quality, but the author often seems to content himself with the citation of the sources and some modern

authorities rather than being critical and asking himself whether he could not find out more than his predecessors. Even if scholars agree in assuming that "M. Nonius Mucianus P. Delphius Peregrinus" is identical with "P. Delphius Peregrinus ... M. Nonius Mucianus" (p. 55), does this really have to be so? In the case of C. Sornatius C. f. Vel. (p. 97), one can surely say more than that the man was probably Italian: the only other Sornatius with a tribe also has the Velina (MAMA VI 260) and combined with the fact that this extremely rare *nomen* is in fact attested in an early inscription from Pola (CIL V 116 = Inscr. It. X 1, 200) this definitely points to Pola. In other cases assumed *patriae* are certainly wrong (Larcus Lepidus described as a Cretan, p. 46 [modified p. 47 n. 208]; Instuleius Tenax assumed to be from Ascalon, p. 89, and Volusius Magnus Italian on the basis of his *nomen*, which is common everywhere in the Roman world, p. 99; etc.), and there are some things I do not like, for instance the habit of saying that someone "was born" somewhere instead of saying that someone's family came from somewhere (p. 27, 56, 58 etc.), not to speak of details like Reate being constantly called "Raete" and Cures Sabini "Cures Sabinis". But it is of course hard to please everyone, and since this is in many ways a useful and welcome book, small blunders like those noted above should be forgiven.

Olli Salomies

MICHAEL DONDERER: *Die Mosaizisten der Antike und ihre wirtschaftliche und soziale Stellung. Eine Quellenstudie.* Erlanger Forschungen, Reihe A, Bd. 48. Erlangen 1989. ISBN 3-922135-64-1. 183 S., 73 Taf. DEM 79.

In letzter Zeit hat man in der archäologischen Forschung besonderes Augenmerk auf sozialhistorische Fragestellungen gelenkt, indem man mehr und mehr nach der Herkunft und dem sozialen Milieu antiker Künstler und Handwerker zu fragen begonnen hat. In diese Trend ist vorliegendes Werk zu stellen. In einem *catalogue raisonné* hat Donderer alle inschriftlich belegten Mosaizisten zusammengestellt (gesondert werden unsichere Fälle bzw. vermeintliche Mosaizisten angeführt); leider blieben nur literarisch überlieferte Mosaizisten ausgeklammert, wie der berühmte Sosos aus Pergamon. Der Katalog wird als vorzügliches Arbeitsinstrument bleibenden Wert haben. In den einleitenden Bemerkungen befaßt sich Donderer u.a. mit Fragen des antiken Sprachgebrauchs, d.h. mit den technischen Termini im Zusammenhang (ich würde *scutularius*, nach CIL IV 10155 zu zitieren, weglassen, denn das nur hier belegte Wort ist mehrdeutig, und außerdem könnte es sich u.U. um einen Eigennamen handeln), der Organisation der Werkstätten, der Gründe für das Signieren und des sozialen Status der