GERMANIA

ANZEIGER
DER RÖMISCH-GERMANISCHEN KOMMISSION
DES DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

JAHRGANG 101 2023 1.–2. HALBBAND

SCHRIFTLEITUNG FRANKFURT A. M. PALMENGARTENSTRASSE 10–12

GEBR. MANN VERLAG BERLIN

Die wissenschaftlichen Beiträge in der Germania unterliegen dem Peer-Review-Verfahren durch auswärtige Gutachter*innen.
Contributions to "Germania" are subject to peer-review process by external referees.
Les articles publiés dans « Germania » sont soumis à un processus d'évaluation par les pairs.

Der Abonnementpreis beträgt 39,00 € pro Jahrgang. Bestellungen sind direkt an den Verlag zu richten. Mitglieder des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts und Studierende der Altertumswissenschaften können die Germania zum Vorzugspreis von 19,50 € abonnieren. Studierende werden gebeten, ihre Bestellungen mit einer Studienbescheinigung an die Schriftleitung zu richten. Wir bitten weiterhin, die Beendigung des Studiums und Adressänderungen unverzüglich sowohl dem Verlag (vertrieb@reimer-verlag.de) als auch der Redaktion (redaktion.rgk@dainst.de) mitzuteilen, damit die fristgerechte Lieferung gewährleistet werden kann.

ISBN 978-3-7861-2921-9

ISSN 0016-8874

Gebr. Mann Verlag . Berliner Straße 53 . 10713 Berlin –
info@reimer-verlag.de . www.gebrmannverlag.de
Graphische Betreuung: Oliver Wagner, Lara Hies, Römisch-Germanische Kommission
Formalredaktion: Nadine Baumann, Bonn;
Heiko Fischer, Julia Hahn, Timo Müller, Römisch-Germanische Kommission
Satz: Print + design GbR, Frankfurt am Main
Druck: Beltz Grafische Betriebe GmbH, Bad Langensalza
Printed in Germany

DAVID FONTIJN

* 20. 3. 1971 † 1. 5. 2023

Mitglied des Wissenschaftlichen Beirats der GERMANIA

von 2022 bis 2023

IN MEMORIAM

Inhalt

Aufsätze / Articles

Diskussionen / Discussions

Rezensionen / Reviews / Comptes rendus

the world – viz., enchainment" *(Chapman/Gaydarska/Jakob, p. 2)*. It is true that a relational approach shines through here. But this remains, first and foremost, limited to the relations of people to objects. These can be located and linked as 'metadata', so to speak. However, they are not granted any logic of their own. Thus, the addition of places ultimately remains trapped in a transportation logic, as criticised by Tim Ingold (2011, 149–150).

With these three aspects of the triangle, the authors offer an alternative interpretation following the presentation of previous research results on Herxheim. Despite my criticisms above, this can be considered a very successful interpretation. I found myself smiling again and again while reading it and putting positive exclamation marks on the text. Even if I do not share the preconditions myself, the interpretations are comprehensible and plausible. It shows what clout the fragmentation theory, or perhaps better enchainment theory, has for interpreting archaeological contexts. Only the tendency towards the 'obsession with wholeness', which can often be observed among archaeologists, seems to me to be a little too predominant. Why do places, objects, and people in the past have to be fragmented only to be re-unified? The *synecdoche* as a type of interpretation suggests a *pars pro toto* wholeness, but what if the fragments do not refer to a whole, but rather enact precisely that incompleteness, imperfection, and distributedness that already exists in a non-representational way?

