

Erfreulicherweise lassen sich von den 74 „Anlagen“ 48 einigermaßen zuverlässig datieren. Die übrigen 26 sind entweder ganz fundlos oder entziehen sich auf Grund des spärlichen Fundanfalls einer sicheren Zuweisung. Daß die Zeitspanne vom Endneolithikum bis zur Spätbronzezeit mit 37 Nachweisen am stärksten vertreten ist, entspricht in etwa dem Befund im Pustertal. Auf die Eisenzeit entfallen 22 Belege, auf Römische Kaiserzeit und Frühmittelalter je vier Fundpunkte (die Summe der Datierungen übersteigt die Zahl der datierbaren „Anlagen“, weil 22 davon mehrperiodig sind). Besonders weitgespannt ist die Siedlungsabfolge im Überetsch, z. B. in St. Hippolyt (Endneolithikum bis Frühmittelalter, aber sicher nicht als echte Kontinuität), auf der Tuifflammer (Endneolithikum bis zur jüngeren Eisenzeit) und auf dem Putzer Gschleier (mittlere Bronzezeit bis zur jüngeren Eisenzeit). Allerdings deuten auch günstig gelegene Wallburgen im oberen Vinschgau wie Tartscher Bühel und Ganglegg auf eine Siedlungsspanne von der Frühbronzezeit bis zur späten Eisenzeit hin. Daß Kaiserzeit und Frühmittelalter so schwach vertreten sind, mag z. T. in der anders gearteten Siedlungsweise (Kaiserzeit), z. T. im Fehlen entsprechender sicherer Funde (Frühmittelalter) begründet liegen. Hier werden zukünftige Forschungen das Bild noch entsprechend korrigieren müssen.

Da es an modernen guten Grabungen bisher völlig fehlt, sind wir über Fragen der Befestigungsweise, Mauerkonstruktion, Innenbebauung usw. sehr schlecht unterrichtet. Riesige Steinversturzhalden deuten in manchen Fällen auf ein recht umfangreiches Trockenmauerwerk hin. Das eindrucksvollste Beispiel bietet die am Abhang des Mendelstockes gelegene Tuifflammer, die fast schon nuraghenartigen Charakter aufweist. Bescheidener in der Dimension, aber mit gut erhaltenem Trockenmauerwerk nach Art von Castellieri ausgestattet sind Anlagen wie z. B. Hohenbühel und Roßzähne in den Montiggler Bergen. In vielen Fällen ist einstweilen überhaupt kein Befestigungsnachweis möglich und auf Grund der Geländebeschaffenheit auch gar nicht zu erwarten. Gelegentlich scheinen auch nur oder zusätzlich Brandopferplätze vorzuliegen. Es sei in diesem Zusammenhang etwa auf Tartscher Bühel, Ganglegg und Tuifflammer hingewiesen (bisher unpublizierte Befunde).

Wenn sich auch gezeigt hat, daß der zweite Band der „Wallburgen Südtirols“ wie schon der erste Teil erhebliche Mängel aufweist, so sollte doch der negative Eindruck nicht überwiegen. Sowohl Innerebner wie Lunz haben wirklich keine Mühe gescheut, für unsere Kenntnis des vorgeschichtlichen Südtiroler Siedlungswesens und der Wallburgen erstmals eine solide einheitliche Grundlage zu schaffen, auf der die zukünftige Forschung aufbauen kann und muß. Es werden viele Jahre vergehen, bis ein solch umfassendes Werk wie das vorliegende Corpus erneut in Angriff genommen wird – und dann gewiß nicht von einem einzelnen, sondern als Gemeinschaftsunternehmen.

Frankfurt a.M.

Eckehart Schubert.

**Sabine Gerloff, *The Early Bronze Age Daggers in Great Britain and a Reconsideration of the Wessex Culture*. Prähistorische Bronzefunde, Abteilung VI, Band 2. C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, München 1975. VIII and 298 pages and 64 plates.**

Britain is well endowed with archaeologists who have been very assiduous in producing splendidly rational and logical analytical works but who, equally, have been rather slow in providing comprehensive corpus-type publications of large assemblages of material. As far as the Early Bronze Age is concerned, D. L. Clarke's

