researchers and/or practitioners. For the reviewer—falling into the last two of these categories—the authoritative use-value of such overview volumes ranks high. Accordingly, of the British programmes and their arising publications, the University of Reading's 'Roman Rural Settlement Project' (Smith *et al*. 2016), directed by Mike Fulford, comes top and, in some respects, it is this volume to which that by Fokkens *et al*. is most akin. Put simply, *Farmers, fishers, fowlers, hunters* is a really useful book and that in itself is of no small value.

Aside from making so much data available, the volume exposes us to another way of doing developer-funded archaeology. The Dutch system is more centrally controlled and there is stricter maintenance and implementation of its officially sanctioned research frameworks (see Bazelmans 2012). Generally, this appears to work well, and there is a stricture that a site's final report must be issued within two years of the completion of fieldwork. All this is entirely laudable, but it has promoted something of a divorce of academic departments from developer-related projects (in which they used to participate more). Practising large-scale site-stripping, a number of the sites suffer from a 'methodological sameness'. For example, there seems to be little sampling interrogation of buried soils and their chemical/artefact distributions (although see excavations at Oldeboorn). As a result, what we have is a mostly house-based settlement archaeology, mainly focusing on either single farmsteads or larger hamlet settings. There are, however, notable exceptions such as the Late Neolithic post alignments at Den Haag Wateringseveld, or the Beaker pit settlements (with graves and a post-circle) at Hanzelijn and Bedrijventerijn Zuid.

Despite the recognition of the need to explore seasonal land-use dimensions of the periods covered here (i.e. the fishers, fowlers and hunters), surprisingly few artefact cluster sites have been identified (see fig. 5.5), and it is these that are likely to represent any kind of seasonal foraging component. While some sites have yielded significant 'wild' assemblages (e.g. tabs 7.6, 7.10, 7.13), the Dutch planning regulations seem to have led to relatively little 'off-site' archaeology. Perhaps because the 'home settlements' are so well-defined and evident (not least by their hallmark longhouses), relatively few palaeochannel systems have been investigated; where they have been examined, the evidence is promising, such as the fish traps recovered at Emmeloord-J97. Hopefully, with this volume's clear future research framework—in which such issues and others are explicitly highlighted—this situation will soon be addressed.

There is a seriousness of intent in this volume's synthesis that reflects a genuine commitment to knowledge generation and research orientation. Certainly it is of an entirely different order than what widely passes as regional research frameworks in the UK. Given the manner in which this book reflects upon developer-funded practices generally—plus the wealth of data presented—it marks a major achievement and deserves to be widely read.

References

Bazelmans, J. 2012. Serving two masters: Dutch archaeology since the Valletta Convention, in L. Webley, M. Vander Linden, C. Haselgrove & R. Bradley (ed.) *Development-led archaeology in northwest Europe: proceedings of a round table at the University of Leicester 19th–21st November 2009: 9–21*. Oxford: Oxbow.

Bradley, R., C. Haselgrove, M. Vander Linden & L. Webley. 2016. *The later prehistory of north-west Europe: the evidence of development-led fieldwork*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Groenewoudt, B. 2015. Valletta Harvest: value for money. Dutch initiatives to make 'Malta' excavation results relevant to heritage management, science and society, in P.A.C. Schut, D. Scharff & L.C. de Wit (ed.) *Setting the agenda: giving new meaning to the European heritage* (EAC Occasional Papers 10). Budapest: Archaeolingua.

Olalde, I. *et al*. Forthcoming. The Beaker phenomenon and the genomic transformation of northwest Europe. *Nature*. https://doi.org/10.1101/135962

Smith, A., M. Allen, T. Brindle & M. Fulford. 2016. *New visions of the countryside of Roman Britain, volume 1: the rural settlement of Roman Britain* (Britannia Monographs 29). London: The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.

