Roman helmets with face masks were found throughout the Roman Empire, in graves and where cavalry units were stationed. Their usage is dated back from the turn of eras to the 4th century. Although references to masked helmets appear in the works of Roman authors their provenience and application as a type of armour is still unclear and arouses much interest amongst researchers.

Helmets with masks consist of a bell and a metal facial protector which depicts human countenance. The leading motif is a young man's face. Both parts – the bell and the mask – were bound with a hinge or hooks hidden under the hair line, behind the diadem or a piled up hairdo. Both elements were attached with a leather strap at the bottom of the rim and nailed to buttons placed at the edge of the mask and the neck guard. A lot of masks take the shape of women's faces with more or less impressive hairstyles. There was smoothly combed back hair adjacent to the head and hairdos styled with inwrought wreaths, both constructions being made of strings and chains.

The bells, similar to masks, were produced with a hammering technique. The right form was obtained by a stroke of a hammer and the use of organic intermediary tools. The major part of the helmet is covered with a relief decoration depicting figural scenes, leaves, flowers and military signs. Additional decorative elements are imitations of precious stones. For example, the placement of a blue oval made out of glass paste was used as an additional adornment whilst producing female mask discovered in Eining (Lkr. Kelheim/D).

Studies on their functions have been initiated already in the 19th century. In 1878 O. Benndorf wrote that the masks' function was to be placed on the face of the deceased. Whereas, according to P. Coussin the two-part construction of helmets using hinges and hooks, allowing lowering and lifting up the mask, proves that the helmets were used before putting them on its owner in his grave.

Due to the absence of written and iconographic sources relating directly to the possibilities of using masked helmets in combat the majority of modern scholars, in compliance with Lucius Flavius Arrianus' record, accepted the hypothesis that they were not used in battle. According to them, these helmets were ceremonial or »tournament« equipment. Their significance was not only religious, i.e. for parades and tournaments, but was also linked to propaganda, with a special reference to the people from the frontiers. They were to demonstrate the wealth of Rome and the combat efficiency of the Roman soldiers. Other researchers have cautiously suggested the possibility of using them in battle, but without any explanation. However, there are some reasons to enhance the latter thesis.

**ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT**

To demonstrate the usefulness of masked helmets in combat, it would be the best to discover one of them at a battle ground in a context that prevents any other interpretations. However, even such finds of ordinary equipment are rare because such sites were immediately looted after a battle. Due to these circum-
stances a discovery of such a spectacular weaponry like helmets with masks in a battlefield seems almost impossible. However, in two cases, their archaeological context may indicate utilisation during a real fight. In Kalkriese (Lkr. Osnabrück/D), apart from a mask (fig. 1), the following inventory was discovered: elements binding wooden and metal parts of *pila*, spearheads, arrowheads, lead sling shot bullets, swords fragments, *lorica hamata* and *lorica segmentata* fragments, bronze *cingulum* buckles, shield-bosses, Hagenau helmet fragments, elements of harnesses, *phalerae* and other metal military equipment elements.

The abovementioned findings prove that during the battle which took place at Kalkriese in Teutoburg Forest in AD 9 between the Roman division and barbarian tribes, at least one horseman armoured with a masked helmet was present.

Another case is a mask (dated from the mid-2nd to the 3rd century) found in Aïn Grimidi (prov. M’Sila/Algeria; fig. 2) at one of the limes outposts in the province of Mauretania. P. Salama made an attempt to identify the present unit as well as the holder of the mask. The author considers the possibility that this person was a member of another division stationed in forts in close vicinity to this border. According to him, a military service was a rotary and weaponry used for ceremonial or parade purposes during the time of these duties would stay in the main camp.

Grave finds of masked helmets or parts thereof are rare but their analysis may also help us to understand their function. In a tomb at Tell Oum Hauran (gouv. Daraa/SYR), two helmets were deposited, one with a
mask and the other without. In this case, these helmets were intended for two different actions. The specimen with the face mask would be used for the hippika and the other for the real fight. However, many graves were equipped with only a masked helmet, for example, in Hellingen (Kt. Esch-sur-Alzette/L)\textsuperscript{18}, in Neuvy-Pailloux (dép. Indre/F)\textsuperscript{19} or in Chassenard (dép. Allier/F)\textsuperscript{20}. In this light, the deposition of two helmets in the Syrian burial should be interpreted primarily as a highlighting of the status and wealth of the soldier buried there, which could afford to buy such a magnificent equipment. This case should not be considered as a secure proof of the thesis that the helmets with masks were not used in combat. What is more, most funerary findings suggest such a possibility.

**TECHNICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL ISSUES**

In the 19\textsuperscript{th} century O. Benndorf admitted that the selection of metal from which the helmets were made, as well as the rich ornamentation giving them luxurious character, rules out its combat usage. Additional arguments were difficulties with binding the mask, limiting visibility as well as giving problems with breathing\textsuperscript{21}. These beliefs, often repeated by other researchers\textsuperscript{22}, still do not have a convincing explanation.

The material used for production of these helmets is of the same quality, as other elements of Roman military equipment\textsuperscript{23}. The bells were hammered out of a bronze or iron plate. Masks made of iron, bronze or brass were covered with an extra silver or golden plate or they were silvered or gilded. Wearing helmets made of materials other than iron was not anything unusual in the Roman army. In the 1\textsuperscript{st} century Montefortino and Coolus helmet types – used by infantrymen – were made of bronze. Since the appearance of the Imperial-Gallic type, the basic material used for production of helmets was iron, but bronze was also in use\textsuperscript{24}.

Gilding and covering the bells and masks with a layer of a different metal also had a decorative purpose for other helmet types, those of an unquestionable combat capacity. An iron Weisenau type specimen from Haltern (Kr. Recklinghausen/D), dated back to the second half of the 1\textsuperscript{st} century, was covered with a brass plate undoubtedly to improve its aesthetic quality\textsuperscript{25}. The bell of the helmet from Deurne (prov. Noord-Brabant/NL), dated to the 4\textsuperscript{th} century, is partially covered with a silver and a partially gilded plate\textsuperscript{26}. Also relief decoration of the helmets cannot be considered as an argument against its use in combat. The thesis that the rich adornment makes it difficult or even impossible to fight seems irrational and void.

Based on a test conducted with a copy of the mask from Dormagen (Rhein-Kreis Neuss/D) it is stated that the universal size of the mask made it possible to be used by many different people\textsuperscript{27} and the correct placement of the eye, mouth and nasal holes established the accurate visual angle and ease of breathing\textsuperscript{28}. However, it seems very likely that most of the masks were custom-made\textsuperscript{29}. The variety of representations reflects the individual tastes of soldiers thus allowing the masks to fit better to the wearers’ faces.

If the helmets with masks limited the perception and breathing ability of the horsemen, they would not be able to do manoeuvres described by Arrian, which were shown at the Roman army demonstration\textsuperscript{30}. This was of great importance when presenting the skills and abilities of a Roman soldier to foreigners. Even applying additional decorative elements like a ring imitating an iris did not have any effect on the battlefield whilst being within eyeshot of the cavalrymen\textsuperscript{31}.

The simple construction of the helmet allowed them to be handled easily and fast. The lower binding of the bell and the mask with a metal button and a leather strap was not much more complicated than tying it up under the chin like with other helmets. It was also a measure to prevent the mask from rising up accidentally.
Fig. 2  Mask from Ain Grimidi (prov. M’Sila/Algeria). – (Drawing E. Szewczyk).

Fig. 3  Helmet from Homs (ancient Emesa/SYR). – (Drawing E. Szewczyk).
The elements of the helmet were fitted to each other so that a mask did not lean towards the face but created a whole set with a bell. After striking a blow to the mask the impact was transferred to the back side of the helmet. It also protected from ricochets and effects of sliding the weapon of the opponent down the other elements of equipment.

