

TRADE OR CONTROLLED SUPPLY?
ROMAN ARTEFACTS IN NORTHWESTERN GERMANIA
A review article

Maarten Derk de Weerd

Michael Erdrich, *Rom und die Barbaren. Das Verhältnis zwischen dem Imperium Romanum und den germanischen Stämmen vor seiner Nordwestgrenze von der späten römischen Republik bis zum Gallischen Sonderreich*, Römisch-Germanische Forschungen, Band 58, Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz am Rhein 2001. XII + 192 pp., 16 Abb., 2 Beilagen. ISBN 3-8053-2622-X, EURO 85,-.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Introduction: Type of research | 340 |
| Rom und die Barbaren | 341 |
| Chapter 1: Introduction | 341 |
| Chapter 2: Status quaestionis | 342 |
| Chapter 3: The frontier of the Empire | 346 |
| Chapter 4: The archaeological finds; Chapter 5: The coins; Chapter 6: | |
| The periodisation of the archaeological finds | 348 |
| Models to explain the distribution of finds | 348 |
| The <i>interpretation</i> of dated archaeological contexts | 350 |
| Phases 1-6: archaeological characteristics | 350 |
| Phase 1: 58/52 - 28 BC | 350 |
| Phase 2: 28 BC - AD 19 | 351 |
| Phase 3: AD 19 - 50/70 | 352 |
| Phase 4: AD 50/70 - 100 | 353 |
| AD 100-160: no supply | 354 |
| Phase 5: about AD 160 - before 200 | 354 |
| The Noord-Holland Fundlandschaft | 355 |
| The Chaucian Fundlandschaft | 356 |
| Phase 6: before AD 200 - Imperium Galliarum | 357 |
| AD 273 - Constantinian period | 358 |
| Summary and lists | 359 |
| Chapters 7 & 8: Zusammenfassung & Summary | |
| Chapter 9: Catalogue of the terra sigillata | |
| Chapter 10: Lists of findspots and maps | |
| Bibliography [of <i>Rom und die Barbaren</i>] | |
| Concluding remarks and future research | 359 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY [of this review article] | 361 |

Introduction: Type of research

Five years after he defended his thesis at Amsterdam University in 1996, Erdrich's *Rom und die Barbaren* is published – and rightly so – in the *Römisch-Germanische Forschungen*. We remind of the *Leitmotiv* (1928) of the series: “Abhandlungen ... von allgemeiner Bedeutung als wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Gesamtgebiet der römisch-germanischen Forschung ... ohne sich engherzig auf die Reichsgrenzen zu beschränken“ (Drexel 1928).

Since the Romans crossed the Rhine, the *Verhältnis* between Rome and the Barbarians has been subject of study and Caesar himself articulated his images on that in *De Bello Gallico*; in our time Eggers' *Der römische Import im freien Germanien* (1951) has moulded modern archaeological research in the foreland of the Roman limes.

Erdrich focuses on archaeological *realia* as the main source for debate, analysis and reconstruction of the Roman-Germanic political/diplomatic *Verhältnisse* in this bordering region of the Empire in its proper historical perspective, irrespective of all fashionable debate on anthropology, sociology and the like. Not guided by (Erdrich, p. v) “fertige, an anderen Kultursituationen entwickelte Modellvorstellungen”, Erdrich shows how the power and force of Roman administration shaped the character of all Roman *mobilia* and *immobilia* archaeologists have collected and excavated over the years in the Germanic barbaricum.

Rom und die Barbaren is firmly grounded in the extensive and detailed inventories (of nearly all public and private collections comprising Roman finds) Erdrich had drawn up in 1988-1992 (working from Amsterdam and Wilhelms-haven) in The Netherlands to the north of the Rhine and – in Germany – Niedersachsen (including Bremen) and Schleswig-Holstein (including Hamburg). The resulting catalogues have been published in the series CRFB, the *Corpus der römischen Funde im europäischen Barbaricum*, a project which is steered by the *Römisch-Germanische Kommission des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts*, based in Frankfurt am Main (Erdrich 2002; 2003b; in prep.). Already in the early nineties Von Schnurbein and Erdrich (1992) had shown how the project ‘works’ on the basis of the data from Niedersachsen.

Rom und die Barbaren connects the northwestern limes zone of the Roman Empire with those parts of Scandinavia where Lund Hansen (1987) has mapped Roman imports.

Erdrich's analysis of all his data results in six chronological phases of a – discontinuous! – inflow of Roman commodities into the foreland of Rome's northern frontier. That is new in the Roman period archaeology of the barbaricum and it is also an *Umwertung* of Roman provincial archaeology: our ideas of a not interrupted supply and a growing amount of traded goods into ‘Free Germany’ has now been proven to need revision.

All Erdrich's conclusions are solely based on his distribution maps for the periods he has constructed on the basis of dated finds, for the most part coins, bronze vessels and Samian ware. The coins needed separate mappings.

By crossing modern state borders, Erdrich is the first (!) archaeologist to proceed in the tradition of Caspar Reuven's who mapped – over 150 years ago – all “Romeinsche, Germaansche of Gallische oudheden, gevonden in Nederland, België en een gedeelte der aangrenzende landen” [reaching from Paris in the S.W. corner of the map to the mouth of the river Elbe in the N.E. and Baden and Karlsruhe in the S.E.] (Reuven's/Leemans/Janssen 1845). Reuven's early death obstructed “the inclusion of all finds in the Roman provinces BELGICA I AND BELGICA II, GERMANIA I OR SUPERIOR, GERMANIA II OR INFERIOR, and the greater part of GERMANIA MAGNA” (*o.c.*, vi). By the way, Reuven's categories of Germanic and Gallic antiquities included also prehistoric and (as we now know) early medieval monuments and finds.

In Germany, Hansselmann (1768) had treated the question *wie weit der Römer Macht ... in die nunmehrige Ost-Fränkische ... Lande eingedrungen, dargestellt aus denen in solchen Landen noch vorhandenen ... römischen Monumenten und andern Ueberbleibseln*. It is the oldest example of systematic mapping of Roman antiquities in northwestern Europe, be it on a regional scale.

Rom und die Barbaren

Chapter 1: Introduction

Archaeological artefacts produce our knowledge of the *Verhältnis* between Rome and the Germanic tribes in the northwest. The mapped artefacts are produced within the borders of the Empire (which settles the archaeological date of an artefact type) and were eventually deposited on some *later* moment in time (fixed by the finds' *Germanic* context) in the foreland of the limes; a limes which for that matter only ‘functioned’ since Germanicus' death in AD 19. Erdrich's chronology stretches from Late Republican times up to the end, AD 273, of the *Imperium Galliarum* of the Gallic usurpators. Backbone of the scene is the frontier along the Rhine of Lower Germany (chapter 3).

Chapter 4 discusses the finds, relevant to precisely date the periods of time in which Roman artefacts flew into Germania. Such a chronology – Erdrich argues – can only be constructed on the basis of a critical discussion of selected categories, especially plain and decorated Samian ware, bronze vessels with manufacturer's stamp and coins. The result is a series of 13 distribution maps (including the two loose appendices), the core of the book. The maps of the successive phases show the finds with differences as to the geographical distribution of artefact types. All other artefact types – not suitable for dating their archaeological contexts – are discussed in the CRFB volumes. Even some early find categories – *e.g.* Celtic coins – can not be used to date phase 1 precisely.

It is a minor omission that in *Rom und die Barbaren* finds are not illustrated.

Only Fig. 2 shows the tombstone of Q. Atilius Primus which does *not* prove the existence of trade between Rome and Germania (discussion in § 2.4.3). All relevant illustrations are found in the CRFB-catalogues, indispensable for those – most – archaeologists who do not have specialised knowledge of *all* types of artefacts. We should have welcomed a simple map with the territories of the Germanic tribes mentioned. A summary of the book (Erdrich 2001) has illustrations, *e.g.* of the important and beautiful bronze finds at the Sommeltjesberg on Texel (1777).

Not included in the book is the category of over 600 fragments of decorated sigillata from Friesland (Erdrich, p. 158); other colleagues are willing to publish these in Erdrich's CRFB-volume 'Niederlande' (Erdrich in prep.).

Problems of dating Roman finds in Germanic contexts are discussed in chapter 2.

Chapter 2: Status quaestionis

Erdrich enlightens his position in the methodological debate on the basis of four earlier inventories, that are relevant for northwestern Germania or elucidate methodological questions: Eggers (1951), Kunow (1983), Berke (1990) en Lund Hansen (1987). Did earlier inventories cover all find categories, known from autopsy or from the literature? What can be concluded – afterwards! – from their artefact inventories and distribution maps on the basis of modern views?

