
The first paper is indeed an overview of the main results of the *Troesmis – Project* (2011-2012), by Cristina-Georgeta Alexandrescu and Christian Gugl (pp. 9-22). Mentioning all previous preliminary reports, the authors state that "our interests in this region focus on the most significant settlement transformation processes, from the Roman imperial age to the late Antiquity and the Byzantine period" (p. 9). Previously the area was practically not investigated from an archaeological point of view. A small scale excavation, performed by Emil Coliu in 1939 at the northern rampart of the western fortification, whose results, with the exception of an important inscription, are unknown, and a rescue excavation near the two late Roman fortifications, with the occasion of the construction of an agro-industrial complex in 1977, were the only moments when the site was investigated. During the second half of the 19th century, a French archaeological expedition made a survey of the site and small scale excavation, bringing some inscriptions to light. Thereafter, the site was...
investigated by Gr. Tocilescu and P. Polonic in 1882.\(^8\)

Without any hesitation the most important result of the *Troesmis* – Project is the clear localization, by geomagnetic prospection (see into this respect Gerald Grabherr and Barbara Kainrath’s paper, pp. 23-32), of the legionary fortress of the *V Macedonica* legion. The legion garrisoned at *Troesmis* between Trajan’s Dacian war and AD 162,\(^9\) when it was sent in Lucius Verus’ Eastern campaign and was never returned to *Troesmis*, being settled at Potissa, Dacia, in AD 168.\(^10\) Up to this moment, the exact location of the fortress was unknown. The *canabae legioni*, known also from the epigraphic material,\(^11\) were also identified on the ground, laying to the east and west in the vicinity of the fortress. At the south-eastern corner, an *amphitheatrum castrense* was also identified. Two graveyards, east and south of the fortress, were also highlighted by means of geomagnetic prospection. Curiously, no traces of the civilian settlement, the *vicus*, epigraphically attested,\(^12\) were found. It is likely that it lies outside the prospected area, perhaps a little bit further eastward. This area has only been surveyed by Airborne Laser Scanning (p. 17, fig. 10), being divided from the *canabae legioni* by the eastern and north-eastern graveyard of the fortress, although one could also expect to find the civilian *vicus* north of the fortress, also on the Danube, as is the case of the civilian *vicus* from Durostorum, at Ostrov\(^13\) (the future *municipium Aureum Durostorum*) and the civilian *vicus* of Novae, at Ostrite Mogili (see Agnieszka Tomas’ paper, pp. 191-204). Furthermore, the relations between the fortress, the *municipium* that certainly overlapped the former legionary fortress, and the two late antique fortifications – the so-called eastern and western fortifications, are still unclear.

Moreover, since it is pretty clear that the *municipium’s* structures must have overlapped the legionary fortress, one might ask what happened with the legionary fortress during the 15 years, between 162 and 177, when the legion was away and no *municipium* existed? The authors do not want to take into consideration the possible presence of a detachment of the *I Italica* legion from Novae (pp. 18-19), although a centurion of that legion set a monument, probably a statue base, in *Tib. Claudius Pompeianus’* honour, Marcus Aurelius’ son in law.\(^14\) It is also possible that a detachment of the *VMacedonica* legion, probably an entire *cohors*, had been left behind to defend the legionary fortress and to maintain its structures. When it was sent to the East, no one envisaged that the legion was never to return to its fortress. Therefore, in my opinion, the fortress was still functioning. The civilian settlements, the *canabae* and the civilian *vicus*, continued their existence, as it has been proved by *T. Valerius Marcianus’* inscription, born *castris* (*canabae legioni*), who came back to his *lares* (*reversus at *(sic) *lares suis*) after AD 170 (*missus honesta missione in Dacia, Cethego et Claro consulibus, sub Cornelio Clemente*),\(^15\) and by the inscriptions raised by *ordo Troesmentium* to honour the governors of Lower Moesia after AD 162.\(^16\)

One should have expected, similar to the situation in Oescus and Novae, an enlargement of the *municipium* precinct in order to garrison the *legio I Iovia Scythica* (see, for the presence of this legion at *Troesmis* starting with the Tetrarchic period, Mihai Zahariade’s paper, pp. 165-176) in the late 3rd century. No traces of such enlargement are to be found, only two completely separate fortifications, although their exact chronological frame is not entirely known. If one could think that the eastern fortification could be positively identified as the legionary fortress of the *I Iovia Scythica* legion, then the western fortification would most probably date from the Byzantine period (10th–12th century),\(^17\) but no direct evidence is available. Moreover, given its small dimensions, it is unclear whether the legionary fortress could also receive the civilians between its walls? And if not, where is the late Roman civilian settlement at *Troesmis* supposed to be located?

