standing of the Burnby Lane settlement, has parallels in the south; for example, a humble third-century AD cottage in Insula IX at Silchester, associated with dog skinning, has yielded a fine ivory-handled folding knife and rare 'Mercury' bottle (Allen 2011: 142; Crummy 2011: 110–13).

The fortunes of the settlement at Hayton are closely linked with the road and the changing patterns and intensity of its use. Insight into these fortunes is provided by the stratified material evidence, particularly the ceramics from Burnby Lane, but also by the material collected through systematic field-walking and by metal detecting. The combination of the latter two methods also gives a fresh perspective on the length of occupation of the fort at Hayton, extending activity to the end of the first century AD. Nonetheless, the densities of Romano-British pottery sherds recovered from the roadside settlement, at about 12 sherds per hectare, are low compared with the remote chalkland landscapes of Salisbury Plain, where even the off-site densities are commonly in the range of 6–16 sherds per hectare (Fulford *et al.* 2006: 14–18). Is this difference a reflection of diverse cultural practices with respect to pottery, or a comment on the intensity with which the York to Brough road was used?

The quantitative approach adopted, including the measurement of the volumes of deposits, has come to be expected of Martin Millett and his colleagues; it is not only welcome but vital for any kind of comparative study. The planned route of the HS2 (high speed 2) railway from London to the north of England will affect another Roman roadside settlement, at Fleet Marston on Akeman Street in Buckinghamshire. Let us hope that the results of that investigation are undertaken and published in such a way that they can be compared with those from Hayton.

References

Allen, D. 2011. The glass, in M. Fulford & A. Clarke, *Silchester: city in transition* (Britannia Monograph 25): 133–42. London: Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.

Crummy, N. 2011. The small finds, in M. Fulford & A. Clarke, *Silchester: city in transition* (Britannia Monograph 25): 100–32. London: Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.

Eckardt, H. 2006. The character, chronology and use of the Late Roman pits: the Silchester finds assemblage, in M. Fulford, A. Clarke & H. Eckardt, *Life and labour in Late Roman Silchester* (Britannia Monograph 22): 221–45. London: Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.

Fulford, M.G., A.B. Powell, R. Entwistle & F. Raymond. 2006. *Iron Age and Romano-British settlements and landscapes of Salisbury Plain* (Wessex Archaeology Report 20). Salisbury: Wessex Archaeology & University of Reading.

Halkon, P. & M. Millett (ed.). 1999. *Rural settlement and industry: studies in the Iron Age and Roman archaeology of lowland East Yorkshire* (Yorkshire Archaeological Report 4). Leeds: Yorkshire Archaeological Society.

Maltby, M. 2010. *Feeding a Roman town: environmental evidence from excavations in Winchester, 1972–1985*. Winchester: Winchester Museums.

Millett, M. (ed.). 2006. *Shiptonthorpe, East Yorkshire: archaeological studies of a Romano-British roadside settlement* (Yorkshire Archaeological Report 5). Leeds: York Archaeological Society.

Michael Fulford
School of Archaeology,
Geography & Environmental Sciences,
University of Reading, UK
(Email: m.g.fulford@reading.ac.uk)

Urs Peschlow, with a contribution by Wolfram Brandes. *Ankara: Die bauarchäologischen Hinterlassenschaften aus römischer und byzantinischer Zeit*. 2015. Volume 1: 306 pages; Volume 2: 586 b&w and colour illustrations. Vienna: Phoibos; 978-3-85161-132-8 hardback €129.

Ankara, the capital city of modern Turkey, was the most important Roman and Byzantine metropolis on the central Anatolian high plateau. In the past, knowledge and understanding of the city's archaeology has been rather poor. Monuments have been badly damaged by modern development, and earlier scholarly attempts to reconstruct and date them made little sense, particularly in light of the emerging evidence for the Byzantine settlement of the surrounding region, with which they appeared to disagree. This situation has now been put right by Urs Peschlow, with his new and holistic treatment of the archaeological evidence for Roman and Byzantine Ankara, incorporating unpublished material from the archives of the German

Review

© Antiquity Publications Ltd, 2016

https://doi.org/10.15184/aqy.2016.156 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Archaeological Institute on the early twentieth-century excavations of the church of St Clemens, as well as Peschlow's own observations during his regular visits to the city over the last 50 years.

