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.

Asia Minor, a region not yet that well served with scientific archaeology. The chapters on the skeletal material that make up the second half of the volume show what modern scientific technology can do, but also show the difficulty of connecting such local results to larger historical narratives of health and prosperity. The chapters often show a fairly basic diet with a lot of carbon hydrates, high perinatal and infant mortality, and even at more elevated ages mortality was high. Of course, this is not unexpected for any preindustrial society, but what one would like is more detail (when and where were things better or worse?), and this proves difficult. The reason is the combination of a lack of chronological resolution, and small sample sizes. The authors tried hard, but are justly cautious. Even so, life in the Roman period or some part of it seems to have been somewhat healthier and more prosperous than much of the Byzantine period.[3] Unfortunately, and probably due to the often degraded quality of the material, only just occasionally are details reported on long bone length. This is unfortunate as precisely this has become an important measure in comparative historical studies on health by historians such as John Komloss, Richard Steckel, Robert Fogel or Joerg Baten.[4] In fact, none of that research is even mentioned, and that reflects an unfortunate disciplinary isolation, where scientific archaeologists are often unaware of the larger debates and conceptual and methodological advances in comparative history, and where historians are often blissfully unaware of the spectacular potential of forensic scientific archaeology: we can not only read documents about people in the past, but we can actually study the remains of their bodies.

The first half of the volume presents on the one hand a series of excellent, mostly local and largely descriptive, studies of funerary practices and primarily funerary architecture and on the other hand some more analytical studies in social history. Unlike the chapters on health, these chapters are by and large limited to the Roman period, but like those chapters they often still cover very long periods, if for no other reason than that tombs were reused multiple times over the centuries. The end result could be large landscapes of the dead, such as shown in the huge cemeteries around for example Ephesos. The, to us, somewhat creepy habit of reusing existing tombs is perhaps not surprising, given the high and unpredictable mortality such as is amply documented in the second half of the volume: family continuity would be hard to achieve, but worth claiming with a multi generation tomb or the purchase or appropriation of an existing tomb. Here, however, family mostly does not seem to have extended more than a few generations: family continuity would have been hard to achieve given the high and unpredictable levels of mortality.[5] This perhaps also explains the presence of slaves and freedmen in these tombs. Ahrens' chapter on cemeteries at Hierapolis and elsewhere contains an interesting argument about the social location of these funerary practices. He argues that there was enough space for a large part of the population, and that cost (particularly of sarcophagi) was not prohibitive, even if the monumental tombs were probably only for the more well to do. This provides an interesting contrast to the rural non-elite burials from central Turkey studied by Goldman. These were far more modest, and largely individual. The final chapter of the first half of the book covers a rather longer time period, well into the late Byzantine period, and attempts to connect changing burial practices to cultural and mental changes, and to the coming of Christianity in particular. It is a brave attempt, but shows how hard it is to do such a thing.

The volume as a whole is indeed a brave attempt, and connects recent work from a number of regions and cities, and combines quite different approaches. As such, it shows what can and should be achieved, but there is clearly more work to be done, both in terms of enlarging datasets, and in terms of connecting to wider historical and methodological concerns.

Willem M. Jongman
Department of History,
University of Groningen
w.m.jongman@rug.nl

Laslett, P. 1965. *The world we have lost*. London: Methuen.

Hopkins, K. 1983. *Death and Renewal*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hopkins, K. 2018 [1966]. On the Probable Age Structure of the Roman Population, in C. Kelly (ed) *Keith Hopkins, Sociological Studies in Roman History*: 105-134. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jongman, W.M., J.P.A.M. Jacobs and G. Klein Goldewijk, 2019. 'Health and Wealth in the Roman Empire. *Economics & Human Biology* 34, 138-150.

[3] But see Jongman, Jacobs and Klein Goldewijk 2019 for a negative correlation between health and prosperity.

[4] See Jongman, Jacobs and Klein Goldewijk 2019 for discussion.

[5] C.f. Hopkins 1983.