

**WOLFGANG CZYSZ, Handbuch der Provinzialrömischen Archäologie. I. Quellen, Methoden, Ziele.** Münchner Beiträge zur Provinzialrömischen Archäologie. Ergänzungsband 1. Reichert Verlag, Wiesbaden 2019. € 29.80. ISBN 978-3-95490-355-9 (Hardcover). € 29.80. ISBN 978-3-95490-621-5 (E-book). doi: <https://doi.org/10.29091/9783954906215>. 344 pages with 28 illustrations (b/w).

In contrast to the anglophone scientific community, where not only overviews on the archaeology of the Roman provinces have become more frequent in recent years (e.g. S. JAMES / St. KRMNICEK (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of Roman Germany*. Oxford Handbooks [Oxford 2020]. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199665730.001.0001>; M. MILLETT et al., *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Britain*. Oxford Handbooks [Oxford 2016]. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199697731.001.0001>) but a theoretical discourse is also more actively and openly pursued, the German-speaking *Provinzialrömische Forschungsgemeinschaft* has been more quiet in this respect. This disparity hasn't gone unnoticed, as the series editors themselves write in the foreword, citing the lack of a handbook covering the theoretical basics of German-speaking Roman provincial archaeology. The first supplement of the series "Münchner Beiträge zur Provinzialrömischen Archäologie" thus aims to fill this desideratum. The author of this handbook is Wolfgang Czysz. After studying Archaeology of the Roman Provinces, Prehistory and Zooarchaeology at Mainz, Heidelberg, Oxford, and Munich, where he earned his doctorate in 1975, Czysz directed the German Research Foundation (DFG)-Project Heldenbergen (Hesse, DE) from 1975–1977 before entering employment with the Bavarian State Department for Monuments and Sites, where he worked as head of division (Thierhaupten / Nuremberg offices) until his retirement in 2014.

The book is broadly split into three parts: (1) an introductory part consisting of a glossary on abbreviations, Latin / Greek termini, and an introduction by the author; (2) the main part consisting of 118 alphabetically ordered entries of terms; and (3) an extended bibliography, comprising not only the cited archaeological publications but also many other types of reference works, lexica, and corpora.

In the author's introduction ("Einleitung", pp. 27–33), the discipline of Roman provincial archaeology is described from different angles. On one hand, its development as a university subject and its relationship to neighbouring disciplines is discussed, and, on the other, its chronological and geographical framework is delineated. The introduction also sees first critical reflections on the *modus operandi* of German-speaking *Provinzialrömische Archäologie*. Citing the "theoretical turn" which has heavily influenced German-speaking prehistory in the last few decades, Czysz makes the claim for a more theoretically informed and methodologically transparent German-speaking Roman provincial archaeology (for a contribution on the theoretical discussion in German-speaking prehistory see K. P. HOFMANN / P. W. STOCKHAMMER, *Beyond antiquarianism. A review of current theoretical issues in German-speaking prehistoric archaeology*. *Arch. Dialogues* 24,1, 2017, 1–25. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1380203817000022> and the following responses 25–87). Despite the masses of finds and spectacular excavation results, the scientific process of getting from the research question to results has – according to Czysz – largely gone ignored, resulting in a theoretical and methodological lag. The aim of the handbook is thus not to give an introduction into the findings of archaeological excavations, the material culture, or even the "achievements of the civilisation" of the Roman provinces but intends to further or at least kickstart the aforementioned theoretical and methodological discussion within this specific field.

The main part of the book consists of 118 entries arranged in alphabetical order (pp. 37–314). The entries themselves vary in length. Eleven (9%) are under two pages long, 64 (54%) of the