The Kalkriese mask type does not have any elements that could be bound with leather straps. That is why it could not be worn without stabilising cheeks. The Nijmegen-Kops Plateau mask type (fig. 3) has got an ear protection in the form of an artistic auricle. The buttons used for binding the mask to the bell with a leather strap are situated under them. They were associated with the cavalry helmet Weiler/Koblenz-Bubenheim type, indicated by findings from Vize (Il Kirklareli/TR), Homs (gouv. Homs/SYR; fig. 3), Tell Oum Hauran and a bell of this type from Antinopolis (modern Sheikh ‘Ibada, gouv. Minya/Egypt) with a hinge placed in the middle of the forehead. Also masks of other types were assembled with helmets used by the Roman cavalry.

Tests conducted with face protection replicas enhance a thesis on the combat use of early Kalkriese and Nijmegen-Kops Plateau mask types and their compilation with Weiler/Koblenz-Bubenheim helmet types. Literature emphasises their psychological leverage in the early phase of combats at Roman-Germanic borderland.

In his work Taktiká Arrian carried out the classification of helmets and divided them into two groups due to their combat or parade/«tournament» usage. This record concerns the use of the helmets with masks in the 2nd century and does not apply to their function in the 1st century. That is why we need to assume that those helmets could have been used as combat weaponry as well as ceremonial or »tournament« equipment.

**WRITTEN SOURCES AND THEIR FUNCTION IN THE LATE ROMAN EMPIRE**

Due to the fact that most of the discovered helmets are dated back to the 2nd and 3rd centuries, we need to assume that in this period of time they were the most popular ones. Only taking Arrian’s record into consideration we might think that this situation is an effect of parades and tournaments being held more often than in the earlier century.

Although in the context of Ammianus Marcellinus and Julian the Apostate records, when describing the use of helmets with masks by heavy-armed Roman cavalry in the 4th century, we should reflect on the possibility of its combat usage.

No later than in the times of Hadrian a new type of a battle formation appeared, called *cataphracti*. In Arrian’s record there is no information on using masked helmets by those units, so we could assume that he was not well acquainted with the Roman heavy-armed cavalry. The beginnings of a new formation are connected to Moesia, where the units *ala Gallorum* and *ala Pannoniorum* had been stationed, forming part of the later *ala I Gallorum et Pannoniorum catafractata*. The presence of helmets with masks in this area (a dozen or so), dating back to the 2nd century, can be linked to military actions of the aforementioned formation.

The constant increase in the number of masked helmets being found, from the 2nd to 3rd century, allows us to believe that the meaning and manpower of the *cataphracti* units in that time was growing significantly. It probably had some connection with the military actions against Persia.

The authors of both records from the 4th century, describing heavy-armed Roman cavalry, state that their peculiarity was to fully protect the horse, as well as the cavalryman and his face. In the description of a
parade which took place in AD 357 in Rome, Ammianus Marcellinus recorded a heavily cavalry, describing in depth an armour which did not limit body movements and protected the whole cavalryman. Further, the author mentions several more times this unit type, also fighting on the enemy's side. A record of a clash between Persian clibanarii and Julian's units seems to have a great importance. Ammianus Marcellinus wrote that Persian warriors were fully covered with armour and arrows could only harm them if reached the masks' holes.

Why did Ammianus Marcellinus not state the difference between the use of helmets with masks by heavily armoured Roman cavalry and their opponents? There is no doubt that he knew both types. His work Res Gestae is a wealth of knowledge concerning the Roman military system. Why, when describing that formation many times, did he not mention any distinction, despite being such an experienced soldier himself?

If there was a difference, surely he would have written it right away. Thus, the answer is simple – there was none. Cataphracti fought in a battle array against the infantry holding a contus along horse's back. As for the clibanarii, they carried it crosswise the horse's neck, the spearhead pointing to the left side. Those, with lighter armoured horse archers, fought against the cavalry in a wedge – column battle array. A particular feature of both units was full armour which enabled them to withstand a frontal clash from an opponent. In this case, the lack of a facial protection would have been an Achilles' heel. Although the opportunity of counterstrikes by shields, the helmets with masks had to play an important role in the military equipment of clibanarii because their opponents were carrying weapons at the same level. Although having an advantage in height over the infantrymen, the cataphracti cavalrymen had to protect their faces when the weapon was sliding down the other armour elements, from an infantry position was heading upwards. Full body protection had a special significance here due to the lack of a shield.

