

**Alain Daubigney (Hrsg.)** Archéologie et rapports sociaux en Gaule. Annales Littéraires de l'Université de Besançon 290; Centre de Recherches d'Histoire Ancienne 54 (Les Belles Lettres, Paris 1984), 243 S. Broschiert.

This book comprises the thirteen papers delivered at a round-table conference which took place in Besançon in May, 1982, under the auspices of the CNRS. The conference was held to facilitate the exchange of ideas on the archaeology of Gaul, from the Bronze Age to the early Roman Empire, with special reference to its contribution to the study of social relations. Such relatively small and intimate gatherings of experts are usually productive, and the Besançon conference seems to have proved no exception. Explicit and implicit references in the text certainly indicate that it was a very lively occasion. Its proceedings make fascinating reading, and deserve a wide circulation. The volume is physically well produced, and its contents have been edited with care (I noticed only one major typographical error in the main text: a redundant "soit" on p. 85, Section 3, line 3; however, the List of Contents shows some carelessness in its checking). Indeed, since it closes with an excellent set of resumés, nothing would be served here by simply summarising the contents of each paper. Instead I will attempt to identify an comment upon the broader issues.

As the ancient peoples of western Europe became more successful in the exploitation of their physical environment they grew materially wealthier, as is evident from the increasing quantity and quality of the artefacts which have come down to us. For many years the most intensively studied of these remains were those discovered in a funerary context, and in the volume under review this tradition is well represented in the contributions of Daubigney ("Tombes et signes hiérarchiques en Champagne protohistorique: problèmes"), and Vuaillet ("Tumulus hallstadiens et société du premier Age du Fer en Franche-Comté"). More recently, however, in line with a growing interest in the evolution of the ancient landscape, there has been a move to reconstruct the living "habitat", be this construed as the domestic architecture of a single site (as here Passard, "Plan d'habitats au Néolithique et au début de l'Age de Bronze en Franche-Comté: éléments d'interprétation sociale"), or as the economy of a whole region, deduced from the distribution and chronology of all its settlements, field-systems and means of communication (thus Arcelin, "Evolution des rapports sociaux dans la basse vallée du Rhône au II<sup>e</sup> et I<sup>er</sup> siècles avant notre ère"; Buchsenschutz, "Structures d'habitats protohistoriques en Europe de l'Ouest et rapports sociaux"; Chouquer, "Cadastrés et sociétés des Gaules"; and Py "Evolution des rapports sociaux de la fin de l'Age du Bronze à la conquête romaine en Languedoc oriental"). As far as the development of Gaul is concerned, both approaches have led to certain important common conclusions, such as the identification of an increase in and diffusion of population (Chouquer, Passard, and Vuaillet) and, most of all, of growing specialisation and hierarchisation within and between communities (Buchsenschutz, Daubigney, Duval ["Economies et sociétés en Gaule non méditerranéenne - III<sup>e</sup>-I<sup>er</sup> siècle avant notre ère - d'après les données archéologiques"], Guillaumet ["La signification de Bibracte dans la cité des Eduens"], Passard, Py, and Vuaillet). The conventional explanation for the latter is the growing importance of trade and the emergence of a market economy, with particular emphasis being laid upon the economic stimulation resulting from contact with the more advanced peoples of the Mediterranean world, (so Arcelin, Daubigney, Guillaumet, Passard, Py, Vuaillet). Perhaps the most striking feature of the change was the beginning of Gallic urbanisation (Arcelin, Buchsenschutz, Daubigney, Guillaumet, and Py).

So far so good, but to establish how people were affected by these developments, and how they reacted towards them, is another matter. The editor, in his "Postface", laments that in the event most contributors tended to concentrate more on "archaeology and society" than on "archaeology and social relationships", which I take to mean that they used the archaeological evidence to produce objective explanations as to how and why Gallic society developed as it did in certain periods, but did not press further to examine the likely character of the resulting social structures, i. e. how they actually governed people's lives. This is hardly surprising: as Lévêque notes in his Introduction, this aspect of ancient society is the most difficult to grasp from the archaeology. Nevertheless, despite the absence of explicit statements by their authors, it is very noticeable that most papers in this volume are permeated by the conviction that change was for the worse: that for the mass of the Gallic population the price of specialisation and hierarchisation was exploitation and dependency. The villains of the piece are, in the first instance, indigenous landowning aristocrats; but always in the background lurks foreign imperialism, either of Marseille, or of Rome (so e. g. Arcelin, Chouquer, Py, Vertet ["Religion populaire et