The result of this synthesis is that Peschlow is able to present convincing new building sequences, reconstructions and dates for St Clemens, for the church inside the Temple of Augustus and Roma, for a massive terrace wall next to the latter, and for the fortress. All of these structures date from the ninth century AD, the period following the devastating Arab raid of 838, which reduced Ankara from a city to a fortress (*kastron*) and a few outlying churches. Prior to this, during the invasion period of the seventh–ninth centuries, Ankara had maintained the extensive Late Antique city walls for its defence, dating back to the third century. Similarly, a bath-gymnasium, also built in the third century, probably under the emperor Caracalla, may have remained in use throughout the invasion period, surviving until the Arabs cut the water supply in 838.

Much of the evidence for Roman Ankara is to be found recycled into the fabric of the Byzantine city. Dismantling of the stadium started around the middle of the third century, when its parts were reused for the building of the Late Antique city walls. In contrast, the theatre was repeatedly remodelled throughout Late Antiquity and the early Byzantine period, until it was taken apart and its components reused during the rebuilding campaign of the ninth century.

This recycling makes it harder to evaluate the earlier phases of the city. For example, although the so-called Nymphaeum housed a spring, the function of the associated tall and massive building remains unclear. Nonetheless, advances are still possible; for example, the early Roman Temple of Augustus and Roma appears to have had Corinthian columns throughout, and—contra earlier suggestions—the interior was not gilded. A poorly documented complex in the city centre may have been the praetorium, that is, the seat of the Roman governor; and the river was regulated during the Roman period by a dam.

Moving into later phases, two of the city's cemeteries have yielded, in addition to numerous Roman sarcophagi, an important ensemble of Late Antique tombs or hypogea with ornamental frescoes, one of which is located within a walled-off, early Christian burial ground (area) that also included wooden coffins. At least one of several of the known Roman streets and porticos was renovated during the early Byzantine period, around AD 500, and an honorific column can be assigned to the sixth century on the basis of its impost capital.

The emerging picture is in keeping with Ankara's history as a Roman foundation that prospered during the imperial period and that continued to play an important role during Late Antiquity and the early Byzantine era. Most importantly, Peschlow's results lead to the conclusion that Ankara remained a sizeable settlement within the confines of the Late Antique city walls throughout the invasion period and up until the Arab conquest in 838. The subsequent reconstruction, during the later ninth century, was on a much-reduced scale, and Peschlow has nothing to report in relation to the middle Byzantine period, extending through to the Turkish conquest in the eleventh century. The dearth of middle Byzantine evidence is reflected at other Anatolian cities and contrasts with a wealth of contemporary finds in rural contexts. This situation suggests that, once the Arab threat was over and urban defences were no longer needed after the later ninth century, settlement activity shifted from town to countryside.

Ankara during the Turkish period is poorly documented due to the instability caused by various short-lived conquests: the Crusaders, the Danishmendids, various Seljuk lines, the Mongols and, finally, the Ottomans. Peschlow dedicates an appendix to the Ottoman-period city walls, which date from the seventeenth century; they reused much ancient spolia, but were entirely unrelated to the Late Antique city walls, which were partially dismantled during the ninth-century reconstruction of the city, and which seem to have vanished completely by the Ottoman period. A final chapter by Wolfram Brandes summarises the textual sources for Ankara's history during the invasion period (seventh to ninth centuries).