The success of the heavy cavalry depended on the discipline and capacity to keep the battle array. The combat methods did not need greater manoeuvres abilities which light cavalry had to possess. The results of the tests carried out on the abovementioned helmets, together with Kalkriese and Nijmegen-Kops Plateau types of mask replicas prove that the original ones had a significant utility in combat. The later types only differ stylistically so we should appreciate their military worthiness as well.

Ammianus Marcellinus, while writing about the impossibility of wounding a warrior wearing a helmet with mask, states a psychological aspect of this equipment. To make such an impression on the opponent was one of the purposes for using masked helmets. Surely, it was not as easy with more experienced soldiers, but it had to have had an impact on the imagination of their younger colleagues. Describing the march of Roman army from the camp before the Battle of Argentoratum the author states that amongst cavalry shielding infantry flanks were heavily armoured riders, arousing fear.

One of the reasons for mentioning cataphracti and clibanarii horsemen was often for their elite character. Only a soldier with great experience acquired in other units of cavalry service could join that formation. An exquisite prestige was emphasised by choosing the right recruits and also by their equipment. The cost of a full set of such equipment had to arouse jealousy from soldiers of other types of military formations and the rich decoration stressed out their elite character and impressive look; thus, they were participants of many parades.

The use of cataphracti and clibanarii units by Julian during the Battle of Argentoratum and the supporting of Roman infantry during Valentinian military actions against Saxes prove a sufficient manpower in this formation. Also a description provided by Julian leaves no doubt as to the numerical force of the units and their combat utility. With a large number of soldiers, it seems too expensive and unnecessary for them to possess two sets of arms, one for fighting and another for parade, because the equipment of Roman cataphracti and clibanarii was perfectly suited for both purposes.
CONCLUSIONS

The context of the masks findings indicates the thesis on their combat character. A specimen from Kalkriese discovered at the battlefield of AD 9 seems to prove it. The mask from the military post in Aïn Grimidi in Algeria also confirms this thesis. Soldiers going to that post did not need to take equipment with them that was not suited for battle. Also specimens from the graves do not exclude this possibility and even suggest it. We need to say that helmets with masks are not different in a matter of technology to other helmets. They are made of the same material and manufactured in a similar way. They are not inferior to other types, undoubtedly qualified for combat purposes. Their luxurious character and rich adornment of the bells does not prevent their use in combat. Masks – proven by a conducted test – made it possible to observe the battlefield and did not restrict air circulation in a meaningful way.

Aftermentioned sources confirm the use of the helmets with face masks since the 1st century. If we can assume that they were used in combat at that time, we do not have any reasons to believe that in later periods things were any different. The lack of obvious reasons not to use these types of helmets in battle at the beginning of the 2nd century, when their popularity was rising, seems to verify this thesis. Helmets with masks were a great addition to protective armour of the *cataphracti* and *clibanarii* formation, created in the Roman army in the 2nd century. The works of Arrian are extraordinary sources referring to ancient warfare, but they may not be treated as directly concerning the Roman heavy cavalry.