Eggers (1951) hypothesizes *a priori* that the trade between Rome and Germania had produced the different distributions of Roman artefacts in Northern and Central Europe. To that end he mapped – as to their typology and chronology – bronze vessels, glass and other wellknown artefact types, without using however all detailed knowledge of types and dates of Samian ware. As to method, Eggers (1950; not mentioned by Erdrich) takes the position that the aim of all research is not grouping and mapping finds as such; *any* series of data whatsoever is capable of seriation. Seriation of archaeological data makes only sense, when other types of information – as to people, tribe, migration, trade – become visible that way and can be understood as real and true. Eggers has laid the foundations for an absolute chronology of Roman and Germanic archaeological finds in the barbaricum. So, distribution maps of Rome's traded goods are recognised as the territories of the Germanic customers, and the distribution of terra sigillata, fibulae and small (bronze) commodities prove the existence of *Kleinhandel*, up to 100 km from the limes. The distribution (maps) of more expensive goods (bronze, silver, glass) shows the patterns of long-distance trade. Trade routes in Germania begin in the forts at the limes: Vechten, Xanten, Mainz (am Rhein) and Carnuntum [Deutsch Altenburg]. Roman goods reach Schleswig-Holstein and Scandinavia by sea transport.

Kunow (1983) follows in the track of Eggers, but keeps within the bounds of published finds of (traded) bronzes and glass. He inserts dated Roman artefacts in the chronological system of Germanic finds in their barbarian context, but makes no use of their implicit potentials for further analysis, based upon independent precise datings. He observes that the variability of types (*e.g.* bronze vessels) decreases in the course of time: jugs and pans disappear, but bronze buckets continue to be used by the Germanic customers as cooking-pot or cremation urn. The actual traders – Kunow postulates – are Roman, not Germanic middlemen. Gorecki (1989) attacks Kunow’s fundamental notion of *Germani*, which departs from a uniform, pangermanic ‘behaviour’ as a reaction to the inflow of Roman commodities. Kunow, Erdrich observes, overlooks diplomatic contacts as a stimulus for supplying commodities in giving effect to *Klientel-Verträge*, known from historical sources.

With bronze vessels and Samian ware, Berke (1990) tries to construct a chronology of the Roman trade in the Central-European barbaricum and this should produce absolute dates of the native wares. In the combinations of Roman bronze vessels and Germanic fibulae in graves he sees four successive phases in their distribution, however without the use of sigillata and coins to define these phases more precisely. A very small part of all goods might have reached the Germanic tribes as booty or gift. Roman commodities are traded on markets in Germania. Berke wonders whether the mobility of the Germanic customers at times might have outreached the scale of local border traffic.

Lund Hansen (1987) catalogued the Roman imports in Scandinavia. She carefully analysed bronze and glass vessels, and sigillata. The result is a refinement of Eggers’ system. Her catalogue is however not complete in all details. Lund Hansen does not work with different dating systems for Roman and Germanic artefacts. In this manner, Germanic finds cannot be dated independently. Not the Roman artefact is dated, but the moment of its deposition in a Germanic context: the earlier and later periods show differences as to the combinations of bronze vessel types. Samian ware is only found – just a few sherds – in Denmark, including solely decorated wares and mortaria Drag. 45. Probably since the start of the Markoman wars, the Danish area ‘filtered’ the supply of Roman wares of which a specific selection eventually (depositional delay) were to reach Southern Skandinavia. Some Roman wares from the Danish island of Sjaelland – produced in the Roman Rhine provinces and dating to the first half of the 3rd century AD – are *not* known from Erdrich’s study area: Lund Hansen “rechnet ... mit einem direkten Zufluss unter Umgehung des norddeutschen Raumes” (Erdrich, p. 14). Lund Hansen signals the importance of Rome’s political influence upon the specific selection of commodities, intended to flow into the barbaricum. Opposing Erdrich, she sticks to a short chronology for those depositions that include both Roman and Germanic

wares (*e.g.* elite-context). More attention should have been paid to the coins. Lund Hansen notes ‘gaps’ in the geographical distribution of some wares. These gaps, Erdrich hypothesizes, had resulted from the fact that the mobility of the Roman traders in the foreland of the *limes* was controlled by the Germanic tribes.

Erdrich regrets that ‘small region’ studies were not capable of presenting clear methodological concepts, useful on his supra-regional level (§ 2.2): Schönberger only refines Eggers’ typo-chronology and introduces a series of explanations – not based on archaeological finds – about ‘trade’ and Germanic ethnic identity, *e.g.* in the discussion on Rheinwesergermanic ceramics and Markoman sites near the *limes* of Germania Superior (Schönberger/Simon 1980; Schönberger 1985). In his interpretation of the distribution of Augustan finds, Erdrich follows Glüsing (1989), who postulates that the early offensives purposely protected the borders of Gallia; these borders were threatened by the Sugambri, whose territory was invaded by the Elbe-Germans. According to Redlich (1980) and Keiling (1989), the finds do reflect not so much trade as the diplomatic gifts, which Rome launched to secure its interests by means of playing off Germanic tribes against each other.

Archaeologists see most Roman finds in the coastal area of modern Northern Germany as traded goods. Settlement finds shape the type of discussion: Bentumersiel for instance may be an early central place (Schmid 1985) or a military post (Ulbert 1984). The residents of the *Herrenhof* on the Feddersen Wierde are traders (Haarnagel 1979; Schmid 1985; for Erdrich’s view *contra*, see *infra*, phase 5). In the Dutch part of the foreland of the *limes*, Van Es (1981) singles out two phases: finds from the first half of the first century AD are seen in the context of the Roman army and Van Es includes the modern province of Noord-Holland in the Empire – the very argument for Erdrich to exclude these finds from his inventory. As regards the next two centuries, Van Es follows Klose (1934), who had postulated *Klientel-Randstaaten* in the *limes* foreland. A small part of all Roman things is in the category of diplomatic gifts, the greater part however results from frontier-crossing trade, especially in modern Friesland and Groningen. According to Van Es, some type of monetary economy is not to be excluded during the 2nd and 3rd centuries in this region: here too, the contact with Rome transformed the internal structure of Germanic society. The supply of coins ended with Septimius Severus (AD 193-211) at the latest, but numerous 3rd century ceramic finds show the ongoing contact between Rome and the northern Netherlands, which indeed were never romanised. In § 6.5.4.3, Erdrich gives an alternate explanation of the distribution of these finds. We remind here that Bazelmans’ new distribution maps of the Roman coins in the northern Netherlands (2003; with a comment by Van Es) invite us to have a fresh look to old problems.

In § 2.3 (Numismatic research) Erdrich resumes the Roman coins in north-western Germania (Berger 1992): gold and silver Celtic coins reflect internal Germanic contacts, the (younger) copper coins fit the distribution of Augustan coins, flown from the Lippe forts at Anreppen and Haltern. Berger identifies the battle-field of the *clades Variana* in AD 9 in Kalkriese (see also Berger 1996).

Most important is Berger's analysis of 15 hoards with (together 3063) denarii from the second half of the 2nd century. These hoards close with (the later years of) Marcus Aurelius or (most often) Commodus. Berger sees these hoards as Rome's payments to various Germanic tribes. In his phase 5, Erdrich returns to the function of these *Stillhaltergelde*.

In § 2.4 (Historical research) Erdrich throws light upon the method by which Wolters (1990) puts together literary/epigraphic data and the exchange of goods between the Empire and Germania. Wolters signaled a major divergency between time periods mentioned in historical sources and the actual dates archaeology produces. Only Caesar's *De Bello Gallico* gives, according to Wolters, reliable primary information on the trade in the early period. Opposing Wolters, Erdrich argues convincingly (§ 6.1.2) that Caesar's traders and sutlers only operate *within* Gaul and near the Roman troops; *De Bello Gallico* does not describe Germanic tribes *trans Rhenum*. Certainly, there has been trade across the Rhine in the years 25 BC – AD 9, Wolters argues, but the proper *Funde* and *Befunde* are missing.

From later periods only political and military crises in the *Verhältnis* between Rome and the Germanic tribes are reported. There are however no archaeological indications for small scale cross-frontier trade. Apart from military confrontations, Rome shows no interest whatsoever in Germanic affairs before the 3rd century.

In § 2.4.2 Tausend (1987) is summarised: small scale cross-frontier trade (also in aid of the troops) is seen as distinguished from those Germanic commodities, which reach Rome and other centres as tribute or traded wares: cattle, corn, amber. Historical sources underline, Tausend signals, the importance of fur trade and that in blond woman's hair and hair-dye materials which "einen nicht unwesentlichen Beitrag Germaniens am römischen Luxusartikelmarkt darstellten." The capacity of this German trade, Erdrich argues on the basis of archaeological data, is however basically insignificant compared with the trade of Roman goods within the Empire.

In a short section (§ 2.4.3), Erdrich discusses the evidence of epigraphy and defends the position that the tombstone of Q. Atilius Primus (Boldog, Slovakia) is immured in a Romanic church and for that reason cannot prove that this centurio – who was a *negotiator* – traded with Central Europe.

Erdrich reminds Wolters' important observation (1991, 87) that the massive epigraphic evidence of the trade between Rome and Gallia or Britannia contrasts sharply with the absence of such evidence that might point to a Roman-Germanic exchange of goods.

Chapter 3: The frontier of the Empire

In § 3.1 Erdrich outlines the history of the northwestern Roman provinces, the relevant archaeological research, its backbone the Roman frontier, and the military installations in fore- and hinterland. Indeed, what happens at the limes creates all dynamics of the exchange of goods between Rome and the tribal societies in Germania.