'Beaker Pottery of Great Britain and Ireland' of 1970 is an obvious exception, but – until the appearance of this corpus on daggers by Sabine Gerloff – no one had taken all the metal weapons of Early Bronze Age Britain out of their sheaths, as it were, and given them the full exposition they deserved. Let us hope that this new publication will encourage students to add to it *inter alia* a full account of British Bronze Age axes – a project for which the unpublished material collected by the British Association in the 1920's and 1930's could form a useful starting point. 'Prähistorische Bronzefunde', the Frankfurt-based series edited by Professor Müller-Karpe, provides an ideal vehicle for such a publication, dealing as it does with the presentation of individual types of metalwork of a particular period as well as the gravegoods which accompanied them. It ought to be said to Professor Müller-Karpe's great credit that in this instance he has allowed Dr. Gerloff to extend her discussion beyond the bounds of the dagger finds so as to include material from the Wessex culture which was not found with daggers. This latitude adds greatly to the scope and value of the book, as it gives us a more balanced and rounded account of the Wessex culture taken as whole. Indeed the volume is to be heartily welcomed as giving us a much-needed modern review of the Wessex culture, and a new insight into the chronological and cultural relationship between it and contemporary cultures on the Continent – a survey which will be illuminating for both sides of the English Channel.

The work is based on a thesis submitted to the University of Oxford in 1969, and due credit is doubtless rightly given by Dr. Gerloff to her 'Doktorvater' Professor Christopher Hawkes to whom the book is dedicated. One of the 'three wise men of British prehistoric studies' as Colin Renfrew so neatly dubbed him recently, Hawkes is not often mentioned in the book, but one feels that his always refreshing discussion must have found at least some expression in his pupil's work (cf. C. Hawkes, *Zur Stellung und Zeitstellung der Wessex-Kultur Südenglands. L'Antica Età del Bronzo in Europa* [Preistoria Alpina vol. 10] pp. 291–295), and that he must have been a great encouragement in this publication, which researchers will surely come to appreciate as one of the most important works (if not the most important work) on the Early Bronze Age metalwork of Britain.

Naturally, the book revolves around the classification, description and illustration of all the daggers known from the Early Bronze Age in Britain. The earliest of these are the tanged daggers which Gerloff sees as being more western than central European in origin. If, as most believe, Beaker pottery and therefore Beaker people, came to Britain ultimately from the Rhineland, are we to see in Gerloff's interpretation the suggestion of an independent arrival of Beaker pottery and people on the one hand, and tanged daggers – and by implication, metallurgy – on the other? The problem can be side-stepped to some extent of course if we accept Beaker pottery as being of western European origin anyway, but this is a theory to which not everybody would necessarily subscribe. However, it was probably from central Europe that the inhabitants of Britain at the time got the stimulus to develop their own tanged blades by adding rivets to them. These flat riveted daggers – of Gerloff's type Butterwick – are probably to be considered as being contemporary with both phases of the Wessex culture and not earlier than Reinecke's phase A 2 in southern Germany. However, these daggers ought to be considered at least to some extent apart from the Wessex culture proper as we know it, as their distribution extends far beyond the boundaries of the old kingdom of Wessex from which the culture gets its name; they have been found, for instance, in northern England where a variant – type Merthyr Mawr – was found in two instances with Food Vessels which seem

to have developed outside Wessex. Some of the other similar flat riveted blades Gerloff has been able to relate chronologically to one or other or both of the phases of the Wessex culture, and she shows how her type Masterton can be as late as the Tumulus culture in Germany.

