

Eine zusammenfassende Auswertung, die sich auch unter zusätzlichen Fragestellungen mit bekanntem Material auseinandersetzt und somit neue Aussagen ermöglichen kann, ist grundsätzlich zu begrüßen. Der vorliegende Band ersetzt dabei keine Überblicksdarstellung, so sind beispielsweise Befunde wie die Tore der großen augusteischen Befestigung (zusammenfassend DRIESSEN 2007, 44–49 mit Rekonstruktion des Osttors Fig. 16) hier kein Thema. Im Zusammenspiel von Auswertungen und methodischen Überlegungen kommen in den einzelnen Kapiteln gelegentlich Wiederholungen vor. In den drei längeren Beiträgen sind manche Aussagen trotz der jeweiligen Zusammenfassungen etwas versteckt und könnten auch pointierter formuliert sein. Sehr positiv ist herauszuheben, dass das Buch bereits kurz nach Erscheinen online als PDF frei verfügbar war (abgerufen am 15.7.2019: <https://english.cultureelerfgoed.nl/publications/publications/2016/01/01/no-19-four-approaches-to-the-analysis-of-pre-roman-nijmegen>).

D-40227 Düsseldorf
Kruppstraße 97
E-Mail: raymundgottschalk@gmx.de

Raymund Gottschalk

PETER FASOLD / ANDREA HAMPEL / MARKUS SCHOLZ / MARIANNE TABACZEK, Der römische Bestattungsplatz von Frankfurt am Main-Zeilsheim. Schriften des Archäologischen Museums Frankfurt Band 26. Verlag Schnell & Steiner, Regensburg 2016. € 49.95. ISBN 978-3-7954-2974-4. 317 pages with 315 illustrations and 3 inserts.

In 1990, extensive field-walking was conducted by the Office for Archaeological Heritage Management, under the direction of Margarete Dohrn-Ihmig, in the predominantly agricultural district of Zeilsheim at the western edge of the city of Frankfurt. Two sites (ZEI 18 and ZEI 19) in the area known as the “Langgewähr Flur” proved to be of particular interest; here, unusually large numbers of fragments of Roman pottery were collected and, in the case of ZEI 19, fragments of Roman building rubble. Soon afterwards, in 1994, pieces of Samian ware, gathered up in the same area by a private individual and handed in to the Darmstadt branch of the Hesse Office for Archaeological Heritage Management, provided a first indication of the date of the site: Norbert Hanel assigned the pieces to the second half of the 2nd century AD. Since the features had long lain in the plough horizon, a rescue excavation was mounted at site ZEI 18 in 2004, uncovering the remains of a Roman cemetery with 41 graves. In the same year, and later in 2011 and 2012, the excavations were accompanied by geophysical surveys, which suggested that the cemetery extended further than the excavated area. On the basis of these investigations, the feature has been interpreted by Andrea Hampel and others as a Roman farmstead (ZEI 19) with a cemetery situated about 300 m away on the Roman road between Mainz and Nida (ZEI 18) (pp. 13–18). What makes the excavation and the present book so unusual, however, is the discovery, in the eastern section of the excavated area (findspots 6–9), of over 530 stone fragments (according to p. 122, or “around 500” according to p. 131) belonging to a Roman funerary monument which once must have dominated the cemetery. As Markus Scholz points out, the assemblage is thus “one of the few completely excavated and published cemeteries associated with a *villa rustica* in the area of the north-western provinces of the Roman Empire where funerary architecture survives. The rare occurrence – almost unprecedented in the frontier region – of monumental funerary architecture being preserved in the context of its cemetery makes it possible to adopt a synthesis of archaeological and art-historical approaches and methods” (p. 9).

The scientific analysis and publication of the site is the result of an exemplary collaboration between the Office for Archaeological Heritage Management of the City of Frankfurt am Main,

the Frankfurt Archaeological Museum, and the Romano-Germanic Central Museum of Mainz (RGZM) in association with the Institute for Spatial Information and Surveying Technology at the Mainz University of Applied Sciences (i3mainz). With support from the German Research Foundation (DFG) and the committed efforts of 17 researchers, primarily in 2011 and 2012, every state-of-the-art method available was applied to the analysis of the cemetery, and the results have been assembled in a faultlessly edited publication.

After a short introduction by Markus Scholz (pp. 9–12), Andrea Hampel provides an outline of the excavation and research history and the results of the geophysical prospections (pp. 13–18). Then follow two substantial chapters devoted to the graves (pp. 19–120) and the funerary monument (pp. 121–264) respectively.