Most important are the early periods (58 BC-AD 70/Flavii), and the general items are known. Erdrich however, demonstrates convincingly (see also § 6.1.3) that since Caesar's conquest of Gaul (58-52 BC), the Lower Rhine was the constitutional frontier of the Empire and only 'built' to protect Gaul; subordinate to this strategy were also Rome's successive campaigns (since Augustus) into Germania up to the Elbe. The Batavian revolt in AD 69/70 resulted from a struggle for power between the troops of Vitellius and Vespasianus that got out of hand after Nero's death. According to Schönberger (1985, 357), this struggle was a "ganz entscheidende Einschnitt in der Entwicklung der Grenzsicherung am Rhein und der oberen Donau." After the Batavian 'revolt' the castra at the Hunerberg (Nijmegen) for Legio X gemina were built, and Erdrich typifies these building activities as the outcome of Rome's *innenpolitische* measures, aiming to extend the Lower Germany system of frontier defense. Rome's later 2nd century reaction to Chaucian offensives (tile stamps of Didius Julianus and forts of a newbuilt coastal defensive system give evidence of that) are only indirectly influenced by the Markoman wars at the Danube (Erdrich, p. 30).

Our knowledge of the chronology of artefact types, Erdrich rightly reminds, is grounded on the study of imports from the stratified layers in forts (discussed in chapters 4-6). The usual examples are the auxiliary forts in Valkenburg Z.H. and Zwammerdam. Actually however, Valkenburg is not standard, because a full publication of finds and stratigraphy is still to be awaited. Only published – with some degree of completeness – are the excavations in 1941-1950, 1962 and 1980, and a number of find categories (refs. in De Weerd 2003b, 45-50). Tiberian in date, (a purse with) 11 AES – found (1987) on the Valkenburg Marktveld – might indicate a base built in AD 16, as is Velsen (Bult/Vons 1990; de Weerd 2003a, 191). The dendro-date (AD 39) of the oldest Roman road in Valkenburg – wrongly supposed to pass the oldest fort – is recently corrected: AD 94 (Jansma 1995, 135: Valkenburg (ZH), Roman road, Object H41). Haalebos (1977) has published the successive forts from Zwammerdam and all the finds.

It is still possible to date (with coins) the building of (stratified) forts more precisely. In principle, this affects our knowledge of the chronology of the artefacts' types from such sites. A beautiful example is Kemmers' recent thesis (2005). From her integrated archaeological and historical analysis of all Augustan coins from the earliest castra and from the Flavian *canabae legionis* at the Hunerberg (Nijmegen), we now know that the early castra were built between 19 and 15/12 BC. The logistics – political connotations implied! – of the (military) production of coins and their distribution in the Flavian period create new perspectives for archaeological research.

Nowadays, we reach the moment in provincial Roman archaeology that the massive employment of coin dating and dendrochronology takes over the role of historical sources in fixing precise dates. The building of more auxiliary forts on the southern bank of the Oude Rijn between Valkenburg and Vechten started at least as early as AD 41 (e.g. dendro from Alphen: Polak *e.a.* 2004), and not – our longstanding interpretation of Tacitus' *Annales* (XI, 19-20) – in AD 47 when “Corbulo withdraw his garrisons to the left bank of the Rhine” ... and ... “dug a canal of 23 miles in length between the Rhine and the Meuse”. See also De Weerd 2006.

In § 3.3 (the diplomatic instrumentarium of Rome's foreign policy), Erdrich mentions – for the sake of completeness [in the Dutch academic discussion] – the ‘Centrum-and-Periphery’ paradigm, but follows Kehne (1989), who refines Klose's concept (1934) of *Klientel-Verträge*, which departs from Rome's relation with the more complex societies of its eastern neighbours. Such a model does not make understandable the *Verhältnis* with the instable intertribal relations in Germania. Rome had to intervene frequently in these (inter)tribal troubles. The chiefs in the Germanic *Gefolgschaft* system based their personal respectability on Rome's diplomatic gifts, but their unstable position created once more the risk of having to stay in Rome as the emperors 'guest' (see *infra*, phase 4: Verritus en Malorix). According to Klose (Erdrich cites), Rome's treaties with the Frisians and the Batavians provided an administrator by order of Rome, a *praefectus gentis*. The Augustan offensives must have produced a series of treaties, Erdrich adheres, but the actual historical and archaeological evidence is still to be awaited.

Here we like to mention the critical analytical ideas Van Driel-Murray has brought to the front. She demonstrates convincingly that the 'treaties' with 'allies' do not show any symmetry of partnership. “Masked under honourable terms as an ‘Ancient treaty’ we need entertain no doubt as to essential asymmetry of the relationship when we consider the cynical positioning of Batavian troops by that noble general Agricola, so that he could gain greater glory by the least sacrifice of *Roman* lives” (Van Driel-Murray 2003a, 207; 2003b, 59).

Further research will have to clarify the character of Rome's diplomatic contacts as these can possibly be deduced from their archaeological residues. And when is trade the plausible interpretation of an archaeological context of Roman goods, deposited in the northern barbaricum? If Kehne's position is right, and Klose's 'model' in its proper sense only clarifies Rome's diplomatic contacts with its *eastern* neighbours, the model to elucidate the trade with Palmyra, Syria and Arabia (Katsari 2002, reviewing Young 2001) might be different from the one we have need of to understand the flow of Roman goods to the north.

Chapter 4: The archaeological finds; Chapter 5: The coins; Chapter 6: The periodisation of the archaeological finds

Chapters 4-6 are the core of *Rom und die Barbaren*. Upon an analysis of the chronology and distributions of finds and notably coins, six chronological phases are constructed, each with its own archaeological characteristics. Here, we should have welcomed some sort of table of relevant finds, which might have shown at a glance the resulting periodisation of Roman goods in their barbarian archaeological contexts.

The coin distributions are mainly based on Berger (1992) and Van der Vin (1992; 1996). In the northwestern foreland of the limes, Erdrich signals different patterns in the distribution of early and middle Roman period coins, the massive numbers of early coins in the modern province of Friesland and the strong increase of AES in the years of the *Imperium Galliarum*, AD 259-273. Such distributions were steered for the greater part by Rome's diplomatic interferences in the (unstable) relations between Germanic tribes.

Models to explain the distributions of finds

The difference Erdrich makes between distributions resulting from trade within the borders of the empire and those of Roman goods deposited in the barbaric foreland of the limes, is in our opinion open to discussion.

A massive inflow of Roman goods, *e.g.* decorated sigillata from Rheinzabern and Trier, must have been the result of a significant increase of their production, and shapes a distribution of later archaeological contexts which is not primarily the result of civil trade *within* the empire. The utility of such wares as a dating tool has grown from the excavations in a long series of military forts along the limes, but will be provisional as long as the production (within the Empire) has not been dated precisely, independent from the archaeological context of the ultimate deposition of the wares.

The precision of some (typological) dates in a military context is once more disputable when we are not sure of the system of garrisoning troops in the forts. Some forts might only have been garrisoned when they were needed to suppress local rebellion (De Weerd 2006).

Dating an archaeological context with the aid of coins meets the problem of coindrift in a civilian circulation, as opposed to the absence of coindrift with

the payment of *solds* to the troops in the forts at the *limes*. Van Heesch (2000) has discussed *coindrift*-related problems for the period Augustus-Tiberius. No author has generalized the problem of *finddrift*. Problems arise when we try to date Roman armour found in a Germanic archaeological deposit: Erdrich observes that some ‘Roman’ types show ‘Germanic’ characteristics (Erdrich, p. 61).

In the early Roman periods the production of *e.g.* Samian ware increased massively, to cope with the demands of the army. The set of types of South Gaulish sigillata recorded in a military context was a selection of types which could survive bulk transport over long distances, different from the set we see in the trade within Gaul; the circulation however of all (?) South Gaulish Samian ends at a date that is only ascertained in a military archaeological context (Saalburg, *cf. infra*). If coinfinds in such a context can tell something about the distribution rate of Roman wares, these wares continue to circulate in the hands of *veterani* coming home in *barbaricum* (*cf. infra*, phase 5: the *Chauci* bought Central Gaulish sigillata in Regensburg). We see another type of distribution in Erdrich’s Phase 1: The northern Elbe-Germans themselves go to Central Gaul to acquire their bronzes.

So, all discussions – since Eggers – about ‘long’ and ‘short’ chronologies of Roman goods in barbarian contexts are complex: the pre-depositional circulation time depends not from the ‘normal’ factors which determine the point in time when wares are deposited in the region of their production and within the borders of the Empire. Erdrich applies a ‘long’ chronology on his Germanic system of six phases. So, the depositional ‘delay’ can rise to 30-40 years (Erdrich, p. 93). Whatever our methodology, fundamental for all the methods that we use to date Roman finds are typology (producing relative dates) and a series of possibly precise historic dates, as these are supplied by the disciplines of ancient history, numismatics and dendrochronology. As far as archaeological finds can produce evidence to get the precise dates in Erdrich’s system of phases, only terra sigillata and Roman coins can be used, and in some cases specific types of bronze vessels (§ 4.1).

