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 is 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

of the legionary fortresses known to us then there might be some hope of 'deducing from the evidence where the legions must have been'. However, such precision is likely to elude us (and much in any case remains obscure in the process of commissioning and decommissioning legionary fortresses).

F. offers this as a synthesis and in consequence excuses the lack of detailed citation and the 'select' nature of the bibliography. However, the lack of any review of earlier research is a serious omission: his assertions are not all uncontroversial and there are certainly cases where more detailed argument would have aided the case he wishes to make. For instance, one could perhaps accept an argument for identifying the third legion in Egypt in the early Augustan period as *legio VIII* (there is evidence which might place the legion in the East or North Africa at an early date), but locating it in an otherwise unidentified legionary fortress at Thebes requires more evidence to be presented (the later fort at Luxor is far too small and there is no evidence that anything there predates the fourth century).

Taking Britain (as we might) arguments of varying force have been made for occupation at Chichester, Silchester and Lake Farm (*II Aug.*), or Towcester and Mancetter (*XIV*). However, placing *legio IX* at Newton-on-Trent from A.D. 44–45 until a move to Lincoln in A.D. 66 rests on little or no evidence and would receive rather less support. Despite the declared aim to present the study as an interlinked series of movements (where these varying decisions have consequences for other deployments), the issue of where *legio XIV* could have been stationed on its return to Britain (A.D. 69–71) is ducked. *Legio XX* (certainly not *Valeria* alone at this or any date) drops off fig. 11 despite its assumed occupation of Wroxeter throughout this period. The thorny issue of re-occupation at Gloucester is avoided, perhaps wisely; discoveries at Alchester presumably came too late.

Although sometimes justified for ease of reference, the raft of tables give the impression of merely presenting the same information in different ways to the extent of unnecessary repetition. Tables H and D, both essentially lists of events in date order, might perhaps have been usefully combined. On the other hand Table G, offering a distribution of legions by province at various dates, might have been very useful indeed were it better laid out (the table appended to J. Mann's *Legionary Recruitment and Veteran Settlement* comes to mind). The arrangement in columns by date means that headings are necessarily selective (44, 66, 73, 89, 106 …) and if some allow for the introduction of a specific change of garrison (the appearance of *X Fretensis* at Jerusalem from A.D. 73), many others fall through the gaps.

One might excuse some small slips — 'Viminiacum', 'Troesmi' — others are less explicable: 'Tiberius Aelianus invades Britain' (100). Presumably Ti. Plautius Aelianus is meant; the wrong Plautius nonetheless. On the whole this seems a missed opportunity. An up-to-date synthesis on the subject would be welcome, but the lack of reference or background to the study does not inspire confidence.

Archaeological Project Services, Sleaford STEVE MALONE

Roman Art, Religion and Society: New Studies for the Roman Art Seminar, Oxford 2005. Edited by M. Henig. British Archaeological Reports International Series 1577. Archaeopress, Oxford, 2006. Pp. ix + 213, illus. Price: £36.00. ISBN 978 1 84171 791 3.

These papers from participants in Martin Henig's Roman Art seminar range widely within the themes set out in the title. Part I addresses aspects of the minor arts, with papers on: 'The Hardwick boot: a Roman bronze balsamarium'; 'The body-chain from the Hoxne Treasure'; 'The language of love in Roman Britain'; 'Two intaglios from St Peter Port, Guernsey'; 'Votive leaves from Roman Britain'; and 'Differing interpretations of the Romano-British site at Marcham/Frilford, Oxon'. Part II contains two papers on pagan art seen from a Christian perspective: 'How a Christian might approach images of deities in polytheistic religions' and '*Sumus novi dei*: approaches to a renewed understanding of the identity of the Romano-British church'. The final section concerns collecting and the reception of Classical art in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries: 'Girolamo Zulian; the collection, the man and his world' and 'Displaying the antique: the country house, Merseyside 1777–1959'.

In his Foreword, H. emphasises that the overall approach 'tries to engage directly with material culture' and to examine material with fresh eyes. He is scathing about methods that pay more attention to abstract theory than to concrete evidence, and his fervent belief that the arts are 'of major import to society, as a focus for philosophical, religious and intellectual enlightenment' seems obvious to some of us, but alas, is alien to many.