

Session Abstracts

1D – Defining Viridia: New Perspectives on Roman Gardens and Designed Landscapes

Kathryn Gleason, Cornell University, klg16@cornell.edu

Sarah Gilboa-Karni, University of Haifa, gilboakarni@yahoo.com

Rona-Shani Evyasaf, Technion University, rona.evyasaf@gmail.com

Samuli Simelius, Helsinki University, samuli.simelius@helsinki.fi

This session seeks to build on recent conferences and publications on Roman gardens and designed landscapes to hear new perspectives on archaeological theory, method and interpretation. Pioneering archaeologist Wilhelmina Jashemki gathered hundreds of gardens together in Gardens of Pompeii. Her penultimate work, Gardens of the Roman Empire, will be published posthumously in January of 2018 with co-editors Kathryn Gleason, Kim Hartswick and Amina-Aicha Malek. These compendia chart the extent of the praxis of Roman gardening and landscape architecture, as well as the making and curation of associated sculpture, fountains, paintings, garden ceramics and other elements. The data they provide has presented new scholars, such as Sarah Gilboa-Karni, with opportunities for synthetic assessment of garden culture, as well as for critical re-assessment of the gardens themselves. The papers in this session, such as that proposed by Samuli Simelius, seek to explore new definitions of gardens and their characteristic features, as well as new understandings of designing, constructing and experiencing the Roman garden. Papers exploring unintended “after-life” uses of gardens are also welcomed. Gardens and other designed landscapes are built environments whose understanding is greatly enriched by the perspective of practicing landscape design professionals. While architects and engineers have been involved with the archaeology of their disciplines for centuries, landscape architects have rarely done so. Landscape architect and archaeologist Rona-Shani Evyasaf builds on recent scholarship on design by exploring the role of contemporary visual analysis methods in the assessment of archaeological sites. Built environments are constructed ecologies, as well, understood through specialized approaches to environmental

archaeology and papers are welcomed in remote sensing, archaeobotany, malacology and pedology.

1E and 2E Double Session – Formal Approaches to Complexity in Roman Archaeology: Exploring Complex Systems and Understanding Change

Tom Brughmans (University of Oxford) tombughmans1@gmail.com

John W. Hanson (University of Colorado) John.Hanson@Colorado.EDU

Matthew J. Mandich (University of Leicester) mjm66@le.ac.uk

Iza Romanowska (Barcelona Supercomputing Centre) iza.romanowska@bsc.es

Xavier Rubio-Campillo (University of Edinburgh) Xavier.Rubio@ed.ac.uk

In recent years archaeologists have increasingly employed innovative approaches used for the study of complex systems to better interpret and model the social, political, and economic structures and interactions of past societies. However, for the majority of Roman archaeologists these approaches remain elusive as a comprehensive review and evaluation is lacking, especially regarding their application in Roman archaeology. In brief, a complex system is made up of many interacting parts ('components' or 'agents') which form a whole that is more than the sum of its parts – i.e. the interactions of these parts lead to emergent behaviours or outcomes that cannot be (easily) predicted by examining the parts individually. While such systems are characterized by their unpredictable, adaptive, and/or non-linear nature, they are (often) self-organising and governed by observable rules that can be analysed via various methods. For example, many past phenomena, such as urbanism or the functioning of the Roman economy, are complex systems composed of multiple interacting elements and driven by the diverse processes acting upon individuals inhabiting the ancient world. Thus, they can be explored using the approaches and methods of complexity science. The study of complex systems has primarily been undertaken in contemporary settings, in disciplines such as physics, ecology, medicine, and economics. Yet, as the complex nature of ancient civilizations and their similarity to present-day systems is being steadily realized through ongoing analysis, survey, and excavation, archaeologists have now begun to use methods such as scaling studies (e.g. settlement scaling theory), agent based

modelling, and network analyses to approach this complexity. Since these methodologies are designed to examine the interactions and feedback between components within complex systems empirically, they can provide new ways of looking at old data and old problems to supply novel conclusions. However, such methods have only been applied sporadically in ancient settings, and even less so in a Roman context or using Roman archaeological data. Thus, in this two-part session we aim to bring these methods, and the Roman archaeologists using them, together by offering a critical review of the theoretical and empirical developments within the study of past complex systems and their interplay with existing ideas, before investigating how we might capitalize on the new opportunities afforded by them in the future. Part I of this session, 'exploring complex systems', is concerned with examining and unravelling the underlying structures present in the archaeological record using the formal tools provided by the complex systems framework. Part II, 'understanding change', will focus on applications exploring the dynamics of change that generated the patterns observed in existing evidence. In particular, we invite contributions using formal methods including computational modelling and simulation, GIS, and network analyses, as well as diverse theoretical approaches to better understand ancient complex systems.