Reviewing *Rom und die Barbaren* Lund Hansen (2003, spec. 239) comments: “Datierungen werden nie auf der Grundlage fremder Sachgüter, sondern immer anhand lokaler Gegenstände vorgenommen. ... Archäologen die über die römische Eisenzeit im *Barbaricum* arbeiten, basieren (die Chronologie) auf lokalen Gegenständen”. She refers to her study of the Harpelev-cemetery (Lund Hansen 1976), which is not commented by Erdrich.

So, dating Roman goods in a ‘foreign’ barbarian context will be a central theme to discuss in the decennia to come. Is, indeed, depositional delay of Roman artefacts a relevant theme to discuss *only* in *non*-Roman archaeological contexts?

The interpretation of dated archaeological contexts

Erdrich mentions some historic years, found on building inscriptions, which notably underpin the chronology of decorated sigillata: Regensburg (AD 175), Niederbieber and Holzhausen (early-Severan). Ancient chronicles for the years 16 BC-AD 28 are connected with the building of the Lippe-forts, including the dendrodate [11 BC] of Oberaden, the dendro- and coindates in Velsen (AD 16) and the identification of Flevum in Velsen (AD 28). A coindated ditchfilling (without South Gaulish sigillata) in the Saalburg is connected with a historical date and marks that way the end of the production of this ware in AD 135 or 139. Closed finds are capable to date more precisely the different phases of the limes of Upper Germany and the Odenwald limes in the years AD 148-161 (Erdrich, p. 37).

Unfortunately, Erdrich makes no clear distinction between building-inscriptions producing archaeological-historical dates, ancient textual evidence, historical years *post quos* on coins in an archaeological context, and context-independent dendro dates. None of these dating methods contribute something to our knowledge without our *interpretation* of the archaeological context concerned. And a new interpretation of old evidence can produce new dates. As a model can serve the discussion on the building date of the Vechten fort: an analysis of the combined dating evidence of the early Roman coins in Vechten and Velsen (coins and dendro) makes it plausible that these bases were built at the same time, and – *interpreting* Tacitus – the context must be Germanicus' campaign in AD 16, not an earlier, Augustan, campaign to the north (De Weerd 2003a; Bosman & De Weerd 2004).

Further research of the type Erdrich has initiated, will have to include more historical and epigraphic evidence, especially from the Netherlands.

Phases 1-6: archaeological characteristics

Erdrich's six periods of influx in his study area are based on closely dated finds, and to some – most – of them historical dates can be attached. When no Roman goods flow into the foreland of the limes, the period concerned is not framed in the system of phases. So, phase 4 ends about AD 100 and phase 5 starts AD 160. Erdrich's methodological perspective is Germanic: the actual (provincial) Roman influences in the foreland are recorded, and the(ir) Germanic contexts are preferably not inserted in a Roman frame. However, nearly all dates in Roman artefact typological series are ultimately connected to the (Roman) historical records (*cf. infra*, concluding remarks).

Phase 1

Phase 1 runs from Caesar's conquest of Gaul (58-52 BC) until the consolidation of Octavian's (Augustus') power in 28 BC. Erdrich sticks to these historical dates because the wares, flowing (mainly from Gaul) to the north, can not *sui generis* be dated exactly.

In § 6.1.2 Erdrich challenges the widely accepted position that Caesar's *De*

Bello Gallico should prove the existence of Rome's trade with Germania. Fourteen times Caesar mentions *Germani* and *mercatores*, but the territories concerned are to be situated on the Gaulish bank of the Rhine.

Virtually all phase 1 finds are from Germanic-Langobardic cemeteries on either side of the river Elbe and in Schleswig-Holstein: bronze vessels from Gallic origin or manufactured in Northern Italy. No Celtic nor Republican coins are recorded. Celtic gold coins between Weser and Aller might indicate early contacts of individuals with Celtic territories.

Erdrich follows Laux and Wielowiejski in a threefold periodisation of bronze wares. To quote Erdrich's summary: "The first 'wave' consisted entirely of Gallic vessels. In the next wave Italic vessels predominated; the native fibulae found here date without exception from the late pre-Roman Iron Age. ... in the last phase of the Late Iron Age and in the Augustan period again bronze kettles of Gallic origin were used as urns. ... (There is) sufficient evidence for linking the archaeological finds from this period (in the Langobardic-Germanic barbaricum) with the presence of Elbe-Germanic and/or Suebian groups in Gaul, where they fought with and against Gallic and Roman troops after 70 BC. ... Remarkable is the brief though clear chronological distance between the first, Gallic and the second, Italic 'wave'. It is tentative to link the occurrence of Italic bronze vessels on either side of the Lower Elbe with mercenaries who fought under various military commanders in the Roman civil war. Historical sources describe their actions on various battlefields in the Mediterranean region."...

The archaeological/historical evidence of the final phase of the Roman Iron Age is more difficult to interpret: "Various types of Elbe- and East Germanic fibulae and pottery from Westphalia, but also from the Central Rhineland and Southwest Germany, bear witness to an unbridled expansion of these groups until into the Augustan period."

Phase 2

Erdrich convincingly argues that during the years of phase 2 (Augustus - Germanicus' death in AD 19) there is no exchange of wares whatsoever in the foreland of the limes and consequently no trade between Rome and Germania. Nearly all Roman finds west of the Elbe are military in character and supposedly deposited during Germanicus' campaigns in AD 14-17. In our opinion, the distribution maps (Erdrich, Abb. 4-5) of coins and finds of phase 2 are only understood if Germanicus' bases and forts are added.

Seen from a Roman perspective – not different from that in phase 1! – the character of the phase 2 finds needs in our opinion a subdivision of this period, as the finds in the barbaricum are intimately related to the finds recorded from the military installations at the limes.

So, we propose a phase 2A, which runs until Augustus' death in AD 14. This period sees the forts built in Lower Germany on the borders of the rivers Rhine and Lippe; no military installations north and west from Nijmegen (De

Weerd 2003; Bosman/De Weerd 2004; De Weerd 2006). Between Ems and Weser, the early coinhoards (denarii) close at the latest with Augustus, as opposed to the hoards between Rhine and Ems: these close under Tiberius (Erdrich, p. 84), our proposed phase 2B (Germanicus' campaigns; auxiliary forts downstreams from Nijmegen). Here, we remind the bronze helmet (of marine *Hirundo*), type Hagenau, found on the beach of the island of Texel in 1948 (Klumbach 1974, 34-35), which is not mapped (by Erdrich, Abb. 4) as a phase 2 find. Recently, an Augustan As with a CAESAR countermark from northern Noord-Holland is published (Diederik 2002, 14, Afb. 5 & list on p. 155, nr. 2).

The finds from the years of phase 2 in the territories to the north of the Oude Rijn and in the modern province of Noord-Holland are not recorded in *Rom und die Barbaren*. Erdrich defends this exclusion with the position (note 128) that the Frisii [minores] *de jure* were included in the Roman Empire, and hypothesizes – not taking his stand on the *recorded* absence of relevant archaeological and historical evidence (treaties are plausible, but not proven) – a proto-imperial *Verhältnis* between the Empire and the(se) Frisians: practically without trade or exchange of goods. A parallel situation should be found in Rijswijk, south of the Oude Rijn (Erdrich, p. 88). Such an (unproved) *Verhältnis* might not have checked Frisian auxiliaries to join the army. A rather curious situation is found in native settlements of the 1st and 2nd century, surrounding the base in Velsen: the inhabitants visited and stripped the abandoned forts after the departure of the Roman soldiers; taken home, the stripped early Roman pottery fragments should eventually go into deposits of a later date. Some sherds from a native site demonstrate this course of events: they fit to fragments, recorded in the Velsen fort (Vons & Bosman 1988).

Indeed, an actual recording of phase 2 Roman goods in the Frisian (minores)/Germanic foreland of the (later) limes, would plausibly have shed light on the Frisians' *Verhältnis* to the Empire.

Phase 3

A transitional phase 3 runs from AD 19 (Germanicus' death) until the middle of the first century (47?; 69?; the start of Germanic *Stufe B2*). With the exception of some graves (Putensen, Nienbüttel, Ehestorf-Varendorf: including Germanic fibulae and clothes, and Roman bronze casseroles and buckets), there is no evidence for a supply of Roman goods in the territories of the tribes closely connected (Erdrich surmises) to the Roman Empire by treaty since Augustus.

This phenomenon cannot be explained by the quality of archaeological research. Even Celtic and Roman bronze vessels in the Langobardic cemeteries can easily be assigned *only* to phase 1 *or* phase 4. A list of findspots and sites as well as distribution maps fail for this transitional phase.

The region's archaeological void – with the possible exception of modern

Friesland (Erdrich, note 509 & p. 96): the supposedly early sigillata could not be determined by autopsy – contrasts sharply with neighbouring territories: from Bohemia and Slovakia a large quantity of high quality early Roman finds is known: the close ties between the Roman Empire and the kingdoms of Maroboduus and Vannius, and the inter-Germanic networks of these centres ‘produce’ the scanty finds of the period in Erdrich’s study area. With regard to his northern barbaricum, Germanic merchants, Erdrich concludes, were kept out of Roman marketplaces.

