

1985 and with the British project from 1992); their scrutiny and context were aided by cutting a dozen trenches alongside the curtain course; recognising the methods of construction — in terms of fabric, form, materials, sequence — enables better appreciation of logistics; such data then give scope to assess timescale, context, role and impact — locally and regionally. The main report is organised into four chapters, each of the two main authors overseeing two of these (chs 1 and 2 — Wood; chs 3 and 4 — Esmonde Cleary). Most substantial is the architectural or built archaeological analysis of the extant fabric of the defensive wall (ch. 1, 17–119; noting, on p. 17 that the walls were designated a ‘Monument Historique’ in 1996). Dividing the circuit into 26 sectors (based around changes in wall direction, form, tower provision, plus modern/medieval land property parcels), the survey treats each sector in turn, describing and illustrating visible or accessible fabric (though in some instances vegetation could not be cleared for this alone is holding the wall or its face in position; at other points, medieval rebuild or more recent restoration or plasterwork rendered analysis problematic); close scrutiny was essential to trace lost/presumed towers, though for some of these the evidence is limited (e.g. Towers 5–6, pp. 35–7, 43). Sectors 21–22 on the south-west flank are amongst the best preserved, featuring remnant wall-walk and battlements (62–96 for detailed analysis with excellent photographs and elevations. These were the focus of Wood’s 2002 paper in the *Journal of Roman Archaeology*). Ch. 2 (121–74, including tabulated data on wall measurements) then evaluates the defences in terms of their build, facing, parapets, gates, towers, materials and techniques, providing solid foundations on which to offer ideas on manpower and logistics — here estimating, for what is labelled a ‘modest’ defensive curtain, 23,500 man-hours, equating to 200 days for 120 men (143–8). Whilst only 67 ‘architectural’ fragments (such as from columns and capitals) were recognised in the wall fabric, which could signify limited decay/robbing of the lower town by A.D. 400 (as argued in ‘Rapport I’ by J.-L. Schenck-David, 231–61), a counter-argument is that this decay was more widespread given that much of the basic stonework and brick/tile used in the upper town curtain is likely also to be *spolia*.

Invaluable was the series of excavations in private and public garden spaces adjacent to the walls between 1993 and 2000 designed to clarify the chronology of wall construction and of occupational activity on the hill. Results are detailed in ch. 3 (175–209) and supported by ‘Rapports III–X’ (269–329) on ceramic, metal and faunal finds — these include useful Merovingian-period data. The key sector, Parcelle 881, revealed traces of a fourth-century A.D. house predating the rampart wall construction and persisting in use into the eighth century.

The final chapter (211–29) offers a very clear assessment of the evolution of the urban landscapes of *Lugdunum-Convenae* from classical Roman to late antique/Merovingian times, tracing first the decay of the lower centre and the city’s altered identity as a new heart was planted on the hill in c. A.D. 400; crucial questions of logistics, direction and status are addressed, alongside the ongoing debate regarding a centralised or regional programme of urban fortification in the *Novempopulana* province (first articulated by S. Johnson, *Late Roman Fortifications* (1983), 106–12). Currently the late Roman defences at other sites like Bazas and Auch remain insecurely dated; the comprehensive analyses at Saint-Bertrand-de-Comminges, however, provide significant and firm foundations for tackling properly the crucial sequence of urban redefinition in fourth- and fifth-century Gaul as elsewhere.

*University of Leicester*

NEIL CHRISTIE

*Marshland Communities and Cultural Landscapes from the Bronze Age to the Present Day, The Haddenham Project Volume 2.* By C. Evans and I. Hodder. McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research, Cambridge, 2006. Pp. xxv + 509, illus. Price: £35.00. ISBN 978 1 902937 32 8.

