

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

grasped through his analysis of ceramics or whether material culture as such enables access to corresponding questions at all. In this respect, he points out the need to differentiate between producers and consumers of material culture and to include this in further considerations.

In chapter 2 ‘Classification and typology’ (pp. 5–19), a definition of the terms classification and typology is given, whereby the former is described as a means to organise all material of a given research area, while typology combines different aspects of material culture in order to clarify a defined question. Subsequently, Auer gives an overview of the state of research in *Noricum* which, in the author’s opinion, relied too heavily on morphological aspects alone and, according to his definition, corresponds to a classification.

For chapter 3 on ‘Ceramic classes and types’ (pp. 20–24), Auer lists classes of information in order to implement them in his typology. The technological class includes features such as temper, thickness of the sherds, and manufacturing technology. The morphological class describes the form of the vessel divided into zones. The stylistic class mainly deals with ornamentation, and the functional class focuses on traces of use, vessel shapes, and sizes in terms of their significance in relation to the former use of the pieces. Auer’s typology then combines different attributes of these classes. He again underlines that these types depend on the questions asked and are individually shaped by the researching scientist. In this respect, he muses on ceramics being classified differently by their former users as well. From the potter’s perspective, for example, the manufacturing technique in the form of a *chaîne opératoire* can be of central importance, while from the consumer’s point of view, various questions such as decoration or the intended use could have been vital.

Chapter 4 ‘The repertoire of types that can be evaluated chorologically’ (pp. 25–106) first defines the region in which Auer is working. It is based on the Roman province *Noricum* but is expanded if the distribution of the types analysed asks for it. In terms of time, his analysis spans the 1st to 5th centuries AD, in some cases even discussing pieces from the early Middle Ages if the types in question reach that far. In the following, Auer describes his types I to XVIII, which combine technological, morphological, and stylistic classes, assigns them to functional classes (e.g. cooking vessels), divides them into variants – mostly defined by stylistic attributes –, shows typical representatives, and finally describes their chronology and chorology. For further analyses, the chronology of the types is taken into view, leading to chapter 5 ‘Ceramic repertoires in western *Noricum*’ (pp. 107–138). On this basis, the author succeeds in describing four micro-regions within *Noricum* (northeast, southeast, southwest, and northwest) which are, however, subject to chronological changes: While in period I (turn of time until 50/60 AD) common features can be observed in southern *Noricum*, in period II (50/60–150 AD) this region, like the whole of *Noricum*, breaks up into a western and an eastern area. This development continues in period III (150–250 AD), while in period IV (250–400 AD) and period V (after 400 AD) there are again stronger differences between north and south, with the south being more strongly connected to regions even further south.

In chapter 5.6 ‘Direct associations in the archaeological record’ (pp. 123–131), Auer presents grave ensembles complemented by settlement finds as far as they belong to a clear stratigraphy, leading him to the question if “direct associations of ceramics indicate the identity of their users” (pp. 131–132). In this respect, he firstly states that there are no major differences between ceramics found in graves and in settlements. And secondly, that there are no preferences in favour of locally or regionally produced ceramics over imported goods. Thus, they do not allow Noricans to be separated from Romans or a “degree of Romanisation” (p. 132) to be determined.

Chapter 6 focuses on the question of ‘Ornaments as information carriers’ (pp. 139–142). It is based on the author’s observation that decorations of pottery produced locally in *Noricum* have a particularly restrictive distribution area. According to Auer, the use of different decorations

already indicates that they have a communicative character and are not integrated into a network of external influences, such as raw materials available in the region, the cooking and eating habits of the users, or the function of the vessels, which are of high importance for some technological and morphological elements (see p. 140 fig. 111). For some elements of decoration, Auer thinks in the direction of personal preferences of individual craftsmen, for other, more widespread features, a different explanation has to be considered. But Auer quickly draws the conclusion: “A conscious communication between manufacturers and producers by means of the decorative elements seems rather improbable due to the limited repertoire of styles” (p. 141). He misses a repertoire of elements that can be used in “grammatical” arrangements and therewith in analogy to language. While the idea of communication via things and / or their decoration is not new, it is highly debatable if this does work in terms related to language (for an ethnoarchaeological view see for example H. P. HAHN, *Die Dinge als Zeichen – eine unscharfe Beziehung*. In: U. Veit et al. [eds], *Spuren und Botschaften. Interpretationen materieller Kultur*. Tübinger Arch. Taschenbücher 4 [Münster i. a. 2003] 29–51). Because of the rudimentary decoration, Auer then adds elements of morphology and production technology to his considerations in order to learn more about ceramic regions, communication, and identity.

In chapter 7 ‘Production technology – innovation and tradition’ (pp. 143–147), he firstly defines aspects of pottery produced in *Noricum* relevant for its analyses in this respect, mentioning temper, shaping, and firing. Auer notes that so far, no major production centres of the corresponding ceramics have been identified. Regarding the production technique, and in contrast to morphology and decoration, a pronounced traditionalism seems to be observable.

