

auxiliary camps). Four of Mocsy's contributions are reprinted here: "Das Territorium Legionis und die Canabae in Pannonien" (1953), "Zu den Prata Legionis" (1967), "Das Problem der militärischen Territorien im Donauraum" (1972), and "Zu den Auxiliarvici in Pannonien" (1980). The interested reader ought to take into account the thorough discussion of the new inscription mentioning *solum Caesaris* from Germania by R. Wiegels, *Chiron* 19, 1989, 61-102.

Chapter 4 "Die Namen und Heimatangaben der Soldaten" contains one of Mocsy's most important contributions in this collection. Based on a study of those Roman soldiers for whom military diplomas were issued, he argues in "Die Namen der Diplomempfänger" (1986) that their names do not reflect their legal status at the time of enrollment, but instead conform to specific bureaucratic practices of the army. Moreover, these practices show geographic differences. Therefore, a soldier bearing the *tria nomina* does not necessarily have to be a Roman citizen. The only certain indication of Roman citizenship among soldiers is the mention of the tribus. If correct, this thesis is bound to cause very interesting, not to say disconcerting, methodological problems for Roman social historians in general. What is one to do, if one cannot infer Roman citizenship from the *tria nomina*?

The four papers in the final chapter "Spättrömische Festungen in Pannonien" mean that the volume contains material of interest also for readers focusing on late antiquity.

*Christer Bruun*

M. P. SPEIDEL: *Roman Army Studies II*. *Mavors Roman Army Researches VIII*, ed. M.P. Speidel. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 1992. 430 p. DEM 158 (hardback).

It is astonishing that only eight years after the publication of his first collection of *Roman Army Studies* (1984), Professor Speidel has prepared a new volume of over 400 pages containing 59 papers, almost all written after 1984. Moreover, as is well-known, Speidel not only writes shorter papers, but also writes monographs, of which the most recent is *Die Denkmäler der Kaiserreiter (Equites Singulares Augusti)*, Bonn 1992 (not yet seen by the reviewer but referred to repeatedly in this book).

The content of this book is divided into ten chapters: "The Legions", "The Auxilia", "The Ethnic Units (*nationes, numeri*)", "Ranks and Careers", "The Army in Europe", "The Army in Asia", "The Army in Egypt and Africa", "Art and Religion", "Recruitment, Service, Discharge", and "The Later Roman Army" (the division is identical to Speidel's *RAS I*, except that the chapter on Recruitment etc. has been added).

The large number of papers naturally means that many of them are quite short. They rarely lack interest, though, since Speidel has a unique eye for the interesting detail or the misunderstood passage in epigraphic (mostly) and literary texts. Reading through his pages, one is alerted to questions of which one so far has been completely unaware, such as: How did the Roman army units store their weapons? Did the soldiers own their weapons or have them on loan? ("The Weapons Keeper, the *fisci curator*, and the Ownership of Weapons in the Roman Army", one of six previously unpublished contributions), What do we know about the supply of wood for Roman camps? ("Legionsabteilungen aus Mainz beim Holzschlag im Odenwald"), or (concerning archival practice) How did the Romans distinguish between two soldiers bearing the same name? ("*Prior* and *Sequens* on Inscriptions of the Roman Army ...").

According to Speidel, the discussion of such matters is not an end to itself. In the author's words, "the task of Roman army studies is to set forth the army in all its aspects. Its aim is to understand how Rome succeeded so long and how it failed in the end. ... Moreover, as a rich and long-lasting experience, spanning 500 years and three continents, the Roman imperial army offers a truly vast picture of human society" (Foreword, p. 11).

In this collection, a number of larger papers rank above the others in their way of promoting our knowledge of the Roman army. The first of these is the introductory "Work to be Done on the Organization of the Roman Army" (1989). Continuing in the tradition of Professor Eric Birley, who presented a similar agenda in 1952, Speidel presents a list of topics that still need to be studied; students in search of a topic for a dissertation may profit. As so often in the field of Roman army studies, the approach is solidly positivistic along the lines of: "This we know, that we do not. Let us collect the facts, and then we will know about that too."