Notes

1) The oldest specimen discovered so far comes from Bramsche-Kalkriese in Germany (Franzius 1995, 78). – More on this mask, see Hanel/Wilbers-Rost/Willer 2004.
2) Arr. takt. 44. – Iulian. or. l. 37 D. – Amm. 16.10.8.
3) On their interpretation, see Bartman 2005, 108-117.
5) Garbsch 1978, 16.
6) More on this topic, see Künzl 2004.
8) Benndorf 1878, 63.
9) Coussin 1926, 413-414.
12) Bishop / Coulston 2006, 142, 175. – Junkelmann 1991, 154; 1996, 52; 1999, 40, allows the possibility that they were used in combat but limited to a small territory and a narrow period of time (see below).
14) Schlüter 1999, 137-138, 145. – Bartman 2005, 100 note 5, believes that these findings (especially the mask) were part of the baggage train but in the light of the archaeological context, this explanation seems to be too simple. In addition, soldiers could fight in this place because wagons make defense much easier and in case of the ambush they were probably the only cover. This tactic was extremely developed during the Hussite Wars in the 15th century (see Durdik 1955).
16) On their archaeological context, see Abdul-Hak 1954/1955.
17) Bartman 2005, 103.
18) Apart from a mask no other item of military equipment was discovered, see Namur 1854.
19) In this tomb two masks were accompanied, among others, by spearheads and arrowheads, see Waurick 1986, 794. – Beck / Chew 1991, 120.
20) Apart from an iron mask pieces of chain mail, sword, torque, *strigillum* and coins were discovered, see Dechelette 1903.
21) Benndorf 1878, 62.
23) Coussin 1926, 420.
27) Sometimes on the inner side of the bell a name of the owner was engraved. Quite often next to an actual user, few names of his predecessors were crossed out: Kellner 1978, 13. – More on this topic, see MacMullen 1960.
28) Hanel / Pelitz / Willer 2000, 262.
29) For example the mask from Kalkriese (see Franzius 1995, 78; Junkelmann 1996, 19) or from Ain Grimidi (see Salama 1986, 649-651).
30) Arr. takt.; on these exercises, see Hyland 1993.
31) Robinson 1975, 110.
37) Hanel / Pelltz / Willer 2000, 265.
41) Arr. takt. 34.
45) Amm. 16.10.8. – The records directly do not concern using helmets with masks in combat.
46) Mielczarek 1993, 73.
47) The idea to create a *cataphracti* formation may have appeared during the Trajan’s campaign against Parthia (ibidem 73). – If this military formation was formed, based on the model of the eastern heavy cavalry, we can assume that to their equipment belonged helmets with masks because the Parthian heavily-armoured horsemen surely used them (ibidem 60).
49) Of course, other types of cavalry units also may have used such helmets.
50) Mielczarek 1993, 76.
51) Ammianus Marcellinus did not witness the parade in AD 357. At that time he stayed with Ursicius outside Rome. There are no records to prove his stay in this city before he stepped aside after a failure of Julian’s Persian campaign and his stay in the East (see Thompson 1947, 13-19; Blockley 1975, 10). So we can assume that he described heavy-bodied cavalry in this way he knew it from other military actions.
52) Amm. 16.10.8.
53) Amm. 16.12.7, 21-22; 24.6.8; 25.1.12; 28.5.6.
57) Ibidem 48.
58) Amm. 25.1.12.
59) Amm. 16.12.7; on the battle, see Nicasie 1998, 219-233.
60) Rea 1984.
61) Amm. 16.12.7; 16.12.21-22.
62) Amm. 25.1.12.
63) Iulian. or. I. 37 C-D. – The nature of this work was favorable to the addressee (in this case to the emperor Constantius), though exaggeration could suggest that the author was mocking the ruler.
64) On parade, see Bishop 1990.
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Das kalte Antlitz der Schlacht – einige Bemerkungen zur Funktion der römischen Helme mit Gesichtsmaske


The cold face of battle – some remarks on the function of Roman helmets with face masks

This essay offers reflections on the functions of Roman helmets with masks. They were one of the most effective elements of Roman soldiers’ equipment, arousing scholars’ interest and controversy since the 19th century. Despite abundant literature, their function is still the subject of numerous discussions. Scholars’ views revolve around a few possibilities. Two most popular of such theses supposedly exclude one another. They claim that the helmets were used during parades and festivities or during battles. The author, taking into consideration archaeological sources, historical records, metallographic analyses and the outcome of various experiments seeks to show that these helmets proved to be a perfect solution in both cases.

La face froide de la bataille – remarques sur la fonction des casques romains à masque

Cet article propose des reflexions sur la fonction des casques romains à masque. Ces casques étaient l’une des pièces les plus effectivées de l’équipement défensif militaire romain et ils ont éveillé l’intérêt et la controverse des scientifiques depuis le 19e siècle. Malgré l’existence d’une abondante littérature sur le sujet, leur fonction est toujours sujette à discussions. Les deux propositions les plus fréquentes – une utilisation pour la parade ou pour la bataille – semblent s’exclure. Sur la base des sources archéologiques, historiques et d’analyses métallographiques comme d’expérimentations, l’auteur propose que ces casques étaient une solution parfaite pour chacun de ces usages.
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