For the material both from Wessex and from other areas of Britain outside Wessex, the chronology of the Wessex culture is the pivotal king-pin. Gerloff divides the Wessex culture into two phases – the ‘Armorico-British’ and the ‘Camerton-Snowhill’ – and the material ascribed to one or other of these phases differs somewhat from that put forward by A. M. ApSimon in 1954. The daggers which ApSimon grouped under the heading of ‘Bush Barrow’ type are called ‘Armorico-British’ by Gerloff, but only the first two of her three types of ‘Armorico-British’ daggers – type A (without midrib) and type B (with midrib) – belong to her ‘Armorico-British’ phase. These two types are most likely to have been introduced into Wessex from Brittany, a movement which she sees in conjunction with the search for metal. Nevertheless, it is strange that Cornwall, well known for tin which was a necessary ingredient for bronze daggers, is not represented at all in the distribution of these dagger types. The newly arrived Breton smiths later made themselves independent of their homeland and developed a new and typically British form of dagger on their own – Gerloff’s ‘Armorico-British’ type C – which she associates not with ApSimon’s older ‘Bush Barrow’ phase but with her partly later ‘Camerton-Snowhill’ phase. In Gerloff’s view, the obvious parallels for the earlier Wessex daggers lie in Brittany, and – probably at a further remove – in Uenze’s Oder-Elbe daggers, whereas the Singen daggers she sees as being similar but so comparatively smaller as to be not necessarily ancestral. Gold pins in the handles of some of the earlier daggers together with gold objects found among the gravegoods of the ‘Armorico-British’ grave series can be shown to have Mycenaean connections, and Gerloff seems to re-establish the link with Mycenae which Renfrew recently doubted. This also helps her towards a chronology for her ‘Armorico-British’ A and B daggers which last for little more than a century, filling out the 16th century B.C. and lasting possibly into the 15th century. The dagger of type B from Kernonen in Brittany was found with a wheel-headed pin which can be paralleled in the Lochham horizon, thus aligning the B type daggers with the very end of the Early Bronze Age or the transition to the Middle Bronze Age. Normally, however, while the English daggers of Gerloff’s ‘Armorico-British’ A and B types appear to have central European connections in the Oder-Elbe group, the accompanying gravegoods do not.

The ogival blade form which ApSimon saw as the decisive characteristic in his ‘Camerton-Snowhill’ daggers is typical of the ‘Camerton-Snowhill’ phase, but Gerloff points out that it had already appeared in the daggers of the ‘Armorico-British’ series. For Gerloff, it is the convex section which is the real distinguishing feature of the ‘Camerton-Snowhill’ daggers, which also have a straight to slightly trapezoidal hilt-plate with stout plug-rivets. These ‘Camerton-Snowhill’ daggers are found to be much more widespread over southern England than were the daggers of the ‘Armorico-British’ series, and while the daggers are peculiarly British, their grooving may have been inspired by Apa and Sögel blades. Unlike the ‘Armorico-British’ series which is largely Breton-orientated, the gravegoods found with the ‘Camerton-Snowhill’ daggers are orientated more towards central Europe than to other parts of England or to Ireland. Indeed, the detailed discussion of these central European connections is very germane, and will be revealing also to continental scholars. It is interesting that the pointillé decoration on the ‘Camerton-Snowhill’ series of daggers shows virtually no pattern, whereas the Irish and continental

examples do, suggesting that this type of decoration when found on Irish daggers may be derived from the Continent independently of Britain. On the Continent, pointillé is found in Switzerland, the Rhône culture, the Middle Rhine area (e.g. Gaubickelheim) and northern France, but not in Brittany. Gerloff therefore sees the influence of this form of ornamentation as coming from south-west central Europe via the Middle Rhine and northern France to England, but by-passing Brittany. H.-J. Hundt, on the other hand, in a recent study (*Der Dolchhort von Gau-Bickelheim in Rheinhessen. Jahrb. RGZM 18, 1974, 1-39*), suggests that the pointillé decoration on one of the Gaubickelheim daggers is probably to be derived from Brittany, though in the Gaubickelheim hoard he also sees connections with Switzerland, the Rhône culture and Italy. The 'Camerton-Snowhill' daggers and the objects found in association with them can no longer be related to the Early Bronze Age proper. They start in a phase contemporary with Reinecke A 2 in southern Germany, but the daggers have parallels with the Sögeler Kreis and last into the Middle Bronze Age, possibly even as late as Reinecke C. In absolute terms, this gives a dating of the 'Camerton-Snowhill' phase as going from the end of the 16th century B.C. (thus overlapping partly with the 'Armorico-British' phase) to perhaps even the 14th century, so that the two C 14 dates for a dagger of this type found at Earls Barton near Northampton in the 13th century B.C. (BM 680 and 681) need no longer cause us too much surprise.

