

The book is explicitly written as a student text as part of the introduction to short three-year degree courses at Italian universities. The language is straightforward and should be accessible to students with basic Italian literacy. The chapters on the range of evidence available to Mediterranean landscape archaeologists will be particularly useful for students approaching the subject from a non-Mediterranean background.

Francovich and Hodges pick up the story where D. signs off, following the development of the Roman countryside into the medieval period. The book forms another of the *Debates* series and similarly uses case-studies to illustrate the controversies surrounding the transformation of the rural landscape. The book focuses specifically on Italy, though takes every opportunity to put the peninsula in its European and Mediterranean context. In comparison to D.'s single chapter, it is not surprising that F. and H.'s book provides more detail; but it also takes a different approach. Its principal aim is to review and further the debate that has developed over the past two decades, in particular in the light of new archaeological evidence from sites such as San Giovanni di Ruoti, Mola di Monte Gelato, Santa Cornelia, Montarrenti, and San Vincenzo al Volturno. F. and H. declare a particular mission to break down the simplistic opposition of the Object (i.e. archaeology) and the Voice (i.e. history), though it is clear that the former is the key to their new perspective, a new rural sociology.

Debate about the transition from dispersed Roman settlement to nucleated medieval hilltop villages has polarized between the continuists and the catastrophists. The former have argued for the continuity of classical settlement through to the *incastellamento* of the tenth century. In contrast, the catastrophists have argued for a profound break with the classical past during Late Antiquity with a long interim before the start of *incastellamento*. Perhaps unsurprisingly, recent archaeological work has nuanced the picture. Thus, regional diversity admitted, F. and H. propose four phases of transformation: (1) a fourth-century rural reorganization with large-scale desertion by the rural aristocracy and replacement of some villas with villages; where the rural élite persisted, they must be viewed within a regionalized context; (2) the final rupture with the classical past coincides with the political crises of the sixth and early seventh centuries. 'Public power' was eclipsed and replaced by myriad local aristocracies. This was a 'golden period of a largely independent peasantry' with the rise of farming collectives — villages; (3) the Carolingian period witnessed new conflict between landed aristocrats and between clerics and laity. The peasantry aligned itself with the most expedient local option, but its independence was undermined. Institutional reorganization included hilltop estate centres and papal *domuscultae*, with manors added to many villages; (4) by the tenth century, local aristocrats had cemented their territorial power bases and villages became seats of government and religion. *Incastellamento*, building on the developments of the previous 400 years, colonized land abandoned for over half a millennium with new hilltop villages. This coincided with the rise of new Mediterranean markets; the collusion of the peasantry was secured via access to new material culture, at the expense of their independence.

Each of the three books occupies different, but complementary ground. D. looks at the history of study and theoretical debate; C. outlines a range of practical methodologies; and F. and H. focus on the relationship between archaeology and history and the Roman-medieval transition. All three books draw heavily on the authors' personal work and their experience of landscape archaeology and this serves to reflect the very personal/biographical nature of landscape itself. Of the three, D. and C. will prove most useful for students studying landscape or Roman archaeology; F. and H. may have a wider appeal because of its specific remit, the recent archaeological work it summarizes, and the complexity of the debate around the end of antiquity.

*University of Durham*

ROBERT WITCHER

P. ATTEMA, G. BURGERS, E. VAN JOOLEN, M. VAN LEUSEN, and B. MATER (EDS), *NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN ITALIAN LANDSCAPE ARCHAEOLOGY: THEORY AND METHODOLOGY OF FIELD SURVEY, LAND EVALUATION AND LANDSCAPE PERCEPTION, POTTERY PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION* (*Proceedings of a three-day conference held at the University of Groningen, April 13–15, 2000*) (British Archaeological Reports International series 1091). Oxford: Archaeopress, 2002. Pp. 265, 4 pls, illus. ISBN 1-8417-1469-0. £35.00.

