

Il n'est malheureusement pas possible de rendre compte ici, dans le détail, de tous les chapitres concernant l'étude du mobilier; tous ne fournissent d'ailleurs pas des données chronologiques aussi précises que les fibules. Mais G. Ulbert s'attache, pour chaque catégorie, à préciser la fonction (anneaux de strigiles) ou la datation (vaisselle de bronze) d'objets qui n'étaient bien souvent, jusqu'alors, que peu ou mal connus. Malgré l'ampleur de la documentation bibliographique sur lesquelles s'appuie l'A., le déséquilibre des recherches entre les provinces occidentales et l'Italie elle-même limite, bien souvent, la portée synthétique de ces chapitres. Malgré cette lacune, G. Ulbert peut néanmoins dans la plupart des cas replacer les petits objets de Cáceres dans leur contexte culturel et typologique. Les passages consacrés à l'armement viennent, eux aussi, apporter des précisions fondamentales à notre connaissance, encore si imparfaite, de cette catégorie de mobilier à la fin de la République (les jalons bien datés entre Numance et Alésia sont en effet particulièrement rares).

Si l'étude céramologique contribue elle aussi, du moins grâce aux éléments les mieux datés (lampes, Campanienne B, parois fines, amphores Dr. 1B et 1C, Lamb. 2 et Beltran 85), à placer l'ensemble du gisement dans la première moitié du Ier s. av. J.-C., c'est sur l'inventaire des monnaies que repose, en dernier ressort, le principal argument archéologique pour fixer le terminus ante quem (G. Ulbert note [p.182 et 187] l'absence de toute amphore de type gréco-italique et Dr. 1A, alors que ces deux types sont représentés à Numance. L'écart chronologique entre les deux sites ne suffit pas à expliquer totalement cette absence: des amphores Dr. 1A se rencontrent encore assez fréquemment, sur les sites du littoral languedocien ou catalan, au début de la deuxième moitié du Ier s. av. J.-C.). Confrontée, comme on l'a vu, aux données historiques et topographiques, la datation du camp de Cáceres dans les premières décennies du Ier s., et principalement une dizaine d'années jusque vers 80 environ, semble donc très correctement établie.

Bien que la qualité des observations de terrain limite à plusieurs reprises l'exploitation qu'a pu en faire l'A., il est certain que le laps du temps écoulé depuis la fouille n'a pas été préjudiciable à A. Schulten: Cáceres el Viejo trouve avec ce volume la publication de qualité que méritait le site. Tous ceux qui, en Europe continentale, s'intéressent aux relations avec l'Italie à la fin de l'Âge du fer remercieront G. Ulbert de leur avoir donné, avec Cáceres el Viejo, une monographie aussi précieuse que les publications des sites classiques de La Tène III.

Lattes

Michel Feugère

P. J. Woods and B. C. Hastings, Rushden: The Early Fine Wares. With contributions by V. Rigby, D. Mackreth, D. Sutherland. Edited and revised by K. Brown. Northamptonshire County Council, Northamptonshire 1984. 118 Seiten mit zahlreichen Abbildungen.

Before embarking onto a detailed consideration of this book, it seems advisable to set it into the context of recent developments in the study and publication of Roman pottery, for there have been considerable changes in the style of archaeological publication in Britain in the last ten years. Because of the relative paucity of Romano-British monumental remains and literary documentation, much more emphasis has been placed upon the *minutiae* of the physical excavated evidence than in many other provinces of the empire. In addition to the traditional role of ceramic study (the establishment of typologies to determine site chronologies) pottery has become a specialised field of study in its own

right. Its academic validity has been assisted by the general growth of interest in economics amongst archaeologists, and the ever-increasing range of scientific techniques and methodological approaches available to them.

The implications of books such as D. P. S. Peacock's *Ceramics and trade* (1977), combined with the enormous quantities of pottery recovered in the major rescue excavations of the 1960s and 1970s, led to an attempt to set standards for publication. It was recognised that the fragmented structure of British archaeology had led to numerous incompatible approaches to the study and presentation of Roman pottery; the Department of the Environment, the body responsible for state-funded excavations, set up a steering committee on Roman pottery (SCORP), which produced *Guidelines for the processing and publication of Roman pottery from excavations* (ed. C. J. Young [1980]).

The Guidelines set out basic standards, but in many ways these came into conflict with the recommendations of a different Department of the Environment committee, about publication in general. The "Frere report" (*Principles of publication in rescue archaeology*, Department of the Environment [1975]) defined four levels of information, only one of which (a synthesis of the structural history of a site, with selected key dating evidence) merited full-scale publication in printed form; much of the new detailed work in progress on pottery was in danger of being relegated to unpublished archives, or condensation onto microfiche, a medium disliked by much of the archaeological community.

