

YANN LE BOHEC (Hrsg.), *La hiérarchie (Rangordnung) de l'armée romaine sous le Haut-Empire*. Actes du Congrès de Lyon (15–18 septembre 1994). Édition De Boccard, Paris 1995. 480 Seiten, zahlreiche Abbildungen im Text.

Great credit is due to the editor and contributors for the speedy publication of this volume. Further, another commendable aspect, the contents are organised systematically, by way of tribute to a classic work: ALFRED VON DOMASZEWSKI'S „Die Rangordnung des römischen Heeres“, first published by this journal in 1908 and given a new existence in the „2. durchgesehene Auflage“ with „Einführung, Berichtigungen und Nachträge“ by Brian Dobson, as Band 14 der Beihefte der Bonner Jahrbücher (1967). The Actes are divided into eight sections: I. Les préables (pp. 9–37); II. La bibliographie et les sources (pp. 39–126); III. La hiérarchie et les unités (pp. 127–154); IV. La hiérarchie des officiers (pp. 155–207); V. La hiérarchie des centurions (pp. 209–248); VI. La hiérarchie des soldats (pp. 249–309); VII. La hiérarchie sur les sites et dans les régions militaires (pp. 311–381); VIII. La hiérarchie à l'époque tardive (pp. 383–439). Over forty individual contributions are distributed between these sections, followed by the editor's Conclusion générale (pp. 441–447) and two indices, of army units registered in *L'année épigraphique* 1981–1990 and of the Actes themselves.

In most of these sections some papers are included which deal with individual items or particular areas. M. REALI, *Amicitia militum: un rapporto non gerarchico?* (I, pp. 33–37), in spite of a title which suggests more, actually discusses terms such as *amicus* on military inscriptions in the Cisalpina. M. CHRISTOL / T. DREW-BEAR, *Inscriptions militaires d'Aulutrène et d'Apamée de Phrygie* (II, pp. 57–92, with thirteen photographs), by contrast, offer a detailed discussion of evidence new and old from a proconsular province which opens up new perspectives on this region, through which „une grande route transversale“ passed. One may note briefly other papers in this category: from section IV, Y. BURNAND, *Un officier méconnu* (I. L. T. G. 347) (pp. 193–200); M. EUZENAT, *Praefecti equitum* adjoints au gouverneur de province (pp. 201–207, largely concentrating on the much discussed inscription from Sala, I. A. M. 2, 307 – not everyone will find his arguments persuasive and one would have welcomed comment from e.g. H. Devijver, the acknowledged expert on equestrian officers); from section V, G. MENNELLA / F. FILIPPI, *Un nuovo primipilare della legio III Cyrenaica* (pp. 221–229); R. FELLMANN, *L'inscription d'un optio princeps au temple de Ba'alshamin à Palmyre* (pp. 239–240); P. MORIZOT, *Ex tubicine princeps, ex tubicine principis, ou ex tubicine, princeps* (pp. 241–243); C. C. PETOLESCU, *[e]x trecentario* (pp. 245–248); from section VI, A. SARTORI, *Un legionario privilegiato e il „suo“ imperatore* (pp. 291–297); almost all those in section VII, J.-P. REY-COQUAIS, *Officiers équestres, centurions et sous-officiers dans les inscriptions de Syrie* (pp. 313–318); M. MAYER / I. RODÀ, *La presencia de militares en la zona norte del conventus Tarraconensis* (pp. 319–322); T. SARNOWSKI, *L'organisation hiérarchique des vexillationes Ponticae au miroir des trouvailles épigraphiques récentes* (pp. 323–328); N. VILLAVARDE VEGA, *La hiérarchie militaire et l'organisation architecturale interne du castellum de Tamuda (Tétouan, Maroc) du Haut au Bas-Empire* (pp. 329–341, with ten plans); J.-P. LAPORTE, *Notes sur les camps de Tatilti et d'Aras (Maurétanie Césarienne)* (pp. 343–366, with thirteen figures); L. KEPPIE, *Soldiers and veterans at the colony of Forum Julii (Fréjus)* (pp. 367–372). But the last piece in this section, F. BÉRARD, *La cohorte urbaine de Lyon: une unité à part dans la Rangordnung?* (pp. 373–382), in effect offers a valuable new look at the whole history of the detached *coh. urb.* Finally, in this category, there are, from section VIII, C. ZUCKERMANN, *Deux centurions commandants d'ailes en Égypte vers 300* (pp. 385–387); J. IRMSCHER, *La carrière militaire et civile de Solomon (VI siècle après J.-C.)* (p. 439).