rapport au pouvoir d'après les statuettes d'argile sous l'empire romain chez les Arvernes"])). Given the problems involved in the interpretation of the archaeological evidence already noted, I find such conviction difficult to understand. At one level it is perhaps ascribable to Marxist or neo-Marxist historiography, made manifest elsewhere, for example, in the continuing strong desire of at least two contributors (Chouquer and, much less convincingly, Fiches, "L'archéologie et la transformation des rapports sociaux dans la cité de Nîmes au Haut-Empire") to characterise the agricultural economy of the Roman Gaul as one dependent upon the large-scale exploitation of slave labour. However, behind this one can perhaps detect an even greater influence, namely Caesar's description of pre-Conquest Gallic society. This is clear in Buchsenschutz; and both Heinen ("Archéologie et rapports sociaux en Rhénanie: l'exemple des Trévières") and, especially, Daubigny look to the archaeology specifically to confirm the impression of extreme polarisation of wealth and power to be found in the *Bellum Gallicum*. In other words, our views of the basic social structure in (at least late-Iron Age and early-Roman) Gallic society owe more to the texts (Caesar; and later Tacitus: Heinen), and even medieval Celtic sources (Buchsenschutz) than to straight archaeology. This is an important distinction, since if such data had not survived there can be no doubt that the material remains might well be interpreted in quite a different way. In fact in respect of central and northern Gaul, as both Buchsenschutz and Duval note, the funerary evidence on its own seems to show, if anything, that La Tène society was much more egalitarian than that of the Hallstatt period. And while Daubigny makes a determined effort to accommodate the La Tène burials with Caesarian dependence, even he has to allow the great difficulties involved in such an interpretation, and to admit that the domestic architecture of the time cannot be said to confirm the notion of social differentiation. With regard to the south, it is instructive how Arcelin and Py have to invent otherwise unattested ruling classes – the former supposing the existence of a landowning aristocracy which put its wealth into consumable items, such as display and warfare, and the latter a tame "political" aristocracy which allowed the communities under its control to be ruthlessly exploited by Marseille – in order to set the remarkably homogeneous material remains of the region within a framework of dependency. There is seldom any serious consideration that the literary sources could be mistaken, and that, at least for some individuals and communities, the effect of economic change might have been beneficial, in weakening their dependence upon former social superiors. The exception is provided by Duval who, in probably the most controversial paper in the collection, argues that the manifest growth of commercial and artisanal specialisation in the late-La Tène period was a dangerous challenge to the great landowners. Of course in this he must be mistaken: he goes too far in seeing *oppida* virtually as forerunners of medieval Free Towns, and he avoids obvious questions concerning the means by which resources were mobilised to create and protect them, and to keep open their lines of communication. However, he recognises the need to treat the archaeological material on its own terms, free from preconception. Indeed, the idea that high Iron Age Gallic society was not exactly like that described by Caesar ties in well with my own thinking on the subject (see Drinkwater, *Roman Gaul*, 1983, pp. 176f; cf. De Boë's – "L'évolution des villas romaines dans le Nord de la Gaule: aspects sociaux de l'habitat rural", sadly available for publication only as an extended summary – observations concerning the apparent predominance of a "modest" landowning aristocracy in the north of the country in the Roman period); and a more positive reappraisal of the position of the earlier artisans and merchants might help to explain the subsequent emergence of the "trading" class here usefully brought to our attention by Heinen.

The analysis of social relationships from the conventional archaeological evidence has therefore to be treated with great care, and certainly with somewhat more circumspection than the majority of the contributors in the present volume have given it. However, there remains a category of archaeological evidence which can be employed more easily in such a context, because it comprises statements made by individuals about their situation. This includes, of course (to interpret "archaeology" in its widest sense), the information found in inscriptions, here so usefully employed by Heinen; but it also takes in the plastic arts. This brings us to Vertet's study of the religious statuettes of central Gaul, which I consider to be the most promising contribution in the collection. Vertet's proposal that such figures represent the lowest level of Gallo-Roman religion, beneath the conventionally accepted "official", "oriental" and "assimilated" forms, is extremely persuasive; and his suggestion that they reflect something of their worshippers' world picture is highly plausible. I feel that his suggestion that they express the poor's helpless and uncomprehending subjection to Rome is too pessimistic (because over-influenced by the prevailing negative tradition, discussed above). However, he has opened up an important new avenue

of research which may eventually lead to a much closer understanding of the mentality of the lower orders in Gallo-Roman society.