2D – 1st General Session

3D – Quantifying Public Construction: Figure Labour, Territory exploitation and Cost of production

Dr. Christopher Courault, University of Córdoba (Spain), Research in Archaeology Group: Antiguas ciudades de Andalucía: de la investigación arqueológica a la rentabilización social (PAI Hum-884),
christopher.courault@gmail.com

The economy of public construction has to be considered not only as a simple historical aspect, but also as a way to understand all necessary steps to explain an urban project. Behind all Roman monuments there are several aspects (building techniques) environment factors (category of stone, topography...) and

organisation of labour (status, number of workers, slave, army, professional of construction, salary ...).The objective is to join activities from quarry exploitation to building making, with special attention to materials and social impact. All these elements are indissociable to address this process, which also constitutes a field within the Archaeology of construction. In this sense, transformations of material resources (estimation of volume), figure labour organisation and transport are the main lines which allow us to investigate the construction effort. The archaeological information is quite dispersed, that is why is important to identify local specificity and labour organisation change, which may constitute complementary information for further research. Concretely, by the same occasion, the investigation use to associate manuals of XIXth century with historical sources on salary. Most of the information on ancient labour cost is dedicated to East Roman Empire, so we should reflect on their use on West Roman Empire. Therefore, the methodology constitutes another question to address in relation to the influence of XIXth manual on current investigation. During the last years, the development of quantitative study enabled us to get a real point of view about logistic and new economic data. Thus, by correlating all these elements it is possible to evaluate the cost of production for an edifice and each material resource, according to the force workers and environment. This economical evaluation should be enough to get a general point of view when literary source does not give any information on the price of a construction; in a few cases, however, it may enable us to compare between both factors.

3E – Beyond Adoption, Imitation, Hybridization: Representation and Visuality within and beyond the Roman Frontiers

Peter S. Wells Department of Anthropology University of Minnesota
Wells001@umn.edu

There now exists a vast literature on Roman imports beyond the frontiers, on questions of imitation and hybridization, and on amalgamating of Roman and indigenous techniques and motifs in specific objects in the material culture. Papers in this session develop a new perspective on interactions between craft

producers and consumers in the Roman provinces and those beyond the frontiers by focusing specifically on contrasting patterns in the visibility of objects made, used, and deposited within the provinces on the one hand and outside them on the other. In what ways were the products made in the provinces similar to those crafted beyond the frontiers, from the perspective of the use of visually striking features ('enchanted' in Gell's terms), and in what ways were they different? Addressing this question will shed new light on differences between the uses of and responses to material culture (Gosden 2005, 2008) on the two sides of the frontier and contribute to our understanding of the active role of objects in the context of interactions across the frontiers. Among the categories of material culture examined will be pottery, bronze vessels, glass vessels, coins, and gold and bronze ornaments. Of special concern is the nature of the contexts in which the objects examined occur – in settlement deposits, in graves, in hoards. This approach will lead to challenges to some attributions of objects being 'imports' from the Roman world and will show that they are more likely products of indigenous manufacture outside of the imperial boundaries. Finally, papers will address the question, How different were patterns of visual representation and of visual reception within and outside of the empire?

4D – Remembering and Social Memory in the Roman West

Dr Ralph Häussler, Faculty of Humanities, University of Wales Trinity Saint David, Lampeter campus, Lampeter SA48 7EU, r.haeussler@uwtsd.ac.uk

Prof. Günther Schörner, Institute of Classical Archaeology, University of Vienna, Franz Klein Gasse 1, A-1190 Wien, Austria, Guenther.Schoerner@univie.ac.at

Dr Thomas Schierl, Institute of Archaeology and Cultural Anthropology, University of Bonn, Regina-Pacis-Weg 7, D-53113 Bonn, Germany, thomasschierl@gmx.de

'Memory' and 'remembrance' in societies and of societies have been key terms in social sciences for more than twenty years and also became key topics in the study of the Classical world. The material remains of the past – for which the French sociologist Maurice Halbwachs (1950) coined the term *cadre matériel* – allow archaeology to

study the material aspects of memory. Studies of memories in the Roman Empire focused either on the city of Rome herself or on the Eastern Greek-speaking part, while the West has been neglected or even treated under the heading 'forgetfulness' to demonstrate that the cultures in the western and northern provinces did not remember their pre-conquest pasts (cf. e.g., Woolf's 'The Uses of Forgetfulness in Roman Gaul', 1996).