Volume 1 concludes with substantial English and Turkish abstracts that recount the contents of each chapter, making them accessible to non-German readers. Volume 2 is dedicated to plates, including many new colour photographs, numerous hitherto unpublished archival images, and new drawings and reconstructions. The Temple of Augustus and Roma, the fortress and St Clemens are particularly well documented.

Peschlow's opulent book replaces all earlier publications as the standard reference work on the archaeology of Roman and Byzantine Ankara.

© Antiquity Publications Ltd, 2016

https://doi.org/10.15184/aqy.2016.156 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The lasting value of this volume lies in the way that Peschlow—both through archival material and his own long-term personal observations on the ground—has been able to piece together and document evidence that is now in many cases irretrievably lost. The publication thus also records Ankara's rapid urban development during the twentieth century and the history of Turkey's evolving heritage policy as indicated by the preservation and presentation of the archaeological monuments of its capital city.

PHILIPP NIEWÖHNER
Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Berlin, Germany
(Email: philippniewoehner@hotmail.com)

CHERYL GREEN & ROBERTA GILCHRIST. *Glastonbury Abbey: archaeological investigations 1904–79*. 2015. xxi+501 pages, numerous colour and b&w illustrations. London: Society of Antiquaries of London; 978-0-854313-00-6 hardback £45.

Glastonbury is a name that conjures many images and associations. Steeped in Arthurian history and legend by the notable historical talents of William of Malmesbury and Gerald of Wales, and remediated through different manifestations of story-telling and popular culture from the Middle Ages to the twenty-first century, it remains a real place, just this side of the fantasy landscape of Camelot. The site of the abbey lies at the core of this imagined topography, and has attracted a series of archaeological investigations in the course of the twentieth century that have both fired and fed mythical readings of place. It is these excavations that are critically reviewed in this important new study, which also seriously engages with the archaeology of the post-conquest abbey for the first time.

Generously endowed by royal patrons from the seventh century, the Benedictine house had become the second richest monastery in the country by the time of the Dissolution. Although most of its medieval fabric disappeared at this time, the ruins of the church and the surviving abbot's kitchen are very visible testimony to the lifestyle of its lord and the grandeur of its buildings.

In terms of project management alone, the authors have presented themselves with a considerable challenge, aiming to review the primary evidence from all of the various excavation campaigns, much of which has been previously inaccessible. It is also clear that the extant finds are only a part of the material recovered from these excavations: earlier listings include material that has now disappeared.

The volume is ordered into three introductory chapters addressing the chronology of excavations; the results of new geophysical survey, which proved an important tool in refining the precise locations of the archaeologists' trenches; post-excavation methodology; and a general review of the abbey in its setting. These are followed by four chapters dealing with the sequence of buildings in different areas of the site, a review of finds and a final chronology and discussion. A digital archive has also been created through the Archaeology Data Service (http://dx.doi.org/10.5284/1022585), which provides some additional material including a detailed image catalogue of the artefacts. The report generally avoids critique of the different strategies used to explore and record the site over the decades, accepting that they are of their time; this is a constructive approach that at least partly spares the reader from a lengthy dissection of detail.

Archaeological interest, driven by its most influential investigator, Ralegh Radford, has mostly focused on the earliest phases of the site and his published interpretation that meshed history and legend with the archaeological record, in a sequence of identifiable building episodes. For Radford, this sequence began with an early British monastic community, succeeded by an Anglo-Saxon royal foundation of the late seventh century that was later reformed and rebuilt by Dunstan in the tenth century, along classic Benedictine claustral lines. By the twelfth century, the monks were very actively engaged in the production of their own history, famously excavating the tomb of Arthur and Guinevere in 1191; Radford believed he had successfully located the site of this pioneering archaeological endeavour.

Scrutiny of the archive has tempered this narrative, revealing the tenuous nature of the evidence that underpins it, but also adding much to our understanding of the post-conquest monastery, which also had an interesting and dramatic history. The

© Antiquity Publications Ltd, 2016

https://doi.org/10.15184/aqy.2016.156 Published online by Cambridge University Press