Christopher Evans
Cambridge Archaeological Unit,
University of Cambridge, UK
(Email: cje30@cam.ac.uk)

C. Carreras & J. van den Berg (ed.). *Amphorae from the Kops Plateau (Nijmegen)* (Archaeopress Roman Archaeology 20). 2017. x+404 pages,

https://doi.org/10.15184/aqy.2017.200 Published online by Cambridge University Press

numerous colour and b&w illustrations. Oxford: Archaeopress; 978-1-78491-542-1 paperback £55.

Nijmegen is home to the largest and most significant Roman site in the Netherlands, with both military and civilian components. The Kops Plateau, just one part of this larger complex, is a site of extraordinary archaeological interest. Its importance relates to its early start date within a north European context (*c.* 12/10 BC), its sequence of occupation phases through to the Batavian revolt of AD 69/70, the changing nature of its military occupants and the proposal that it was the base of the highest imperial command during the Augustan campaigns in Germany. The volume under review provides a detailed catalogue of the large amphora assemblage (a minimum of 690 vessels) from excavations at the Kops Plateau site. Its contribution to the study of these essential transport and storage vessels in the northern parts of the empire will be deep and surely enduring. This impressive volume is the product of a team of international experts with the particular knowledge and skills that the study of amphora forms and fabrics requires. Yet this is not simply a record of the exotic, regional and local amphora types present (remarkable in composition as they are), but also a consideration of intra-site spatial distribution and changes through time, together with the regional context of the assemblage. The analysis is assisted by innovative mapping of distribution densities for amphora types, raising and considering questions around the geography and economy of Roman distribution systems. Amphorae, of course, tell us about what was being consumed, where it originated and, from trends in occurrence, the probable types of consumers. In this case, there is much discussion of the supply over very long distances of what initially were Mediterranean products, and the subsequent increase in the prominence of provincial foodstuffs arriving in amphorae from the Rhineland and southern, central and north-eastern Gaul.

Chapter 1 introduces the site, the history of its study and of earlier work on amphorae from the site and local area. The Kops Plateau was excavated between 1986 and 1995; it is not a large site, but has an exceptional configuration of buildings and has produced a rich assemblage of finds (including 400 000 pottery sherds). Chapter 2 outlines the methodology, in which quantification and mapping using state-of-the-art software are central. Next follow a series of chapters detailing the amphora types present, organised by place of origin, with Chapter 8 reporting stamps, graffiti and *tituli picti* (painted inscription) on amphorae from Nijmegen. Not all of these middle chapters and sub-sections are in English, and non-specialists might be tempted to skip these detailed sections for the synthetic chapters; if so, they will miss well-written elements, not without general interest and certainly testimony to an immense amount of scholarship. Chapter 9 provides a report on the amphorae from the legionary camp on the Hunerberg at Nijmegen of the early Augustan period (19–16/12 BC), immediately preceding the use of the adjacent Kops Plateau. Chapter 10 places and weighs the evidence in a rounded perspective. Naturally, drawings of amphora forms are a significant feature of the volume, but so too are tables, graphs and lists, thin-section micrographs, photographs and rubbings of stamps and graffiti, all likely to prove helpful to researchers.

As a report on a single class of pottery vessel from extensive excavations, it is unsurprising that the volume gives the impression of a fascicule. The material is contextualised, but aspects that some readers may be interested in are not expanded upon, such as why and how the site was excavated, how this volume came to be and how it was financed. These aspects of the 'back story' could all have been explained in a few words to reinforce the stand-alone status of this monograph. A section by Beijaard and Polak reports their use of correspondence analysis to investigate the occurrence of artefacts across the site and through time, and thereby to elucidate the sequence and supply, depositional trends and site formation. The objective nature of this powerful discriminating method makes its application potentially advantageous, although some readers might feel that explanation is required as to why conventional phasing was not used (or, at least, not referenced) and this statistical means thought necessary; was this choice made due to the way that the site was excavated and recorded or, perhaps, due to the sheer quantities of material involved?

