

# Diskussionen

## Unravelling Neolithic Europe? Opportunities and obstructions in overviewing the European Neolithic

By Silvine Scharl

Since 2009, Oxford University Press has published a number of Handbooks on various topics in Prehistoric Archaeology. With this series, Oxford University Press aims at covering specific topics – such as the Neolithic of Europe (6500–2500 BC) – as comprehensively as possible. Eventually, in 2015 the “Oxford Handbook of Neolithic Europe” came out<sup>1</sup>. Comprehensive, in this case, refers to regions, finds, analytical methods and interpretive approaches. It is considered to be a compendium combining up-to-date syntheses with current innovative thinking in order to inform and inspire the reader. The last part aims at developing key debates for Neolithic studies (p. 3).

These aims could not be more ambitious. Therefore, 56 contributions have been integrated and arranged into four parts comprising a short introduction (Part I) and conclusion (Part IV) as well as two parts on “Mobility, change, and interaction at the large scale” (Part II) and “Neolithic worlds and Neolithic lifeways” (Part III). The last two comprise subchapters headed “Movement of plants, animals, ideas, and people” and “Sequences of cultural interaction and cultural change” (Part II) and “Houses, habitation, and community”, “Materiality and social relations”, “Monuments, rock art, and cosmology” and finally “Death, bodies, and persons” (Part III). Dividing the book into thematic parts rather than chronological or regional sections is promising. This facilitates not only the comparison across regions (p. 7) and thus helps to overcome differences in chronological sub-divisions of the Neolithic, but also enables extending questions on various aspects of Neolithic life. Certainly, this also enhances the “compelling new perspectives” announced on the jacket. Various articles provide thought-provoking impulses making the handbook an interesting read.

The contributions are conceptualised in quite different ways. While some provide a good overview on the respective topic (including the current state of research, but not always developing new perspectives), others focus on interpretation and debates without providing detailed background information, let alone a comprehensive overview. However, taken as a whole, both kinds of contributions add to a quite complex and comprehensive picture of the Neolithic period, since a considerable range of subjects is covered in a more or less detailed way by the enormous number of articles. Yet, it works out differently in the various parts of the handbook.

### Part I: Introduction

The first part aims at giving a short overview and at defining the Neolithic in Europe (p. 4). Thus, compelling new perspectives could have been developed in this part of the book already; or at least a thorough summary of the current state of research could have been given. However, the authors

<sup>1</sup> CHRIS FOWLER / JAN HARDING / DANIELA HOFMANN (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Neolithic Europe*. Oxford University Press, Oxford 2015.

£ 125.00. ISBN 978-0-199545841. 856 pages, 197 illustrations.

confine themselves to listing well-known key-words like “agriculture”, “pottery”, “polished stone” or “novel relations between people, things, animals and places”, stating that “the Neolithic was a way of life, a way of getting on in and with the world” and that despite of a considerable degree of variation “archaeologists still think it valuable to talk about some societies as Neolithic and others as Mesolithic or Bronze Age” (pp. 4–6).

This key section of the handbook is a bit disappointing for those, e. g. undergraduate students, who might have expected to get introduced to more developed statements. Besides, it is not sufficient, as the authors repeatedly do, to refer to the contributions of Thomas and Kristiansen in the last part of the book, since both articles constitute a very interpretive approach providing a rather narrow perspective of what “Neolithic” may mean. Moreover, it would have been worthwhile considering a brief history of the term Neolithic, which could easily have been written from a European perspective, if only to make clear that we are dealing with a European resp. Eurasian concept. Based on this, a global perspective (as it has been taken for the beginnings of food production during the last decades, e. g. BARKER 2006; DIAMOND 1997; SMITH 2001) could have been developed, looking at definitions and meanings of the concept on other continents.

