

Das Feld der Paläographie möchte der Autor lieber „Kundigeren“ überlassen (S. 38). Das ist zwar legitim, doch bietet der beträchtliche Materialumfang durchaus Chancen dazu, zumindest im Falle geritzter und durchaus auch punktierter Inschriften. So hätte das silberne Votivblech aus Weißenburg (S. 151 Nr. 46), das nur den punktierten Götternamen trägt, wohingegen die nachfolgenden Zeilen für Stifternamen etc. leer blieben, Anlass geboten, über eine mögliche Mehrphasigkeit solcher Votivinschriften nachzudenken, d. h. ob man solche Bleche wie Devotionalien vorfertigte und den Stiftername dann fallweise ergänzte; vgl. zu dieser Quellengattung jetzt N. BIRKLE, Untersuchungen zur Form, Funktion und Bedeutung gefiederter römischer Votivbleche. *Univforsch. Prähist. Arch.* 234 (Bonn 2013) 33. Das Material für solche und ähnliche Studien ist nun aber aufbereitet und erschlossen. Der Feststellung des Autors, dass orthographische Devianzen nicht automatisch mit Fehlern gleichzusetzen sind, sondern auch auf unterschiedliche Aussprache zurückgehen können, ist beizupflichten. Allerdings reichen die Belege nicht aus, um von einem „obergermanischen“ oder „rätischen“ Latein (wenn auch vom Autor in Anführungsstriche gesetzt) zu sprechen. Wenn Kleininschriften und Graffiti auch künftig derart konsequent und gründlich erfasst werden, erscheinen weiterführende Studien in diese Richtung immerhin denkbar.

Als Fazit bleibt festzuhalten, dass dieses zum Teil recht eigenwillige Werk zwar etliche Unzulänglichkeiten und Fehler im Detail aufweist, dass sich der Autor durch seine kategorischen Aussagen oft selbst im Weg steht und bei Auswertungsansätzen stehen geblieben ist, doch ist das Potential der sog. Kleininschriften weitgehend erschlossen. Die künftige Forschung wird gewiss dankbar auf dieses Corpus zurückgreifen!

D – 60629 Frankfurt am Main  
Norbert-Wollheim-Platz 1 / Uni-Campus Westend  
E-Mail: m.scholz@em.uni-frankfurt.de

Markus Scholz  
Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität  
Institut für Archäologische Wissenschaften, Abt. II  
Archäologie und Geschichte der  
römischen Provinzen

**NIVES DONEUS (ed.), Das kaiserzeitliche Gräberfeld von Halbtorn, Burgenland.** Teil 1–4. With contributions by M. Berner, F. Daim, N. Doneus, E. Draganits, Ch. Ertel, H. Herold, G. K. Kunst, A. Preh, A. Rohatsch, H. Taeuber, U. Thanheiser, K. Vondrovec, H. Winter und S. Wiesinger. *Monographien des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums* Volume 122,1–4, Mainz 2014. € 226.00. ISBN 978-3-88467-233-4. 4 volumes, 1586 pages with 810 plates and 317 figures.

The four volumes under review here present the results of a research project initiated in 1988, in which several members and departments of the *Institut für Ur- und Frühgeschichte* (today the *Institut für Urgeschichte und Historische Archäologie*) of the University of Vienna took part. The focus of this long-term investigation was the site of Halbtorn (district of Neusiedl am See) in northern Burgenland in Austria, close to the border to Hungary. In Roman times, the location of the site provided a link to the road from *Scarbantia* to *Carnuntum* in the province of *Pannonia Superior*. Today the largely agricultural and unbuilt terrain offers ideal conditions for large-scale investigations. After a chance discovery of two inhumation burials in 1986, a cemetery of the imperial period and its corresponding *villa rustica* as well as the remains of a Roman field system were investigated by surveys and excavations between 1988 and 2002, over an area of around 20 hectares. Numismatists, anthropologists and specialists in archaeozoology, archaeobotany, archaeometrics and geoarchaeology were involved in the evaluation of the data. This multidisciplinary approach,

which included extensive geophysical and aerial surveys in advance of the excavations, meant that this project was particularly innovative for its time, and became a cornerstone for later projects in terms of research methodology and analysis.

The first results from these endeavours were published in 2004 in the series *Monographien zur Frühgeschichte und Mittelalterarchäologie* (F. DAIM / N. DONEUS [eds], Halbtorn I. Das kaiserzeitliche Gräberfeld und die Villa von Halbtorn, Burgenland: Naturräumliche Voraussetzungen, Prospektion und Vorbericht. Monogr. Frühgesch. Mittelalterarch. 10 [Innsbruck 2004]), reviewed by O. HEINRICH-TAMÁŠKA (*Ethn.-Arch. Zeitschr.* 47, 2006, 385–387). This publication focused primarily on survey methods and their potential applications for large-scale investigations, whereas the 2014 volumes reviewed here have the cemetery at their heart. The archaeological analysis submitted by Nives Doneus to the University of Vienna in 2006 as her doctoral dissertation constitutes the basis of this work.