The growth of information in this whole field of Roman military studies is now probably more rapid than ever before. In particular, affecting principally our knowledge of the auxilia, there has been a startling increase in the number of diplomata, of which several new examples come to light each year (mostly, it is sad, the product of – often illegal – metal-detecting; and in many such cases, as a result, with no known provenance). Happily, publication has, with one or two exceptions, been rapid, in particular in the „Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik“ (which, with the additional advantage of appearing five times each year, has in itself made a most laudable contribution to increased knowledge of the Roman army by the rapid dissemination of new evidence of all kinds). It is proper also to pay special tribute in this connection to the heroic labours of M. M. ROXAN, whose three supplements to CIL XVI, *Roman Military Diplomas 1954–77* (1978), *1978–84* (1985) and *1985–93* (1994) – all published by the Institute of Archaeology of the University of London – are an indispensable tool to scholarship. The third volume appeared shortly after the Lyon Congress, a further volume is in preparation (and is already badly needed – exciting new examples are already „forthcoming“). It is appropriate that Dr. Roxan has a paper in this volume, in section III: M. M. ROXAN, *The Hierarchy of the Auxilia. Promotion prospects in the Auxilia and work done in the last twenty years* (pp. 139–146).

It is also fitting that section II has a contribution by the editor of „Rangordnung“, B. DOBSON, on the Bibliography of the subject (pp. 41–46), with an impressive list of over seventy monographs or major studies. Among these one may note, in particular, H. DEVIJVER's *Prosopographia equestrum militarium* (Leuven, 5 volumes – so far – 1976–93; Devijver is also a contributor to these Actes: *Les milices équestres et la hiérarchie militaire* [pp. 175–191], with a valuable brief survey and some important new suggestions). Further, it is right to signal here the series founded and edited by M. P. SPEIDEL, *MAVORS* (originally published by Gieben, Amsterdam, now by Steiner, Stuttgart). M. P. Speidel's own magnum opus, *Die Denkmäler der Kaiserreiter. Equites singulares Augusti*, is listed in Dobson's survey as „1993 (Bonn)“. In fact it did not appear until 1994 (after some delay), as Band 50 of the *Beihefte* of this journal. (It is a pity that not all contributors were, so it seems, familiar with all the works on Dobson's list: R. Bartoloni's „ipotesi“ on the composition and numerical strength of auxiliary units [pp. 147–150] would have been much improved by consulting, e.g. P. A. HOLDER, *Studies in the Auxilia of the Roman Army from Augustus to Trajan*. BAR Internat. Ser. 70 [1980]). One item, not available when the Congress took place, deserves registering, for as a „desk top“ publication it may still not have become widely known: J. E. H. SPAUL, *ALA<sup>2</sup>* (1994). It was conceived as a revised version of the article „ala“ by C. Cichorius in the very first Halbband of the *Realencyclopädie* (1893), and will certainly be found very useful, even if the flood of new evidence now makes any such attempt at compilation out of date within a short time. Another work not yet available when the Congress met has recently appeared: M. A. SPEIDEL, *Die*

römischen Schreiftafeln von Vindonissa. Lateinische Texte des militärischen Alltags und ihre geschichtliche Bedeutung. Veröffentlichungen der Gesellschaft Pro Vindonissa 12 (1996). This follows by two years the publication by A. K. BOWMAN / J. D. THOMAS, *The Vindolanda Writing Tablets. Tabulae Vindolandenses II = TV II* (1994). M. A. Speidel's task, it is right to stress, was in many ways much harder than that of the editors of TV II: he had to read the often seemingly indecipherable scratches left by the stylus on wax-tablets. By contrast, the Vindolanda leaf-tablets in TV II were written in ink, making them, when photographed, in many respects similar to papyri. The Vindolanda stylus-tablets (for a great quantity has been found there too) are as yet largely undeciphered. Both these finds should act as an incentive to all archaeologists working on Roman sites where wood is preserved. But they would do well to pay attention to the nature of the Vindolanda leaf-tablets and the methods by which they were recovered (cf. R. E. BIRLEY, *Vindolanda Research reports, new series, 1, 1993*). These specially prepared slivers of wood, mainly birch or alder, were undoubtedly widely used, as a cheap substitute for papyrus, all over the north-west of the empire, if not beyond, and thousands of them may be awaiting discovery. But conventional trowelling and sieving of material from damp or water-logged deposits will simply destroy this evidence; and to put them in water when they are found (as has happened at at least one other site) will simply wash the ink off. They need special treatment and conservation.

A new source comparable to the writing-tablets is afforded by the ostraka from Mons Claudianus and Bu-Ngem. Both are exploited, along with the Vindolanda tablets and other material, as well as the papyri themselves, by K. STROBEL, *Rangordnung und Papyrologie* (pp. 93–111), a paper full of valuable insights. He properly laments the all too limited role previously played by papyri in this subject (including by Domaszewki). That this neglect is now a thing of the past is shown by the admirable contribution of R. HAENSCH, *A commentarius und commentariensis: Geschichte und Aufgaben eines Amtes im Spiegel seiner Titulaturen* (pp. 267–284). The same scholar's outstanding paper, of monograph length, R. HAENSCH, *Das Statthalterarchiv, Zeitschr. Savigny-Stiftung Rechtsgesch.* 109, 1992, 209–317, also deserves mention here. One will note also J.-J. AUBERT, *Policing the Countryside: soldiers and civilians in Egyptian villages in the third and fourth centuries A. D.* (pp. 257–265).