## Part II: Mobility, change, and interaction at the large scale

Chapters 2–7 are concerned with “Movements of plants, animals, ideas, and people”, treated in a regional approach (South-East Europe, Mediterranean Europe, Central / Eastern Europe and North-Western Europe), supplemented by the contributions of Shennan on “Languages, genes, and cultural interaction” and Brown et al. on “Environments and landscape changes”. The latter is particularly valuable since climatic change or, more generally, environmental factors and their influence on cultural processes are a major topic in Neolithic research. This is probably due to the fact that several marked climatic events and climatic shifts fall into this period, e. g. the 8.2 ka event or the Boreal-Atlantic transition and the Atlantic-Sub-Boreal transition. Due to the publication policy in the natural sciences (short articles in various international journals, barely any comprehensive books), there is only a small number of publications so far that would allow for a quick overview on climatic change and reconstructions, underlying methods and basic proxies. In this respect, Brown et al. fill a major gap. Table 2.1, for example, gives an excellent overview on important climatic shifts during the Neolithic, relevant underlying data, postulated causes and pertinent references. In the text, the regionally different sources for climatic proxies (e. g. lake level record in the Alps, bog surface wetness (BSW) in northern Scandinavia and European Russia etc.), their potential and meaning are discussed.

Based on the claim to be a compendium that combines up-to-date syntheses with current innovative thinking, to inform and inspire the reader, the coverage and quality of the following contributions is rather variable. Tresset’s contribution is an excellent example for a well-structured synthesis on the early Neolithic in northwestern Europe that integrates the current state of research and up-to-date analytical methods (e. g. isotope analysis) as well as major debates, going beyond topics like chronology, typology, settlement systems or burial practices, which dominated research on Neolithic Europe for a long time. Meanwhile, scientific methods of analysis allow for questions we would not have thought of 10–15 years ago, e. g. on the adaptation of biological cycles of animals to non-Mediterranean environments (p. 129). Tresset’s contribution is indeed informing and inspiring and helps to develop concepts for future research. Other contributions, e. g. on Central and Eastern Europe (Schier) or Mediterranean Europe (Guilaine), provide a good overview on the current state of research concerning the Mesolithic-Neolithic transition and later developments. The article on South-East Europe, however, follows a different structure. It is not an easy task to

write a synthesis on “mobility, change and interaction” during the Neolithic in this vast area – particularly since the state of research and publication is quite inhomogeneous. Therefore, Müller’s idea to treat various major topics on the basis of key studies seems reasonable. Consequently, he focuses on case studies from Impresso (as an example for mobility) and Butmir (as an example for interrelations between mobility and demography) contexts as well as on early copper metallurgy. Rather brief mention is made of important regions like Macedonia and Greece and major archaeological phenomena like the Vinča or Karanovo cultures’ role in exchange networks or the importance of the Tiszapolgár and Bodrogkeresztúr cultures to early copper metallurgy. This leads, however, to a somehow narrow perspective on the vast archaeological record from South-East Europe, focused mainly on the Adriatic Neolithic. Moreover, the long timespan between submission and publication poses a problem not only to this contribution. Due to new results on early copper metallurgy – first published in 2010 (RADIVOJEVIĆ ET AL.) – parts of this paragraph are already out of date as finds of copper slag from the Vinča settlement of Belovode (Serbia), dating to around 5000 BC, provoked new debates on the role of Europe in the development of early metallurgy in Eurasia (lately e. g. RADIVOJEVIĆ 2015; ROSENSTOCK ET AL. 2016).

Shennan’s contribution is an important supplement to the regional articles, because he discusses both the possibilities and various analytical methods of genetic research. His focus is on the expansion of farming populations, languages and genes. In this context he examines *inter alia* aDNA analysis and studies on demographic patterns that gained importance in the last decade. He also addresses the issue of “summed radiocarbon date probability” (often abbreviated as “dates as data”) used as population proxies. This comparatively new approach has been highly debated during the last years. However, the number of applied studies increases steadily (e. g. HINZ ET AL. 2012). Since Shennan is one of the protagonists of this method, his contribution – unsurprisingly – does not contain any detailed critique. Nonetheless, the Oxford handbook would have been a proper place for a more critical view or even a separate discussion.

Despite its topic, Part II does not provide more detailed discussions of isotope analysis on Neolithic mobility at this point. Its absence might be explained by a lack of analysis in various regions, e. g. southeast Europe (though there are some, e. g. GIBLIN 2009, and its number is increasing). It might also be explained by the fact that only during and after production of the handbook this method became established. Hence, the long timespan between conceptualisation, submission of articles and publication has to be mentioned once more. Meanwhile, several major studies were conducted or are in progress (for Central Europe e. g. BICKLE ET AL. 2011 on LBK in Lower Bavaria, TURCK ET AL. 2012 on LBK and the settlement site Herxheim [Germany], TURCK ET AL. 2014 on the Michelsberg Culture site Heidelberg-Handschuhsheim) and during the last decade or so, isotope analysis has definitely become one of the most innovative and influential methods not only for Neolithic contexts but for prehistoric research in general. Therefore (and since Oxford handbooks claim to be a compendium combining *up-to-date* syntheses with *current innovative thinking*), this part lacks a separate contribution on methodological aspects as well as a thorough critique – particularly since isotope analysis promises exciting results, provided that archaeologists ask the right questions and are aware of what can be achieved by this method.

The last point to be made concerns numerous overlaps in content, particularly for contributions with a regional focus and supra-regional topics, e. g. early copper metallurgy (contributions of Schier and Müller), the Mesolithic-Neolithic transition in Greece and Macedonia (Müller and Guilaine) or the Adriatic Early Neolithic (Müller and Guilaine). However, it is not detrimental to the authors since the articles do not contain any contradictions. Considering the limited space, though, avoiding overlaps would have enabled further contributions on aspects that are lacking.

The second section of Part II, addressing “Sequences of cultural interaction and cultural change” (chapters 8–11), is designed to complement the previous section (p. 8), but produces thematic overlaps. Malone’s contribution, for example, contains various aspects already covered by Guilaine; e. g. Guilaine’s figure 4.2 and Malone’s figure 9.1 are almost identical. Both maps illustrate the diffusion of Neolithic farming into the Mediterranean and Europe.

### Part III: Neolithic worlds and Neolithic lifeways

This critique on thematic overlaps does not apply to Part III. Its focus is on individual aspects of Neolithic life, comprising material as well as social, cultural or cognitive aspects. With their clear thematic delimitation, the articles provide excellent overviews on “Houses, habitation, and community”, “Subsistence and social routine”, “Materiality and social relations”, “Monuments, rock art, and cosmology” and “Death, bodies, and persons”. Most authors provide basic information and crucial insights into the current state of research and address numerous aspects. That way they develop a complex and vivid picture of the Neolithic in Europe and provide fascinating insights on allegedly well-known finds, e. g. Last’s contribution on “Longhouse lifestyles in the Central European Neolithic”. Apparent overlaps, e. g. between Last’s contribution and Coudart’s article on the Bandkeramik longhouses, rather complement each other due to different approaches. Coudart’s reference to Last’s contribution shows that the authors have obviously coordinated each other on thematic aspects. This gives rise to a multilayered picture of Neolithic architecture with its various levels of meaning. Considered as a whole, the section on “Houses, habitation, and community” is an excellent piece of work.

The same holds true for the following sections on “Subsistence and social routine” and „Materiality and social relations“. For example, the contributions by Schulting, Bogaard and Halstead provide excellent surveys on methods, results and critique of research on Neolithic subsistence. Taken as a whole, the contributions written by or together with natural scientists are definitely inspiring, since various new analytical methods allow for new perspectives on the archaeological record (e. g. the analysis of dental microwear in sheep and goats from Ecsegfalva 23 in Hungary and Makriyalos in Greece, revealing a very abrasive diet which in turn implies restriction to heavily overgrazed or freshly cultivated pasture [p. 393]). Moreover, there are well-written archaeological overviews on large-scale and complex phenomena (e. g. Vander Linden’s article on the Bell Beaker phenomenon) as well as more specific articles treating important Neolithic materials such as spondylus, amber or copper. The latter is covered in three regional contributions that complement each other in a perfect way, thus providing a comprehensive picture of early copper metallurgy in Neolithic Europe. The reader will definitely benefit from this section, for the first time providing brief, concise surveys on several types of material. Still other contributions offer inspiring new perspectives on seemingly well-known, rather unappealing evidence (e. g. Garrow’s article on “Depositions in pits”), or on Neolithic individuals and their daily routine in general (e. g. Mlekuž’s article on the “Neolithic year”). The same goes for Loveday’s text on “Religious routine and pilgrimage in the British Isles”. He adds another exciting perspective on the archaeological record and on Neolithic lifeways; the integration of further regions would have been quite interesting.

Taken as a whole, the sections on „Monuments, rock art, and cosmology“ and „Death, bodies, and persons“ can also be characterised as a good piece of work. The contribution on Central European enclosures, however, might not come up to some reader’s expectations (postgraduates and more experienced scholars), in particular because the last decade witnessed considerable research on this type of monument (from the LBK to the Final Neolithic), e. g. ZEEB-LANZ ET AL. 2009 on Herxheim (LBK), BERTEMES 2008, MELICHAR / NEUGEBAUER 2010, MEYER / RAETZEL-FABIAN

2006 or SCHIER 2008 on various middle Neolithic enclosures (Kreisgrabenanlagen) and GESCHWINDE / RAETZEL-FABIAN 2009 on Michelsberg enclosures, to name but a few. This vivid research is neither reflected in the text nor in the list of references. Whereas the contributions on Neolithic rock art (in Iberia, the Italian Valcamonica and Northern Europe) are a good and inspiring read, helping to bring this sometimes marginalised topic into focus. After all, this archaeological source constitutes an essential store of information on the cosmology of Neolithic people that reflects an important sphere of Neolithic life.

All in all, Part III covers numerous important aspects of the European Neolithic, even seemingly marginal topics. Nonetheless, there are some – minor – gaps. Various smaller areas, such as Albania, are left out. Eastern Europe only plays a minor role, which also applies to Poland despite its rich archaeological record from Neolithic contexts and its special role as border region between Central European Neolithic societies and hunter-gatherers in the neighbouring areas to the north and east. Still other topics and regions are covered comparably detailed and from every conceivable perspective, e. g. the Central European Bandkeramik (LBK). Therefore, there is a bit of an avoidable disequilibrium concerning the issues addressed. Then again, even 56 contributions are presumably not sufficient to present and discuss every single aspect of the overwhelmingly rich archaeological record of this period.

#### Part IV: Conclusion: Debates in Neolithic Archaeology

The last part of the book aims at “developing key debates for Neolithic studies” in three contributions that focus on quite different aspects. Whittle addresses the Neolithic in Central and South-East Europe while Thomas develops more general thoughts on Neolithic society and Kristiansen examines the Neolithic-Bronze Age transition. Due to these various issues and the different research traditions the authors represent, they develop quite diverse perspectives. Whittle, for example, would want to see future research unpicking trajectories of commencement and first development (e. g. the beginnings of the Neolithic) with much more precision – given our ability now to define radiocarbon timescales with much more confidence (p. 1052 f.). He also points to the potential of aDNA analysis, developing a critical view on the method and current models based on this data. More generally, he emphasises the relevance of a detailed analysis in order to reconstruct the complexity of Neolithic societies. The considerable regional variation and staggering of Neolithic development is often blurred by the “big picture” that leads to conventional predictions of steady evolution (p. 1064). Whittle quite rightly notes that the “dominant tendencies in interpretation [of social structure] have been to seek and find differences in social position within any given community, and to see an intensification in social differentiation through time” (p. 1059). Rather, the reconstruction of late Neolithic societies (e. g. Michelsberg contexts in Central Europe) as hierarchically organised chiefdoms is highly questionable, since regular settlements and burials are barely known.

Thomas’ and Kristiansen’s contributions likewise examine Neolithic societies. Thomas focuses on the Neolithic as a period of social transformation. Whether Kristiansen develops key debates for Neolithic studies in his article at all has to remain open from my point of view. In his comparative approach to Neolithic and Bronze Age society, he indeed develops important research questions. His work is highly interpretive, however, and his hypotheses can only partly be substantiated with the archaeological record. In general, his reconstruction of Bronze Age society is highly debated (see e. g. KIENLIN 2015), which is why his contribution is of relevance but might not be a good choice to form the closing article.

Finally, some minor points need to be made concerning formal as well as thematic aspects. Various contributions contain mistakes due to insufficient editing. Considering the price of 125 £ or c. 180 € and the reputation of Oxford University Press I would have expected a more thorough editing. For example, Müller's contribution on South-Eastern Europe contains two different spellings of Tokai (fig. 3.1) resp. Tokay (p. 67). In Schier's article on Central Europe, Lesser Poland is translated as "Little Poland" and Hofmann and Orschiedt refer to the contribution of Roberts and Frieman as Roberts and Friedman (p. 999), to name but a few.

The long timespan between submission (in 2009/2010), revision (in 2011) and publication (in 2015) has already been mentioned. It would have been helpful, if all – not only some chapters – were marked with a "date stamp" of submission and revision. This would have helped to assess the timeliness of each contribution, particularly since some were obviously written considerably later than others (e. g. Part IV).

Taken as a whole, the editors selected the right contributors – not only because numerous experts contributed to the book at hand but also because they come from different fields and traditions of research (natural sciences, material studies etc.), thus facilitating an interesting mixture of different perspectives on the Neolithic in Europe. Moreover, the great effort of coordinating this multitude of authors and articles has to be acknowledged, although there are some overlaps that might have been avoided. The large number of contributions and their coordination might explain the long timespan between submission and publication.

The last point to be made is the question whether this handbook meets the requirements of being a compendium that combines up-to-date syntheses with current innovative thinking to inform and inspire the reader. As far as the regional coverage is concerned – reaching from Spain and Portugal to the Ukraine, Latvia and Estonia and from the Mediterranean to the Orkneys – this description is definitely appropriate. Some periods, however, are only partly represented, and there is a disequilibrium in favour of larger phenomena – first and foremost the Central European Bandkeramik – while many minor archaeological cultures are only touched upon briefly or do not play a role at all. In addition, there are some gaps concerning analytical methods, such as a critical survey on aDNA analysis or the "dates as data"-approach. Analytical methods and data on the relevance of milk and dairying are also missing. Moreover, there are some major debates and hypotheses of the last decades that would have been worth a critical review in the light of new data. Sherratt's Secondary Products Revolution, for example, is mentioned in several chapters, a more detailed view on the current state of research on wheeled transport, milk, wool, horse riding etc. is lacking, however.

Nonetheless, most contributions cover numerous important aspects of the Neolithic in Europe and provide bibliographies containing the relevant publications. Therefore, most of them constitute a valuable first step into the respective topic and are a good read, presenting the current state of research and "compelling new perspectives". Considered as a whole, the book can indeed be recommended to undergraduates, postgraduates and more experienced scholars (p. 3). However, it has to be kept in mind that the quality and coverage of the chapters and subchapters are variable. Still, for the following years this handbook will be a good source for getting a first impression of many specific topics. First and foremost because of the immense range of issues which are addressed, whereby a complex and detailed picture arises, not only of the European Neolithic but also of an innovative and vivid research providing a sense of the future direction that is definitely exciting.