The aim of this session is to show that – contrary to conventional opinion – people in the western provinces used various means to come to terms with the knowledge and memory of one's pre-Roman history: indeed, remembering one's origins and descent as an essential part of social memory also played a key role in the West for identity-building within the framework of the Roman Empire. Different means can be detected archaeologically – for example:

- the connection with a common mythological past by making use of well-known founder heroes like Hercules (e.g. in Mauretania Tingitana)
- the framing of pre-Roman monuments and their loading with a new meaning especially in sacral sepulchral contexts (e.g. in the province of Baetica, Britannia, etc.)
- the conscious recourse on pre-Roman material culture in Roman times (e.g. in Africa proconsularis)
- the use of pre-Roman sanctuary sites for the construction of a unbroken tradition to the Roman Empire (in most provinces, e.g. Britain, Gaul, Africa proconsularis, Iberia)
- persistence and creation of deities and cult places to express local memory and history (e.g., Southern Gaul)

4E – Boundaries, Borders, and Frontiers: Modern Methods and Frameworks for Ancient Phenomena

Meg Moodie, meg.moodie@ed.ac.uk

Rory Nutter, rory.nutter@ed.ac.uk University of Edinburgh

Kai Radloff, Römisch-Germanische Kommission kai.radloff@dainst.de

Rob Collins, Newcastle University robert.collins@newcastle.ac.uk

Borders and boundaries were a significant feature of the Roman perception and construction of space, articulated in religious, domestic, urban, provincial, republican and imperial contexts (Whittaker 1994). This session seeks to distinguish between our ability to identify boundaries, borders, and frontiers in geospatial terms, and the frameworks that we employ to understand the significance of such concepts within as well as outwith Roman society. Where 'hard lines' can be observed, as in the external walls of a domus or the civitas, fossae, and clausurae, then boundaries and borders can be reasonably identified. But how do we identify borders when such demarcations are missing, as with the Roman imperial provinces? How do we identify larger transitional zones, like the frontier beyond the militarised border? In addition to the physical elements that indicate boundaries, borders, and frontiers, how do we approach the cultural impact of such structures? Are modern theoretical paradigms and frameworks appropriate to communicate the meaning of such features for Roman and non-Roman alike? Or do such approaches only have meaningful value for modern scholarship? This session seeks to investigate borders and frontiers as complex cognitive formations realised in the landscape throughout the entire Roman era, from the 4th century BC to the 7th century AD. We invite papers that:

- employ geo-spatial methods to identify borders and transitional zones

- investigate how borders materialised in the physical and cultural landscape
- adopt theoretical frameworks that provide insight into Roman conceptions of space
- the extent to which contact with the Roman state changed the manner in which space was conceived, for example through the imposition of borders or frontiers

5D – Workshops –

1) The Praxis of (Roman) Archaeology: Alienation and Redemption

Jake Weekes, Canterbury Archaeological Trust

Jake.Weekes@canterburytrust.co.uk

Andrew Gardner, UCL Institute of Archaeology

andrew.gardner@ucl.ac.uk

This workshop session aims to tackle the long-standing problem of the division between different forms of interpretative labour in Roman archaeology. Like any other sub-discipline within archaeology, Roman studies is divided between distinct groups of practitioners, and different sets of priorities and agendas. While much effort continues to be made to overcome these divisions by lots of people in many contexts, they remain entrenched, as does the alienation they propagate. One indication of this is furnished by the data gathered for a paper at TRAC 2017 ('Tracking Diversity in TRAC', Lodwick, Gardner & Derrick), which suggested that the proportion of non university-based speakers at TRAC has declined over time, and rarely rises above 10% of speakers at a conference. The format for this workshop will be a panel-led discussion rather than formal papers, with themes to be considered including: the ways in which 'interpretation at the trowel's edge' works in practice; the structures that govern interpretation in 'threat-led' archaeology; the status of 'Roman Britain' as a conceptual framework in the totality of British archaeology; and the ways in which archaeology has been colonised by contemporary neo-liberalism - and how this might be contested.

2) A Place for an Experiment in Roman Studies

Dr Tatiana Ivleva, Newcastle University Tatiana.Ivleva@ncl.ac.uk

When Dana Millson was organising a session on experimental archaeology at TAG held in Southampton in 2008, she was faced with the problem of whether there is a place for the experimental archaeology in a theoretical conference (Millson 2010, 1). The answer was yes, as experimental archaeology is very much stuck in-between theory and practice, using scientific applications to understand how things were

produced and used in the past but at the same time drawing its inspiration from various theories and hypotheses, and individual subjective knowledge based on the careful observations of objects and practices. Yet, the experimental archaeology has somehow been of secondary importance in Roman studies and does not feature prominently in Roman archaeology. While few institutions in UK or on the Continent teach experimental archaeology module in their archaeology degree, many Roman archaeologists are cut off from any experimental aspects, which became the sphere of knowledge of an experienced artisans or reenactors with interest in the Roman past. For instance, when Roman Military Equipment Conference held in St. Andrews in 2016 had re-enactors displays on horseback riding skills and cavalry warfare, majority of the delegates were not versed in wearing a Roman helmet or riding a horse or throw a javelin, albeit having a deep knowledge about the types of pilum and styles of horse decoration.

