individuals and groups responsible for this clearly export-centred industrial activity, the authors reasonably propose that it was an economic sphere dominated by wealthy elites at a distance, working through the agency of slaves, freedmen, shippers and *negotiatores* – entrepreneurial businessmen and portfolio managers. There is indeed some slight evidence for such involvement on the island, which is much better documented on a Mediterranean scale for late Hellenistic and Roman times (Bintliff 2013).

John Bintliff
University of Edinburgh
johnlbintliff@gmail.com

Bintliff, J. 2013. The Hellenistic to Roman Mediterranean: A proto-capitalist revolution?, in T. Kerig and A. Zimmermann (eds) *Economic Archaeology:* 285-292. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt.

Cooper, F. 2002. *Houses of the Morea: Vernacular Architecture of the Northwest Peloponnesos (1205-1955).* Athens: Melissa Press.

Hulek, F. and H. Lohmann (eds) 2019. *Ari and the Laurion from Prehistoric to Modern Times.* Köln: Universitäts- und Stadtbibliothek Köln.

Rizakis, A. D. and Y. Touratsoglou (eds) 2013. *Villae Rusticae. Family and Market-Oriented Farms in Greece under Roman Rule.* Athens: National Hellenic Research Foundation-De Boccard.

Sigalos, E. 2004. *Housing in Medieval and Post-Medieval Greece* (British Archaeological Reports International Series 1291). Oxford: Archaeopress.

Bleda S. Düring and Claudia Glatz (eds), *Kinetic Landscapes, the Cide Archaeological Project: Surveying the Turkish Western Black Sea Coast*. pp. 504, 48 b/w and 162 col ills, 25 tbls. Warsaw: De Gruyter Open Poland, 2015. ISBN 978-3-110-44497-1, open access E-book via https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110444971.

Archaeological knowledge of the Black Sea coast of Turkey is limited for all periods of history and prehistory. Lacking the instant appeal of the Classical to Roman monuments of the south and west coasts, or the universal prehistoric interest of sites like Çatal Höyük or Göbekli Tepe, the deeply forested and often inaccessible mountainous Black Sea coast remains largely neglected. The name Cide derives from the ancient Kydros (mod. Gideros), a modest Classical town set between the major coastal cities of Amastris (Amasra) in the west and Sinope (Sinop) - once capital of Mithradates' empire - to the east. On the district's eastern boundary is Cape Karambis, which is the most northernly point in Turkey and has the shortest sea crossing to the Crimea. As the introductory chapter shows, communications over water were all. When sea traffic flourished, so did the coastal settlements and towns. Internal routes were poor. Until recently, the motor road to the provincial capital Kastamonu could take 8 hours; now improved, it is only two. Thus at all periods there was limited contact with the Anatolian plateau, more easily with Constantinople/Istanbul, and especially in Classical and Byzantine times around the Pontic littoral. While it is not unfair to describe the district of Cide as unexceptional, this study reveals the wider significance of a carefully structured local enquiry.

Both of the project directors are prehistorians and the project evolved from ambitions elsewhere in the region. Initially the survey was limited around Cide and restricted to 'pre- and protohistory', but for the last two seasons it included a wider area and extended the chronological range to the Roman, Byzantine and later Turkish periods. Consequently, what has emerged in the full publication is a model of a diachronic regional survey in a challenging region. The Black Sea climate of high rainfall and temperate winters ensures that the hills and mountains are richly forested, although as a resource this is today less significant than in the past, when coastal timber was a major benefit for Byzantine and Ottoman Constantinople.

The introduction (Chapter 1) serves as timely reminder of some the challenges for gaining permission for fieldwork, a situation which for foreign projects shows little sign of improving. Once allocated with the Cide district (*ilçe*), the project team evolved an impressive strategy combining extensive and intensive survey methodologies, a 'Hybrid and Adaptive method' (Chapter 4) and a response to the fact "that much of the survey area was unsuitable or inaccessible for large scale probabilistic sampling and intensive pedestrian survey". It is worth noting that for some areas with contemporary agriculture a machete (or örak) was required. What emerges is a combination of various survey approaches involving the documentation of historical traveller's accounts and local oral testimony, integrated with remote sensing and targeted reconnaissance. Out of the survey area of 926km^2, the Cide Archaeological

Project (CAP) was able to cover 3.44km^2 or 0.4% of the total by intensive field walking.