The problems with the Frisii (*e.g.* in AD 28) are essentially *innenpolitisch* (Erdrich, p. 92) or – in our opinion – ultimately (since Caligula) an inducement for the Roman administration to start building a series of auxiliary forts on the southern border of the Oude Rijn between Vechten and Valkenburg: to implement the Roman control of Gaul, and not to facilitate any campaign into Frisia? In this period of time, the reinforcement of this series of forts is only paralleled at the Danube limes (Schönberger 1985, Karten A & B).

Phase 4

The main characteristics of phase 4 are the bronze vessels that are dated to (the first half of) Lund Hansens’s Stufe B2 (AD 50/70-100; *cf.* Erdrich, p. 12). The bronzes – some of them with manufacturer’s stamps of Adraxius, Axtucus, Cambaro, P. Cippius Polybius, Cuganus, Matutius and Sol. Catusius – are predominantly found in (cremation) graves. Some South Gaulish sigillata and a few glass finds only turn up in settlements (Frisian terps; Feddersen Wierde) and do support the period’s dating.

Essentially, Erdrich bases the chronological framing of his phase 4 on the dates of Germanic fibulae and ceramics in archaeological contexts in the foreland; the associated Roman bronze vessels were produced in the empire: the period of time concerned begins not with certainty already before AD 50 and there are no bronzes of which the production can be dated with certainty to the first half of the second century.

All bronzes in the barbaric foreland are drinking wares – pan, dish, spoon and sieve – and consequently an intended selection of all types produced that we know from urban settlements in the Empire and the Roman military forts.

Among the Flavian weaponry in (cremation) graves, widely distributed in the foreland, Germanic imitations of Roman arms are strikingly present, especially between the rivers Weser and Elbe. These arms might have belonged to the *Germani transrhenani*, who had served in the armies of Vitellius and Vespasianus. Here, Erdrich argues convincingly that depositional retardation is a relevant problem to solve.

In the years of phase 4, Rome’s priorities shifted from Germania tot Britannia, and consequently, Erdrich argues, the supply of Roman goods to the foreland is only modest. To control the relationships with the Germanic tribes, Domitianus completed the northwestern limes and the Chatti were crushed in

AD 83. To preclude any revolt in the northwestern barbaricum, Rome realised its diplomatic contacts by keeping Germanic tribal elite in Rome. When such ‘hostages’ were released, they returned home, endowed with precious Roman bronzes. Here, we should remind the Frisian kings Verritus and Malorix, AD 58 in Rome (Brunsting 1966): “They were admitted into Pompey’s theatre and ... exclaimed that no men on earth surpassed the Germani in arms or in loyalty ... Nero gave both of them the Roman franchise” (Tacitus, *Annales* XIII: 54).

Such a procedure can also be recognised in the 1868-Hildesheim (“Galgenberg”) treasure of silver vessels (weighing together 54 kg [Erdrich 2002, 83-91]). The date is (accordingly) Flavian and not Augustan-Tiberian, Erdrich argues. Upon his ‘release’, the Hildesheim tribal chief might have been expected to sustain an enduring friendship with Rome.

Among the coins from the years of phase 4, 40 aurei (Nero and Vespasianus) attract attention, found in the eastern part of the study area: payments for the delivery (upon a treatise) of irregular troops? Here, it is important, to remind the treasure of 50 aurei (including 35 from Nero and 2 barbarian imitations, closing AD 68), found in 1933 in the pre-Flavian strata of the Utrecht auxiliary fort (cf. Ozinga *e.a.* 1989, 21), bordering the *western* part of the study area.

AD 100-160: no supply

The years AD 100-160 produce no phases, as Roman goods do not reach the foreland of the limes. The limes military zone sees however a continuation of (road) building activities (Graafstal 2001; 2002; IJtsma *e.a.* 2004). However, early 2nd century finds are virtually absent *in* the auxiliary fort (period 5) of Valkenburg Z.H., that was built in AD 116 or 117 (Bogaers 1990; De Weerd 1972, 124). A similar situation is recorded in the auxiliary fort of Alphen aan den Rijn, AD 70-160 (Polak *e.a.* 2004).

An early 2nd century *desideratum* for further research is, we think, the distribution of coins of Traianus or Hadrianus in Filsum (?), Leese-Stolzenau and Welsede (?) and of Antoninus Pius in Middels-Osterloog, Jever, Gieten, Spahn, Mehr and Rehme (?), mapped by Zwickler (1941, Karte II; sources not mentioned), or those included in *e.g.* the listings of sites by Reuvens *e.a.* (1845) and Byvanck (1947). Their ultimate deposition in the years of phase 5 can naturally not be excluded. It is easily understood that Erdrich has not included these coin finds, which are lost nowadays, in his inventories. The coins are not recorded in *Die Fundmünzen der römischen Zeit in Deutschland*.

Phase 5

About AD 160 – and contemporary (since AD 166) with the Markoman wars in Central Europe – a fresh, now massive supply of a broad spectrum of Roman commodities enters the northwestern barbaricum, and is recorded in settlements and graves. This supply, phase 5, comes to a stop before AD

200. Chaucian pirates from the German North Sea coastal area invade Belgica. Archaeological contexts can be dated precisely with the help of sigillata and coins only. In northwestern Germany and in the eastern part of the Netherlands, sigillata is almost the only type of ceramics recorded. However, other goods that are not be dated so precisely in the years of phase 5, e.g. some bronzes, glass and a series of ceramic types, must have been supplied. Erdrich notes a massive flow into Germania of military equipment: the standardised production in these years of some bronzes – goblet, sieve, a variant of the steep-sided basin and the type Hemmoor bucket – indicate their military purpose (Erdrich, p. 107).

Erdrich clearly demonstrates that private (illegal) trade of arms cannot be the only mechanism of their massive distribution. Such a mechanism would indeed not have restricted the supply of Roman arms to the foreland of the limes to the years of only phase 5.

The low numbers of Roman wares in the foreland just near the limes do not indicate any trade on a small scale. Similarly, archaeology fails to show the use of a limes-bordering zone as *glacis*, where the natives were expelled in aid of the zone's military use.

Suddenly and without explicit reasons, well before AD 200, the supply of Roman goods to the northern barbaricum stops. For lack of something better, Erdrich surmises an “einschneidende Veränderung in der Konzeption der römischen Sicherheitspolitik im Vorfeld seiner Nordgrenze”. It is plausible, Erdrich argues, that *Stillhaltergelde* (cf. *infra*) had some effect, but more influence can be ascribed to a decrease of tax revenues in Gaul and in (Upper and Lower) Germany as a result of a plague, and to a decrease of the population in the western Netherlands as a result of the problems of natural drainage of the coastal zone (cf. Erdrich, p. 134).

From about the end of the 2nd century AD new limes forts are built and the extant forts are reinforced.

A careful analysis of the find distributions in the years of phase 5 enables Erdrich to introduce the notion of *Fundlandschaft* in two regions in his study area, each with its particular set of archaeological characteristics: the territory of the Frisii minores in the modern province of Noord-Holland can be classified as an actual Roman *provincia* in these years and the trading route of some Roman goods to the Chauci – *via* the Roman market in Regensburg – can be reconstructed.

The Noord-Holland Fundlandschaft

In northern Noord-Holland (§§ 6.5.4.1 en 6.5.6.2), the potter's spectrum of decorated sigillata and of some other types of Roman ceramics from the years AD 160-180 in some settlements at Schagen closely resembles the ceramic

spectrum of the native settlement at Rijswijk ‘De Bult’, to the south of the Rhine in the same period, as opposed to a differing proportional selection of ceramic types in the limes forts in Zwammerdam and Utrecht. The spectrum of ceramics in some settlements in the eastern river area – some of them show a military character – is fairly similar to that of Rijswijk.

Erdrich concludes that the natives in Schagen (north of the limes) and those of Rijswijk (to the south of the limes) were similarly allowed to visit Roman market places that supplied also the troops in the limes forts. Even the Frisian eating-habits in Noord-Holland get romanised: Rijswijk and Schagen show similar proportions of quartz sprinkled (Samian Drag. 45) and quartz tempered (coarse ware) mortaria. This might be a plausible argument to have included the Frisians in Schagen *in* the Empire in the years AD 160-200. Erdrich signals, moreover, that there is no constitutional act known for such a hypothesis. Reviewing *Rom und die Barbaren*, Carroll criticizes the argument that a high percentage (10%) of Roman mortaria in Germanic settlements should reflect the adoption of Roman practices of preparing food: “does the absence of Roman bronze jugs, plates, and platters indicate conversely the rejection of Roman customs of serving food?” (Carroll 2002, 216). However (cf. *supra*), possible – and once more *rare* – bronze finds cannot be dated precisely in the years of phase 5 only, and a contemporaneity with the mortaria can for that reason not be made plausible.

The Chaucian Fundlandschaft

The territory of the Chauci (§§ 6.5.4.2 & 6.5.6.1) in the coastal area of northern Germany to the west of the river Oste, is characterised, in the years of phase 5, by a domination of sigillata from Central Gaul and early decorated products from Trier in the Samian spectrum with 38% and 41% respectively. The wares from potters from Central Gaul as Cinnamus, Paternus and Doeccus (AD 150-179) cannot have been supplied via direct exchange: the supply of Central Gaulish sigillata had reached its maximum already before AD 150, and in Germania Superior and Inferior the later types of this ware are only recorded in low numbers.