Finally, I would like to put forward a thesis: Fragmentation theory is too connectable. At the outset, I stated that fragmentation theory is a middle-range theory. This is true both because of the theory's design and its scale. It remains easy to understand without getting lost in too abstract explanations and assumptions. Unfortunately, at no point does it become clear between which practices and grand theories it actually wants to mediate. Here, I have tried to read it from the perspective of New Materialism and posthumanism. This was only partially successful, as it is too strongly rooted in Cartesian concepts. At the same time, however, it uses relational practices and can therefore be understood as a further archaeological advancement of practice theories. Moreover it is not based on an explicit theory of practice. It is preceded by 'fragmentation as a practice' of the 'fragmentedness' of the world. Further developments such as the distributed nature of practice and agency are not integrated (cf. Schreiber 2022; Veling 2022). It also operates with a strong premise reminiscent of the hypotheses or so-called Mickey Mouse Laws of Processual Archaeology. This is quite positive, both for the alternative perspectives to Herxheim and for integration into quantitative as well as qualitative research. Ultimately, fragmentation theory is welcome everywhere, but at home nowhere. It is itself fragmentary and enchained. But it does not work as a middle-range theory. Rather, it serves as a bridge between paradigms. In this way, however, it primarily fulfils communicative rather than analytical tasks. However, this cannot be valued highly enough. In the end, it is not only separating theories that are needed, but also connecting ones. Even 'after the break'.

Fragmenting and moving the parts: a reply

By John Chapman, Bisserka Gaydarska and Tina Jakob

At the outset, we should like to thank the *Germania* editorial team for agreeing to a feature on the Herxheim site and also thank the six colleagues who took the time to read and comment on our article. Since we wrote the article for *Germania*, two of us (B. Gaydarska, J. Chapman) have had the opportunity to visit Herxheim – both site and museum – in the company of Andrea Zeeb-Lanz, who continued to voice the established views of the Herxheim Team. It is these views, together with other external perspectives, that have been summarised here in the form of short critiques of our article.

It is hard to believe that nine archaeologists in the same room can agree on most things about a complex and controversial site but it seems to us that we can all agree on the following six points about Herxheim:

1. Herxheim is a unique site. There may be other 'killing fields' (Talheim, Halberstadt or Asparn / Schletz) but the numbers of dead amount to fewer than 70, **not** hundreds or thousands of persons.
2. Although there are many thousands of sherds, human bone fragments, etc., there were very few **complete** entities, whether human bodies, whole pots or even individual human bones. The Herxheim Team's heroic re-fitting exercises demonstrated the significance of deliberate fragmentation of human bones as well as objects. Despite the large areas which remain unexcavated, there is a strong presumption that much of this material is missing – viz., not deposited at Herxheim.
3. While a high proportion of the individuals analysed for strontium isotopes were born in the uplands, it is still unclear where these persons lived in the years, months and weeks before their deaths. Depending on the tooth type that has been used, the strontium analysis covers the ages of 3.5–14.5 ± 6 months for permanent teeth, based on complete tooth crowns and under a year if using deciduous teeth (Beaumont / Montgomery 2015, tab. 1). Isotopic studies are currently methodologically unable to place a single person as residing at Herxheim *pre-mortem*, even the children with "loess-signals" who could come from other loessic areas and not necessarily from Herxheim.
4. Owing to extensive site erosion, there were very few preserved houses or pits at Herxheim in LBK Phase V, so it is difficult to estimate the size of the local resident community. But it is highly improbable that this local community could have accounted for the density of human remains at the site. Equally, very few Phase V sites are known from the lowlands close to Herxheim.
5. The presence of a significant quantity and diversity of non-local objects (viz., not locally made at Herxheim) – whether pottery, ground stone, polished stone, chipped stone or shell – supports the inference from the isotopic studies that there was considerable mobility across the landscape at the local, regional and inter-regional scales. The Herxheim Team have successfully demonstrated that a mobility model can account for the exotic pottery and stone tools which were brought by some means to Herxheim.
6. So there is a conundrum with Herxheim – and none of the published 'explanations' can account for **all** of the points raised above.

Unsurprisingly, at this point the unanimity dissolves rather rapidly. The five commentaries in this special issue, as well as the *Germania* editors' comments, cover the theoretical approach, isotopic studies, site studies and more general considerations on the LBK[3]. It is important to underline that, although some of the points made by A. Zeeb-Lanz / Alexander Gramsch and Daniela Hofmann do indeed challenge our approach directly, none of the comments from Alasdair Whittle, Stefan Schreiber and Rouven Turck put our overall approach in any jeopardy. On this occasion, we had hoped to detour around the well-trodden route of responders to critiques with the claim that our views have been misunderstood or misrepresented. Sadly, this road cannot be avoided. Two fre-

[3] The surprising absence of a commentary from a bioarchaeologist has been explained to us by the editorial team: the only bioarchaeologist who read the text stated that, since the original bioarchaeological data were used without commentary or criticism, there was nothing on which to comment.

quent characteristics of the replies to our model are the accusation of omissions which we have, in point of fact, actually discussed; and the inclusion as criticisms of points which actually do not contradict our model.