Finally, a number of contributors stress the relative novelty of their approach within a French archaeological tradition which has found it difficult to escape the twin constrictions of simple antiquarianism and the exegesis of texts. The concept of using archaeology to reconstruct ancient society as a whole indeed originated elsewhere, and owes much of its current impetus to Anglo-Saxon scholarship, particularly in the field of prehistory. It is something of a pity, therefore, to find British scholars of the standing of, for example, Collis and Nash, so little referred to in the bibliographies of the articles in this volume; and local archaeologists working in central and southern France would now be well advised to take note of the researches of Mills (e. g. N. Mills, "Iron Age settlement in Europe: contributions from field-surveys in central France", in S. Macready and F. H. Thompson [eds.], *Archaeological Field-Survey in Britain and Abroad*. Society of Antiquaries [London 1985], 74–100).

*John F. Drinkwater, Sheffield*

**Heinz Menzel**, *Die römischen Bronzen aus Deutschland III: Bonn* (Verlag Philipp v. Zabern, Mainz 1986) Text. VIII, 215 S.; Tafeln. IV S., 180 Taf. Leinen, 235,- DM.

Mit der Vorlage der römischen Bronzen im Besitz des Rheinischen Landesmuseums Bonn hält der Leser ein weiteres Werk von Heinz Menzel in Händen, dessen Zielsetzung die katalogmäßige Aufarbeitung einer wichtigen Gruppe von Erzeugnissen antiker Kleinkunst ist.

Das vom Verf. zugrunde gelegte Konzept geht davon aus, daß nicht die Bronzen eines Fundortes oder einer Region bearbeitet werden, sondern daß der Besitz eines bestimmten Museums aufgearbeitet werden soll. In gleicher Weise verfuhr der Verf. bei seiner Vorlage der Bronzen des Historischen Museums der Pfalz in Speyer (im Jahre 1960) und der des Rheinischen Landesmuseums Trier (im Jahre 1966). Dieser Ansatz bringt es mit sich, daß der Bonner Bronzenband zum Beispiel ein Stück mit Fundort Herculaneum (Nr. 464) verzeichnet. Solche von weit entfernten Fundstellen kommende Stücke bleiben allerdings die große Ausnahme; grundsätzlich darf man wohl davon ausgehen, daß die Bronzensammlung eines Museums einen Einblick in die für die Region typischen Dekorationsstücke gibt, in der es beheimatet ist.

Das Bonner Material erweist sich als sehr umfangreich. 582 Stücke werden katalogmäßig erfaßt und in einem separaten Band im Maßstab 1:1 auf 180 Tafeln mit 837 Abbildungen dem Leser plastisch vor Augen geführt. Von sich gelegentlich einschleichenden Unschärfen abgesehen eröffnen die in der Regel sehr guten Abbildungen zusammen mit den Katalogtexten dem Betrachter eine Fülle von Details dieser sehr kleinformatigen Statuetten, Zier- und Gebrauchsgegenstände.

Die Texte, die der Verfasser zu den einzelnen Objekten liefert, gliedern sich in Beschreibung und kurzen Kommentar; weiterführende Literaturangaben oder Hinweise auf Parallelen werden angefügt. Die straffe Gestaltung und die deutliche Konzentration auf das angesprochene Objekt machen den hohen Wert der Arbeit als Katalogwerk aus.

Der Text wird ergänzt durch die Angabe der Inventarnummern der Stücke und ihres Fundortes – hier seien einige Anmerkungen gestattet: Die Inventarnummern des Rheinischen Landesmuseums Bonn lassen den Kundigen anhand der vor die eigentliche Nummer gestellten Großbuchstaben erkennen, aus welcher der in das Museum integrierten Sammlungen ein Stück stammt. Der Verfasser weist im Vorwort auf die kurze Geschichte der Bonner Sammlung in Hans Lehnert's „Führer durch das Provinzialmuseum in Bonn“ (2. Aufl. 1924) hin; diese Zusammenstellung hätte ohne Probleme in das Vorwort aufgenommen werden können und so dem Leser, der Lehnert's Führer nicht griffbereit hat, die Suche erleichtert. Die zusätzliche Angabe des Fundjahres würde anzeigen, ob es sich bei den Stücken um Altfunde oder um Erwerbungen neuerer Zeit handelt.

Auch wäre ein sorgsameres Umgang mit den Fundortangaben wünschenswert. Die Fundorte sollten, wenn möglich, genauer angegeben werden; der Hinweis auf die Quelle (zumeist wird es wohl das Inventarbuch gewesen sein) wäre günstig. Erstaunlich ist die Fundortangabe einer Mänadenbüste (Nr. 299): „allgemein Belgica“ heißt es im Text, „aus der Belgica“ im Tafelband. Hier würde man gerne die