Fully aware of the low number of finds and the incomplete recording of their distribution, Erdrich hypothesizes that an explanation might be found on the Roman marketplaces at the limes of Raetia and Pannonia: in Regensburg the proportions of decorated sigillata in the period concerned are 58% Central Gaulish ware and 39% Rheinzabern Ia, whereas decorated sigillata from Trier fail completely. Chaucian auxiliaries have possibly taken home the Central Gaulish sigillata – bought in *e.g.* Regensburg – in the years preceding the Markoman destruction of the auxiliary fort at Regensburg-Kumpfmühl in AD 171/172, or at the latest before the building of the new legionary base at Regensburg in AD 179; from this base no Bernhard Ia sigillata is recorded. As coin finds (dating the destruction of Regensburg) indicate, the supply of

Rheinzabern Bernhard Ia sigillata comes to a stop in AD 179 at the latest. At the same time, Central Gaulish sigillata is recorded in some quantities at the Pannonian limes, but hardly in post AD 178 sites.

Essentially, the Chaucian findspots of later Central Gaulish sigillata are an isolated series of records. This ware is however also recorded at a few sites in the modern provinces of Groningen and Friesland (Erdrich, Abb. 10 en 14). So, we wonder whether some Frisii as well bought their sigillata in Regensburg. Or do these ceramics reflect contacts between (raiding) Chauci and Frisii?

For the time being, a Chaucian or Frisian identity cannot be determined with the help of Roman or native ceramics ('Chaucian' funnel-shaped dishes: Taayke 1996-1997, 177-179 & Abb. 8) and coin distribution, unless Diederik (2002, 145-148) is right: from the *Roman* perspective the Frisii were the Frisii (minores) in the northern part of Noord-Holland.

After a careful analysis of the distribution of the sigillata in the Feddersen Wierde settlement, Erdrich closes a long-standing debate (since Haarnagel 1979) on trade between Rome and Germania, and concludes that the use of sigillata was not restricted to the (for that reason elite) residents of only the *Herrenhof* [in the south-westerly part of the settlement]: *all* inhabitants of this grand settlement might have used these Roman ceramics.

The distribution of late-Antonine/early Severan denarii plausibly reflects Rome's payment of *Stillhaltergelde* to the Chauci (and other tribes in the northern barbaricum) to recruit auxiliaries for the Markoman wars. Even in the absence of historical sources, Erdrich argues, treaties must have been concluded. Evidently, the Chaucian piracy into Belgica could not be precluded this way.

Phase 6

During the years of phase 6 – about AD 200 till the Gallic Empire – Roman artefacts produced in the first half of the 3rd century are virtually absent in the study area. Only some late ornamented sigillata reflects contacts between Rome and the Germanic tribes, especially in Friesland and Noord-Holland: most of their dates (Trier and Rheinzabern/Bernard IIIa-c) run unto and include the years of the Gallic empire (AD 259 – 273). The same applies to some coin hoards closing with Antoniniani of the Central and Gallic emperors. Datable bronze vessels that might characterize phase 6 are not recorded. Erdrich gives (§ 6.6.2) the historical debate on the Gallic Empire a clear archaeological perspective.

Only in some parts of the study area Roman artefacts show strong ties of the local tribes with the Gallic Empire. The discussion on the Roman or Germanic character of the archaeological context in some rich graves is not settled. Strikingly, antoniniani (cf. § 5.3) struck by the Gallic emperors are not known from Schleswig-Holstein and the Langobard territorium on either side of the river Elbe, but are massively recorded in Friesland where Antoniniani struck

in Rome are rare. A similar situation is found in the eastern part of modern Germany. In Central Germany Antoniniani of the Roman emperor predominate.

The *ingentia auxilia germanorum* of Postumus are not, Erdrich argues (§ 6.6.3.1), auxiliaries from Central Germany/Thüringen (Werner 1973), but troops garrisoned at the *traditional* limes, keeping off raids from the foreland tribes. Archaeology proves convincingly (§ 6.6.3.2) that Postumus' 'Frankish' auxiliaries (known from Gallienus' *Vita*) came from Frisia – forced by a treaty? – and not from Westfalia or the eastern Netherlands. Diplomacy could however not preclude the Frankish raids (since AD 270) on the limes installations downstreams from Xanten.

Roman artefacts in Noord-Holland (§ 6.6.3.2) from the first half of the 3rd century probably indicate a low level continuation of Rome's diplomatic contacts with the Frisii since the years of phase 5: the settlements at Schagen-Muggenburg and Texel-Den Burg are still supplied with late sigillata and black burnished ware, and native Germanic fibulae are no longer deposited. Much material has still to be published that could shed light on this question.

Archaeological depositions in the northern barbaricum – Roman in context and younger in date than the Gallic Empire – are absent. Especially the rich graves from the late Roman period can only be understood from a Germanic perspective and – for the first time! – a precise chronology of the Germanic artefacts in the archaeological contexts can be ascertained, in which the date of Roman contact finds is not conclusive.

AD 273 - Constantinian period

Seen from a Germanic viewpoint, the 'barbaricum' sees no break in its ongoing development after AD 273.

Recently, Erdrich has done further research on this period – without applying a phase-number 7 – in his Nijmegen University inaugural address (Erdrich 2003a). The Constantinian period is characterized by Germanic fibulae (Almgren Gruppe VII) and by some types of Germanic ceramics (Chenet 342/Pirling 273) in the *hinterland* of the limes of the study area. The presence of the Germanic militaries *within* the borders of the Empire is a structural phenomenon: probably, the *Panegyrici* refer to treaties between Rome and different Frankish groups which that way were obliged to deliver troops and were allowed to visit Roman market places. This fundamental change in Rome's diplomatic contacts is accompanied by a growing supply of small AES denominations and household ceramics to Germanic groups in the eastern Netherlands and bordering Westfalia, but *not* to the northern Netherlands and Niedersachsen.

Summary and lists

Chapters 7 & 8: Zusammenfassung & Summary

These chapters give a concise and clear overview of the structure and contents of *Rom und die Barbaren*.

Chapter 9: Catalogue of the terra sigillata

The about 600 fragments of decorated sigillata from Friesland, which could not be included, surpass the total of the numbers in the other parts of The Netherlands north of the Rhine, Schleswich-Holstein and Niedersachsen. The explanation is (Erdrich, p. 5) that the *terpen* and *wierden* (dwelling-mounds) in Friesland and Groningen were levelled in the 19th century to gain fertile soil for manuring; in northern Germany these mounds were not dug off.

Chapter 10: Lists of findspots and maps

The *Listen der Fundstellen* have all the sites, which are numbered on the maps (appendices 1 & 2); these numbers return in the corresponding CFRB-catalogues.

Lists and maps show clearly the phases in the successive diplomatic and military contacts and the lists of each phase are subdivided as to region. § 10.1 and *Beilage 1*: list and map of all Roman finds (excluding the coins); § 10.2 and *Beilage 2*: list and map of all coins; § 10.1.1-10.1.4: lists of finds in phases 1 and 4-6; § 10.2.1-10.2.4: lists of coinfinds in phases 2 and 4-6. The separate distribution maps of *all* six phases ('finds, excluding coins' and 'coins') are however included in chapter 6. Roman military findspots in phase 2 are not included.

The lists are to be used with the CFRB-catalogues (Erdrich 2002 and 2003b). Erdrich's arguments can be followed on the basis of his maps.

Bibliography

Erdrich has selected 75 publications that are cited frequently. Unfortunately, Dutch archaeology is only represented by ten. Erdrich is not answerable for that: his 'selection' of relevant sources is exhaustive!

Concluding remarks and future research

Rom und die Barbaren is well produced and the argument is transparently and eloquently formulated, but only so if one accepts the tacit invitation to look for data, belonging together, which are dispersed in the different paragraphs of the book. Essentially, Erdrich's monograph is a well-conducted series of separate papers on a wide range of connected themes. Therefore, we should have welcomed some indexes, additional to the useful subdivision of the text in sections.

Erdrich's methodology is what archaeology has to be but only rarely is: facts are the basis for any theory whatsoever, without going astray in all

those levels of abstraction some archaeologists prefer to abide with. With Erdrich, Roman and Provincial Roman archaeology have made their biggest step forward since Eggers in the historical and archaeological research of the Northwestern Empire and its barbaric foreland. The book's impact will last for decennia and invite all of us to produce a wide spectrum of *Eggers-ähnliche* distribution maps to guide the entangled discussions on archaeological facts, especially artefacts.

Thinking of Rome's *trade* with the tribes in the northwestern barbaricum we will have to discuss the possible relevance of the position of Young (2001 [*non vidimus*]: reviewed by Katsari 2002). In his *Rome's Eastern Trade* he convincingly shows the absence of a centralized imperial policy on trade [with Rome's *eastern* neighbours] and the importance of local authorities in the active promotion of commerce, and opposes the position that the Roman emperor showed a strong interest in interregional trade and followed a pro-active policy.