We begin with our response to Alasdair Whittle. We accept his summary of the detailed perimortem questions about natural deaths or deliberate killings, the processes of dismemberment and dissolution, the possibility of cannibalism, and the significance of the transformed skulls ('calottes'), We have never argued that the people who died at other sites but part of whose remains were deposited at Herxheim did not die natural deaths. Likewise, the evidence for cannibalism has been reviewed in our paper and rejected (see *Chapman / Gaydarska / Jakob, p. 10*). The nests of calottes are also strong evidence for the deliberate practices which typified Herxheim. While Whittle complains that the relations between upland communities and Herxheim were overly orderly and sanitised, we make it abundantly clear that this was a very messy, probably smelly and unpleasant task to move bodies or body parts from site to site. If by 'orderly', it is meant that we are dealing with a repeated practice, which may have become so repetitive that it became more formalised – then we concur. But 'formalised' voyages do not make them any less unpleasant. While Whittle fails to identify our vision of the fate of missing bones – a criticism echoed by *Zeeb-Lanz / Gramsch (p. 26)* –, we submit that our model discusses in detail how persons in upland sites died, how their bodies were (sometimes) curated, how some parts were left in their 'Home Communities' and how parts of the bodies were taken on a trip to Herxheim, which included overnight stop-overs and possibly also depositing parts of bodies on these sites *en route*. What more detail can we provide? We submit that no other explanation of Herxheim comes anywhere close to matching our vision of the fate of the missing bones.

Turning to D. Hofmann, she observes that the longer use we posit for Herxheim means that above-ground deposition of parts of the material (at least for a time) can explain the different post-depositional histories of re-fitting fragments, while the incorporation of material into the ditches could have been periodic, and not necessarily marked with great formality, explaining the appearance of the spreads or "concentrations". However, there is a difference between post-fragmentation and post-depositional lives of sherds from the same vessel; post-fragmentation differences could have occurred before deposition, with some curated in one way, others in different ways, and others not at all. Periodic deposition in ditches does not contradict our model but the greater the sense of an overall mortuary congregation centre, the more probable it was to have formal 'events', involving the local Guardians and also the visitors. In response to Hofmann questioning whether all Herxheim remains were 'ancestral', we readily concede that not all of those who died at sites linked to Herxheim (upland or lowland) were selected for special transport to Herxheim. Not all of the deceased on any site became ancestors – they had to be deliberately selected and it seems probable to us that only those selected for the Herxheim deposition were in the same way selected as ancestors.

Zeeb-Lanz / Gramsch conclude that the striking over-representation of juveniles and young adults is one of the elements missing in, or even contradicting, our narrative, while interpreting this as an indication of intentional killing of members from communities of the living. One explanation could be based on methodological issues: age estimation of children and young adults is comparatively easy since it relies on dental development and eruption and fusion of epiphyses. Unerupted or partially erupted teeth can still be observed in fragmentary remains and provide fairly narrow age ranges especially for children and older individuals up to their early 20s (Vodanović et al. 2011, 15). There is also an inherent preservational bias favouring bones of young adults which are more mineralised compared to bones from very young and very old individuals (Walker et al. 1988). But why would juveniles and young adults not have been selected as 'ancestors' at other sites, especially

if they came from significant families and / or achieved something important in their lives? Zeeb-Lanz / Gramsch's interpretation that this was a sign of intentional killing of people merely confirms our argument that there was a selective process going on in the 'Home Communities'. Their puzzlement at the inclusion of 'ancestral' material in the Herxheim ditches *(Zeeb-Lanz / Gramsch, p. 26)* is readily explained by the myriad cases where older material was often highly valued and therefore often curated for later deposition. There are clear parallels from the mortuary domain at Varna in the Copper Age of the East Balkans (e. g., the 'antique' *Spondylus* bracelet curated for generations before deposition in Grave 43 at Varna: Chapman 2023, 296 fig. 18,3).