The site at Rushden is on the south side of the Nene Valley in Northamptonshire, near to the small Roman town of Irchester. The Nene Valley will be well known to pottery specialists as the production centre for "Castor ware", one of the predominant colour-coated fine ware industries of Roman Britain from the mid-second to the fourth centuries A.D. The fine wares which are the subject of this stylish A4 paperback book are much earlier in date, and have a distribution restricted to a small area of Northamptonshire alone. The following justification for its publication can be found on the back cover, and similar remarks in the foreword reinforce it to the extent of over-statement:

"The scale of the Rushden site, spreading over 5.5 hectares, was most impressive but it was the pottery, manufactured at the site in the early Roman period, which proved to be of major importance ... Because of the widespread interest aroused by this material, it was considered appropriate that a report should be published with emphasis on the pottery and its significance, both historically and from the viewpoint of ceramic development."

The reader is surely entitled to ask how such a small quantity of unique pottery can possibly be more important than the publication of a massive Iron Age and Roman period settlement? Furthermore, does this volume conform to the recommendations of the Guidelines for the processing and publication of Roman pottery from excavations, and the recent discussions of the levels of information which should see the light of day in published form?

The contents of the book are logically presented, including the minimum relevant site details, and some dating evidence provided by brooches (p. 107–109). However, it must be stressed that the phasing of the site must be taken entirely on trust without a full excavation report; recording took place under "salvage" conditions, and the site apparently existed between 100 B.C. and A.D. 250. These circumstances must surely have implications for the extent of disturbance and rubbish-survival on the site, with consequent doubts about the validity of the sparse dating evidence for its periods and their individual phases. The "Intrusive Group" of potters whose wares are described in the report appeared in Period III, dated c. A.D. 45–60, and their pottery is associated with working areas and kilns related to two pre-existing enclosures (p. 7 fig. 3.2). The forms they produced share some elements with the "Gallo-Belgic influenced" pottery found on the site since the beginning of the first

century A.D., but are most remarkable because of the variety of finely-made forms and the extensive use of painted decoration.

All of the "Intrusive Group" pottery clearly belongs to a La Tène tradition; the platters, elegant butt-beakers and narrow-necked flasks suggest Gallo-Belgic sources, whilst the carinated and triple-legged bowls are presumably related to those found in Switzerland and south Germany, where the fashion for painted decoration can also be found (e.g. G. Ulbert, *Die römischen Donaukastelle Aislingen und Burghöfe*. *Limesforsch.* 1 [1959] Taf. 6; E. Ettliger, Ch. Simonett, *Römische Keramik aus den Schutthügeln von Vindonissa*. *Veröffentl. Ges. Pro Vindonissa* 3 [1952] Taf. 3). The first century A.D. obviously provided plenty of scope for regional forms and styles to overlap on the continent, as Roman occupation broke down earlier cultural frontiers; there is no reason why an "Intrusive Group" of continental potters should arrive with a pure repertoire of forms derived from a single region. The book contains a brief but sensible discussion of the significance of the pottery in relation to its continental and local connections (p. 35–38), which tends to gloss over the geographical diversity of the former, partly by assuming that Manching is a site in the Rhineland. It ends on the interesting (but debatable) observation that the use of painted decoration on Nene Valley pottery in later centuries is in fact part of a continuous tradition. The kilns used by the "Intrusive Group" of potters should be assessed in the broader context of Woods' earlier article about them (*Britannia* 5, 1974, 262–281) and the more recent comprehensive *Pottery kilns of Roman Britain* by V. G. Swan (1984).

It is very difficult to assess the significance of the "Intrusive Group" without quantified presentation in the manner recommended in the SCORP Guidelines; the catalogue consists of "... all the recognisable vessel forms and types of decoration present in the collection of Intrusive Group pottery recovered from Rushden" (p. 39). The find-contexts cited with each pot's description do not reveal whether only the stratified material was searched, or if these really do represent all of the vessels found over the full 5.5 hectares. Whilst the relative percentages of vessels in each fabric type are stated (p. 40), we are not informed what proportion of the total pottery these vessels actually formed, nor whether the percentages represent individual pots, sherd totals or weights.

It is really important to have some idea of the quantities involved, from pit-groups or other suitable contexts, in terms of weight, estimated vessel equivalents, or some other valid standardised measure. If we are to accept that potting was a major activity displacing settlement (p. 13), this evidence is vital. Another missing aspect concerns the functions of the pottery in relation to terra sigillata and other fine and coarse wares. Did any of the excavated contexts relate to use, rather than wastage from manufacture?