No traces of the settlement mentioned by Ovid were identified either (p. 18). In that time, *Troesmis* was almost surely the stronghold of a Thracian strategy – and not a Roman settlement – like in the epigraphically attested case of Axiopolis\(^18\) and Aegyssus, also mentioned by
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\(^8\) *ISM* V, pp. 156-157.

\(^9\) In AD 162, the legion was still at *Troesmis*, CIL III 6169 = *ISM* V 159.

\(^10\) Matei-Popescu 2010, pp. 52-53.
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\(^12\) CIL III 6167 = *ISM* V 157; AE 1960, 337 = *ISM* V 158.

\(^13\) *Mușeteanu* 1990.

\(^14\) CIL III 6176 = ILS 1108 = *ISM* V 142; see also CIL III 6185 = *ISM* V 176, another *centurio legioni* *I Italicae*, buried at *Troesmis*; Doruțiu-Boilă 1972, p. 143.

\(^15\) *ISM* V 160.

\(^16\) *ISM* V 144-145.

\(^17\) Doruțiu-Boilă 1972, p. 139.

\(^18\) In a decree to honour *Mokaporis*, son of *Auluporis*, *strategos* of the king *Rhoemetalces I* (12 BC – AD 12), which was discovered in the archaeological excavations of the temple of the Pontic Mother of Gods in Dioniopolis (*Εὐδέξη τῆς βουλῆς τοῦ θησαυροῦ Ἀυλούπολισ Ἀυλούπολος* / Αὐλούπολος καὶ Δαοτίκη), a military campaign beyond the Danube against the common enemy, the *Iazyges*, is mentioned (*στρατευσάμενος δὲ πέραν τοῦ Ῥομηταλκοῦ καὶ Δαοτικῆς κατασθατεὶς ὑπὸ βασιλέως Ρομηοταλκοῦ / Αὐλούπολος καὶ Δαοτίκη*). The *strategos* *Mokaporis*, the son of *Auluporis*, was praised for his military achievements as being the *strategos* of *Apsioupolis* and *Daotike*. The former is obviously *Axiopolis*, nowadays *Cernavoda*, while the latter still needs to be located, Sharankov 2015, pp. 62-64, no. 1.
Ovid in AD 12.19 It is highly possible that the legionary fortress and the municipium overlapped the Thracian period building structures, but we are still waiting for the decisive proof.

Werner Eck publishes two bronze tables, part of the lex municipalis Troesmentum (pp. 33-46), issued during Marcus Aurelius’ and Commodus’ joint reign (AD 177-180). Part of the text was already presented and commented by the author into several previous articles, cited here. I would only add the extended version published last year, where the reader is able to follow the entire discussion raised by the discovery of this highly important epigraphic source.20

The section dedicated to Troesmis is closed by two articles, one on the provenience of the stone used for the monuments at Troesmis (Cristina-Georgeta Alexandrescu, pp. 47-62) and the other on the oil lamp discoveries (Florin Topoleanu, pp. 63-116). In my opinion, to the Troesmis section there must have also been added Mihail Zahariade’s paper on the legio I Iovia Scythica (pp. 165-176), although the editor chooses to intercalate three other papers. Zahariade’s paper is directly connected with Troesmis, as he succeeds in fully arguing that the I Iovia Scythica legion occupied the new legionary fortress at Troesmis during the Tetrarchic period.

Daniel Spânu’s contribution on the barbaric milieu of the Lower Danube before and after the establishment of the Roman provinces, and after the abandonment of the Dacia province, is a synthetic and an up to date overview, wonderfully illustrated by three maps. The author emphasizes the so-called “cultural reconfiguration after the Roman conquest of Dacia”, stressing that the input came from the Romans and not from the natives, as the Romanian historiography pointed out so far (pp. 117-128). Without being an expression of continuity, the archaeological cultures around the Dacia province are rather expressions of discontinuity with the late La Tène period.

Only generally tackled by Spânu, the Sarmatian presence on the Lower Danube is fully discussed by Liana Oţa (pp. 129-150). To the discussion, the decree of the strategos Mokaporis, the son of Auluporis, already mentioned, must be added. This fully proves the presence of the Iazyges in the Lower Danube area during Augustus’ reign.