Zeeb-Lanz / Gramsch's discussion of special and elaborately treated animal bones, which added to the complexity of the practices, is a classic example of interesting details which not only do not contradict our model but actually reinforce it. The special animal remains in the ditches included the wing bones from a large wading bird, a number of *bucrania* and *aigicrania* as well as around 40 mandibles (mostly cut in half and sprinkled with ochre) from small carnivores like marten, polecat or wild cat. We cannot comprehend why Zeeb-Lanz / Gramsch think that symbolic deposition of animal parts is somehow contrary to our model, which is centred on enchainment and symbolic practices. The first enchained link is between the hunter and the wild animal or bird; the second links the hunter, the prey and the person(s) preparing the deposit; and the third links any aspects of the depositional practice (e. g., red ochre, division into halves) with other deposits where similar aspects appeared. The most obvious relationship to our approach is that all of the 'wild' deposits represent the **parts** of birds or animals – especially prominent in the case of precise halves! Where were the missing parts? Has anyone tried to re-fit two separate halves to make an 'entire' mandible? We thank the commentators for adding to the complexity of our fragmentation story.

Zeeb-Lanz / Gramsch make several points about the complexities of the depositional processes at Herxheim. There is a straightforward rebuttal of two of their observations: that many pottery re-fits between freshly broken sherds lying in neighbouring concentrations speak for longer parts of the ditches standing open simultaneously and that it was not possible to have specific areas, namely distinct long pits, into which each group of uplanders deposited the enchained bones and sherds of their specific bonds with selected lowland communities. These observations do not vitiate our depositional model, since they ignore the practice of sherd curation, which, in any case, the commentators confirm in the case of the Flomborn decorated Early LBK and Middle-Late LBK sherds. We have never denied that there may have been two or more long pits open at the same time. Our suggestion that there were distinct long pits for deposition by specific social groups may work in certain parts of the site – after all, why did Fabian Haack define long pits as the primary architectural units in the first place? – but all that you need to do is to substitute for the phrase 'specific long pits' the phrase 'specific sectors of long pits' and a similar effect is created. The final criticism levelled at our approach concerns the material deposited both below and above finds 'concentrations'. It remains unclear why Zeeb-Lanz / Gramsch assume that this huge amount of material (a) eludes any kind of enchainment and therefore (b) is ignored in our narrative. In point of fact, we do not ignore the material in the layers stratified above and below the 'concentrations'. Such a large quantity of material clearly must be incorporated into our model and indeed the human remains explicitly form part of the modelling calculations while the objects are implicitly part of the story of the enchainment processes at the heart of the Herxheim phenomenon.

R. Turck's isotopic data provide important but also limiting information about the Herxheim dead. Although Turck can claim that at least some of the individuals the remains of which were deposited in the Herxheim ditches – the children with their mothers and perhaps even further relatives – had lived there for several months or years prior to their death, dismemberment and deposi-

tion, we have never claimed that all of the persons whose bodies or bodily parts were deposited at Herxheim were all from exotic places – whether in the uplands or the lowlands. But 80 % of the isotopic sourcing shows an upland component in childhood and there is as yet no evidence that they did not spend much of their lives in the uplands. Equally for neonates and *infans I* children, Turck remarks that all individuals of the age group *infans I* lived on loess and that the neonates did not belong to the group of 'individuals growing up on highly crystalline bedrock'. He draws three conclusions: these individuals were clearly part of the ritual and definitely were not brought from upland sites; they did not live off-site or at least not in regions unusual for the LBK; and they could not have been members of upland 'Home Communities'. However, Turck cannot demonstrate that the large sample of **three** neonates and **four** *infans I* babies were born at Herxheim – only that they were born on an area of loessic substrate. This could be a loessic area at Herxheim, any one of the many loessic areas near Herxheim or even at some distance from Herxheim. There is **no** evidence that the neonates did not live off-site – only not in areas of geology different from that of the loessic substrate. By contrast, Turck confirms that their mothers lived part of their lives on or near crystalline rocks – another confirmation of the Neolithic mobility which Hofmann so correctly supports. Moreover, Turck's statement that those individuals with upland signatures gained them in their childhood implies that there *were* indeed upland settlements where these young people ate the food that gave them such signatures – indeed for up to 15 years of their lives. Turck's data do not remove the problem of upland settlement – they actually confirm it.