https://doi.org/10.15184/aqy.2017.200 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Regardless, the associated pitfalls and interpretive scope of the method are outlined frankly by the authors, making the study informative for those applying the technique to other assemblages. In this case, the results are most illuminating in relation to the chronological sequencing of material, but some spatial clustering of amphora sherds was also identified, around the stables and the main road. One wonders whether this was for surface consolidation—some practices are seemingly timeless, for in the week prior to reviewing this book, I was told by a builder that he was collecting broken domestic tiles to lay across ground used daily by horses. Correspondence analysis often verifies patterns that are readily apparent, or tells us what we can already discern by other means, providing 'confirmation'; patterns in archaeology frequently prove mundane, as human practice often is too.

That this volume is largely published in English doubtless reflects the nature of the collaborative international scholarship involved; perhaps too this could result in a wider readership. The choice to publish in English leads one to reflect on the lack of similar publications on amphorae from individual British sites. It is true that Britain received fewer amphorae at certain times than sites on the European mainland and generally shows less variety than seen even at sites in close proximity across the Channel. While reports on amphorae have formed large parts of general works on Roman pottery in Britain (e.g. Davies *et al*. 1994; Monaghan 1997), an exception remains Paul Sealey's (1985) report on the Sheepen amphorae. Sealey's volume, published as a British Archaeological Report, was ground-breaking: thorough in terms of typological reporting and sophisticated discussion, including the provincial and international context; these, likewise, are characteristics of the present study, which itself is brought to us by Archaeopress: the successor to British Archaeological Reports. One cannot but ponder why, given this lead and the inspirational work of David Peacock and David Williams, there are not more such studies of collections from Britain. Continuing with 'British contrasts', it has for some time been striking that the prominent regional and local production of amphora types (and evidently the wine, fish sauce and possibly preserved fruit they contained) in Gaul and the Rhineland is something for which we still have only tantalising suggestions from Britain in terms of pots, vineyards, ale production and fish-processing remains. Fresh exploration of *Britannia* may prove rewarding.

The consumers at the Kops Plateau received an unusual variety of amphora-borne products, varying over time, alongside wider economic trends and the changing occupants of the site. Insights from this study include the high proportions of imports from the Eastern Mediterranean (including the Cam. 189, probably a fruit container, a form then copied in the Rhine hinterland) and riverine fish products from the Lyon region. Questions arise given the distances, variety and costs involved—was this administered supply? Were the consumers especially wealthy? Was there an ethnic dimension to supply through the presence of personnel accustomed to such commodities? The authors suggest the probable routes by which amphorae from different sources arrived at the Kops Plateau, while their assessment of the regional situation shows some contrasts between military and civilian sites. The discussion of these and other matters makes for essential reading for those interested in Roman-era economics and the functioning and character of the wider Roman system in the early decades of empire. Carreras and van den Berg have overseen the publication of a work of great value.

References

Davies, B., B. Richardson & R. Tomber. 1994. *A dated corpus of early Roman pottery from the City of London* (CBA Research Report 98). London: Museum of London.

Monaghan, J. 1997. *Roman pottery from York* (The Archaeology of York 16/8). York: York Archaeological Trust and the Council for British Archaeology.

Sealey, P. 1985. *Amphoras from the 1970 excavations at Colchester, Sheepen* (British Archaeological Reports British series 142). Oxford: British Archaeological Reports.

Steven Willis
Classical & Archaeological Studies,
University of Kent, UK
(Email: s.willis@kent.ac.uk)

Jan Schneider. *Ländliche Siedlungsstrukturen im römischen Spanien. Das Becken von Vera und das Camp de Tarragon—zwei Mikroregionen im Vergleich* (Archaeopress Roman Archaeology 22). 2017. vi+214 pages, numerous colour and b&w

https://doi.org/10.15184/aqy.2017.200 Published online by Cambridge University Press