

weiteres gestempelt Bruchstück dieses Töpfers im Museum Worms bringt nur bereits bekannte Figuren (*Abb. 2*). Schwierig freilich ist es, sich ein Bild zu machen, in welchem Umfang der aus mittelgallischen Arbeiten dieses Töpfers bekannte Figurenschatz nach Blickweiler gelangt ist. Dies wäre sehr erleichtert worden, wenn ähnlich wie die nicht durch Stempel bezugten Figuren (unsigned types) auch die durch Stempel bezugten mit den Oswaldnummern auf S. 180 hätten zusammengestellt werden können. Solche Angaben finden sich gelegentlich bei anderen Töpfern, es hätte das Buch kaum wesentlich verteuert, wenn sie überall gemacht worden wären. Sie aus dem Index S. 285 zu gewinnen ist, wie der Versuch lehrt, ziemlich zeitraubend.

Wichtiger natürlich als diese Einzelheiten ist der Beitrag für die Chronologie der Fabrikate. Er beruht auf dem Vorkommen in gut datierten Straten neuerer Ausgrabungen in Großbritannien, denen wir auf dem Festland für das 2. Jahrhundert noch kaum Vergleichbares entgegenzusetzen haben. Nach Stanfield-Simpson gehören die Arbeiten des Austrus in Lezoux in die Jahre 125–150 n. Chr. Knorr setzte die Arbeitszeit des „Haupttöpfers“ von Blickweiler, der – ob nun Austrus oder sein Nachfolger – jedenfalls mit dem Figuren- und Dekorationsschatz des Austrus gearbeitet hat, in die Jahre 105–130! Weniger groß ist die Diskrepanz etwa für das Lezoux-Material vom Erdkastell der Saalburg (Saalb.–Jahrb. 9, 1939, 92), wo unter anderem Stücke des Sacer (nach den Verfassern 125–150 n. Chr.) vorkommen. Denn wir erkennen jetzt mehr und mehr, daß das Erdkastell der Saalburg zwar keine Gründung Hadrians ist, aber doch erst am Ende seiner Regierungszeit aufgegeben und durch ein Kohortenkastell ersetzt wurde (vgl. *Germania* 35, 1957, 117).

So bringt das vorliegende Buch gerade in seiner Beschränkung auf britisches oder doch in Großbritannien leicht erreichbares Material eine große Hilfe für Feld- und Museumsarbeit auf dem Festland. Möge es hier ein Ansporn für weitere Forschungen werden.

Frankfurt a. M.

Wilhelm Schleiermacher.

Dietrich Hafemann, Beiträge zur Siedlungsgeographie des römischen Britannien. I. Die militärischen Siedlungen. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Abhandlungen der mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Jahrgang 1956, Nr. 3. Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz. In Kommission bei Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, Wiesbaden 1956. 198 S., 15 Karten.

We have a saying in England that "the onlooker sees most of the game": it is perhaps not surprising that it has been left to a German geographer to write by far the most stimulating and useful survey of the siting of Roman fortresses and forts in Britain, and of their relationship to the native population-pattern; British as well as German readers will be additionally grateful to Dr. Hafemann for the very full bibliography with which he has furnished his study. It is a particular pleasure for me to be allowed to review for *Germania* a work which had its origins in the seminar which I had the privilege of conducting at Featherstone Park prisoner-of-war camp near Haltwhistle, Northumberland, where H. was one of the German officers who took an active part in studying the history and archaeology of Roman Britain. The scheme which he worked out in 1947, of which this is the first instalment, involved a detailed survey of the Siedlungsgeographie of Roman Britain, taking full account of the results of archaeological and topographical research – which has proliferated to such an extent that a less determined investigator might have been daunted at the idea of trying to master it, as H. has been able to do conspicuously well.

A detailed review would be out of place here, but it may be said at once that the present study – to be followed in due course by a survey of the civilian sector, towns and villages and *villae rusticae* – is full of interest. Not only does it provide a fuller conspectus of the published evidence than any English publication; it also offers some most stimulating suggestions for further research, notably in its analysis of the relationship between the sites selected for Roman military occupation and the lands which had already been cleared for cultivation by the native inhabitants. His analysis of the evidence for Wales in particular deserves special attention: H. shows reason for inferring a larger population in the hill-country of the Silures than has been postulated hitherto; in central Wales, he points out, the siting of forts such as Caersws in valley bottoms implies that they had already been cleared for cultivation before the Romans occupied the district; and he stresses the need for further investigation of the Roman road-system which linked the forts. Further north, his analysis of the evidence makes it clear that there must have been a far greater native population than our prehistorians have been able to infer from specific remains; for example, in Cumberland and Westmorland H. is certainly right in supposing (S. [139]) „daß durch die Bodenbestellung die Siedlungsreste zerstört wurden“: prolonged cultivation over the centuries has destroyed most of the evidence for the native population whose presence must be inferred from the siting and the road-links between Roman forts such as Watercrock and Ambleside. Some recent investigations, prompted by H.'s work, have shown that there was in fact pre-Roman occupation of several fort-sites in Cumberland – for example, Ravenglass, Maryport and Old Carlisle.

Many of the points made by H. obviously deserve the careful attention of people concerned with the investigation of other Roman provinces, notably in assessing the relationship between native settlements and the pattern of Roman military control in frontier districts. In that connection, it may be noted that an excellent book just published in England, *Town and Country in Roman Britain* by A. L. F. Rivet (Hutchinson, London 1958), will form an indispensable supplement to H.'s study, though its scheme precluded Mr. Rivet from paying more than passing attention to the areas of military government – Wales, north-west England and Scotland. With Rivet's book and the third edition of the Ordnance Survey Map of Roman Britain (1956, published too late for H. to be able to make use of it), German readers now have a full and really adequate basis for studying the anatomy and understanding many of the historical problems of Roman Britain; and the appearance of H.'s survey of non-military sites will be awaited with all the more eager anticipation because of the high quality of this first instalment.

One further new book deserves a brief mention, by way of postscript: *Roman and Native in North Britain*, edited by I. A. Richmond (Nelson, Edinburgh 1958), contains chapters contributed by five scholars who took part in a conference on Roman Scotland at Dumfries in 1953; its first chapter, by Stuart Piggott, is a brilliant exposition of the pastoral and largely nomadic economy of Britain north and west of the Jurassic Ridge – that is to say, of the whole of the area in which, from the time of Vespasian onwards, the army of Britain was concentrated: the chapter is of far greater importance for an understanding of British history in general than its incorporation in the present volume might suggest. The remaining chapters are full of interest, but their authors would all have profited if they had been able to study H.'s work before writing them.

Corbridge.

Eric Birley.