All of these detailed claims and counter-claims share a pattern of inference that their core observations somehow falsify our narrative. We find it ironic that we can utilise so many of these points in **support** of our narrative.

It is now time to turn to more general issues of criticism rather than to wade through the mass of site detail only to discover that these data reveal a wide range of complex practices which led to such an extraordinary deposition of human bone fragments. Zeeb-Lanz / Gramsch pinpoint three alleged failings in our research: (a) the downplaying of the sheer scale of the operations – a criticism also made by Hofmann; (b) the over-simplification of such practices and (c) the exclusion of much material because it does not fit our favoured general practice of enchainment. However, none of the strictures of Zeeb-Lanz / Gramsch provides a conclusive argument against the movement of bodies or body parts to Herxheim from other sites. What we sought to demonstrate for Herxheim was a pattern found at many other European Neolithic and Chalcolithic sites – the movement of parts of human bodies across the landscape to special places.

In response to point (a), in our bodily mobility model, we have discussed the movement of up to 1,000 bodies to Herxheim – twice the number of persons which Zeeb-Lanz / Gramsch infer from the total number of skulls (viz., 500). There is an underlying tension in the project team publications between the significance of random behaviour at the site in contrast to the systematic, regular, rule-bound practices which may be expected to govern such a complex operation. This tension underlies Hofmann's critique of our implied micro-management of depositional processes through small-scale management and tracking of every piece of human bone and sherd *(Chapman / Gaydarska / Jakob, p. 21–22)*. But Hofmann overlooks the actually modest number of human body part sets brought to Herxheim each year – varying from a minimal four body part sets to a much larger 73 *(Tab. 1)*. There is thus no need for a Teutonic bureaucracy, or masses of Guardians' resources, to distribute the bone fragments to different parts of the long pits or different long pits. The addition of stone objects and pottery would admittedly have increased the organisational load but the increase in body part sets comes with a concurrent growth in the number of 'Home Communities', each of whom would have contributed to the organisation of the enchainment process.

Zeeb-Lanz / Gramsch show a sad lack of imagination when they note "the impossibility of imagining how many 'Home Communities' should have been involved to create" the Herxheim remains. If they had studied our model more closely (see *Tab. 1*), they would have learnt that, **at any one visit**, representatives from between one and 14 'Home Communities' would have come to Herxheim. These critiques stem from a lack of understanding of the temporality of the Herxheim deposition.

Moreover, there is a second answer to the criticism of 'micro-management' and the sheer scale of material deposited. The response relates to the scale of fragmentation – a point which we emphasised in the first Fragmentation book (Chapman 2000, 7; fig. 1,4). While the whole may become two or more fragments, many complete objects but, critically, also **many fragments** can form a set. At Herxheim, instead of hundreds of sherds and human bones being treated as individual items, their identities were subsumed under the identity of a set. The set was then treated in a new way, in parallel to that of another set. These different sets were deposited in different parts of the enclosure ditches; a new 'ensemble' of many sets was created. The selection of material to include in any specific set was far less of a bureaucratic burden than would have been the selection of every sherd and each human bone fragment but, crucially, would have still permitted the creation of enchained relationships both within and between the sets.

In response to point (b), the novel idea we propose as a 'solution' to the Herxheim conundrum is the movement of corpses or parts of corpses to Herxheim from other sites in the uplands and / or the lowlands. What happened to the bodies / body parts **at** Herxheim was a vital but secondary concern to us[4] and became fundamental as part of our approach based upon deliberate fragmentation and the creation and maintenance of kinship and ancestral relationships through enchainment. While Hofmann questions whether all of the Herxheim body parts were 'ancestral', it is a term which we used as a generalising term to include all persons related by kin of whatever generation, whether they were newly-dead or ancestors for a generation or more. Much recent anthropological research on ancestors (Helms 1998; McAnany 2014) highlights the deliberate selection of only small numbers of the deceased in any given community as the 'ancestors' of that group. Movement of a small number of deceased from other settlements to Herxheim implies that these persons were chosen as 'ancestors' – as representatives of their Home Community.