The results of these surveys are arranged in chronological chapters, starting with the Early Holocene. For this period, it was apparent that the limitations of fieldwork made meaningful chronological comparisons difficult. One significant observation was that while there is evidence for Galatian obsidian from central Anatolia implying inland movement, there is little comparable material to the findings from excavations at Ikiz Tepe, south of Samsun and well connected with the Black Sea coast, questioning any evidence for significant coastal movement. In Turkey it is difficult to gain permission for sondages or test pits as part of a survey programme, but it is ironic that crucial evidence often derives from sites disturbed by treasure hunters. For CAP one instance of this is the cave at Kılıçlı Mağarası which presents the richest assemblage from the Early Bronze Age period. Here the ceramic evidence implies not only a strong local tradition, but connections with west Anatolia and the south-east Balkans. The character of the assemblage of cups, bowls and pouring vessels implies a special setting for consumption. For the Middle to Late Bronze Age, the period of Hittite dominance in north-central Anatolia, it had been previously assumed that the north Pontic region remained uninhabited, so although limited, the discoveries by CAP questioned this view, although the nature and scale of occupation remain poorly understood.

The First Millennium BC witnessed the emergence of new polities across western Anatolia and the recognition of a discrete Black Sea region, Paphlagonia - a name that amused Aristophanes - west of Sinope. The region extended inland as far as Çankırı, and the name persisted into the late Middle Ages. The archaeology and historical contexts are summarised by Şerifoğlu (Chapters 8, 9), but Iron Age material remains sparse, with a possible early trading post (*emporion*) of Sinope at Kytoros (Gideros), west of Cide. Similar observations hold for the Hellenistic period, with the appearance of transport amphora made at Sinope and elsewhere defining greater connectivity. The range of known ceramics continues to increase in the Roman period, with finds indicating communications well beyond western Anatolia. The increasing centrality of Constantinople as a market and distribution centre is reflected in the dominance in the late Roman period of Phocaean LRC fine wares (from western Turkey), to the exclusion of the other contemporary Pontic forms. Structural evidence is confined to moulded stones from Gideros and elsewhere, and quarries. The remains of bridge abutments at Atköprü are dated in different chapters to the Roman or late Roman period. From the illustration the former seems more likely, but there seems to have been no attempt to follow the associated roadway. This reveals one of the minor problems in this report. It is clear that the publication of specific periods was assigned to individual authors, resulting in some repetition of sources, but also an over reliance on secondary material. If there is a bridge, what about the road? The Peutinger Table marks a road along the coast, although from our research at Amasra we found traces quite a way inland, as the Roman highway avoided the coastal valleys. The Peutinger Table is not discussed as a source except in reference to specific places, but given the comments concerning the district's poor state of communications until very recently, a Roman predecessor is surely worthy of greater note.

CAP makes a significant contribution to the district's Byzantine heritage. Churches, fortified sites, settlements are described in greater number than sites and monuments of earlier times. Among the most significant was the ruined church of Çadır Ini Kilise at Abdulkadir east of the port at Gideros. Having extolled the use of the örak or machete, it is unfortunate that the overgrowth was not cleared before photography of this and other structures. The building underwent later modifications and was closely associated with a cave; the complex is plausibly identified as a monastery. There is also good evidence for other religious use of caves elsewhere across the study area, with carved features, graffiti and inscribed crosses, comparable to the profusion found in the rock-cut church at Kiyiköy on the Black Sea coast of Turkish Thrace. The important fortified and multi-period site at Okçular Kale is discussed in more detail in the later chapter, "A Tale of Three Landscapes", written by the editors. Here they attempt a holistic view of the landscape and draw together the differing periods, especially the Byzantine, identifying not just the fortified site, but the clusters of settlements/farmsteads, cisterns and water conduits and artefact scatters, together with possible field boundaries. A problem the project faced was the lack of any nearby local excavated sites to provide some stratigraphic control and chronology on the pottery assemblages collected through the field surveys.[1]The specific difficulties faced of chronological resolution in the post Roman period are noted on a number of occasions, but they are also acknowledged for earlier periods, problems recognised by other Black Sea surveys including

[1] See the comments by Jackson (2019) concerning similar issues facing the Avkat Survey.