Chapter 8 ‘Organisation of pottery in *Noricum*’ (pp. 148–167) lists all known archaeological findings in the region pointing to the production of local ceramics. These are usually remains of kilns, the surroundings of which, however, have not been investigated in the majority of cases. What’s more, it is sometimes even hard to identify what kinds of vessels were produced there. This leads Auer to the analyses of the products with respect to their manufacturing processes. But here as well, information on temper, shaping technology, and firing atmosphere are regularly lacking. Even so, Auer is able to define regional differences in the production of pottery. To get an idea of the possibilities of ceramics production in *Noricum*, Auer presents some ethnoarchaeological examples from different regions of the world. Unfortunately, the individual studies remain largely uncommented and stand without further context. Depending on the information available, details are given on the gender of the craftsmen or crafts-women, the extraction of raw materials, the location and organisation of production and distribution. Due to different kinds of information, the individual examples are sometimes difficult to compare. Furthermore, although Auer gives the impression of being aware of the problem of the transferability of such observations, he does not explicitly discuss them. Thus, the examples given remain out of context and are limited in their informative value. With regard to the conclusion on pottery production in *Noricum* (chapter 8.3, pp. 162–167), Auer then again refers to numerous observations on the archaeological material itself, for example, to regional and micro-regional differences, to shaping techniques (vessels made on the potter’s wheel *vs.* hand-made vessels) as well as to tempering. Especially when different methods of this kind occur within one type, Auer thinks of pottery groups or workshops relating to different communities of practice. Next to regional differences, divergent organisational forms can be expected in urban and rural settlement surroundings.

In chapter 9 ‘Ceramic regions – origin and change’ (pp. 168–176), Auer looks into the exchange between the different production sites and discusses its effects on the origin of types and their distribution. He distinguishes between two forms of exchange: trade and direct transport (pp. 168–173) and the transfer of ideas (pp. 173–176), whereby the latter is seen here as an immediate

exchange from person to person. For both variants, Auer identifies references in the archaeological material. In the case of trade, the sale of goods – especially in the context of markets – plays a crucial role. Direct transport is considered via dowry, gift, or in the context of migration. In terms of the transfer of ideas, learning networks are of central importance. For Auer, the direct interaction between potters seems to have been of the highest significance. He can distinguish several regional and micro-regional communities of practice, which mainly differ in shaping techniques and temper. Several times, Auer mentions the lack of archaeometrical analyses for the given material. It has to be fully agreed that these methods would strongly add to our knowledge of the ceramics analysed here, allowing for further studies on their production techniques, provenance, and distribution patterns as well as asking questions on the archaeology of economics.

In chapter 10 ‘Ceramic regions as indicators for interaction spheres’ (pp. 177–193), Auer first gives a short overview of previous research approaches on “Noric culture”. He considers burial rites including grave forms, Noric costume elements, and building techniques using the example of hypocaust sites. Again, regional differences within *Noricum* can be demonstrated more or less clearly, with Auer pointing out existing research gaps or a lack of material. All in all, this suggests that the contact zones in question refer to individual communities of practice and do not necessarily apply to the entire population of certain regions. Moreover, in Auer’s opinion, a sense of belonging is unlikely to be defined solely by the usage of different artefact types “but is essentially shaped by the micro-regional differences in external influences on different areas of life” (p. 183). In chapter 10.2 ‘Archaeological culture, contact zones, identities, cultural zones?’ (pp. 187–193), Auer again explicitly poses the question of the significance of the ceramics he worked on in relation to the aspects mentioned in the chapter’s title. He refers to research approaches that see “Noric ceramics” as a material sign of a “folk culture” trying to set itself apart from “Roman culture”. He himself would like to proceed in a much more differentiated way in this context and speaks of different models of cultural change. According to Auer’s study, the ceramics produced in *Noricum* show regionally and temporally different elements of cultural change. Thus, one cannot speak of “Noric ceramics” as a uniform group of material culture at all. On the contrary, the ceramics produced in *Noricum* point to a differentiated involvement of diverse ceramic traditions leading to an active shaping of regional material culture. They do not reflect a cultural group defined from an emic perspective but are the products of craft networks in the sense of communities of practice. The motor for the observed changes grounds in exchange, migration, and the transfer of ideas, which can also take place in smaller parts of the population. Auer subsequently rejects the identification of cultural identity through material culture. In his opinion, there is no uniform cultural group in *Noricum*. With regard to the recognisability of cultural groups, Auer assigns a high position to the analysis of the contexts of use: Only the knowledge of the use of artefacts would allow an investigation of different identities. But the interaction zones defined here are based on communities of practice of the potters and do not reflect the usage of consumers, which is hard to analyse yet, as the needed information is still rare in *Noricum*. Concerning archaeological groups, identity, and their identification through material culture, a look at the discussion on the relationship between humans and objects might have been helpful here (see for example I. HODDER, *Entangled. An Archaeology of the Relationships between Humans and Things* [Chichester 2012] doi: <https://www.doi.org/10.1002/9781118241912>).