In response to point (c), it is worth reminding readers that, far from simplifying the treatment of dead bodies at Herxheim, we quoted with approval Zeeb-Lanz's *chaîne opératoire* of bodily treatment at Herxheim: (1) intentional killing; (2) dismemberment of their bodies; (3) removal of muscle tissue; (4) smashing of all bones except for the cranial material; (5) burning of some of the bones; and (6) final deposition in the ditches and, more rarely, in the settlement features (Zeeb-Lanz 2019b, 431–432). The artefacts were also 'processed' through various operational chains, all of which concluded in deposition as the final stage of the ritual process. As we stated in our article, we do not see an objection to these six stages forming parts of enchained relations between the living and the dead. Part of these practices would have included curation. The likelihood of human and animal bone and sherd curation is an important factor at Herxheim and helps to explain the freshly broken sherds in different long pits that re-fitted, rather than necessitating the simultaneous opening of different long pits. Sherd curation is also a good explanation for the incorporation of so-called 'ancestral' material in later deposits.

Several reviewers seem to have a problem with 'enchainment'. For example, Zeeb-Lanz / Gramsch envisage enchainment as described in our account as not only free of conflict, but as a very techni-

[4] An analogy can be found in Tom Lehrer's song about Werner von Braun: "Once the rockets are up, who cares where they come down? That's not my department!" says W. von Braun.

cal, sober, matter-of-fact, processual procedure – without regard to probably involved emotions such as grief or irritation or to ambitions such as wanting to outplay other feasting participants. As we have stressed from our earliest publications on enchainment, there are specific ways in which enchained relations between persons, objects and places developed in a variety of contexts and it is our job, as fragmenterists, to define more closely the kind of enchainment that was most likely to have occurred in any particular context. I doubt that many archaeologists would accept that the death of a relative or friend, their bodily fragmentation and the movement of their bodily parts across the landscape to a central mortuary congregation site would have been devoid of strong and often negative emotions. But part of the journey, involving overnight stop-overs, moderated the pain through communal feasting and recollections of the dead persons. Although the approach to the mortuary congregation place of final deposition of these lovingly carried bodily parts must have been emotionally challenging, the act of further dismemberment and deposition with other material culture would have brought come measure of closure – again, enveloped in a communal atmosphere of shared grief and emotion.

It is worth re-iterating Andy Jones's (2012, 19–20) point that enchainment is the basis for the creation and maintenance of **all** social relations. We have always stressed that enchainment is an 'umbrella' term which requires more precise definition in individual contexts (Chapman / Gaydarska 2007, 196–201; *contra Whittle, here p. 36*). The Herxheim case is a classic version of a very specific kind of enchainment of smashed human bones and broken human bodies. The deeply emotional aspects of bodily transport and ultimate dismemberment would certainly have been a key aspect of the Herxheim experience but there is nothing in the nature of enchainment or enchained relations that excludes that possibility. Part of the inestimable value of the Herxheim database concerns the extensive re-fitting studies, which show a richly interconnected set of contexts underlining the materialisation of enchained relations through fragment deposition.

On the theoretical basis of the fragmentation premise, Stefan Schreiber is supportive of the use of what he terms fragmentation / enchainment theory at Herxheim but he remains critical of the Cartesian basis of the theory. By this, he means that 'after the break' does not include the rupture of the object-subject dichotomy. Instead, it is exclusively the object that is broken, fragmented and subjugated. In an instrumental relationship, the human determines both when the object breaks and how continued 'use' cements the continuity of the object 'as object'. At the same time, the concept of objects determines what parts and wholes are.

We dispute what Schreiber terms the proposed Cartesian basis of fragmentation theory on two levels. First, there is always a recursive relationship between persons, places and things, such that they are mutually constitutive and this is an essential (but not essentialising) part of fragmentation theory. Enchained relationships are carried forward as much by the object as by the person – it is the fragment in another context which does the work of sustaining the human-to-human relationship. Secondly, we never posit a fixed, essentialist relationship between wholes and parts – indeed, in our most recent publications, we are finding it increasingly difficult to separate the two. What seem to be parts on one level have soon, in another time-frame, become wholes.