entries are between two and four pages long, 34 entries (29%) are between four and six pages long, and nine entries (8%) are seven pages or longer. The longest entries are ‘excavation’, ‘dating methods’, ‘neighbouring disciplines’, ‘Roman provincial archaeology’, ‘sources’, ‘settlement archaeology’ and the ‘systematic of Roman provincial archaeology’, ‘types of text’, and ‘the construction of time’ (“Ausgrabung”, “Datierungsmethoden”, “Nachbarwissenschaften”, “Provinzialrömische Archäologie”, “Quellen”, “Siedlungsarchäologie”, “Systematik der provinzialrömischen Archäologie”, “Textsorten”, “Zeitrechnung”). As the author mentions in the introduction, many entries are not solely confined to the realm of Roman provincial archaeology but venture into other fields such as hermeneutics, knowledge production, and scientific theory. Besides entries covering archaeological subject matters, entries on more abstract topics can also be found such as ‘progress’, ‘clear and explicit’, ‘objectivity and subjectivity’, ‘meaning’, ‘reality’ (“Fortschritt”, “Klar und deutlich”, “Objektivität und Subjektivität”, “Sinn”, “Wirklichkeit”). All entries are rich in information yet written in a clear and structured manner. Easy to read diagrams accompany and complement the longer entries. A succinct bibliography figures at the end of each entry with further literature on the topic. Many entries are accompanied by the term translated into English and / or Latin (in some cases French and Italian) and consist of sub-entries. For example, the entry on ‘sources’ is around six-pages long and consists of four sub-entries (“Archäologische Quellen”, “Quellenkunde”, “Kritische Quellenedition”, and “Forschungsstand”). As the table of contents does not list all the sub-entries, the reader must also consult the glossary (pp. 335–343) to find further keywords but neither is this comprehensive. For example, Czysz’ elucidating thoughts on site formation processes (and the corresponding literature) can only be found by reading the sub-entry on ‘sources’ (“Quellenkunde”). The following comments concern some of the longer entries as together they make up a substantial part of the handbook.

The entry ‘excavation’ (“Ausgrabung”, pp. 48–57) tackles the concept from a multitude of angles. Here, Czysz’ expertise as an experienced field archaeologist really comes to the forefront. The entry is split into further sub-entries covering topics such as the legal basics of excavations, the various types of excavation, a short description on the excavation procedure, the key concepts of an excavation (e. g. findings, layers, finds) but also other aspects such as the tools and machines used, the role of private contractors, sampling strategies, financial aspects, and finally post-excavation analyses and publication procedures.

The entry on ‘dating methods’ (“Datierungsmethoden”, pp. 77–85) differentiates between archaeological dating methods (absolute and relative chronology) and scientific dating methods (dendrochronology, radiocarbon dating). The sub-entry concerning relative chronology is further divided into different factors with which the relative chronology of a site or feature can be determined: stratigraphy, closed finds, dated sites, dated events, coins, and sigillata chronology. There then follows a further sub-chapter on the methodological problems and restrictions of archaeological dating, with important thoughts on topics such as object biographies and sample sizes. The whole entry contains key information on the chronological basics of Roman provincial archaeology – the bedrock for any interpretation. It may however be too densely written for archaeologists or readers not *au fait* with chronology and the chronological discussion. Furthermore, the inclusion of dated sites from the 1<sup>st</sup> century BC would have made a welcome addition to the existing chronological framework (e. g. Alésia [FR], Trier-Petrisberg [DE], or the shipwreck of Madrague de Giens [FR]).

The entry on ‘Roman provincial archaeology’ (“Provinzialrömische Archäologie”, pp. 215–222) rightly underlines the significance of the subject as a stand-alone discipline within the German-speaking university sphere (and not as a subdiscipline of ancient history or classical archaeology). As in the introductory chapter (pp. 27–33), this entry delineates the spatial and chronological

framework of the discipline and its relationship to neighbouring disciplines. According to Czysz, the “unique selling points” of Roman provincial archaeology are

1. its multi-source approach – archaeological, literary, epigraphical, and iconographical sources should be analysed and combined in order to obtain scientifically substantiated statements.
2. its focus on the socio-cultural transformation processes which take place before, during, and at the end of the Roman period.

In addition, one could also add other aspects, like its applicability for transdisciplinary approaches to imperialism, conflict landscapes, the study of economic systems, its role in the construction of European identities, or border studies.

The sub-entry on the discipline’s history lists in chronological order when the chairs for Roman provincial archaeology were established at the respective universities in Germany (Strasbourg, Frankfurt, Munich, Passau, Cologne, Mainz, Bamberg, and Osnabrück). The situation in Switzerland and Austria is briefly outlined. Other institutions and their role within the research landscape such as the *Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum* (RGZM), the *Römisch-Germanische Kommission* (RGK), the *Limeskommission* or large museums (i. e. for Germany: *LVR Archäologischer Park Xanten* or *Römisch-Germanisches Museum* Cologne) do not get a mention.

