

KÖNYVISMERTETÉSEK – RECENSIONES

R.C.G.M. LAUVERIER, *Animals in Roman Times in the Dutch Eastern River Area*. Nederlandse Oudheden, 12, Amersfort 1988, 277 pp.

The work that is in fact a dissertation evaluates the animal remains of a smaller geographic area around the town of Nijmegen, Holland. The material is ideal for a Dissertation because it is sizeable, though, it is not too numerous and consists of smaller samples (that can be more easily handled) of a series of sites from a comparatively short time period, the Roman Imperial Age. Besides these, it is attractive because the sites represent different types (Roman castles, army barracks, a defensive ditch, canabae, a military vicus, a native settlement, a temple complex and even a cemetery) giving a good opportunity for fruitful comparisons. At the same time, the occurring fauna is rather simple, most of the domestic species introduced by the Romans into Central and Western Europe (camel, donkey, cat, etc.) are missing in it, and the number of the wild species are also quite low (among them the only rare species was the elk). As a result, the identification, study and evaluation of the material could not mean a serious problem for a well-trained young archaeozoologist.

The author divided the occurring mammal species into three groups:

1. domestic animals whose meat was eaten (cattle, sheep, goat and pig), 2. wild animals that were also eaten (aurochs, elk, red, deer, roe deer, wild swine and hare), 3. domestic animals whose meat was not eaten (horse and dog). Remains of domestic and wild birds and fish only occurred in sieved samples. Here hen was the main domestic species, and among the fishes freshwater and also sea fishes were found.

Hunting played an insignificant part in the economy. Among the domestic animals, cattle were the leading meat-producer, pig was mainly found in Roman settlements and on Pleistocene soils, caprovines in Holocene areas.

The domestic animal species point to an agrarian economy based on mixed farming in which agriculture played the decisive part. The use of the different domestic species was generally the same what one found in other settlements of the provinces in the Roman Empire or what was described by Roman authors.

As for the different domestic species there can be noted an increase of the size of cattle that was attributed by the author to better breeding techniques and feeding on the one hand, and to the importation of improved Italian breeds. In fact, this had been observed in a series of provincial Roman sites particularly in such ones which lay close to Italy, the heart of the Empire. The other species don't excel with their particularly large size with the exception of horse, some individuals of this species – probably Roman military horses – reaching 163 cm in withers, and whose parallels one can only find in Roman Pannonia and in some *castra* in Roman Germania.

Among the dogs one cannot find the usual wide variation and different breeds well known from other provinces. Its reason

is probably twofold: the number of dog bones was very low, and that social class that used luxury dogs was either rare or entirely missing among the inhabitants.

In summary: the dissertation is an honest work precisely describing the Roman animal remains of the Eastern River area of Holland. It is not the author who can be blamed for the rather plain picture of the animal husbandry and the occurring domestic species but the long distance between the area and Italy for the influence of the Roman animal husbandry both in richness of the fauna and in the improved breeding techniques in every species was much weaker than in provinces closer to Italy.

The bone measurement tables are enclosed on microfiches on the inner side of the back cover. This cannot be considered an ideal solution for the measurement tables are that part of the book which will be most often used, and in many cases not in the offices but in homes of researchers. And it is rare that someone has a microfiche reader at home, in fact, it is more probable that he or she owns a computer. Thus, there would have been more useful to include the bone measurements on a computer cassette.

S. Bökönyi

U. MUSS – CH. SCHUBERT, *Die Akropolis von Athen*. (Welt der Wunder – Wunder der Welt) Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, Graz 1988, 266 lap, 133 illusztráció.

Az Athéni Akropolisnak szentelt összefoglalásoknak, vezetőknél se szeri, se száma. Ezek egyrészt az emberiség e „szent helyére” vonatkozó ismeretek gyarapodását és változását tükrözik: elég például e célból összevetni M. Beulé 1862-ben publikált munkáját (L'Acropole d'Athènes) R.J. Hopper 1971-es évszámot viselő *The Acropolis-ával*. A régebbi azonban nem feltétlenül a rosszabb is egyben; O. Jahn és A.T.F. Michaelis *Arx Athenarum-a* (3. kiadás: Bonn 1901) egyike a legnélkülözhetlenebb kézikönyveknek. Másrészt régóta, s egyre inkább, a turisztika heterogén igényei „ihletik” az idevágó irodalmat, s így játékosan kölcsön vehetjük D. Willers gondolatát: „jeder hat den Parthenon, den er verdient” (Antike und europäische Welt, Universität Bern, Kulturhist. Vorlesungen 1983–84, 145).

Bármennyire meglepő, az elképesztő intenzitású és mélységű kutatások ellenére az Akropolisra vonatkozó ismereteket nem a stagnálás, hanem a folyamatos gyarapodás jellemzi. Ki gondolta volna, hogy a szűz szikláig feltárt fennsíkrol, egy nagyobb eső után, 1984-ben kerül elő a Parthenón szobordíszítéséhez tartozó töredék? (Vö. A. Mantis, BCH 110, 1986, 231 skk.). Ki számított arra, hogy régész-generációk erőfeszítései ellenére a múzeumi raktárakban őrzött anyag napjainkban vértanul meglepetéssel szolgáljon? (L. ehhez pl. a Parthenón-megdöbentő: A. Mantis, JdI 102, 1987, 163 skk.) S az talán nem megdöbentő, hogy századunk 80-as éveiben derül ki, hogy a Parthenón cellájának keleti falán, a bejárat két oldalán, 1–1 ablak volt? (M. Korres,