The chronology of the phases in *Rom und die Barbaren* is ultimately rooted – via artefact typology – in the Roman historical record. The phase 4 dates are Germanic in context, and the supply in phase 5 comes to an end on account of the problem of natural drainage of the landscape and a plague.

With the exception of phase 1 – pre-Augustan Langobardic traders in Gaul – the flow (or none) of Roman goods into the northern barbaricum is fully controlled by the Roman army and by Rome's diplomatic control of Germanic tribes in the foreland of the limes. If the supply-mechanism of Roman commodities that flow into the northwestern barbaricum is *not* the result of trade but essentially a Roman (military/diplomatic) phenomenon, Lund Hansen's position in the debate on depositional delay (cf. *supra*): “archaeologists of the Roman Iron Age in the barbaricum have to ground their chronologies on local artefacts”, has to be discussed in a wider context that includes the Roman Empire.

Only phase 5 – and possibly phase 6 on a low level – might see ‘real’ trade: precisely for that reason, Erdrich hypothesizes that the Frisian part of Noord-Holland belongs *de facto* to the Empire: the inhabitants were allowed to visit Roman (military) marketplaces. This *Verhältnis* is quite different from that – about two centuries earlier, in the years of phase 2 (cf. *supra*) – when the Frisians (at least those in this part of Noord-Holland) might have belonged *de jure* to the Empire, practically *without* any supply or exchange of goods.

For about the three centuries (58 BC – AD 273) that are the subject of *Rom und die Barbaren*, Rome's trade with *Germania* was never *libera*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bazelmans, J. 2003: *De Romeinse muntvondsten uit de drie noordelijke provincies. Methodische kanttekeningen bij een nieuwe periodisering de relaties* (Tweede Van Gelder-lezing [Leiden, 20 november 2003]), Utrecht (Geld- en Bankmuseum).
- Berger, F. 1992: *Untersuchungen zu römerzeitlichen Münzfunden in Nordwestdeutschland* (Studien zu den Fundmünzen der Antike 9), Berlin.
- Berger, F. 1996: *Kalkriese 1 – Die römischen Fundmünzen* (Römisch-Germanische Forschungen 58), Mainz.
- Berke, S. 1990: *Römische Bronzegefäße und Terra Sigillata in der Germania libera* (Boreas, Supplement 7), Münster.
- Bogaers, J.E. 1990: Een epigrafische puzzel. Een bouwinscriptie uit de noordelijke zijtak van de Rijn op het Marktveld te Valkenburg (Z.-H.), in: Bult, E.J./D.P. Hallewas (eds.), *Graven in Valkenburg III*, Delft, 52-56.
- Bosman, A.[V.A.J.]/M.[D.] de Weerd 2004: Velsen: The 1997 Excavations in the Early Roman Base and a Reappraisal of the Post-Kalkriese Velsen/Vechten Dating Evidence, in: Vermeulen, F./K. Sas/W. Dhaeze (eds.), *Archaeology in Confrontation. Aspects of Roman Military Presence in the Northwest*, Studies in honour of Prof. Em. Hugo Thoen (Archaeological Reports Ghent University 2), Ghent, 31-62.
- Brunsting, H. 1966: In het spoor van Verritus en Malorix? *Westerheem* 15, 14-16.
- Bult, E.J./P. Vons 1990: Een gesloten Romeinse muntvondst op het Marktveld bij Valkenburg (Z.H.), in: Bult, E.J./D.P. Hallewas (eds.), *Graven bij Valkenburg III*, Delft, 56-71.
- Byvanck, A.W. 1947: *Excerpta Romana. De bronnen der Romeinse geschiedenis van Nederland III* (Rijks geschiedkundige publikatiën 89), 's-Gravenhage.
- Carroll, M. 2002: Review of M. Erdrich (2001), Rom und die Barbaren, *The Journal of Roman Studies* 92, 215-216.
- Diederik, F. 2002: 'Schervengericht'. *Een onderzoek naar inheems aardewerk uit de late derde en de vierde eeuw in de Kop van Noord-Holland* (AWN-reeks 3), Amsterdam.
- Drexel, [F.] 1928: Vorwort, in: Friedrich Behn, *Das Mithrasheiligtum zu Dieburg* (Römisch-Germanische Forschungen 1), Berlin/Leipzig.
- Driel-Murray, C. van 2003a: Ethnic Soldiers: The Experience of the Lower Rhine Tribe, in: Grünewald, Th./S. Siebel (eds.), *Koninuität und Diskontinuität. Germania inferior am Beginn und am Ende der römischen Herrschaft* (Beck, H./D. Geuenich/H. Steuer (eds.), Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde 35 [Beiträge des deutsch-niederländischen Kolloquiums in der Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen (27. bis 30. 06. 2001)], Berlin/New York, 200-217.
- Driel-Murray, C. van [2003b]: Imperial soldiers: Rome and the Batavian identity, in: Groenman-van Waateringe, W./B.[L.] van Beek/W.[H.] Metz (eds.), *Het Instituut. Vijftig jaar IPP/AAC* [Amsterdam], 56-62.
- Eggers, H.J. 1950: Die vergleichende geographisch-kartographische Methode in der Urgeschichtsforschung, *Archaeologia Geographica* 1, 1-3.
- Eggers, H.J. 1951: *Der römische Import im freien Germanien* [2 volumes](Atlas der Urgeschichte 1), Hamburg.
- Erdrich, M. 2001: Wirtschaftsbeziehungen zwischen der Germania inferior und dem germanischen Vorland – ein Wunschbild, in: Grünewald, Th. (ed.), *Germania inferior. Besiedlung, Gesellschaft und Wirtschaft an der Grenze der römisch-germanischen Welt* (Beck, H./D. Geuenich/H. Steuer (eds.), Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde 28 [Beiträge des deutsch-niederländischen Kolloquiums in Regionalmuseum Xanten, 21.-24. September 1999], Berlin/New York, 306-335.
- Erdrich, M. 2002: *Hansestadt Bremen und Bundesland Niedersachsen* (Corpus der römischen Funde im europäischen Barbaricum, Deutschland 4), Bonn.

- Erdrich, M. 2003a: *Spel zonder grenzen? Een speurtocht naar de Limes in de late Oudheid*. Rede uitgesproken bij de aanvaarding van het ambt van hoogleraar Provinciaal-Romeinse Archeologie aan de Faculteit der Letteren van de Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen op maandag 17 maart 2003, Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen.
- Erdrich, M. 2003b: *Hansestadt Hamburg und Bundesland Schleswig-Holstein* (Corpus der römischen Funde im europäischen Barbaricum, Deutschland 5), Bonn.
- Erdrich, M. in preparation: *Niederlande* (Corpus der römischen Funde im europäischen Barbaricum), Bonn.
- Es, W.A. van 1981³: *De Romeinen in Nederland*, Haarlem.
- Glüsing, P. 1989: Die Germanen im Spannungsfeld der römischen Okkupation, in: Trier, B. (ed.), *2000 Jahre Römer in Westfalen*, Mainz, 70-80.
- Gorecki, J. 1989: Review of Kunow 1983, *Bonner Jahrbücher* 189, 1989, 689-695.
- Graafstal, E. 2001: Limes en landschap. Over de uitrusting van de Romeinse rijksgrens in het rivierengebied, *Oud-Utrecht* 74 (6), 145-158.
- Graafstal, E. 2002: Logistiek, communicatie en watermanagement. Over de uitrusting van de Romeinse rijksgrens in Nederland, *Westerheem* 51, 2-27.
- Haalebos, J.K. 1977: *Zwanmerdam Nigrum Pullum. Ein Auxiliarkastell am Niedergermanischen Limes* (Cingula 3), Amsterdam.
- Haarnagel, W. 1979: *Die Grabung Feddersen Wierde. Methode, Hausbau, Siedlungs- und Wirtschaftsformen sowie Sozialstruktur* (Feddersen Wierde 2), Wiesbaden.
- Hansselmann, Christian Ernst* 1768: *Beweis, wie weit der Römer Macht, in den mit verschiedenen teutschen Völkern geführten Kriegen, auch in die nummehrige Ost-Fränkische, sonderlich Hohenlohische, Lande eingedrungen, dargestellt aus denen in solchen Landen noch vorhandenen, seit einiger Zeit weiter entdeckten, bisher noch nicht bekannt gewordenen merkwürdigen römischen Monumenten und andern Ueberbleibseln; Nebst einer historischen Beschreibung der unterschiedlichen teutschen Völker, als gewesenen Inwohnern jeztedachter Landen selbiger Zeit bis nach Ankunft der Franken, mit XVI Kupfer-Tafeln und einem Real-Register*, Schwäb(isch) Hall. Gedruckt und verlegt von Johann Christoph Messerer.
- *Fürstl. Hohenlohisch- gemeinschaftlichen Hof- auch resp. Regierungs- und Lehen-Raths, der Königlich-Preuszischen und [= und] Churfürstlich-Pfälzischen Akademien, auch anderer Societäten der Wissenschaften Mitglieds,
- Heesch, J. Van 2000: Some considerations on the circulation of Augustan and Tiberian bronze coins in Gaul, in: Wiegels, R. (ed.), *Die Fundmünzen in Kalkriese und die frühkaiserzeitliche Münzprägung*, Akten des wissenschaftlichen Symposions in Kalkriese, 15.-16. April 1999 (Osnabrücker Forschungen zu Altertum und Antike-Rezeption 3), Paderborn.
- IJtsma, A./E.P. Graafstal/M.C.M. Langeveld 2004: Utrecht – Vleuten/De Meern*De Balije II, in: Kok, D./R. Kok/F. Vogelzang (eds.), *Archeologische kroniek Provincie Utrecht 2002-2003*, 181-195. Utrecht.
- Jansma, E. 1995: *RemembeRings. The Development and Application of Local and Regional Tree-Ring Chronologies of Oak for the Purpose of Archaeological and Historical Research in the Netherlands*, Dissertation Universiteit van Amsterdam (Nederlandse Archeologische Rapporten 19), Amsterdam/Amersfoort.
- Katsari, C. 2002: Review of Young (2001), *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2002.07.22. <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/bmcr/2002/2002-07-22.html>
- Kehne, P. 1989: *Formen römischer Aussenpolitik in der Kaiserzeit: Die auswärtige Praxis im Nordgrenzenbereich als Einwirkung auf das Vorfeld*, (not published dissertation), Hannover.
- Keiling, H. 1989: Zur rheinischen Welle des frühen römischen Imports im freien Germanien. *Zeitschrift für Archäologie* 23, 201-209.
- Kemmers, F. 2005: *Coins for a legion. An analysis of the coin finds of the Augustan legionary fortress and Flavian cabnabae legionis at Nijmegen*, Dissertation Radboud

