

Cristina-Georgeta Alexandrescu, Christian Gugl und Barbara Kainrath (Herausgeber), *Troesmis I. Die Forschungen von 2010–2014*. With contributions by the editors and Werner Eck, Gerald Grabherr, Barbara Kainrath, Adriana Panaite, Roman Sauer, Alice Waldner. Publisher Mega, Cluj-Napoca 2016. 554 pages, 110 plates.

The volume under review publishes the first results of a Romanian-Austrian survey project (Troesmis-Projekt) which ran at Troesmis for five years. The initial goals are reminded by the two coordinators, Cristina-Georgeta Alexandrescu and Christian Gugl: the exact location of the fortress of the V Macedonica legion and the size of the canabae; the locations of the different graveyards around the fortress; the research of the physical remains of the so-called Eastern and Western forts of Troesmis (two massive ruins that still can be seen in the Troesmis area), in order to verify the different hypotheses regarding the time of their construction and their role; the street network around the Troesmis fortress and the water supply system. The last goal of the project was to locate different settlements in the Troesmis area, using both archaeological and epigraphical finds (pp. 11 s.). A second volume to cover the research activities of 2014 and 2015 is in preparation (p. 13).

The volume consists of seventeen chapters, including the acknowledgements (Chapter 1, pp. 9 s.), the introduction (Chapter 2, pp. 11–13), the summary (Chapter 13, pp. 531–541), a list of abbreviations (Chapter 14, p. 542), a bibliography (Chapter 15, pp. 543–552), the credits for the illustration (Chapter 16, p. 553), and a list of the authors (also by mistake Chapter 16, but correctly labelled in the contents, p. 554).

The first chapter, by Alexandrescu and Gugl, describes the topography and the landscape of the Troesmis area (Chapter 3, pp. 15–28), the changes of the landscape since the Second World War, the agro-industrial plant at the end of the seventies, when rescue excavations were performed by a team of the county Tulcea museum.

Chapter 4 by Alexandrescu deals with the one hundred and fifty years of research at Troesmis and archives information (pp. 29–74). It ends with Ambroise Baudry's unpublished archaeological report, preserved in the French archives, discovered by the author (pp. 68–74). Up to this project, archaeological information on Troesmis was poor, even the exact location of the legionary fortress was unknown. The research focused on the two later forts, the Eastern fortification, dated between the fourth and sixth century and the Western fortification of the Byzantine period, tenth to twelfth century. During the excavations many reused stones bearing inscriptions came up to light and made the site famous, but too little was found concerning the different occupation layers, archaeological features and complexes, chronology, architectural style and method of construction, not to speak about the different types of archaeological materials. With the exception of the small-scale rescue excavations of 1977, we may conclude with the author that the site was nearly unknown from the archaeological point of view.

The methods and principal activities of the 2010–2014 project are described by the editors together with Barbara Kainrath, Gerald Grabherr and Alice Waldner (Chapter 5, pp. 75–87). A wide range of methods was employed: remote sensing, geodesic measurements, building documentation, geophysical prospections (geomagnetic and radar scan), field walking survey (line walking method), and archaeometric analysis on stone, mortar and glass.

The sixth chapter (Alexandrescu, Gugl and Kainrath) is dedicated to the Eastern fortification (pp. 89–127), a typical late Roman fort, similar in shape to other later Roman forts such as Capidava or Dinogetia, which accommodated detachments of the two attested legions of the Scythia province: legio Prima Iovia and legio Secunda Herculia (CIL III 6174 = ILS 683 = IGLR 237, where the name of one of the two legions is attested, probably the Prima Iovia and not the Secunda Herculia as was previously presumed, A. D. 309/310). Some parts of the ruins are still evident above ground. The team has documented all the visible features, such as towers, ramparts and inside buildings, integrating the older published records. Still the relation of this late Roman fort and the early Roman structures of the Municipium Aurelium Troesmense remains unclear. Only future archaeological excavations can answer this question. At the Lower Danube by the