This volume is based on the proceedings of a three-day international conference 'Regional Pathways to Complexity' held in April 2000 at the University of Groningen. The conference was organized by the creators of the RPC Project (Regional Pathways to Complexity, Landscape and

Settlement Dynamics in Early Italy). The RPC project was begun in 1997 as a collaboration between the Netherlands Organization of Scientific Research (NWO), the Groningen Archaeological Institute (GAI), and the Archaeological Institute of the Vrije Universiteit of Amsterdam (AIVU). The project focused geographically on Italy in the first millennium B.C. and was intended to create a multidisciplinary and comparative assessment of three regional Dutch research projects in Italy (the Pontine Region in central Italy, the Salento Isthmus in Puglia, and the Sibaritide in Calabria). Through comparative examinations, the researchers aimed to investigate regional responses to and interaction with Greek and Roman colonialism as well as to construct a long-term, supra-regional picture of first-millennium B.C. Italy.

In the course of this work, the RPC Project collaborators noted that ‘our own attempts to compare the increasingly complex societies in three Italian districts reveals that such a comparison was hampered by a substantial set of methodical and methodological problems’. Further, they speculated that non-Dutch teams working on projects of landscape and regional archaeology in Italy could be even more dissimilar in their methods and strategies. The development of a set of standardized procedures — or at least the discussion of such a possibility — might be a useful exercise. To begin this dialogue, a conference was held in Groningen in April 2000 to discuss issues and problems facing a wide variety of researchers working in protohistoric Italy. One of the major aims of the conference was ‘to spot and inventory the methodical problems that come to light when we try to put a series of regional research programs into a larger supra-regional framework’. The conference stressed the need to work towards a comparative regional archaeology not only to study the development of indigenous societies in the context of early urbanization and Greek and Roman colonization but also to begin a wider-scale examination of the potential of regional settlement and environmental data for mapping the social dimensions of the landscape.

The book is divided into seven sections: Part 1: an introduction: ‘Advances in regional archaeological research in the Mediterranean’ (D. Yntema); Part 2: a group of seven general papers: ‘Aims of the RPC’ (G. Burgers); ‘A short history of Dutch research in the Mediterranean’ (M. Kleibrink); ‘Two challenges for landscape archaeology’ (P. Attema); ‘Settlement pattern analysis and demographic modelling’ (J. Bintliff); ‘Some current approaches to protohistoric centralization and urbanization in Italy’ (A. Vanzetti); ‘Greek colonization and Romanization from a native perspective’ (F. d’Andria); and ‘Pottery production and metallurgy’ (A. Zifferero); and Parts 3–7: proceedings of five workshops, each convened by one of the conference’s organizers: ‘Comparative settlement archaeology’ (convenor: G. Burgers); ‘Understanding digital archaeological landscapes’ (convenor: M. van Leusen); ‘Change in pottery technology and production in the light of urbanization and colonization’ (convenor: B. Mater); ‘Potential land evaluation in archaeology’ (convenor: E. van Joolen); and ‘Landscape perception in archaeology: the urban and colonial experience’ (convenor: P. Attema). The publication of each workshop includes a statement by its convenor that outlines the overall issues of the workshop, a list of participants, a group of short working papers or position statements, and a transcription or summary of the group discussion.

This volume is a dense and richly rewarding book, something that is not always the case with published conference proceedings. Creatively planned as a well-focused conference with specific geographic, chronological, and methodological aims, the proceedings convey a balanced sense of the intelligently organized sessions with their planned presentations and the give and take of the lively discussions. The proceedings admirably provide a sense of the ‘state of the field’ and of the major issues facing researchers working in protohistoric Italy. As the organizers state in the Preface: ‘landscape archaeology can, because of its ability to monitor long-term regional trends of settlement and land use, fulfill a central role in providing a framework for the study of the patchwork of largely rural societies that characterized Italy in the first millennium B.C.’

*Oberlin College*

SUSAN KANE

A. HAUG, *DIE STADT ALS LEBENSRAUM. EINE KULTURHISTORISCHE ANALYSE ZUM SPÄTANTIKEN STADTLIBEN IN NORDITALIEN* (Internationale Archäologie 85). Rahden/Westf.: Verlag Marie Leidorf, 2003. Pp. x + 552, 92 pls, illus. ISBN 3-8964-6357-8. €81.80.

Haug’s book — a slightly revised version of her dissertation from 2003 — explores the fashionable topic of urban change in Late Antiquity, in this case in the administratively homogeneous and politically central region of Northern Italy. The book’s purpose is to provide an exhaustive