Gerloff sees the Arreton tradition of metalwork as being unconnected with the Wessex culture, peripheral to and very much apart from it, introducing new types such as spearheads. Chronologically, the Arreton metalwork can be paralleled with the 'Camerton-Snowhill' phase, and technically it would appear to have outstripped Wessex by exploiting new metalworking procedures such as hollow casting. Gerloff suggests that the spearhead of the Arreton tradition may be of Irish origin, but one may well ask where the Irish may have got the idea from if not through the mediation of the Arreton industry? She points out rightly that there seems to have been considerable affinities between the Irish and Arreton metalwork as can be seen in the cast-flange axes for instance, but as Irish bronze production seems to have been slackening at this period, it is a moot point as to which was the more dominant influence. This, and the question of the priority of the start of the Irish axes of type Ballyvalley over the 'Armorico-British' phase in Wessex is difficult to discuss until there has been a full publication of the British axes (a point raised by Gerloff herself), but even then the problem would not be easy of solution. On the subject of Irish moulds which Gerloff discusses, she ought possibly have referred the reader to the article on that subject by H. H. Coghlan and J. Raftery (*Coghlan and Raftery, Irish Prehistoric Casting Moulds. Sibirium 6, 1961, 223-244*). The hatched triangles on the Irish Ballyvalley axes are found in the Blechkreis, and Gerloff suggests that they might have come to Ireland first before being practised on Arreton metalwork. But this is surely a rather circuitous route; Brittany would be the nearest point on the Continent from which such motifs could have come to Ireland, and connections at the time between Ireland and Brittany would appear to have been rather tenuous. Gerloff dates the Arreton tradition to the transition from the Early to the Middle Bronze Age or to the Middle Bronze Age. The cast-flange axes of Arreton type, which belong to the 'Camerton-Snowhill' phase may, she suggests with Butler, be of Aunjetitz origin, though she also points up the apparent paradox that the main Aunjetitz connections seem to lie not in this phase but in the preceding 'Armorico-British' phase. The continental connections of the Arreton industry seem to correspond both in area and in date with those of the 'Camerton-Snowhill'

circle. The later manifestations of the Wessex culture, it would appear, are to be related to the flourish of the Arretton industry, but it is difficult to explain why they have varying distributions. Perhaps separate peoples and their forms of society made different demands on the metal industry.

The famous Rillaton gold cup is dated through its accompanying dagger to the 'Camerton-Snowhill' phase, or to a period when it overlapped with the 'Armorico-British' phase. That being the case, how can its Beaker affinities be explained other than by explaining it as an heirloom or by supposing that the Beaker culture may have lived on in Cornwall until this period? Could this mean that the Beaker people and their descendants may have had control of the tin mines of Cornwall during much of the Early Bronze Age, a suggestion which could be supported by the lack of 'Armorico-British' daggers of Gerloff's types A and B there? Gerloff provides an interesting discussion on continental gold cups (to which the Swiss example recently published by J. Bürgi and I. Kinnes, *Antiquity* 49, 1975, 132f. with pl. 9; Bürgi, *Helvetica Arch.* 5, 1974, 165 may now be added), and also on the continental parallels for the amber and shale cups of the Wessex culture. In this connection the later-than-conventional dating for the Adlerberg cups to Sangmeister/Christlein phases 3-4 will be of interest and possibly even surprise to continental scholars who – if they accept it – may take up Gerloff's suggestion that the cups ought to be given a new label to avoid possible chronological confusion.

Gerloff offers us a wide-ranging discussion of the contents of the Wessex female graves, both rich and poor. These are not illustrated, but are detailed in an Appendix. The discussion is important as a counterpart to the male dagger graves, as it prevents possible pitfalls. For instance, in the male graves sheet gold ornament can be dated to the 'Armorico-British' phase, and incense cups to the 'Camerton-Snowhill' phase, yet in the female graves they occur together, thus suggesting a certain overlap of the two phases which may not have lasted very long. This overlap Gerloff admits might be a slightly contrived compromise, but it seems to be the most likely solution to the chronological problems raised by the apparent facts of the material. Segmented faience beads, tentatively attributed on admittedly not very strong evidence to the 'Camerton-Snowhill' phase, amber spacer-beads and buttons all seem to be part of the female apparel. The dating of the 'Camerton-Snowhill' phase to the transition from the Early to the Middle Bronze Age and continuing into the Middle Bronze Age proper helps Gerloff to explain the chronological parity which she makes apparent between the Wessex spacer-beads having what she describes as 'basic ornament' and those of the same type which are the earliest in Württemberg, dating there to Reinecke B. This link can be strengthened by the presence of a Wessex-like whetstone from Mägerkingen, dated to Holste B 1, and further supported by the spacer-bead-producing Swiss lake-side sites which revealed pins very close to some found in Wessex. In fact, Gerloff sees the Wessex spacer beads as being ancestral not only to those in Württemberg but also those in Mycenae as well – which would imply a good life-span for them. Further connections with central Europe are demonstrated in the interesting tie-up between the coarse pottery with finger-tip decoration found in Switzerland, the Rhineland and the Rhône area, and the Wessex urns with cordoned decoration, Fort Harrouard acting as an important intermediary station in northern France. The makers of these Wessex urns are seen as probably representing a new influx of people who, on arrival in Britain, may have adapted themselves to local collared urn traditions of Longworth's Primary Series.