Adriana Panaite’s paper deals with the Roman road system of Lower Moesia (pp. 151-164). She follows the development of the network from the pre-Roman period, when such network was missing (“The proper roads are absent from the pre-roman landscape of the lower Danube area, they were rather some access routes”, p. 154) until the late Roman period (p. 153, fig. 1), focusing on the large roads, built for military purposes (Via Egnatia, the so-called central or diagonal road, and the road along the Danube, p. 155, fig. 2), but also emphasizing the roads connecting the most important Roman centres on the Danube with the Thracia province. By means of roads the entire Lower Danube landscape was changing, step by step, from Augustus to the end of the 3rd century. Speaking about the natives in the Lower Moesia, one should be surprised not to find any mention of the Thracian kingdom and its strategies, attested also on the Danube, the ripa Thraciae (Abrittus, Axiopolis, Troesmis and Agyussus), or the Thracian people colonized in Scythia minor (Auxeticenses, Bessi and Lai – in my opinion, despite the fact that they are only attested in the 2nd century, they were colonized by the Thracian kings during the first half of the 1st century). The surprising omission of the archaeological sites of the Getae (pp. 154-157, although one should also have expected more emphasis on the Enisala necropolis, dated to the first half of the 1st century AD) could only be explained through the impact of the Thracian kingdom before AD 46.

Next, two papers on the legionary centre at Novae are published. The first focuses on the legionary fortress of the I Italica legion and the new results of the recently excavated areas, especially the precinct, the earth- and timber one from the Claudian-Neronian period, and the stone one built during Domitian and Trajan, and slightly rebuilt during the 2nd, 3rd and 4th century (Tadeusz Sarnowski, pp. 175-188). The second deals with the area outside the legionary fortress, presenting the results of a three year project (2012-2014) carried out mostly in the canabae area, near the fortress, and in the civilian vicus from the Ostrite Mogili site (Agieszka Tomas, pp. 191-204).

Zdravko Dimitrov publishes the architectural elements (bases, column shafts, capitals, cornices and pediment), discovered in the new archaeological excavations at the two bathhouses of Ulpia Ratiaria (pp. 205-230).

Victor Heinrich Baumann publishes in Romanian (with French abstract) a fragmentary funerary monument discovered at Noviodunum (pp. 231-238). Setting aside the curious attempt to explain the name of the settlement otherwise as commonly accepted (Celtic: “New-Town”),21 the reading of the inscription could also be improved. Stressing the fact that the first line should be without any question read as dec(urio) coh(ortis), the text could be reconstructed as follows: [−−−] / [−−−] dec(urio) coh(ortis) II Mat[i(iorum)] / [−−−] dec(urio) coh(ortis) II Mat[i(iorum)] / [b(ene)] m(ereniti) p(osuit vel –osuerunt). Therefore the name of the deceased dec(urio) coh(ortis) should have been found in the missing part

---

19 Ex Pont. IV 6, 21-22; 7, 53-54. See also I 8, 11-14.

20 Eck 2016.

21 Falileyev 2007, pp. 8-9. See also s. v. Aliobrix, the stronghold beyond the Danube, in the front of Noviodunum, bearing also a Celtic name, pp. 4-5.
of the inscription, while Ael(ius) If - - - could have been his fellow soldier, or one of the fellow soldiers, that set the funerary monument. Since the cohors II Mattiacorum milliaria equitata was transferred to Thracia sometime before AD 155, the funerary monument should be dated during Hadrian’s or at beginning of Antoninus Pius’ reign.

As I already mentioned, the two last papers, closing the volume, deal with ceramic materials: the so-called Lower Danubian Kaolin Wares, a type of vessels to be found mostly in the military milieu of the Lower Moesia province (P. Dyczek, pp. 239-256), and the oil lamps discovered at Sexaginta Prista, kept in the storage rooms of the Regional Museum of History in Rousse (N. Roussev, pp. 257-270).

To sum up, the volume provides us with wonderful new insights on the Lower Danube area during the Early Roman period, focusing not only on the important legionary centres from Troesmis and Novae, but also on different aspects of the Roman presence in the area. The editor should be praised for organizing the colloquium and for editing and publishing the volume in one year’s time. Thus, it allows us to access the results of several still ongoing successful projects, which bring the scientific research on Lower Moesia at a new level.
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The book is the second volume of the collected papers that were presented at the Colloquium on terracotta figurines held at Izmir in 2007, which has gathered more than 150 researchers. It contains 58 from a total of 90 articles published in two volumes (the first volume has been published one year after the second). The Colloquium has been organised by Ergün Laflı on behalf of Dokuz Eylul University (coordinator of the series Colloquia Anatolica and Aegae Antiqua), and by Arthur Muller and Stéphanie Huysecom-Haxhi on behalf of the French School of Athens and of the research centre HALMA UMR of University Lille 3 SHS.

A major progress has been made in the study of terracotta in the last three decades, an important role having the works of two organizers of the colloquium, Arthur Muller and Stéphanie Huysecom-Haxhi, both beginning with the research on terracotta from Thasos.

The main goals of the colloquium from Izmir were to publish the discoveries of recent excavations, and to bring forward new approaches on the production, distribution, iconography and functionality of terracotta figurines. In the first volume23 there are grouped the