The text section is followed by a tabular catalogue (pp. 204–369) in which, sorted according to Auer’s types and variants, information is given on location, rim diameter, colour, temper, and age determination along with the reference to the original publication and the type designation used there. Plates were omitted, since these would have been limited to copies of already published illustrations. Thus, the graphic realisation of the pottery analysed here is reduced to the rather small compilation of types in chapter 4, showing a representative selection of pieces in direct connection

with the description of Auer's types. Due to the uniform implementation of the artefact's drawings, a good insight is gained here, which will also help with the classification of future finds. But a selection of photos would have been particularly helpful to deepen the impression gained.

Overall, the book presents interesting questions and a thorough knowledge of the material analysed. Especially in relation to the typology and its implications, the study is well thought through and written in a self-reflective manner. In respect of the theoretical basis concerning communication via things and / or art and ethnoarchaeological comparisons however, a deeper discussion of their possibilities and limitations would have been helpful. Auer's interpretation of ceramic regions reflecting interaction spheres of craftsmen is interesting and certainly conceivable. It could form the basis for further investigations, especially comprising archaeometric analyses to evaluate provenance and vessel function (see for example A. M. W. HUNT [ed.], *Oxford handbook of Archaeological Ceramic Analysis* [Oxford, New York 2016]), possibly leading to a *chaîne opératoire* for their manufacture and giving hints to their usage. This would enable further questions on origin, production, distribution, and usage of ceramics and, supplemented by economic archaeological questions, could lead to further insights on communication, interaction, and identity in *Noricum*.

DE-85551 Kirchheim b. München
Münchner Straße 6

Jennifer M. Bagley
Bajuwarenhof Kirchheim

JOSÉ REMESAL RODRÍGUEZ (Hrsg.), Colonia Ulpia Traiana (Xanten) y el mediterráneo. El comercio de alimentos. Col lecció Instrumenta 63 = Corpus international des timbres amphoriques 26. Edicions de la Universitat de Barcelona, Barcelona 2018. € 45,-. ISBN 978-84-9168-197-7. 513 Seiten mit zahlreichen Tabellen, Zeichnungen und Abbildungen in Farbe und Schwarz-Weiß.

Seit mittlerweile 40 Jahren interessiert sich ein spezifischer Zweig der spanischen Altertumsforschung für die Amphorenfunde in den nordwestlichen Gebieten des *Imperium Romanum*. Den Beginn machte ein Humboldt-Stipendium, das José Remesal Rodríguez in den Jahren 1979/80 nach Heidelberg führte, von wo aus er an einem halben Dutzend Orten in den germanischen Provinzen jenen Funden nachspürte, die in seiner Heimatregion, der Provinz Sevilla rund um Lora del Río, in Massen auf den Feldern liegen: Bruchstücke von Amphoren der Form Dressel 20, die in römischer Zeit zum Transport von Olivenöl hergestellt und besonders häufig mit Stempeln versehen worden waren. Die Ergebnisse dieser ersten Arbeiten wurden 1986 auf Spanisch (J. REMESAL RODRÍGUEZ, *La annona militaris y la exportación de aceite bético a Germania. Con un corpus de sellos en ánforas Dressel, 20 hallados en: Nimega, Colonia, Mainz, Saalburg, Zugmantel y Nida* [Madrid 1986]) und in erweiterter Fassung 1997 auf Deutsch (J. REMESAL RODRÍGUEZ, *Heeresversorgung und die wirtschaftlichen Beziehungen zwischen der Baetica und Germanien. Materialien zu einem Corpus der in Deutschland veröffentlichten Stempel auf Amphoren der Form Dressel 20. Materialh. Arch. Baden-Württemberg 42* [Stuttgart 1997]) publiziert. Es folgten Schülerinnen und Schüler bzw. Mitarbeiterinnen und Mitarbeiter von José Remesal Rodríguez mit zahlreichen kleineren Studien, aber auch monographischen Vorlagen. Zu diesen zählen Werke von Cèsar Carreras Montfort zu den Amphoren im römischen Britannien (C. CARRERAS MONTFORT, *Economía de la Britannia romana: la importación de alimentos. Col lecció Instrumenta 8* [Barcelona 2000]), eine Kooperationsarbeit zu den entsprechenden Funden vom Kops Plateau in Nimwegen (NL; C. CARRERAS MONTFORT / J. VAN DEN BERG [Hrsg.], *Amphorae from the Kops Plateau* [Nijmegen]. *Trade and Supply to the Lower-Rhineland from the Augustan Period to AD 69/70. Archaeopress Roman Arch. 20* [Oxford 2017]. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv170x49x>; s. a. Rez. U. EHMIG, *Bonner Jahrb.* 217, 2017, 524–530) sowie jetzt die von J. Remesal Rodríguez herausgegebene