The last sub-entry of Roman provincial archaeology is concerned with the developments of the discipline. Here, Czysz again underlines the need for *Provinzialrömische Archäologie* to move away from the descriptive nature of its early work – new studies should focus on solving problems rather than accumulating material (see also G. WOOLF, The present state and future scope of Roman archaeology: a comment. *Am. Journal Arch.* 108, 2004, 417–428. doi: <https://doi.org/10.3764/aja.108.3.417>). Furthermore, the discipline should strive for a more reflexive implementation of methodologies and technical terms. These sentiments can only be echoed.

The entry on sources (“Quellen” and “Quellenkritik”, pp. 222–229) explains the objective nature of archaeological sources and not only lists the three most common types of source used in prehistory / Roman provincial archaeology (settlements – graves – hoards, p. 223) but also adds other types of sources: transport routes, remains of agriculture, quarries, conflict sites, iconographic sources, epigraphic sources (for other types of sources see also M. K. H. EGGERT, *Prähistorische Archäologie. Konzepte und Methoden*<sup>4</sup>. Uni-Taschenbücher 2092 [Tübingen 2012] 83–101).

The entry on ‘settlement archaeology’ (“Siedlungsarchäologie”, pp. 234–241) starts with a short definition of the term “Siedlung” before going on to briefly describe different “types” of Roman-period settlement (e. g. *coloniae*, *vici*, rural settlements). The final part of the entry deals with questions and methods of landscape archaeology. The bibliography of this entry is especially rich and the whole entry makes for an excellent starting point for first-year archaeology students for this topic.

The entry on the ‘systematics of *Provinzialrömische Archäologie*’ (“Systematik der Provinzialrömischen Archäologie”, pp. 261–269) offers a possibility how the discipline could be systematised or broken down into its constituent parts (i. e. for a lecture series) in the form of a structured table. Research themes and subjects are grouped thematically and filed under various categories (e. g. population and society, arts and entertainment, afterlife and burial customs) This type of tabular overview shows once again the author’s knack for the ordering of topics, joined-up thinking and understanding of broader contexts.

In addition to the above comments on the longer entries, this reviewer would like to comment on a few of the smaller entries.

The entry on ‘literature on Roman Provincial Archaeology’ (“Literatur zur Provinzialrömischen Archäologie”, pp. 176–177) lists 15 works on the subject, none of which are newer than 2008. This is a shame as the bibliographical references at the end of the publication are up to date (pp. 323–328).

The subentry on ‘personalities in research history’ in the entry on ‘research history’ (“Forschungsgeschichte”) lists 24 deceased archaeologists in chronological order from the 19<sup>th</sup>, 20<sup>th</sup>, and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries. Here, Czysz does not explain the criteria which led to this choice; it is therefore quite baffling and disappointing to read that all archaeologists mentioned are male with no occurrence of any female Roman provincial archaeologists at all. Possible additions could be: Elvira Fölzer (\*1868), specialist for Roman pottery in the *Provinzialmuseum* in Trier; Hedwig Kenner (1910–1993), integral member of the excavations in *Carnuntum* and on the Magdalensberg (both AT) as well as chairwoman of the Austrian *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum* project; Elisabeth Ettliger (1915–2012), founding member of the *Rei Cretariae Romanae Fautores* (RCRF), co-author of the *Conspectus* volume, and associate Professor for Roman Provincial Archaeology at the University of Berne; or Ingeborg Huld-Zetsche (1934–2013), deputy director and curator of the section for Roman archaeology at the Archaeological Museum in Frankfurt (on this topic see also J. E. FRIES / D. GUTSCHMIEDL-SCHÜMANN [eds], *Ausgräberinnen, Forscherinnen, Pionierinnen. Ausgewählte Porträts früher Archäologinnen im Kontext ihrer Zeit. Frauen, Forsch., Arch.* 10 [Münster / New York 2013]. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:101:1-2014071624104>).

For this reviewer, it is the last entry which makes for the most interesting reading. Under the headword ‘aims’ (“Ziele und Aufgaben”), Czysz again makes the case for a Roman provincial archaeology which is not only interdisciplinary and international in its outlook but also open for dialogue with the neighbouring disciplines on one hand and the non-scientific community on the other. It is a pity that this significant statement is hidden away in the last entry of the handbook.

In the book’s epilogue (“Nachwort und Danksagung”, pp. 329–330), Czysz himself explains that the volume’s origins lie in a card index which he himself curated over the years. Here, the reader learns that Czysz studied with Manfred K. H. Eggert in Mainz, one of the more established proponents of the German theoretical discussion of the last 30 years.