At site ZEI 18, 41 burials were recovered, most of them in their entirety, and these are summarised concisely but thoroughly in a catalogue compiled by Peter Fasold (pp. 77–92) and illustrated with numerous photographs and drawings (Pl. 1–27). In Fasold's analysis of the grave goods (pp. 19–36), the chronology of the graves, covering the period from the Flavian to the Severan era, is based primarily on coins and pottery. According to Fasold, three main burial phases can be distinguished: (1) the Flavian-Trajanic period, (2) the first half of the 2nd century AD, and (3) the second half of the 2nd century AD (see inserts 1–3), each successive phase being associated with a particular area of the cemetery (p. 41). Among the finds, a face pot from the unusually richly furnished grave 28, which also appears in the illustration on the front of the volume, is of particular interest. The remains of an inscription visible on its surface were deciphered by Peter Fasold and Marcus Scholz to read *rat(i)arior(um)*, perhaps referring to a society of raftsmen; whether any message was intended by the differences between the two faces depicted on either side of the vessel remains a mystery (pp. 28 f.). The provenance of six of the pottery vessels found in the graves was investigated in detail by Susanne Biegert and Gerwulf Schneider using X-ray fluorescence analysis; the results showed that most of the pieces were manufactured in nearby Nied (pp. 37–40).

Only limited information about burial methods and rites could be gleaned from the graves, owing to the poor state of preservation of many of them. Generally speaking, however, urn burials predominated in the Flavian-Trajanic period (pp. 43 f.). Grave goods included unburnt vessels, balsamaria, and lamps. Later, the quality and quantity of grave goods markedly declined, prompting the tentative suggestion by Fasold et al. of a new burial phase, perhaps resulting from a change of ownership of the estate. The grave goods and the composition of the assemblages also differed from those of other cemeteries, for example, at Mainz and Frankfurt am Main-Heddernheim. Similar observations on the internal organisation of cemeteries in *Germania Superior* have quite frequently been made in recent years (cf. P. FASOLD, *Die Bestattungsorte des Militärlagers und Civitas-Hauptortes NIDA-Heddernheim*. *Schr. Arch. Mus. Frankfurt* 20 [Frankfurt a. M. 2006/2011]). Importantly, they show, among other things, how difficult it is to draw any conclusions from the grave goods, types of burial, and burial rites about the origins of the deceased. Fasold is nevertheless inclined to see grave goods of brooches and unburnt crockery as indications of a population originating from the left side of the Rhine, where grave goods of this type are more frequent (pp. 45–51) (cf. now also A. HEISING, *Kommunikationsräume innerhalb römischer Provinzen. Das Beispiel Germania Superior – eine Provinz mit zwei Gesichtern?* In: S. Brather / J. Dendorfer [eds], *Grenzen, Räume und Identitäten. Der Oberrhein und seine Nachbarregionen von der Antike bis zum Hochmittelalter*. *Arch. u. Gesch.* 22 [Ostfildern 2017] 199–237).

Grave 28 is a case in point; beyond the observation that, with a glass urn and a pair of silver-plated brooches, it was more richly furnished than the others, little could be stated about the social status of its occupant (pp. 53–56). Nathalie Gangl, Nicole Nicklisch, and Kurt W. Alt carried out histological examinations of the cremated remains of nine individuals in varying states

of preservation. Of those that could be identified, all were adults at the times of their deaths, and some were in old age (pp. 57–61). Anthropological analyses carried out by Carmen Friedrich and Kurt W. Alt of altogether 33 mostly rather poorly preserved burials from features 20 and 40 also revealed two children's burials (pp. 63–72). Christina Wustrow identified nearly half of a total of 260 animal bones found in 19 graves, revealing, as in other Roman cemeteries in the region, a preference for pig parts (especially hindquarters) as grave goods (pp. 73–75).

The second lengthy chapter in the book is devoted to the large funerary monument, whose remains came to light in the form of over 500 sandstone fragments at findspots 6–8 (pp. 271–272) and particularly at findspot 9 (pp. 121–124). According to geologist Gotthard Kowalczyk, the stone originated from two separate sources. A reddish sandstone was quarried in the immediate vicinity (*Vilbeler Sandstein*), while a lighter, variegated sandstone had to be transported to Zeilsheim from further afield (probably from Odenwald). There was no obvious correlation, however, between, for example, the finer stone and the more intricate relief carvings (pp. 237–244). According to Thomas Flügen, no traces were found of the painted decoration which may once have existed (p. 221).