A fully excavated cemetery of around 300 burials (cremations and inhumations), some 180 m west of the reconstructed settlement area, is designated Halbtorn I, while Halbtorn II is a burial ground discovered in 1961 to the east of the *villa* and dated to the 3<sup>rd</sup> century AD. The cemetery of Halbtorn I was in use from the 2<sup>nd</sup> to the 5<sup>th</sup> century AD – as was the *villa* – and it occupied an area of some 6000 m<sup>2</sup>.

In the first contribution (pp. 1–230) to the first volume (Part I: Archaeology, History and Burial Rites), Nives Doneus presents the results of her analysis of Cemetery I. Her evaluation is complemented by the tables and the catalogue in volumes 3 and 4 (Part 3: Tables and Catalogue, pp. 1–398; Part 4: Tables and Catalogue, pp. 399–810). The catalogue contains only the archaeologically relevant features, which leads to a few gaps in the listing. Features and graves are differentiated, whereby the graves are exclusively the inhumation burials (150), whereas the features encompass the cremations (160), small graves and *Grabgärtchen* (“small burial gardens”) as well as the pits and postholes. This scheme, which includes the description of the features or graves in separate plates that include their location, plan, section drawing(s) and contain illustrations and descriptions of the relevant finds, strikes the present reviewer as a rather idiosyncratic solution; it leads to a quite inconsistent, though generously conceived, design, which nevertheless contributes to gaining an overview and facilitates handling.

Nives Doneus’ contribution to volume I is organised along the feature groups defined in the catalogue. First the field boundary ditches, whose extent can be reconstructed from the aerial photographs beyond the excavation areas, formed a NNW–SSE oriented field system that structured the settlement and burial zones. The fields’ quadrilateral layout was governed by varying units of measurement, meaning that their length (the Roman *actus*) could not be determined.

*Grabgärtchen* is the term that the author uses to describe enclosed, mostly quadrangular areas delimited by small ditches; 40 were identified and subdivided into four groups. They contained and partly were overlain by numerous cremation and inhumation burials. Doneus presents the evidence for these grave types in the following two parts of her contribution. Pits, postholes and animal deposits round off this chapter. The second section of Doneus’ study is dedicated to the finds, including pottery, glass, metal and other small finds.

These data form the basis of the cemetery’s chronological sequence. The earliest horizon (dated to the second third of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD) includes the field boundary ditches, whose orientation determined the layout of the later *Grabgärtchen*, which are dated, alongside the cremations excavated in them (as well as some inhumations), to a period spanning the last third of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century to the middle of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century. The 2<sup>nd</sup> century is characterised in the *Grabgärtchen* of Group 1 by ceramics produced in Lezoux, and in Group 2 by pottery from Rheinzabern; the third century is

represented by several groups of Samian wares from Rheinzabern and Westendorf. There are no more cremations after the second third of the 4<sup>th</sup> century. The inhumations of the Late Roman period were found mainly to the west of the field boundary ditch 3. The dating of the polished and burnished pottery recovered in these ditches to the late 4<sup>th</sup> and early 5<sup>th</sup> century has been the subject of justified criticism in a review by Friderika HORVÁTH (*Acta Arch. Acad. Scien. Hungaricae* 67, 2016, 199–202), given that recent research has established that this group of finds occurs earlier (F. HORVÁTH, *Das spätantike Keramikspektrum in Keszthely-Fenékpuszta – erste Ergebnisse*. In: O. Heinrich-Tamáška [ed.], *Keszthely-Fenékpuszta im Kontext spätantiker Kontinuitätsforschung zwischen Noricum und Moesia. Castellum Pannonicum Pelsonense 2* [Budapest et al. 2011] 597–652). The most recent inhumations date to the second third of the 5<sup>th</sup> century and mark the end of occupation at Halbtorn.

N. Doneus ends her contribution with a discussion of the burial rites and concludes that the graves must have been marked above ground since very few graves, or posts and ditches, cut each other and that moving soil from the ditches to the centre of the plot resulted in mounds (see the contribution by Erich Draganits and Alexander Preh in vol. 1, pp. 277–298). She subdivides the *Grabgärtchen* and other burials into six groups (I–VI, p. 181, fig. 126) which are separated in space but are partly overlapping in time. The author shows convincingly that the burial practices and grave goods reflect the gender and age of the deceased, but she does not consider further issues, such as social or religious aspects.