To sum up, the author’s profound knowledge and experience of German-speaking Roman provincial archaeology and his ambition to anchor the subject within the humanities make for an enriching and engaging read. Synthesising and condensing almost 40 years of work experience into a structured publication isn’t an easy undertaking, and Czysz should be commended and congratulated for taking this task upon himself. Czysz deserves credit for elegantly and explicitly articulating concepts and terms which often go unexplained or undefined in Roman provincial literature, but whose definitions are significant for our scientific discourse (e.g. “Argument”, “Befund”, “historisches Ereignis” to name a few).

On the critical side, the book’s aim to fill a desideratum on the theoretical-methodological side of German-speaking Roman provincial archaeology isn’t completely fulfilled. The reasons for this are twofold:

1. The book’s design – an alphabetically ordered encyclopaedia – is also its greatest drawback. This type of publication isn’t the most appropriate platform to elaborate on lengthy methodological explanations or on detailed descriptions of case studies. In fact, the “Sachwortartikel” (pp. 35–36) offer an alternative reading of this volume, one in which similar entries are grouped together to possible chapters. It could be argued that this structure would not only have been a better showcase for Czysz’ transdisciplinary knowledge but also would have given the reader a clearer trajectory to follow.

2. The insufficient integration of the theoretical discourse from German-speaking *Ur- und Frühgeschichte* and anglophone archaeology in general. While there is no need to mention or reflect on every single theoretical trend from these fields, German-speaking Roman provincial archaeology will benefit from the implementation of theories of e. g. agency, materiality, phenomenology, or post-colonial theory, none of which get a look-in in this publication. This could be seen as missed chance. Czysz' comments on Romanisation, however exhausted this discussion may be, only stretches to a few lines.

Thus, anybody expecting a state-of-the-art introduction into German-speaking Roman provincial archaeology – as one may be forgiven for expecting from the title (i. e. a pendant to EGGERT 2012) – may be slightly disappointed.

The closest German language parallel which springs to mind is the following publication: D. MÖLDERS / S. WOLFRAM (eds), *Schlüsselbegriffe der Prähistorischen Archäologie*. Tübinger Arch. Taschenbücher 11 (Münster, New York 2014). This handbook differs in so far from Czysz' version as it consists of 57 key concepts (almost half the number of Czysz') but also as the individual entries are written by various different specialists. In this case, the limitation of entries and the decision to have them written by different authors works in favour of both the publication and discipline, with the two gaining in profile. This multivocal concept should be kept in mind for future handbooks on Roman provincial archaeology.

Returning to Czysz' handbook and to conclude: the publication at hand contains a very useful and wide-ranging collection of definitions and terms from the fields of archaeology and the humanities. Its strength lies in the clarity and intelligibility of the entries; although all stemming from the same pen and thus exuding a somewhat individual flavour, they are well written and coherently structured, thus making it a welcome contribution to German-speaking Roman provincial literature.

CH-3012 Bern  
Mittelstrasse 43  
E-mail: andrew.lawrence@iaw.unibe.ch

Andrew Lawrence  
Universität Bern  
Institut für Archäologische Wissenschaften  
Abteilung Archäologie der Römischen Provinzen

**MARTIN AUER, Municipium Claudium Aguntum. Keramikregionen als Interaktionsräume. Eine westnordische Perspektive.** Ager Aguntinus. Historisch-archäologische Forschungen 2. Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden 2019. € 98.00. ISBN 978-3-447-11173-7. VI + 370 pages with 78 figures, 37 graphs, 1 map, and 57 plates.

Martin Auer defines the aim of his study on locally produced pottery in western *Noricum* as analysing “pottery regions as spheres of interaction” (p. 199). It is an extended version of his dissertation, supervised by Ulla Steinklauber and Eleni Schindler-Kaudelka, based on the finds from *Municipium Claudium Aguntum* / Dölsach near Lienz in Eastern Tyrol (AT) and complemented by material from western *Noricum*. Realising that the investigation of regional distributions of ceramics would not be possible based on morphological features alone, he adds decorations and technological elements to the relevant aspects for his work. After determining the regional and micro-regional distribution of the defined types, their combination within archaeological findings is considered in accordance to potential information concerning the former users of the ceramics. With regard to production techniques, Auer draws back on ethnoarchaeological comparisons. Finally, the question arises for Auer, whether contacts, cultural groups, or group identities can be