The various 'survey' or thematic papers not so far mentioned vary widely. G. BRIZZI, *La gerarchia militare in età repubblicana* (pp. 15–21), confined largely to literary sources (especially Livy), cannot offer much new. M. DUCLOS, *La hiérarchie militaire dans les sources littéraires* (pp. 47–51), offers a brief survey of imperial authors. Since he mentions the *Historia Augusta* in connection with *frumentarii*, he might have added a reference to F. PASCHOUD, *Frumentarii, agentes in rebus, magistriani, curiosi, veredarii: problèmes de terminologie. Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1979/81* (1983) 215–241. Duclos' paper is admirably supplemented by brief remarks of D. B. SADDINGTON, *Problems in military ranks and military personnel in Josephus* (pp. 53–55). Literary sources are also the focus of most of section VIII: C. VOGLER, *Les officiers de l'armée romaine dans l'œuvre d'Ammien Marcellin* (pp. 389–404); P. RICHARDOT, *Hiérarchie militaire et organisation légionnaire chez Végèce* (pp. 405–427); C. GIUFFRIDA-MANMANNA, *La testimonianza di Flavius Vegetius e Johannes Lydus sulla carriera del centurio* (pp. 429–438). One may now supplement Richardot's bibliography (in any case rather limited) by N. P. MILNER (transl. & ed.), *Vegetius: Epitome of Military Science* (1993). Giuffrida's citation of Aurelius Victor, *CAES.* 33, 34, on p. 431, n. 21, is mistaken: that passage is the famous reference to the „Edict of Gallienus“ (*ne imperium ad optimos nobilium transferretur, senatum militia vetuit et adire exercitum*). What is here cited, *virii militares, periti bellorum ac castrorum*, presumably derives from the HA, *Sev. Alex.* 16,3 (which actually reads *militares veteres et senes bene meritos et locorum peritos ac bellorum et castrorum et omnes litteratos et maxime eos, qui historiam novant*).

B. ISAAC, *Hierarchy and command-structure in the Roman army* (pp. 23–31), is focused more narrowly than his title suggests, on the role of centurions in the command structure (hence the piece might have been better located in section V), with important new considerations. The late E. FRÉZOUIS made a shot at a more general coverage in: *Le commandement et ses problèmes* (pp. 157–166), but this was not his strong point and it might have been better to omit this piece. Some of his comments are, at least in the second half of the paper, on the principate, frankly incomprehensible; and there are various errors of fact and interpretation. The often repeated notion that the „officiers supérieurs“ were amateurs, unlike their subordinates, crops up again. One would have liked to see somewhere in this volume a discussion of, e.g., A. Caecina Severus (cos. suff. 1 B. C.), who, so he claimed, *pluris per provincias quadraginta stipendia explevisset* (*TAC. ann.* 3, 33,1). (But length of service was not necessarily what a good general or army commander needed.) M. ABSIL, *La carrière antérieure (principalement militaire) des préfets du prétoire...* (pp. 167–174), lacks documentation and incorporates one or two slips (e.g. Tarutienus Paternus *a libellis* instead of *ab epistulis Latinis*; and the dating of Septicius Clarus' tenure is based on a mistaken interpretation of RMD I21). The often neglected *vigiles* are treated both by R. SABLAYROLLES, *La hiérarchie inférieure des vigiles: entre tradition et originalité* (pp. 129–137) and M. A. SPEIDEL, *Rang und Sold im römischen Heer und die Bezahlung der vigiles* (pp. 299–309), while M. REDDÉ offers

a brief survey of: La Rangordnung des marins (pp. 151–154), the Roman navy being a subject on which he is now the leading authority. C. CASTILLO, *Primipilares* (1978–1992) (pp. 211–220), offers a useful check-list on these officers that have become known since B. DOBSON, *Die Primipilares* (1978). P. ARNAUD, *Les mensores des légions: mensores agrarii ou mensores frumentarii?* (pp. 251–256), makes a convincing case for the latter of these alternatives being much commoner than the former. J. OTT, *Die Mechanismen bei der Beförderung von Beneficiariern der Statthalter* (pp. 285–290), briefly summarises work he has developed elsewhere (cf. now his dissertation: *Die Beneficiarius: Untersuchungen zu ihrer Stellung innerhalb der Rangordnung des römischen Heeres und zu ihrer Funktion*. *Hist. Einzelschr.* 92, 1995). It is odd that he cites the *Passio Fructuosi* and the Acts of Agape and her companions from Ruinart. H. MUSURILLO, *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs* (1972), while in many respects inadequate, is at least in most libraries. (A good deal more could be exploited for military matters from the martyr acts and from Christian sources generally than has so far been the case.) F. PIRET, *Les dévotions des centurions de l'armée romain du Rhin au miroir du documentation épigraphique* (pp. 231–237), is not without interest, although it is hard to see why the paper belongs in a volume about Rangordnung.

Epigraphy and a selection of literary sources dominate this volume. The more welcome, therefore, is the lone contribution by M. FEUGÈRE, *L'équipement des officiers dans l'armée romaine* (pp. 113–126, with eleven illustrations).

Düsseldorf

A. R. Birley