The bulk of the work towards this chapter was carried out by Marianne Tabaczek, who entered 440 fragments into the central object database at the Archaeological Institute of the University of Cologne, known as Arachne (<http://arachne.dainst.org>), and compiled a catalogue of 164 of the best-preserved pieces (pp. 193–220). In addition, approximately 179 fragments, selected by Tabaczek, were examined by Anja Cramer, Guido Heinz, Carina Justus, and Tobias Reich using a 3D scanner (pp. 125–130). The virtual models thus produced, in which the preserved fragments are marked, made it easier to reconstruct the funerary monument (p. 130 Fig. 60) and also formed the basis for an undistorted 2D drawing. Many of the fragments pictured in the catalogue are published not as photos but as scans. While this has the disadvantage of giving the surfaces a very greasy appearance, it makes many aspects of their structure easier to see.

On sound evidence, Tabaczek localises the funerary monument at findspot 9 and deduces that its dimensions must have been roughly 3.0 × 3.0 m. Having established this, she is able, thanks to the standardised proportional relationships between the individual elements of a building and the building as a whole typical of Roman architecture, to produce a methodical and highly worked out visualisation of the structure's original appearance, including the relief decoration, only very small fragments of which have survived. According to this, the monument at Zeilsheim was a two-storeyed *aedicula*. For the reconstruction of the closed plinth storey, which was wider than it was high, the numerous fragments of capitals were particularly important. The front has been hypothetically reconstructed with an inscription, now lost, and – on the basis of a single fragment (no. 36 Figs 74; 167; 168) – an unusually large relief of a horse parade, a theme otherwise known mainly from the Rhineland. Maenads are positioned on the two short sides. Dionysian themes also decorate the relief pilasters which feature prominently on the reconstructed upper storey, which is also closed. On the front, between the pilasters, niches (nos 49–53) for portraits (nos 66–76) of the deceased couple are reconstructed. The monument also had decorative oriental figures, as evidenced by one head (no. 77 Figs 103; 104; 208–210) which was particularly well preserved (pp. 133–162). Using the analogies of other funerary monuments, Tabaczek places this figure on one of the short sides and assumes that a similar figure must have adorned the other. No fragments of the roof were found. Based, again, on analogies with other *aediculae* and funerary monuments featuring columns and niches, this is visualised as a pyramidal roof decorated with scales. A few fragments suggest that it may have been surmounted by a sphinx (nos 84–90). There were also two lions, positioned at either side of the roof or of the upper storey. These were carved from a different type of stone, and the fragments discovered include the lower jaws and muzzles (nos 80–82, possibly also 83). Finally, not only is a reconstruction drawing provided, but the uncertainties and

alternatives discussed in the text are also visualised in two further drawings, slight differences being mainly in the widths and depths of the two storeys (Figs 133–135). The inclusion of abaci at the transition from the lower to the upper storey and from the upper storey to the roof guarantees the stability of the building (pp. 175 f.).

The dating is based on iconographic and stylistic analysis of the architectural elements, the relief decoration, and the overall building type. Both the capitals on the lower storey – which are identified as being of the Kähler H type (although the element of the cradle-shaped bract, which would underpin the identification, is missing) and whose acanthus leaves have spoon-shaped terminations – and the figurative pillars suggest that the building originated in the 2nd century AD, with the most convincing comparisons dating from the middle of the century. In Tabaczek's opinion, the analysis of the relief decoration tends to support this view, although the poor state of preservation – as the author notes – hardly permits any definitive statements (pp. 163–172). Furthermore, the type of monument revealed by the reconstruction shows it to have been one of a sizeable group of *aediculae* featuring niches in the upper storey which were constructed between the mid-1st and mid-2nd centuries AD (pp. 176–181). The interpretation of the relief images that follows remains necessarily tentative, owing to the generally poor state both of their preservation and of research to date. However, Tabaczek, supporting her theory with reference to other, similar images where inscriptions have survived, believes that the horse parade and the toga-clad figure of the deceased suggest that the owner of the grave and of the estate may have been a veteran of a cavalry unit (pp. 181–187).

Finally, the funerary monument is remarkable for the fact that it seems to have been demolished only a few decades after its erection, in around AD 200. On the face of it, this appears somewhat remarkable; Roman tombs were, after all, protected by religious law, as Markus Scholz demonstrates, based on his comprehensive knowledge of Roman funerary constructions (pp. 248–252). Just as in the case of the reconstruction, where different possible solutions are presented in parallel, Scholz offers, with all due caution, two possible interpretations of the feature. According to one scenario, the estate could have changed owners around AD 200, whereupon the new owner demolished the tombs, since they did not belong to his own family, and recycled the building materials for other purposes. That was forbidden, of course, but Scholz is able to cite several other instances of funerary monuments being demolished as early as the early and middle Imperial period, where a similar interpretation has been proposed (pp. 252–259).