Universiteit Nijmegen.

- Klose, J. 1934: *Roms Klientel-Randstaaten am Rhein und an der Donau. Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte und rechtlichen Stellung im 1. und 2. Jahrh. n. Chr.*, Breslau.
- Klumbach, H. 1974: *Römische Helme aus Niedergermanien* (Kunst und Altertum am Rhein 51), Köln.
- Kunow, J. 1983: *Der römische Import in die Germania libera bis zu den Markomannenkriegen. Studien zu Bronze- und Glasgefäßen* (Göttinger Schriften zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte 21), Neumünster.
- Lund Hansen, U. 1976 [1977]: Das Gräberfeld bei Harpelev, Seeland. Studien zur jüngeren römischen Kaiserzeit in der Seeländischen Inselgruppe, *Acta Archaeologica* 47, 91-160.
- Lund Hansen, U. 1987: *Römischer Import im Norden. Warenaustausch zwischen dem Römischen Reich und dem Freien Germanien während der Kaiserzeit unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Nordeuropas* (Nordiske Fortidsminder, Serie B, Band 10) Kopenhagen.
- Lund Hansen, U. 2003: Review of M. Erdrich (2001), Rom und die Barbaren, *Prähistorische Zeitschrift* 78, 236-242
- Ozinga, L.R.P. 1989: Geschiedenis van het historisch en archeologisch onderzoek naar het Romeinse castellum in Utrecht, in: Ozinga, L.R.P./T.J. Hoekstra/M.D. de Weerd/S.L. Wynia (eds.), *Het Romeinse Castellum te Utrecht* (Studies in Prae- en Protohistorie 3), Amsterdam, 19-24.
- Polak, M./R.P.J. Kloosterman/R.A.A.J. Niemeijer 2004: *Alphen aan den Rijn – Albaniana 2001-2002* (Libelli Noviomagenses 7), Nijmegen.
- Redlich, C. 1980: *Politische und wirtschaftliche Bedeutung der Bronzegefäße an der Unterelbe und Saale zur Zeit der Römerkriege* (Studien zur Sachsenforschung 2), Hildesheim.
- Reuvsen, C.J.C./C. Leemans/L.J.F. Janssen 1845: *Alphabetische Naamlijst, behoorende bij de KAART van de in Nederland, België en een gedeelte der aangrenzende landen gevonden Romeinse, Germaansche of Gallische oudheden; benevens de Romeinse en andere oude wegen, enz.*, Leiden, xvii + 100 pp. and map [in 6 parts].
- Schmid, P., 1985: Der Handel der römischen Kaiserzeit im niedersächsischen Nordseeküstengebiet aufgrund archäologischer Zeugnisse, in: Düwel, K. et alii (eds.), *Untersuchungen zu Handel und Verkehr der vor- und frühgeschichtlichen Zeit in Mittel- und Nordeuropa, Teil I. Methodische Grundlagen und Darstellungen zum Handel in vorgeschichtlicher Zeit und in der Antike* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, 3. Folge, Nr. 146), Göttingen.
- Schnurbein, S. von/M. Erdrich 1992: Vortrag zur Jahreszeitung 1992 der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission. Das Projekt: Römische Funde im mitteleuropäischen Barbaricum, dargestellt am Beispiel Niedersachsen, *Bericht der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission* 73, 5-27.
- Schönberger, H. 1985: Die römischen Truppenlager der frühen und mittleren Kaiserzeit zwischen Nordsee und Inn, *Bericht der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission* 66, 321-497, Beilage 4-8.
- Schönberger, H./H.-G. Simon, 1980: *Kastell Okarben und die Besetzung der Wetterau seit Vespasian* (Limessforschungen 19), Berlin
- Taayke, E. 1996-1997: Die einheimische Keramik der nördlichen Niederlande, 600 v. Chr. bis 300 n. Chr., Teil III: Mittel-Groningen, *Berichten van de Rijksdienst voor het oudheidkundig bodemonderzoek* 42, 9-85.
- Tausend, K. 1987: Die Bedeutung des Importes aus Germanien für den römischen Markt, *Tyche* 2, 217-227.
- Ulbert, G. 1984: Die römischen Funde, in: Kossack, G. et alii (eds.), *Archäologische und naturwissenschaftliche Untersuchungen an ländlichen und frühstädtischen Siedlungen*

- im deutschen Küstengebiet vom 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis zum 11. Jahrhundert n. Chr.*, Weinheim (Acta Humaniora), 341-342.
- Vin, J.P.A. van der 1992: *Provincz Friesland* (Die Fundmünzen der römischen Zeit in den Niederlanden 1), Mainz.
- Vin, J.P.A. van der 1996: *Provinczen Groningen, Drenthe, Overijssel, Flevoland* (Die Fundmünzen der römischen Zeit in den Niederlanden 2), Mainz.
- Vons, P. 1987: A second-Century Roman Hoard of Corroded Denarii from Uitgeest, province of North-Holland, *Berichten van de Rijksdienst voor het Oudheidkundig Bodemonderzoek* 37, 123-152.
- Vons, P./A.V.A.J. Bosman 1988: Inheemse boeren bezochten de verlaten Romeinse versterkingen Velsen I en II, *Westerheem* 37, 1-16.
- Weerd, M.D. de 1972: Numerieke vondstbewerking: een bijdrage tot de datering van castella 1-6, in: Glasbergen, W., *De Romeinse castella te Valkenburg Z.H. De opgravingen in de dorpsheuvel in 1962* (Cingula 1), Amsterdam [Groningen, Jaarverslag van de Vereniging voor Terpenonderzoek 52-54], 122-126.
- Weerd, M.D. de 2003a: Archäologische Beobachtungen anhand der Fundmünzen aus Kalkriese und aus den tiberischen Lagern Vechten und Velsen, in: Grünewald, Th./S. Seibel (eds.), *Kontinuität und Diskontinuität. Germania inferior am Beginn und am Ende der römischen Herrschaft*. (Beck, H./D. Geuenich/H. Steuer (eds.), Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde 35 [Beiträge des deutsch-niederländischen Kolloquiums in der Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen (27. bis 30. 06. 2001)], Berlin/New York, 181-199.
- Weerd, M.D. de [2003b]: Voor de monumenten uit: Romeins op het IPP, in: Groenman-van Waateringe, W./B.[L.] van Beek/W.[H.] Metz (eds.), *Het Instituut. Vijftig jaar IPP/AAC*, [Amsterdam,] 45-55.
- Weerd, M.D. de 2006: Repressie op afstand in een voorland zonder grenzen: De Romeinse limes in Nederland vóór de opstand der Bataven, *Westerheem* 55, 5-26,
- Werner, J. 1973: Bemerkungen zur mitteldeutschen Skelettgräbergruppe Hassleben-Leuna, in: Beumann, H. (ed.), *Festschrift für Walter Schlesinger*, (Mitteldeutsche Forschungen 74, 1), 1-30.
- Wolters, R. 1990 & 1991: Die Waren- und Dienstleistungsaustausch zwischen dem Römischen Reich und dem Freien Germanien in der Zeit des Principats. Eine Bestandaufnahme, *Münstersche Beiträge zur antiken Handelsgeschichte* 9,1 [1990], 14-44 & 10,1 [1991], 78-132.
- Young, G.K. 2001: *Rome's Eastern Trade: International Commerce and Imperial Policy, 31 BC – AD 305*, London/New York.
- Zwicker, W. 1941: *Studien zur Markussäule I* (Archaeologisch-Historische Bijdragen 8), Amsterdam.

Maarten Derk de Weerd
 Rembrandtstraat 3
 NL-1816 CE Alkmaar
 The Netherlands