end of the third century, older structures were often enlarged, for example the so-called Oescus II and Novae II, a smaller fort at Troesmis, was probably raised *à fundamentis*. The fort, built at the beginning of the fourth century, several times under repair, lasted up to the sixth century, judging by archaeological material discovered in the nineteenth century. Given the small size of the late Roman fort, it is not all clear whether it could also receive the civilians in its walls? If not, where is the late Roman civilian settlement at Troesmis supposed to be located? Further details and analyses on the internal buildings (the headquarters and the early Christian churches) will be given in the next volume of the Troesmis series (p. 127).

The few visible ruins of the Western fortification are presented in the seventh chapter by the same authors as before (pp. 129–150). The features point to ruins of a Byzantine stronghold from the tenth to twelfth century (see also the concentration of medieval material culture, pp. 438–440, fig. 169 and p. 444). Comparing with the Eastern fortification, only small-scale excavations were performed in 1861 (Desire More) and 1939 (Emil Coliu), which both led to the discovery of many inscriptions.

In the eighth chapter, the same authors together with Gerald Grabherr focus on the early Roman settlements (pp. 151–195). The most important result is the identification and location of the legionary fortress (pp. 168–173 and 188–192), the canabae (pp. 174–179 and 192–195), the military amphitheatre (presented by Gugl in chapter 10, pp. 445–449), and the graveyards (pp. 179–188). The epigraphically attested civil settlement (*vicus* or *civitas*) was not located. The Getic settlement seems to have been overlapped by the Western fortification, but this is not sure at all, since some traces were found east and north of the Eastern fortification, too (see also p. 433: »Das heißt aber auch, dass die Verbreitung der vorlegionslagerzeitlichen Funde keine sicheren Anhaltspunkte für die Lokalisierung einer älteren Siedlung in Troesmis bietet«). Unfortunately, the authors have not taken into consideration a possible Thracian stronghold, mentioned as such by Ovid (Pont. 4, 9, 78–79), which would not have covered a larger area. Therefore, one can consider that the Byzantine fortification overlapped the area of the former Thracian stronghold.

The exact size of the fortress is not known, since the western side, facing the Danube, where the *porta praetoria* was located, is destroyed by erosion. Therefore the authors give four different reconstruction proposals (p. 190 fig. 137), assuming that probably the smaller, the fourth variant should be taken into consideration.

The canabae spread on two sides of the fortress, in the north-eastern area (26 hectares, with houses aligned to the street network, the so called

»Streifenhäuser«, and in the north (p. 192, smaller in size). The amphitheatre was located almost at the south-eastern corner of the fortress (p. 448, Fig. 174–175). North and north-east of the canabae a huge graveyard (30 hectares) was discovered, containing different types of graves. A border trench between the canabae and the graveyard was also identified.

An important part of the volume is dedicated to the material culture discovered during the field surveys of 2012 and 2013 (Chapter 9 by Waldner, Kainrath and Alexandrescu, pp. 197–444, 11.872 artefacts!), mostly ceramics (La Tène, Hellenistic, Roman, Late Roman and Byzantine), but also building materials (bricks and tiles, some bearing the stamps of the V Macedonica, I Italica and XI Claudia legions –, imbrices, clay water pipes, and stones), bronze items, small finds, glass and six coins (from the Augustan to the later Roman period). An important selection is illustrated (photos and drawings) and listed into a very useful catalogue (pp. 248–428). The authors provide a perfect survey of the type of archaeological material that can be found in the Troesmis area.