The second scenario does not exclude the first but goes further. It is based on observations concerning the stone fragments which, according to Marianne Tabaczek (p. 132) and Thomas Flügen (pp. 228–230), suggest that the demolition of the monument was not purely for economic reasons but rather an act of wilful destruction. Evidence to support this theory are the three remaining complete foundation blocks in trench no. 9 and the large number of smaller fragments found in the same area, tool marks on the fracture face of at least one fragment (cat. no. 107 Fig. 275 and possibly also cat. nos 111; 120), and the unusual depth – 6 m – of the ditch at findspot 9 filled with demolition debris. The fact that matching fragments were found at different findspots shows that some stones were moved twice during the demolition process.

In my opinion, these arguments are not sufficient to completely rule out purely economic motives for the demolition of the funerary monument and the clearing of the site. After all, breaking up stones – to obtain material for Roman concrete constructions, for example – and leaving behind of material no longer needed are not in themselves unusual. Should this indeed be a case of wilful destruction, however, reminiscent of the practice of throwing Jupiter Columns into pits, which is frequently documented on the right side of the Rhine (see now: Ph. KIERNAN, Germans, Christians, and ritual of closure: Agents of cult image destructions in Roman Germany. In: T. M. Kristensen / L. Stirling [eds], *The Afterlife of Greek and Roman Sculpture. Late Antique Responses and Practices* [Ann Arbor 2016] 197–222), Markus Scholz suggests the conflict between

Septimius Severus and Clodius Albinus in the AD 190s as a possible cause. He imagines the owner of the Zeilsheim estate as a loyal follower of Clodius Albinus, who was stripped of his possessions following the latter's defeat at the Battle of Lyon in February AD 197. This could have resulted in a sort of *damnatio memoriae*, to which ultimately even the funerary monument fell victim. In support of this theory, he quotes a passage by Iulius Paulus (Paulus Dig. 21,2,11), a lawyer active under Severus Alexander, according to which estates were seized and disposed of on the orders of an unnamed Roman emperor in an unidentified region on the right side of the Rhine and some of them given to veterans as rewards (pp. 259–264).

After brief commentaries by Markus Scholz on the ditches in front of the cemetery, which are interpreted as boundary markers (pp. 265–270), and a catalogue of further finds by Peter Fasold (pp. 271–276), the results of the entire investigation are drawn together by Peter Fasold, Markus Scholz, and Marianne Tabaczek in a synthesis published in both German and English. The authors are keen to explore “the cultural, social and economic life circumstances of those who commissioned the funerary monument and who were buried here”. The results of the analyses of the funerary monument (location, reconstruction, building material, relief decoration, and dating as well as the demolition of the structure and burial of its remains) and the graves (topography, succession of burials, grave goods, and type of burial) are summarised briefly (and less tentatively than before) and forged into a narrative, according to which the estate to which the cemetery belonged was first established by incomers from eastern Gaul during the reign of Vespasian. A change of ownership occurred during the reign of Trajan. The face pot with the inscription, described above, is again advanced as evidence to support the idea that the owner of the funerary monument, built around 150–160 AD, was a veteran of an *ala*, who had made his wealth through rafting. This family was driven out around AD 200 and the monument destroyed. A summary (pp. 301 f.), a bibliography, and references of illustrations follow.

Regardless of how far readers may go along with all the details of the interpretations advanced and usually expressly characterised as hypotheses, the present volume is an excellent presentation of the material, providing the world of scholarship with an exemplary analysis of a spectacular funerary monument with an associated cemetery. The publication is impressive proof of the precision and speed with which such important features as the Roman cemetery at Frankfurt am Main-Zeilsheim can be analysed and published if several research institutions from across the specialist spectrum collaborate in a goal-oriented project. The Rhine-Main region, with its many excellent research institutions and universities, offers ideal prerequisites for a collaboration of this type, and one gladly forgives the occasional repetition resulting from articles by the numerous authors overlapping. This approach of involving every analysis facility currently available has produced an important volume of evidence, which will provide a reference source for future research, especially with regard to funerary architecture on the right side of the Rhine (see also a slightly later publication on a funerary monument in *Raetia*: M. C. PICHLER, Die Grabbauten der römischen Villa “Am Stättbach” bei Harburg [Schwaben]-Großsorheim: eine Analyse der Bauglieder. Ber. Bayer. Bodendenkmalpf. 58, 2017, 153–225). Particularly praiseworthy is the fact that all uncertainties and open questions – concerning, for example, the reconstruction and the increasingly speculative interpretations towards the end – remain clear and transparent.

Translated by Isabel Aitken and Sandy Hämmerle.

D-55128 Mainz
Jakob-Welder-Weg 18
E-mail: jlipps@uni-mainz.de

Johannes Lipps
Arbeitsbereich Klassische Archäologie
Institut für Altertumswissenschaften
Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz