

tralen Basisretuschierung hätte finden können (E. CZIESLA, Das Mesolithikum in der Niederlausitz, Brandenburg. Einsichten und Aussichten. *Ethnogr.-Arch. Zeitschr.* 50, 2009, 361–407). Außerdem löst der gewählte Buchtitel „Kontinuität und Diskontinuität“, der an die von Andreas Tillmann angeschobene Diskussion zum Neolithisierungsprozess erinnert (A. TILLMANN, Kontinuität oder Diskontinuität? Zur Frage einer bandkeramischen Landnahme im südlichen Mitteleuropa. *Arch. Inf.* 16, 1993, 157–187) Erwartungen aus, die nicht erfüllt werden.

Und abschließend noch ein Wort zum Preis dieser Veröffentlichung: Trotz einer finanziellen Unterstützung durch die „Gesellschaft für Archäologie in Bayern e. V.“ und einem Zuschuss des „Historischen Vereins der Stadt und des Landkreises Fürstentfeldbruck e. V.“ liegt der Preis für die rund 260 Seiten mit € 58,- sehr hoch.

D – 14532 Stahnsdorf bei Berlin  
Fasanenstr. 25b  
E-Mail: Wurzel-Archaeologie@t-online.de

Erwin Cziesla  
Wurzel Archäologie und Umwelttechnik  
GmbH

**EVA ALRAM-STERN / ANGELIKA DOUSOUGLI-ZACHOS, Die deutschen Ausgrabungen 1941 auf der Visviki-Magula / Velestino. Die neolithischen Befunde und Funde.** Mit Beiträgen von M. Bergner, F. Bertsch †, C. Dürauer, A. Galik, H. Kroll, A. Pentedeka, E. Pernicka, A. Sarris und Mitarbeiter, Th. Schiefer, G. Schöbel und K. Zachos. Beiträge zur ur- und frühgeschichtlichen Archäologie des Mittelmeer-Kulturräumens Volume 36. Verlag Dr. Rudolf Habelt, Bonn 2015. € 135,-. ISBN 978-3-7749-3876-2. Hardcover. XI, 578 pages with 42 illustrations, 282 plates and 2 folding plates.

There are two respects in which the voluminous work which has now been published as No. 36 of the prestigious monograph series, BAM, fills existing gaps. Firstly, it presents the finds from a hitherto little known but, as we shall see, highly important tell settlement in Thessaly; secondly, in doing so, it sheds light on another chapter of German wartime archaeology. The volume is the result of a collaboration between the Heidelberg Institut für Ur- und Frühgeschichte, the Institut für Orientalische und Europäische Archäologie of the Austrian Academy of Sciences, the Greek Ministry of Culture's Archaeological Institute for Epirotic Studies at Ioannina and, although not explicitly mentioned in the title, the Pfahlbaumuseum at Unteruhldingen. It documents the excavations led by Hans Reinerth in 1941 at Visviki-Magula, near the town of Velestino in occupied Greece, and presents the recovered finds.

The cultural, political and ideological context of the German excavations in Thessaly during the occupation of Greece by the National Socialist regime is thoroughly discussed right at the start of the volume, in a foreword by the series editor, Harald Hauptmann. Hauptmann also contextualises these excavations in relation to archaeological research before and after the Second World War. In their own foreword, which follows, the authors give a brief outline of how the task of publishing the Visviki-Magula excavation – whose importance cannot be emphasised highly enough – was achieved. It involved tracing finds and archive material which had become dispersed across the whole of Europe, in circumstances which become clearer in the pages which follow. In his detailed discussion of the excavations conducted in Thessaly in 1941 by Hans Reinerth (1900–1990), Gunter Schöbel describes the journey made at the end of that year by five cases of finds, via Volos, Thessaloniki, Belgrade and Budapest, to Berlin. By the end of the war, various sub-sections of the material had been further dispersed to Friesack in Brandenburg, Bad Buchau, Unteruhldingen and Salem in Swabia. Just one section was later repatriated to Greece, dispatched by sea from Hamburg

in 1951. It was not until 2014 that a final consignment was sent directly from Unteruhldingen to the National Archaeological Museum in Athens in 2014. The excavation documents relating to the finds were even more widely scattered, and it was only thanks to meticulous research that they were traced to various archives and collections in Germany and Switzerland. Gunter Schöbel's excellently researched chapter also throws light on important parts of the Berlin University study collection, which until 2001 was curated by the reviewer, along with colleagues Gerson Jeute and Holger Grönwald, at the Humboldt Universität zu Berlin's now defunct Institut für Ur- und Frühgeschichte. The relationship between the large holdings of pile-dwelling finds in the Berlin collection, the "Friesack" holdings in the archives of the former Museum für Ur- und Frühgeschichte, in what was then the East German district of Potsdam, and the odyssey of the Velestino finds from east- to south-west Germany can be reconstructed in large measure by reference to the key topographical data of Reinerth's biography, as documented here.

The Greek-German archaeologist Kimon Grundmann (1891–1968) is also given a whole chapter to himself. Following a business training, Grundmann initially worked as an administrative assistant at the German Archaeological Institute in Athens. In the 1920s his archaeological colleagues became aware that he was a talented draughtsman, and later realised that he also possessed a profound knowledge of the Neolithic in Thessaly, acquired through personal study. In a rather unusual career path, he became a corresponding member of the Institute in 1934 and in 1942 even reached the position of research consultant. Given the level of knowledge at the time, Grundmann's ideas about the supra-regional connections of the Thessalian Neolithic and Chalcolithic, as very vividly described by Eva Alram-Stern, are of immense interest. According to her, Grundmann drew connections between the black-burnished and dark-painted red-slip pottery found at Dimini and pottery from Vinča and Tordos. He also saw similarities between the polychrome pottery from the Dimini and Arapi periods and that of Cucuteni and Butmir. This was very far-sighted for the time, since the then-prevailing opinion in European prehistoric research was that the Chalcolithic cultures of the Balkan / Carpathian region were contemporary with the Aegean Early Bronze Age.

In a final chapter of research history by Kostas Zachos, we learn much of interest about living and working conditions in the village of Velestino, in what was then still very much a multi-ethnic region of northern Thessaly. High-quality black-and-white photographs by the Tübingen Institute photographer Heinz (named here as Heinrich) Dürr provide insight into the economy and way of life of this small Balkan settlement, with its Karakachan, Vlach-Aromanian, Slavic-Macedonian and Greek inhabitants. Reinerth is said to have been able to communicate with the local Vlachs in Romanian (H. Hauptmann, p. 2). Even simply from the point of view of research history, therefore, the volume under review is of great value.

During the excavations, which were carried out in the months of October and November 1941, a rectangular area of roughly 20 x 30 m<sup>2</sup>, oriented SW–NE, was uncovered on the highest point of the tell (Area 1), while two smaller exploratory trenches (test trenches A and B) were dug to the N–W. The latter served to clarify the stratigraphic sequence of the tell. Both test trenches were dug in spits, each 50 cm deep, and the settlement layers revealed in the profiles were summarised in seven so-called "cultural phases", numbered in Roman numerals. The lowest of these layers, numbers VII–IV, were assigned to the Sesklo period and the upper layers, III–I, to the Dimini period. The allocation of the finds to the settlement layers proved difficult, since the material had been separated and recorded only according to the artificial spits, not according to settlement layers. When the finds were analysed, they were found to include Early Bronze Age material, which indicated that at least layers I–IV in Trench B had been disturbed. Significant from the point of view of research history, on the other hand, are several fairly large, contiguous settlement features in the central area, which were presented in preliminary reports, published in the archaeological periodi-

als Germanenerbe 6 (1941, 191) and Mannus 33 (1941, 599), as an “excellently preserved, four-roomed megaron”. In fact, this supposed single house was never properly published, only a schematised plan of the building being printed in the National Socialist Party newspaper *Völkischer Beobachter* on 18 February 1942 (s. p. 51 nr. 226). The interpretation of the features followed the prevalent National Socialist line, according to which the so-called ‘megaron’, a type of house with an open vestibule flanked by two side piers (*antae*), was supposed to have spread into Greece from the north. Using the surviving parts of the excavation documentation, Alram-Stern has now been able to prove in detail that the original plan of the stone walls and features comprising the supposed ‘megaron’, on which the schematised drawing in the *Völkischer Beobachter* was based, was assembled from a number of separate sketch plans. It is obvious that features from different periods were joined together to form a single, large ‘megaron’, with no scientific justification and for purely ideological reasons. As only a few finds can be securely associated with these settlement features, it also remains unclear how exactly the individual remains of walls and hearths should be assigned to the individual settlement phases. With appropriate caution, Alram-Stern succeeds, by a process of elimination, in making a case for a Middle Neolithic dating for these features. Ultimately, even the existence of the ‘antae’, highlighted as the most important argument for interpreting the feature as a ‘megaron’, does not stand up to careful scrutiny of the archive documents. It is much more likely that there was simply another room on the west side of the feature.

The volume’s comprehensive presentation of the finds begins with the ceramic vessels. The fragments available for examination were the same 3162 selected fragments which had been shipped to Germany at the end of 1941. Like the features, the finds could only be examined on the basis of the spits, since it was no longer possible, based on the available excavation documentation, to separate them according to settlement layers or even individual features. Caroline Dürauer deals with the finds from the end of the Early Neolithic and the Middle Neolithic, Eva Alram-Stern and Angelika Dousougli-Zachos with those of the Late Neolithic and the Chalcolithic, and in a short chapter Alram-Stern also discusses the few Early Bronze Age pottery fragments. The vessels are presented according to shape and type of ware and in concluding paragraphs, the authors attempt to deduce something, from the little stratigraphic information available, about the development of pottery forms within the tell. In the case of some of the Late Neolithic-Chalcolithic pottery it was also possible to analyse in-situ features and to examine the fragments for traces of wear and repair, in order to obtain information about how the vessels were used. The typological analyses, detailed and exemplary in every respect, are supplemented by scientific examinations by Areti Pentedeka. Comprehensive lists at the end of the section on pottery give the scientific data and measurements for every single find.

The authors are, however, very reticent with regard to supra-regional comparisons and so at this point a few perspectives can be offered on how the finds fit into the wider picture. Owing to the impossibility of establishing a clear distinction between the Early and Middle Neolithic pottery at Visviki, only a few specific forms can be compared with regions outside Thessaly. The Early Neolithic vessel forms appear to include only types which can be linked with the end of the Late Neolithic and early Chalcolithic (according to Turkish terminology) of the west coast of Anatolia. A reliable indication of this is the presence of ceramic wares with red slip, which appear in western Anatolia only with the Ulucak Va horizon (Ç. ÇILINGIROĞLU, The current state of Neolithic research at Ulucak, İzmir. In: R. Krauß [ed.], *Beginnings – New Research in the Appearance of the Neolithic between Northwest Anatolia and the Carpathian Basin*. Menschen, Kulturen, Traditionen 1 [Rahden / Westf. 2011] 67–76; Tab. 1). What is remarkable at Visviki, however, is the complete absence of Impressed ware, although this may be due to the restricted selection of finds. In Macedonia, to the north, and in the Balkans, red slip ware and Impressed ware appear among the earliest pottery. From the Ulucak sequence, the appearance of both types of pottery has been dated

absolutely to shortly before 6000 cal BC (L. CLARE / B. WENINGER, The dispersal of Neolithic life-ways: Absolute chronology and rapid climate change in Central and West Anatolia. In: M. Özdoğan / N. Başgelen / P. Kuniholm [eds], *The Neolithic in Turkey 6* [Istanbul 2014] 1–65; Fig. 14), which can perhaps be taken as a guideline for dating the Early Neolithic settlement at Visviki. The red-on-white-painted fragments in Plate 54 (bottom) are reminiscent of forms from the Anzabegovo-Vršnik III horizon in Macedonia dating from the 59<sup>th</sup>–58<sup>th</sup> centuries cal BC. The black and brown burnished pottery of the Tsangli-Larisa phase (Pl. 55) and the fragments with incised decoration (Pl. 60–61) are linked with the firmly-dated layers at Promachon-Topolnica, where a gradual replacement of painted pottery by vessels with incised decoration is documented between the 53<sup>rd</sup> and 47<sup>th</sup> centuries cal BC (I. VAJSOV, Promachon-Topolnica. A typology of painted decorations and its use as a chronological marker. In: H. Todorova / M. Stefanovich / G. Ivanov [eds], *The Struma / Strymon River Valley in Prehistory. In the Steps of James Harvey Gaul 2* [Sofia 2007] 79–120). The development from late Sesklo through all the Dimini phases, as suggested by the authors on the basis of a comparison of the Visviki finds with finds from other sites within Thessaly, can thus also be confirmed from an extra-regional perspective.

The stone implements are treated just as comprehensively as the pottery. Maximilian Bergner is responsible for the analysis of the flaked and ground stone tools, while Ernst Pernicka and Thorsten Schifer have contributed a whole chapter on the provenance of the obsidian found at Visviki-Magula. Alram-Stern and Dürauer deal with the pottery statuettes and Alram-Stern and Bergner with the other implements made from clay. Alfred Galik analyses the small finds made from bone, antler and mollusc shells and has also contributed a chapter on the animal husbandry and hunting pursued by the settlement's inhabitants, based however, on only 292 archaeozoological remains. Remarkably, a few botanical remains from the old excavation have also been preserved, which are discussed in a final chapter by Franz Bertsch and Helmut Kroll. In an appendix, a thirteen-strong team of authors headed by Apostolos Sarris present the results of remote sensing and geophysical surveys which were carried out at Visviki-Magula in 2010.

On the whole, the quality of the illustrations is very high. The original plans, some beautiful old drawings, for example those of completely reconstructed painted vessels made in 1944–1945 by Aenne von Wedel, and the excellent photographs of the finds are all reproduced to great advantage on the high-gloss paper. The newly-made ink drawings of the finds are also faultless, the only jarring contrast being the careless and unprofessional drawings of the flint artefacts. It would have been worth having these re-done. The editing cannot be faulted either, apart from a few minor quibbles. Fig. 8 (p. 29) is simply a detail of the same picture as Fig. 20 (p. 56), and in the interests of his own present home institute, the referee must point out that the name of the founding director of the Urgeschichtliches Forschungsinstitut in Tübingen, R. R. Schmidt, is quoted incorrectly on p. 1; 'R. R.' stands, in fact, for Robert Rudolf.

This volume devoted to the excavations at Visviki-Magula documents very clearly the cultural politics of the National Socialists in occupied Greece and their subsequent effects on research history. It is only thanks to the committed research work of the participating authors that it has now been possible to publish the finds and those parts of the documentation which still survive, 74 years after the excavation was completed. The finds and excavation plans are now available for anyone who wishes to engage further with the material. Moreover, the book is an important document of German archaeological history and one which should be on the shelves of every specialist archaeological library.

Translated by Sandy Hämmerle.

D – 72070 Tübingen  
 Schloss Hohentübingen, Burgsteige 11  
 E-Mail: raiko.krauss@uni-tuebingen.de

Raiko Krauß  
 Institut für Ur- und Frühgeschichte  
 und Archäologie des Mittelalters  
 Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen

**JACOB ROODENBERG / KRASSIMIR LESHTAKOV / VANYA PETROVA (Hrsg.), Yabalkovo, Band 1.**  
 Maritsa Project Band 2. ATE – Ars et Technica Explicatus, Sofia University „St. Kliment  
 Ohridski“, Sofia 2014. JIB 78,–. ISBN 978-619-90348-1-1. 488 Seiten, 508 Abbildungen,  
 26 Tafeln.

Das vorliegende Buch, herausgegeben von den Projektleitern Jacob Roodenberg, Krassimir Leshtakov und Vanya Petrova, ist der erste Band einer mehrteiligen Publikationsreihe über die zwischen 2002 und 2012 durchgeführten Ausgrabungen in Yabalkovo, Bulgarien. Neben Siedlungsspuren aus dem Äneolithikum (5. Jahrtausend v. Chr.), der Frühbronze- (3. Jahrtausend v. Chr.) und der Eisenzeit (1. Jahrtausend v. Chr.) sowie dem Mittelalter (13. Jahrhundert), sind es insbesondere die großflächigen Untersuchungen frühneolithischer Kreisgrabenanlagen aus dem späten 7. und frühen 6. Jahrtausend v. Chr., die Aufsehen erregten. Dieser erste Band hat einführenden Charakter. Neben den üblichen, in einem solchen ersten Teil zu erwartenden Ausführungen zu Geologie und Geomorphologie, zu Böden und Klimaverhältnissen sowie zu Grabungs- und Dokumentationsmethoden, bietet er eine ausführliche Beschreibung der Ausgrabungsbefunde, aber auch schon Kapitel zur frühneolithischen Keramik, zu den Kleinfunden und zu anderen für die Deutung des Platzes wichtigen Fundgruppen und Aspekten, die dann in den folgenden Bänden – so das Versprechen der Herausgeber – noch ausführlicher beleuchtet werden sollen.

Anders als bei den meisten anderen bekannten neolithischen Fundplätzen in Thrakien handelt es sich bei Yabalkovo nicht um einen bereits obertägig erkennbaren Tell, sondern um eine Flachsiedlung, die im Zuge des Autobahnbaus an der Trasse von Plovdiv zur bulgarisch-türkischen Grenze zum Vorschein kam. Solche groß angelegten Infrastrukturprojekte, die gleichsam einen riesigen Transsekt durch ganze Kulturlandschaften legen, sind immer wieder geeignet, gänzlich neue Einblicke in den vorgeschichtlichen Denkmälerbestand einer Region zu geben, weil dabei auch solche Fundplätze entdeckt werden, die unter normalen Umständen nur durch Zufall oder eben gar nicht aufzufinden sind. Die durch AMS-Daten gesicherte absolutchronologische Zeitstellung von Yabalkovo im späten 7. und frühen 6. Jahrtausend v. Chr. zeigt, dass dieser Ort auf jeden Fall zu den ältesten Spuren einer frühneolithischen Besiedlung Thrakiens zählt. Die Besonderheit seiner Anlage zusammen mit seiner überraschend frühen Datierung führt aber auch deutlich vor Augen, dass die Erforschung der Anfänge von Sesshaftwerdung und produzierendem Wirtschaften in diesem Teil Bulgariens noch keinesfalls als abgeschlossen betrachtet werden darf und gewiss auch in Zukunft noch so manche Überraschung bereithalten dürfte. Dies gilt auch für die möglichen Wege der Neolithisierung von Anatolien aus auf die Balkanhalbinsel.

Besonders bemerkenswert an dem frühneolithischen Fundplatz von Yabalkovo ist die Tatsache, dass er aus drei konzentrischen Kreisgräben im sogenannten Südwestsektor und drei weiteren unmittelbar daran anschließenden im Nordsektor besteht (S. 32 f.). Ein weiterer, ähnlich großer Kreisgraben der jüngeren Frühbronzezeit überlagert die frühneolithischen Kreisgrabenanlagen im Nordsektor, steht damit aber in gänzlich anderem Zusammenhang; Kreisgräben der jüngeren Frühbronze- und Mittelbronzezeit kannte man aus Thrakien auch schon von anderen Fundorten, wie zum Beispiel aus Drama. Im Nordsektor liegt dann auch noch ein deutlich kleinerer Kreisgraben der Eisenzeit, auch dies keine unbekannte Erscheinung jener Zeit, wie ein sehr ähnlicher