In the tenth chapter Gugl, Kainrath and Adriana Panaite raise some questions regarding the settlement of Troesmis and its surrounding area (chapter 10, pp. 445–482). First the problem of the localisation of the amphitheatrum castrumense is treated in the larger context of this type of building in the vicinity of the legionary fortresses in the Rhine and Danube area (pp. 445–449). The amphitheatre was definitely identified almost at the south-eastern corner of the fortress. An inventory of the Roman period settlements and street network in the area around Troesmis is given (pp. 449–458; 451 fig. 176). Surprisingly, we read the spelling »beneficarii consularis« instead of the most common »beneficarii consularis« (for their attestation in the statio at Nifon, v. Inscriptiones Scythiae Minoris [1980] [following: ISM] V, 247 s.). Regarding the possible statio or even fortlet at Horia, I want to stress that Annaeus Pulcher was »centurio legionis V Macedonicae regionarius« and not »frumentarius« as was previously believed (ISM V, 239). Therefore, the area of Horia was in fact a »regio« under the surveillance of the »regionarii«. The burial mounds (in the larger Lower Moesian context) and the water supply system are presented by Gugl and Kainrath (pp. 458–473).

In chapter 11 Werner Eck presents two bronze tables, displaying parts of the *lex municipii* Troesmensium (pp. 483–514), issued during Marcus Aurelius' and Commodus' joint reign (pp. 177–180). An extended version was published in the same year as the book under review, wherein the reader can follow the whole discussion (W. Eck, *Zeitschr. Papyr. u. Epigr.* 200, 2016, 565–606). The entire name of the municipium, according to the law, was *Municipium Marcum Aurelium Antoninum et Lucium Aurelium Commodum Augustum Troesmensium* (p. 497).

Moreover, it was a *municipium civium Romanorum* (this puts an end to an older discussion on a possible Latin right municipia in Moesia inferior), therefore the core of the municipium was the *conventus civium Romanorum*, but which one?

The duality between canabae on the one hand and vicus or civitas Troesmensium on the other hand has generally been admitted (R. Vulpe, *Canabenses și Troesmenses. Două inscripții inedite din Troesmis. Stud. și Cercetări Ist. Veche* 4, 1953, fasc. 3–4, 557–582). The »cives Romani consistentes« lived apparently in the canabae, as attested in: »c(ives) R(omani) cons(istentes) canab(is) leg(ionis) V Mac(edonicae)« (ISM V, 141, l. 3–4), and »vet(erani) et c(ives) R(omani) cons(istentes) ad / canab(as) leg(ionis) V Ma(cedonicae)« (CIL III 6166 = ISM V 154, l. 10–11). The same applies to the vicus or civitas, simply called Troesmis: »c(ives) R(omani) Tr[oesmi] consist(entes)?« (CIL III 6167 = ISM V 157). The *ordo Troesmensium* before the municipium is also epigraphically attested (CIL III 6195 = AE 1950, 170 = ISM V 143; CIL III 6182 = ISM V 144; CIL III 6183 = ILS 1116 = ISM V 145). The question remains, which in fact was the core of the municipium, the »veterani et cives Romani consistentes« from the canabae, the »cives Romani Troesmi (?) consistentes«, or both? Since the legion was transferred to Potaissa for almost a decade (in fact the legion was sent to the East already in 162 and there is no information that it has returned to Troesmis before being sent to Potaissa, see the discussion p. 447 s.) one should probably take into consideration that the two settlements simply merged together. From the archaeological point of view, it seems that the municipium overlapped the former legionary fortress, but further archaeological excavations have to prove that.

The volume ends with a report by Gugl and Roman Sauer on the archaeometric analyses of the mortar and stone (chapter 12, p. 515–530) and a summary in German, English and Romanian (p. 531–541).

We can conclude that the project is a success, and we have to thank Alexandrescu and Gugl as well as the entire team for their wonderful job and the highly interesting volume. Their research is a cornerstone for future projects in the Troesmis area. As mentioned before, by far the most important results are the identification of different early Roman structures: the legion fortress, the canabae legionis, the amphitheatrum militare and the huge graveyard. For an area practically unknown before, the results are an important step forward. Through this volume the Troesmis site gains an outstanding recognition as one of the most important Roman centres of the Lower Danube area.