## Bibliography

- BARKER 2006  
G. BARKER, *The Agricultural Revolution in Prehistory. Why did Foragers become Farmers?* (Oxford 2006).
- BERTEMES 2008  
F. BERTEMES, Die Kreisgrabenanlage von Goseck. Ein Beispiel für frühe Himmelsbeobachtungen. *Acta Praehist. et Arch.* 40, 2008, 37–44.
- BICKLE ET AL. 2011  
P. BICKLE / D. HOFMANN / R. A. BENTLEY / R. HEDGES / J. HAMILTON / F. LAIGINHAS / G. NOWELL / D. G. PEARSON / G. GRUPE / A. WHITTLE, Roots of diversity in a Linearbandkeramik community: isotope evidence at Aiterhofen (Bavaria, Germany). *Antiquity* 85, 2011, 1243–1258.
- DIAMOND 1997  
J. DIAMOND, *Guns, Germs and Steel. The Fates of Human Societies* (New York 1997).
- GESCHWINDE / RAETZEL-FABIAN 2009  
M. GESCHWINDE / D. RAETZEL-FABIAN, EWBSL. Eine Fallstudie zu den jungneolithischen Erdwerken am Nordrand der Mittelgebirge. *Beitr. Arch. Niedersachsen* 14 (Rahden / Westf. 2009).
- GIBLIN 2009  
J. GIBLIN, Strontium isotope analysis of Neolithic and Copper Age populations on the Great Hungarian Plain. *Journal Arch. Scien.* 36, 2009, 491–497.
- HINZ ET AL. 2012  
M. HINZ / I. FEESER / K.-G. SJÖGREN / J. MÜLLER, Demography and the intensity of cultural activities: an evaluation of Funnel Beaker societies (4200–2800 cal BC). *Journal Arch. Scien.* 39, 2012, 3331–3340.
- KIENLIN 2015  
T. L. KIENLIN, A hero is a hero is a ...? On Homer and Bronze Age social modelling. Paper presented at the International Conference Kiel 'Social Inequality as a Topic in Archaeology', 9–12 March 2015. [https://www.academia.edu/12125331/Tobias\\_L.\\_Kienlin\\_A\\_Hero\\_is\\_a\\_Hero\\_is\\_a...\\_On\\_Homer\\_and\\_Bronze\\_Age\\_Social\\_Modelling.\\_Paper\\_for\\_International\\_Conference\\_Kiel\\_Social\\_Inequality\\_as\\_a\\_Topic\\_in\\_Archaeology\\_9\\_12\\_March\\_2015](https://www.academia.edu/12125331/Tobias_L._Kienlin_A_Hero_is_a_Hero_is_a..._On_Homer_and_Bronze_Age_Social_Modelling._Paper_for_International_Conference_Kiel_Social_Inequality_as_a_Topic_in_Archaeology_9_12_March_2015) (last access: 20 December 2016).
- MELICHAR / NEUBAUER 2010  
P. MELICHAR / W. NEUBAUER (eds), *Mittelnolithische Kreisgrabenanlagen in Niederösterreich. Geophysikalisch-archäologische Prospektion – ein interdisziplinäres Forschungsprojekt*. Mitt. Prähist. Komm. 71 (Wien 2010).
- MEYER / RAETZEL-FABIAN 2006  
M. MEYER / D. RAETZEL-FABIAN, Neolithische Grabenwerke in Mitteleuropa – Ein Überblick. *Jungsteinsite 15*. Dezember 2006. [http://www.jungsteinsite.uni-kiel.de/pdf/2006\\_meyer\\_raetzel\\_low.pdf](http://www.jungsteinsite.uni-kiel.de/pdf/2006_meyer_raetzel_low.pdf) (last access: 16 November 2016).
- RADIVOJEVIĆ 2015  
M. RADIVOJEVIĆ, Inventing metallurgy in Western Eurasia. A look through the microscope lens. *Cambridge Arch. Journal* 25, 2015, 321–338.
- RADIVOJEVIĆ ET AL. 2010  
ID. / T. REHREN / E. PERNICKA / D. SLJIVARE / M. BRAUNS / D. BORIĆ, On the origins of extractive metallurgy: new evidence from Europe. *Journal Arch. Scien.* 37, 2010, 2775–2787.
- ROSENSTOCK ET AL. 2016  
E. ROSENSTOCK / S. SCHARL / W. SCHIER, Ex oriente lux? – Ein Diskussionsbeitrag zur Stellung der frühen Kupfermetallurgie Südosteuropas. In: M. Bartelheim / B. Horejs / R. Krauß (Hrsg.), *Von Baden bis Troia. Ressourcennutzung, Metallurgie und Wissenstransfer*. *Oriental and European Archaeology* 3 (Rahden / Westf. 2016) 59–122.
- SCHIER 2008  
W. SCHIER, Zur astronomischen Orientierung der mittelnolithischen Kreisgrabenanlage von Ippenheim, Mittelfranken. *Acta Praehist. et Arch.* 40, 2008, 45–55.
- SMITH 2001  
B. SMITH, Low-level food production. *Journal Arch. Research* 9, 2001, 1–43.

## TURCK ET AL. 2012

R. TURCK / B. KOBER / J. KONTNY / F. HAACK / A. ZEEB-LANZ, "Widely travelled people" at Herxheim? Sr isotopes as indicators of mobility. In: E. Kaiser / J. Burger / W. Schier (eds), *Population Dynamics in Prehistory and Early History. New Approaches by Using Stable Isotopes and Genetics* (Berlin, Boston 2012) 149–163.

## TURCK ET AL. 2014

ID. / B. KOBER / J. KONTNY / J. WAHL / R. LUDWIG, Strontiumisotopenanalysen und anthropologische Untersuchungen an der

Mehrfachbestattung der Michelsberger Kultur in Heidelberg-Handschuhsheim. *Fundber. Baden-Württemberg* 34, 2014, 385–407.

## ZEEB-LANZ ET AL. 2009

A. ZEEB-LANZ / R.-M. ARBOGAST / F. HAACK / M. HAIDLE / Ch. JEUNESSE / J. ORSCHIEDT / D. SCHIMMELPFENNIG / S. VAN WILLIGEN, The LBK settlement with pit enclosure at Herxheim near Landau (Palatinate). In: D. Hofmann / P. Bickle (eds), *Creating Communities. New Advances in Central European Neolithic Research* (Oxford 2009) 201–219.

Address of the author:

Silviane Scharl

Institut für Ur- und Frühgeschichte der Universität zu Köln

Weyertal 125

D-50923 Köln

e-mail: [sscharl@uni-koeln.de](mailto:sscharl@uni-koeln.de)