This workshop explores the place and status of experiments in Roman archaeology in theory and practice. The following discussion points are brought to the fore:

- The status of Roman experimental archaeology: a dying art, already dead, or in the revival stage;
- The view on Roman experimental archaeology: is it at all necessary for academics to be deeply involved with experimental archaeology to understand the technologies and practices of the Roman past (e.g. know how to make or throw a javelin, for instance);
- The classicist view on experimental archaeology: accessibility and relevance to classicists;
- Experimental or experiential archaeology: what is the best fit for Roman studies;
- Challenges and tensions of working with professionals/craftspeople to replicate the objects of the past;
- Challenges and tensions of working with re-enactors;
- Re-enactors perspective on working with academics/scholars;

The participants will reflect and comment for around 15 minutes on the issues raised above. The immediately following discussion will be in the round-table format, allowing the members of the audience to contribute their knowledge and experience as well. The workshop is supported by EXARC, the ICOM affiliated organisation representing archaeological open-air museum, experimental archaeology, ancient technology and interpretation.

5E – 2nd General Session

6D – Crafts: Everyday technologies in the ancient world

Adam Sutton, University of Reading, A.D.Sutton@pgr.reading.ac.uk

Owen Humphreys, University of Reading, O.J.Humphreys@pgr.reading.ac.uk

Crafts – including metalsmithing, potting, weaving, construction, coopering, leatherworking, etc. – were a key part of daily life in the ancient world. As the basic productive activities, crafts formed the basis of the economy, being relied upon as sources of income and requiring the investment of significant time, effort, and economic capital. Craft knowledge and professional practice could also be a significant part of individual identity; key to the construction of personhood. As social networks, craft industries served to tie people together through apprenticeship, commercial interactions, or through *collegia*. Through class, colonialism and gender, crafts could create and reinforce social division.

This perception of crafts sees the production of material culture as an energetic process, contrasting with the usual notion of crafts as ‘traditional’, unchanging windows on the past. Previously, traditional crafts have tended to be overlooked

in favour of the study of new inventions and innovative technologies. Archaeology has the power to change this, being able to provide both a *longue durée* perspective on gradual change in industry, and also the chance to assess the importance of ‘traditional’ techniques as ‘technologies in practice’.

This session therefore seeks to explore crafts as fundamental socially constructive practices: the ‘everyday technologies’ that created, maintained, and changed ancient societies. We invite the submission of papers from all spheres of classics, ancient history, and archaeology which offer theoretically-informed discussions of the roles of crafts and craftspeople in the Roman world. We would particularly like to invite papers which theorise the role of objects within systems of technical knowledge; which bring new evidence bases and methodologies from nonarchaeological traditions; which theorise the position of craftspeople within social networks; or which consider the dialogue between economics and production.

The session will incorporate five papers, each with time for questions, and will conclude with a thirty-minute discussion.

6E – Egypt on the Move: New Meanings of Space and Place in Local Contexts

Stephanie Pearson, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Institut für Archäologie, stephanie.pearson@hu-berlin.de

Lindsey A. Mazurek, Bucknell University, Department of Classics & Ancient Mediterranean Studies, lindsey.mazurek@bucknell.edu

In recent studies of Roman imperialism, issues of place have become increasingly important. A special set of questions are provoked by objects that display a connection to Egypt—whether by iconography, material, or find context—yet are discovered in parts of the Roman world outside Egypt itself. Until the last decade, the “Egyptianness” of these objects was considered paramount to their

interpretation: thus they have often been treated as if they were from an Egyptian context, with an emphasis on the cultic or funerary rituals that would have dictated their use there. But studies particularly of Isis cult outside of Egypt have shown that Egyptian culture took on new meanings as it reached different regions of the Roman world. Objects from Egypt or representing Egypt in some way were highly mobile; they could even gain and shed layers of significance as they travelled from place to place. What impact did this mobility have on the objects, their significance, and their users? What did “Egypt” mean after being deracinated and replanted in disparate parts of the Empire? Pursuing answers to these questions means activating new theoretical models that will advance broader discussions of cultural contact and exchange in the Roman world. This panel examines Egyptian objects as a case study for “periphery - periphery” interactions in the Roman Empire. For this panel, we seek papers that examine the meaning of Egypt outside of Egypt through the study of material culture. We are particularly interested in regional diversity, and welcome submissions that consider Egyptian and “Egyptianizing” material culture from lesser-studied regions of the Mediterranean, as well as themes of place, de-territorialisation, cultural identity, and reception across the Mediterranean region.