The section entitled “Summary” (pp. 204–217) contains a correlation with the results of the natural scientific analyses and presented in volume 2. It is a précis of the development of the settlement, its economic potential and cultivation, and the demographic profile of a rural community in the hinterland of *Carnuntum* from the 2<sup>nd</sup> to the 5<sup>th</sup> century AD. Repetition of the points made in Part 2 is unfortunately unavoidable here. Further, it is to be regretted that the micro-regional aspects reported are not considered reflexively on the wider canvas of Pannonia. Granted it is difficult to provide such insights, given that publication of previous research in the region disadvantages rural contexts in favour of urban spaces in current research. Yet placing Halbtorn I in a wider geographic and administrative framework would have been welcome (see T. LELEKOVIĆ, *Cemeteries*. In: B. Migotti [ed.], *The Archaeology of Roman Southern Pannonia. The State of Research and Selected Problems in the Croatian Part of the Roman Province of Pannonia*. BAR Internat. Ser. 1393 [Oxford 2012] 313–357) for a recent publication on cemeteries of southern Pannonia). This also applies to the field boundaries and the way they were organised, since the observations made at Halbtorn are of fundamental importance for the agricultural history of Pannonia. A greater, more comparative focus on this aspect would have been valuable (see e. g. O. HEINRICH-TAMÁŠKA, *Spätromische Villen an der mittleren Donau. Anmerkungen zu Erforschung der Landnutzung am Übergang zwischen Spätantike und Frühmittelalter*. In: V. Denzer / A. Dietrich / M. Hardt / H. Th. Porada / W. Schenk [eds], *Homogenisierung und Diversifizierung von Kulturlandschaften. Siedlungsforschung. Archäologie, Geschichte, Geographie* 29 [Bonn 2011] 39–59).

The contributions that round off the first part of the report include: a Jewish gold amulet from a child’s grave (Hans Taeuber, pp. 231–235), the coins (Klaus Vondorec and Heinz Winter, pp. 237–254), the *spolia* (Christine Ertel, pp. 255–276), and a calculation, as already mentioned, of the volume of the ditches enclosing the *Grabgärtchen* (E. Draganits and A. Preh, pp. 277–298).

Volume 2 contains the results of the analyses conducted by the specialists in their respective domain of the natural sciences. Margit Berner (pp. 309–483) presents a catalogue and assessment of the human bones from the cremation and inhumation burials, drawing attention to changes in the community’s demographic profile, mainly visible in the decrease in the number of individuals buried in the Late Roman phase compared to those dated to the 2<sup>nd</sup>–3<sup>rd</sup> century AD.

Günther Karl Kunst's chapter on the animal bones recovered at Halbtorn (pp. 485–640) highlights that most of the assemblage was not linked to burial rites (offerings of food, sacrifice or funeral feast) but was recovered in the fills of ditches and pits or was partly redeposited there. These deposits can thus be considered to represent refuse (butchery and kitchen waste) from the *villa rustica*. This interpretation is supported by the parallels he cites from Roman sites in eastern Austria, summarised as “periphere Abfallmilieus von ländlichen Siedlungen” (peripheral milieus of waste of rural settlements, p. 596).

Ursula Thenheider and Silvia Wiesinger come to a similar conclusion in their examination of the plant remains from Halbtorn I (pp. 641–664). Given their low incidence and because the carbonised seeds and fruit were not connected with the burials, the authors also presume that these remains formed part of the *villa rustica*'s refuse.

The results of the petrographic analysis of ceramics based on the thin-sections of 32 samples of pottery and eight of clay are discussed by Hajnalka Herold (pp. 665–690). The microstructure of these samples allowed her to subdivide them into six groups that provide various insights into the composition of the material and the techniques used by the potters. Comparison with the clay samples suggests that local clays were appropriate and available for all the ceramic groups. Several correlations could also be established with the material from *Carnuntum*.

The second volume ends with two contributions, by Andreas Rohatsch and Erich Draganits (pp. 691–716), on the geoarchaeology of the stone artefacts in general and of the material from Halbtorn more specifically. Worked stone recovered in the excavation campaigns numbered 130 specimens, whose analysis is presented here. They consist entirely of Neogene limestone and calcareous sandstone, which do not occur locally but had to be brought in from the near vicinity (from the Leitha and Hainberg Mountains). Moreover, the authors were able to show the presence of traces documenting the use of different tools. Unfortunately, there are no indications as to the context of the worked stone finds or what function they fulfilled, e.g. whether they were re-used (if *spolia*, reference to the chapter by Ch. Ertel would be expected).

Despite the small critical points made above, we must applaud the appearance of this four-volume publication which provides a whole series of data and results concerning rural Pannonia between the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> centuries AD, and stress its importance. Both the perspective of the *longue durée* and the complete excavation of an imperial-period cemetery are rare enough and they deserve such a careful and multidisciplinary treatment. It is only to be hoped that other rural sites will be examined along the same lines in the future to further our understanding of the evolution of settlement structure in Roman Pannonia.

D – 04109 Leipzig  
Reichsstraße 4–6  
Specks Hof (Eingang A)  
E-Mail: orsolya.heinrich-tamaska@leibniz-gwzo.de

Orsolya Heinrich-Tamáška  
Abt. „Mensch und Umwelt“  
Leibniz-Institut für Geschichte und  
Kultur des östlichen Europa (GWZO)