Speidel himself has undoubtedly contributed more than most to illuminating the dark spots in our knowledge of the Roman army. One such paper is his "Exploratores. Mobile Elite Units of Roman Germany" (p. 89-104), where he studies how these elite soldiers "became part of the emerging field army that saved the empire, if not the limes, during the great crisis of the third century." A different sort of "Germanic connection" is present in "Germani corporis custodes" (p. 105-119), where Speidel's treatment on some important points differs from H. Bellen's valuable *Die germanische Leibwache des julisch-claudischen Hauses* (1981). Speidel convincingly argues that the *corporis custodes* were in fact picked horsemen (a statement found in Dio, and actually nowhere contradicted in our sources), and that they as such were direct forerunners of the later and better known *equites singulares Augusti*.

Interesting light on military behaviour and on questions of social history is shed in the papers "Furlough in the Roman Army" (p. 330-341) and "The Soldiers' Servants" (p. 342-352). The latter paper discusses the question of how many camp followers

accompanied Rome's armies, a question recently treated in depth by K.-H. Welwei, *Unfreie im antiken Kriegsdienst III: Rom* (1988, reviewed in *Arctos* 23 (1989) 286-288). Speidel argues, with some good points, for a larger number and a greater military role of the servants.

The last fifty pages of the book are devoted to nine papers on the army of the Late Empire. The fascinating but brief "The Army at Aquileia, the Moesiaci Legion, and the Shield Emblems in the *Notitia Dignitatum*" (p. 414-418) is worth mentioning not least because it is a good demonstration of how Speidel combines epigraphic, literary, and iconographic evidence in his work, a feature in many of his papers. Here he compares designs on a gravestone with the shield emblems in the *Not. Dignitatum*. The result indicates that the drawings in the *Notitia* were accurate. In the same paper Speidel apparently gives the solution of the abbreviation EX AQVIL. written on the standard carried by a soldier depicted on a sarcophagus now in the Grado cathedral (AE 1934, 230; cf. Cl. Franzoni, *Habitus atque habitudo militis*, 1987, 20f. no. 5). It should read *ex(ercitus) Aquil(eiensis)*, not *ex Aquil(eia)* as Franzoni and others before him suggested, nor *ex aquil(ifero)* as others, among them Speidel himself (RAS I, 23 no. 7), followed by the reviewer (*Arctos* 23, 1989, 301), believed.

This new reading is taken to mean that in A.D. 238, when the emperor Maximinus laid siege to the city, it was actually defended by a professional army, the *exercitus Aquileiensis*, not by civilians (mainly), as is commonly thought.

All the papers previously published have been reprinted as such, often followed by short additions. This is in accordance with the practice adopted by the *Mavors* series, and since the papers in this volume are very recent, the readers are not confused by prolific endnotes causing them to rethink what they have just read.

There is only one exception to this, involving another of Speidel's larger contributions, "The Centurions' Titles" (from 1983, on p. 21-39). Speidel argued that the more extensive way of defining the place of a centuria within the legion, e.g. as *centuria cohortis sextae hastati prioris*, gradually was replaced by the shorter *centuria sexti hastati prioris*. In inscriptions, these formulae are almost never spelled out. A text may read *7 VI hast. pos.*, and the reader has to supply the rest. In discussing some thirty inscriptions where the position of the centuria is given, Speidel throughout suggested that the shorter form be inserted. However, pointing to a new inscription where a centurion stated that he *fuit ordine in sexta hastatus posterior*, the reviewer noted that the form "sexta" clearly made Speidel's model of, in this case, *sextus hastatus posterior* impossible (see *Arctos* 22, 1988, 23-40.). This is acknowledged; Speidel adds after his 1983 paper the exhortation "See below for essential improvements". Then follows his "The Names of Legionary Centuriae" from *Arctos* 23, 1989, where the 1983 argument is modified. He now suggests (here p. 41 n. 6) that in all but 5 of the 33 inscriptions in the

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