The contents of the discussion contained in this book are so closely argued but also so extensive that it has not proved possible in a review of this length to give

more than a summary of the main arguments and some of their implications. The lasting impression is one of the book having brought the discussion of the Wessex culture and British metalworking contemporary with it a great step forward, and of having established a chronology for them which shows developments in Britain to have been slightly later than one might have expected from appearances on the Continent, but also bringing out peoples in Britain who are nevertheless very active in trading contacts with wide areas of continental Europe – the details of the latter connections being one of the most important and revealing aspects of the book.

Without wishing in any way to detract from the value of the book, or wanting to leave the reader with a bitter aftertaste, one or two small technical criticisms might be made. Better proof-reading ought to have avoided a number of spelling mistakes. Wigtonshire on pp. 140–141 should probably read Wigtownshire. The line-break *spa/cerbead* on p. 125 is displeasing to the eye. A spot-check of references revealed that in footnote 3 on p. 137 'Daggers 55ff.' should read 'Axes 55ff.', and – while sympathy must be extended to anyone who has to compile as many indexes as the 'Prähistorische Bronzefunde' series requires – the passage referring to V-perforated buttons on pp. 202–203 is not included in the Index of Subjects under buttons on p. 288, although other passages are.

Dublin.

Peter Harbison.

**Ralf Busch, Die spätbronzezeitliche Siedlung an der Walkemühle in Göttingen. Teil I.**

Archäologische Untersuchungen. Göttinger Schriften zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte, herausgegeben von Herbert Jankuhn und Klaus Raddatz, Band 16. Karl Wachholtz Verlag, Neumünster 1975. 75 Seiten, 93 Tafeln und 1 Plan als Beilage.

Das Material zu dieser Göttinger Dissertation wurde vom Verf. größtenteils selbst ergraben. Daß Funde und Befunde sich als recht spröde präsentieren, kann man mithin nicht zum Wertmaßstab machen. Gleich eingangs sei auch angemerkt, daß die vorliegende Veröffentlichung nur die archäologischen Ergebnisse berücksichtigt, daß aber der Erkenntniswert erst nach Vorlage der parallel durchgeführten naturwissenschaftlichen Untersuchungen recht einsichtig wird.

Die besondere siedlungsarchäologische Problematik des südniedersächsischen Berglandes wie vergleichbarer Landschaften besteht in der Schwierigkeit der Auffindung vorgeschichtlicher Siedlungen überhaupt. Bis vor wenigen Jahren gab es aus diesem Gebiet so gut wie keine Siedlungsplätze, von der Bandkeramik abgesehen. Die Ursachen sind in den starken bodengenetischen Veränderungen in diesen Gebieten zu suchen. Als Folge zeitlich unterschiedlicher Rodungen kam es zu Erosionen an den Hängen und zur Bildung unterschiedlich mächtiger Auelehm-Horizonte in den Tälern. Die Entdeckung von Siedlungsplätzen ist also nur im Zusammenhang mit tiefgreifenden Baumaßnahmen oder in Ausnahmefällen unter besonders günstigen morphologischen Situationen zu erwarten. Eine Darstellung der Siedlungsgeschichte etwa auf der Grundlage der archäologischen Landesaufnahme ist daher nicht möglich.

Unter dieser Voraussetzung ist die Entdeckung des Fundplatzes an der Walkemühle am Stadtrand von Göttingen besonders wichtig. Die Lage des Siedlungsgebietes auf einer Löß-Schwarzerde-Insel im Leinetal erscheint nach unserer jetzigen Kenntnis ungewöhnlich. Der Siedlungsvorgang setzte nach der Schwarzerdebildung ein. Im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit – merkwürdigerweise nicht in der Römi-