There can be no argument about the quality of the presentation of this report; it is attractively printed on high quality paper, and the line drawings are clear and crisp. However, the pottery drawings are generously spaced, and many are reproduced at both 1:3 and 1:1. Would the whole report not have been better presented in less lavish form as a paper in the periodical *Britannia*, like Woods' earlier report on the kilns 1974? The discussion would have benefited from expansion, whilst most of the detailed information about the pottery itself could have been documented in a more rigorously quantified form, and preserved in an archive for consultation by interested scholars. As it is, the Rushden book highlights some of the problems which have to be faced in Romano-British archaeology; if every category of material from the site had to be presented in similar detail, however long would full publication take?

Priorities must be determined, and if possible, basic information about sites should be published before monographs on selected categories of finds appear in isolation. Otherwise, Roman archaeology will disintegrate into separate sub-disciplines, which will prove ever

harder to integrate into a meaningful account of this important stage of world history. The reviewer apologises to the authors of this report for using it as a vehicle for commenting on wider problems in publication which are not of their making, and he is aware that he has committed the same sin, by producing a volume on selected pottery before the full presentation of the site evidence (Greene, Report on the excavations at Usk 1965–1976. The pre-Flavian fine wares [1979]).

Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Kevin Greene

Ulf Näsmann, Glas och handel i senromersk tid och folkvandringstid. En studie kring glas från Eketorp II, Öland, Sverige. Archaeological Studies, Uppsala University Institute of North-European Archaeology (= AUN) 5, Uppsala 1984. 166 Seiten, 3 Diagramme, 2 chronologische Schemata, 1 Typentafel, 13 Karten und zahlreiche Abbildungen. Englische Zusammenfassung.

Ausgangspunkt dieser Abhandlung sind die in der Burganlage Eketorp, Öland, gefundenen Glasscherben der späten Kaiserzeit und der Völkerwanderungszeit.

Ziel der Abhandlung (S. 13) ist – von den Glasfragmenten ausgehend – erstens die Art und den Umfang der äußeren Beziehungen Ölands der Zeit von 300 bis 700 n. Chr. zu beleuchten und zweitens die Fragen der Chronologie, der Provenienz und der Distribution der Gläser zu studieren. Leider sind die Gläser der Vendel- und Wikingerzeit in der Abhandlung ausgelassen.

Die Glasfunde Skandinaviens stammen hauptsächlich aus Gräbern, deren Inventar im Laufe der Zeit von der lokalen Grabsitte – Brand- oder Körperbestattung – beeinflusst ist. In der Einleitung diskutiert der Verfasser die damit verbundenen Fehlerquellen und weist u. a. auf die neuen Siedlungsuntersuchungen hin, die das Verbreitungsbild der Glasfunde verändert haben. Eine Übersicht mit Kartierung der Funde, sowohl der nordeuropäischen als auch der südosteuropäischen, wäre daher als Diskussionsgrundlage für einen Vergleich zu den glasführenden Gräbern von Interesse. Das Glasmaterial von Eketorp ist gering und fragmentarisch. Es umfaßt 47 Scherben von facettgeschliffenen Bechern, Nuppengläsern und Fußbechern mit Fadenauflege. Sie verteilen sich auf sieben Typen: Eketorp 1–6 und Eketorp 8 (Typentaf. S. 151, Nr. 2; 4; 11; 16; 20; 21; 26). Dazu kommen Scherben von einem Überfangglas (Eketorp 7). Jeder Typ ist nur mit einem Exemplar vertreten, mit Ausnahme des Typs Eketorp 8, Fußbecher mit Fadenauflege, der wahrscheinlich mit sechs Exemplaren vertreten ist.

Die Glasfunde von Eketorp sind zu wenig, um einen selbständigen Beitrag zur Glasgeschichte der Periode zu ergeben. Näsmans Folgerungen betreffs Chronologie und Provenienz stützen sich auf die in anderen Arbeiten über Glas gezogenen Schlüsse. Die Eketorp-Siedlung enthält Glasformen sowohl aus weströmischen Gebieten (Eketorp 2) als auch aus dem Schwarzmeerraum (Eketorp 3; 5–7). Einige Glasformen (Eketorp 4 und 8) verlegt Näsmann hypothetisch in südgermanische Gebiete, obwohl diese Glastypen dort nicht vorhanden sind (S. 56 und 91).

Bei den in Skandinavien gefundenen Schliffgläsern ist es in vielen Fällen nicht möglich, die Provenienzfrage befriedigend zu beantworten, z. B. der Gläser mit kompliziertem Medaillonschliff (S. 66f. und Typentaf. S. 151 Nr. 25), die auch innerhalb der römischen Grenzen gefunden werden (Pécs und Richborough). Zu den Überfanggläsern zählt auch ein fragmentarischer Becher aus Westnorwegen, der auf Typentafel S. 151 Nr. 25 vollständig rekonstruiert ist. Vom Original fehlen sowohl der Randteil als auch ein größerer Teil der Wandung.