

This is an interesting and original paper about an important subject. I therefore enthusiastically recommend it for publication, *however* with the advice to seriously rethink some of the issues raised and rewrite the text accordingly.

Perhaps the first main main problem is the centrality of the idea of hyperculture as defined by Byung-Chul Han. Now there is nothing wrong with this idea per se; and it is wonderful that the author draws Han into the spotlights of archaeologists. However, the problem that Han discusses in terms of 'hyperculture' is much broader; and I think that the analyses of the author become much more worthwhile if he does not limit himself to Han/hyperculture alone but shows the wider issues at stake. Those wider issues revolve around the fact that, in my opinion at least, the 'hyperculture' Han sees as defining of the present *has a history*. There always have been historical periods for which our traditional notions of culture made no sense; with consequences for our rethinking of typologies as the author describes. I have analysed this myself in 'Understanding objects in motion. An *archaeological* dialogue on Romanisation', *Archaeological Dialogues* 21-1 (2014) 1-20 as well as 'Roman visual material culture as globalising *koine*', in: M. Pitts, M.J. Versluys (eds.), *Globalisation and the Roman world. World history, connectivity and material culture* (CUP: Cambridge – New York 2015) 141-174.

'Hyperculture' has to do with Globalisation, a concept that has now has a rich bibliography in the field with which the author should probably do more (Hodos et al. 2017 is in the bibliography but perhaps not used enough). One of the outcomes of the recent debate is that Globalisation is about the impact of increasing connectivity *for people and cultures*. I was surprised to see that the author limits himself to 'market relations' and consumers and capitalism; this is what the Globalization debate did in the 1990s and 2000s but not anymore! Globalisation is very much about social psychology (as well). The publications of Jan Nederveen Pieterse or Victor Roudometof (Glocalisation) might help her; or, for archaeological applications, the work by Kiel alumna Milinda Hoo, for instance her recent *Eurasian Localisms*. What has 'exploded' our ideas on the relations between typology and culture is the insight of intense connectivity as a characteristic of the present *and* (some periods of) the past; that's the wider issue of which Han is/describes (only) a recent (and particular and very interesting) manifestation. Knappett's *An archaeology of interaction* remains useful here.

My third main issue is that I think that scholars have already provided convincing answers to the central questions of the essay posed (a bit all too naively?) on p. 3 (But what is the alternative? To do away with the idea of culture altogether, and with it, typologies as well?). Arjun Appadurai is very important here, his *Modernity at Large* (from 1996!) was published more than a quarter of a century before Han but already has a lot of the same ideas; please read it! Appadurai's solution is to talk about -scapes instead of cultures, when it concerns people, for instance, he talks about ethnoscapescapes. These ideas have been applied to archaeological typologies by myself and others though the concept of the objectscape, see M.J. Versluys, Object-scapes. Towards a material constitution of Romaness?, in: A. Van Oyen, M. Pitts (eds.), *Materialising Roman histories* (Oxbow: Oxford 2017) 191-199, now with M. Pitts, M.J. Versluys,

Objectscapes. A manifesto for investigating the impacts of object flows on past societies, *Antiquity. A review of world archaeology* 95 (Issue 380) (2021) 367-381.

Some specific issues:

p. 2 genetics: see Crellin/Harris! DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1380203820000082>

p. 4 culture/culturalism: there is much more here; your discussions read somewhat arbitrary; have a look at Bachmann-Medik, *Cultural turns. New orientations in the study of culture* (2016)

p. 7 on anthropology: Comaroff (2010) is wonderful but more recent and more in line with the ideas advocated by the author is the work of Anna Lowenhaupt Tsing, read her Mushroom book if you want to know what 'hyperculture' is about; most pertinent to this essay!

p. 8 Greek pottery *cannot* be associated very well with specific cultural groups I think; most of it was found in Etruria where people used in in their tombs. See above: world history is globalisation (=hypercultures) all-over.....

p. 9: the intensification concerns Afro-Eurasia in general; not southern Europe alone.

p. 10 see my objections above: culture *has much more often* been more complex; it *much more often* was fluid, flexible and 'hybrid'; this is not something unique for the postmodern now!

p. 11 I do not think we rely on one single concept of culture anymore; see my remarks on ethnoscapas and objectschapas above.

p.11 good you draw in Augé (who did *surmodernité* already); Han is not (always) as original as he thinks he is....)

p. 12 capitalism/Marxism: I think this is too limited a view, see above.

p. 15 assemblages are mentioned (again), see the ideas on objectschapas that take a next step; and note the 2017 Cambridge Archaeological Journal (27) that is all about assemblages.

p. 15 we *can/should* push hyperculture into the archaeological past (would be my argument!)

p. 16: hyperculture is *not* a recent phenomenon (as Globalisation is not) ☺

Apologies for referring to some of my own work; that is just out of enthusiasm for the ambition of this essay; and in order to provide the relevant bibliography/discussions in those articles (not at all necessarily these texts themselves!). Keep up the good work Artur!

Kind regards,

Miguel John Versluys.