Sinope (p. 253). However by documenting and illustrating the range of ceramic finds from later prehistoric to medieval makes possible the future reinterpretation and study of the CAP survey data.

From the late 11th century much of Paphlagonia fell to the Turkmen, although Byzantine control was retained along the coast. Turkish sources at the time include a detailed report of the final capture of the castles of Gideros from the Byzantines in 1284, attesting to their continued presence. An intriguing coastal fortified site further east, Çoban Kalesi, is set on a rocky outcrop, and unlike many of the Byzantine and earlier fortified sites in the survey region shows evidence for carefully planned fortifications with regular towers. Ceramic evidence from the site is compared with other Black Sea examples from the 13th–14th centuries and its occupation is associated with the Genoese, who are known to have controlled Amasra as a trading station until the later 15th century. But surviving ceramics are only an indication of occupation, not construction, and the typology of the defences matches closely the north wall of Sinope Kale considered to date from the 9th century AD. Given the evidence cited earlier for the Turkish capture of Gideros, an earlier Byzantine construction seems more likely. In a sense, this example serves to represent how much of the evidence presented, for the historic periods in particular, often seems to conform to existing paradigms common to wider Byzantine Anatolia. Such an approach does not allow the topographic and material data its own, local voice. Significantly the editors in conclusion observe how in the Byzantine period "a densely settled cultural landscape takes shape, ... that stands in stark contrast with both the archaeological and palynological data for regions located south of the Pontic mountains" (p.440). It should also be noted that two of the surveys they cite from southern Paphlagonia and Phrygia do not present and illustrate as complete a range of data as is found in the Cide Archaeological Project publication.[2] Whatever the limitations imposed by the terrain, the material presented and illustrates stands as a resource for future study that can challenge the established research agenda. The volume is well illustrated and is available as Open Access.

James Crow
University of Edinburgh
jim.crow@ed.ac.uk

[2] See also Cassis *et al.* (2018) which compares the CAP findings with three other survey results for the late antique and Byzantine era.

Cassis, M., O. Doonan, H. Elton and J. Newhard, 2018. Evaluating Archaeological Evidence for Demographics, Abandonment and Recovery in Late antique and Byzantine Anatolia. *Human Ecology* 46: 381-98.

Jackson, M. 2019. Review of Archaeology and urban settlement in Late Roman and Byzantine Anatolia: Euchaïta-Avkat-Beyözü and its environment. *Antiquity* 93 (370), 1106-1107.

J. Rasmus Brandt, Erika Hagelberg, Gro Bjørnstad and Sven Ahrens (eds), *Life and Death in Asia Minor in Hellenistic, Roman and Byzantine Times: Studies in Archaeology and Bioarchaeology*. Studies in Funerary Archaeology 10. Oxford: Oxbow, 2017. ISBN 978-1-78570-359-1, hardcover £65.

In one of the most important works of historical scholarship of the last century, Peter Laslett gave a chilling sketch of *The World We Have Lost*.[1] The book built on the recent advances in historical demography and family reconstitution to describe a preindustrial society where the Grim Reaper was omnipotent, with average life expectancies at birth of 20-35 years, high infant mortality, cruelly interrupted marriages, and many orphaned children. It was a fitting antidote to romantic views of a past where everything was somehow comfortably better. For the ancient world, such family reconstitutions were impossible for lack of suitable sources. As Keith Hopkins argued incisively, all we could hope for is to assume that (Roman) antiquity was more or less the same as other preindustrial societies, and use the aggregate information on those societies in the form of model life tables to get an idea of Roman life expectancy.[2] He demonstrated in one stroke that all previous research that had used funerary inscriptions as representative sources of ages at death at population level was wrong because the results were impossible: they document commemorative practices and sentiments rather than mortality.

This volume fittingly combines precisely those two lines of investigation: the reality of disease and mortality, and how such mortality was expressed in funeral culture. The volume is all the more interesting because it presents data from

[1] Laslett 1965.
[2] Hopkins 2018.