This is the second of two volumes that report on a seven-year campaign of research, extending from 1981 to 1987, on a cropmark complex in the lower reaches of the Great Ouse in the south-western Fenland. The key concern of the project was the ‘long-term construction of the cultural landscape, regional environmental adaptation, and changing interrelationship and constitution of ritual/settlement over time’. The cropmark complex was dominated by a series of enclosures and associated boundaries that were subject to a programme of survey, excavation, and palaeoenvironmental sampling. The first two chapters deal with Bronze Age barrows, while chs 4 and 5 describe the excavation of a possible Iron Age shrine (Had IV) and an enclosed settlement (Had V). The latter is one of the most important parts of

the volume, dealing with what appears to have been a specialised settlement exploiting the rich wetland resources of the Fenland. Having been preserved beneath a layer of alluvium, it is claimed to be ‘amongst the best-preserved later prehistoric settlements to be excavated within Britain’, and the surviving floor surfaces and wealth of artefactual and palaeoenvironmental evidence certainly bear this out. A more rigorous editing of the subsequent chapter, on other evidence for the Iron Age landscape, could, however, have made for a more coherent discussion.

The rest of the volume deals with the Roman period, notably a Romano-British shrine complex built on top of one of the Bronze Age barrows in the first century A.D., enclosed by a ditch in the second century, dismantled in the third century, and re-established in the fourth century (ch. 7). Ch. 8 pulls together fragmentary evidence for the wider Roman-period landscape, and includes some important, albeit small-scale, work on other extensive cropmark complexes, comprising settlements, trackways and field-systems, that are so characteristic of the Fenland islands and fen-edge in the Roman period. While the results of the fieldwork reported here are placed in their immediate context by comparing their results with those from earlier surveys of the area, there is no wider discussion of the significance of the results. Ch. 9 deals with ‘The Landscape of “Improvement”: Post-Medieval Times’, while the volume concludes with a discussion of ‘Reclamations: Communities in the Level’. This provides an interesting discussion but could really have done with far greater contextualisation within the wider Fenland landscape, which is after all one of the most intensively investigated in Britain (and for which some key texts are noticeably absent from the bibliography).

Whilst there is much of interest in this report, it is not easy to read. Specialist contributions are fragmented and distributed throughout the chapters, and in places there is little logic to the structure. In Ch. 5, for example, there are specialist reports on the ‘Iron Age pottery’ and ‘Wooden artefacts’ (so far so good), followed by a discussion of ‘Material culture: sets and assemblages’, and then further specialist reports — ‘Fired clay’ (including loomweights), ‘Worked and unworked stone’, ‘Slags’, and ‘Small finds’ with yet more fired clay artefacts (including a slingshot): if there is a logic to the structure it was lost on this reader. There are numerous editorial lapses and while individually these could be overlooked, cumulatively they make this a difficult volume to use. Some illustrations are poorly labelled, and/or contain information that is not explained in a key or caption. The text in ch. 1, for example, makes frequent reference to the ‘Snows Farm’ complex, but it is not labelled on figs 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3, which simply refer to ‘Upper Delphs’ (we have to wait until fig. 2.2 for ‘Snows Farm’ to be labelled). The ‘Introduction’, while an intellectually stimulating discussion of the issues surrounding the study of wetland-edge landscapes, does not actually introduce the project and this particular landscape very well for readers who might not be familiar with it.

Overall, there is much of interest in this volume, if one is prepared to spend some time finding it. There are some important data for the study of the Fenland and indeed Roman Britain as a whole, but it is mostly up to the reader to make of it what they will. There is much stimulating discussion of issues related to the study of landscape, but also many examples of the problems posed by publishing the results of a large-scale landscape project some twenty years after the fieldwork finished.

*University of Exeter*

STEPHEN RIPPON

*The Positioning of the Roman Imperial Legions.* By J.H. Farnum. British Archaeological Reports International Series 1458. Archaeopress, Oxford, 2005. Pp. 121, maps. Price: £26.00. ISBN 978 1 84171 896 5.

Farnum presents us with a slim volume in which he essays a large task: tracking and accounting for the movements of the legions of the Roman army on an empire-wide scale. To this end he presents a series of tables (so described, if more often appearing in the form of lists) and maps supporting a historical narrative, the whole supplemented by a number of appendices on related issues. A mass of data is hidden here, perhaps too well hidden, for the lack of detailed citation makes it difficult to identify the source of some assertions; even so the whole is somewhat lacking in analysis, the main text running to a very slim 11 pages.

The aim, to elucidate a ‘seamless web of legion locations’, is ambitious and perhaps doomed to failure. Our knowledge of the legionary complement is reasonably complete (but even here the fate of some such as *IX Hispana* and *XXI Rapax* is far from clear). If we could determine the precise dates of occupation