Schreiber also argues that most of the concepts used (objects, human bodies, bones, places, identity, fragmentation, operational chains) suggest a common sense that could come from any excavation report or archaeological evaluation (only 'enchainment' and 'itineraries' need more preconditions). In fact, however, he insists that they are not concepts, but merely deductive *ad hoc*-theories. And he warns that it is precisely these concepts that are operated with that should be questioned as preconditions, because it is here that the origin and benefit of the approach become visible. However, we dispute the interpretation of notions of 'fragmentation', 'operational chains' and 'identity'

as in any way co-terminous with objects, human bodies, bones and places. The former group include theoretical assumptions and methodological considerations in quite different ways from those used to consider the second group. Moreover, our discussion of personhood includes a far wider range of concepts than the commentator assumes.

Schreiber also poses the question: "Why do places, objects and people in the past have to be fragmented only to be re-unified?" We suggest that the objects that we discuss are generally manufactured as whole objects *qua* whole objects (e. g., vessels rather than fired clay images of feet or heads = a complete representation of a part of the body). The importance of operational chains of making (additive (e. g., clay) vs. reductive (e. g., stone) vs, transformational (e. g., metals)) shows the manufacturing relationships between materials and objects. The materials have a strong influence not only on how they are transformed into objects, but also on how they were broken. Our *Figure 2* gives an example of these operational chains. There is never a sense that re-unification is a central aspect of our research; re-fitting studies are conducted to demonstrate the means by which enchained relations are materialised. When Schreiber suggests that the *synecdoche* as a type of interpretation implies a *pars pro toto* wholeness, he seems to assume that we do not accept a relational aspect to parts and wholes. The priority of wholes can be seen in the natural world (landscapes fragmented into quarries) or in the world of objects or human bodies. There is nothing inevitable about fragmentation but, wherever and whenever it occurs, it offers people the opportunity to use the resultant fragments in interesting social ways. We take the robust position that fragments can be used positively 'after the break' to sustain enchained relations – so what was preserved was the relationship rather than the complete object. In the same vein, Hofmann emphasises only one aspect of fragmentation – that which dissolves relationships and identities – but overlooks the other, more creative aspect of fragments which leads to enchainment and the persistence of relationships and even, as in the case of the Hamangia figurine fragmentation, to changing sexual identities. In some cases, then, as at Herxheim, fragmentation and enchainment go hand in hand as relational strategies. Nonetheless, despite some contested ground which we explore here, we welcome Schreiber's several suggestions as to the future development of fragmentation theory.

A major disagreement within the Herxheim team concerns the treatment of the human remains, with Bruno Boulestin et al. (2009) arguing for mass cannibalism and Zeeb-Lanz rehearsing lengthy and compelling arguments against this interpretation (Zeeb-Lanz 2019a, 449–454). The alternative that Zeeb-Lanz proposes is the mass sacrifice of human captives at Herxheim following raids on other villages (Zeeb-Lanz 2019a, 457–463). For Zeeb-Lanz, Herxheim possessed the widest range of ritual practices in the latest LBK, with other regions connected to Herxheim through an inter-regional alliance based on traditional lineage ties. The primary aim of the Herxheim ceremonial feasting and rituals was to strengthen and deepen such enchained ties. This much, we can agree with wholeheartedly. However, we part company with the claim that the Herxheim rituals were less about "violence against humans and objects" than "ritually charged transformations of humans and objects using physical force." (Zeeb-Lanz 2019a, 463). We are not sure whether those captured and killed would have agreed. What this meant was that "the destruction of precious artefacts (to which we may add 'precious persons') represented a leading theme throughout the Herxheim scenario as a whole" (Zeeb-Lanz 2019a, 454). Zeeb-Lanz admits that the identity of the victims of this violence is still a mystery but insists that they came from a different ethnic group from the Herxheim residents and were either unfree serfs (slaves) or captives, brought to Herxheim by farming groups from the inter-regional alliance. But this is a claim hardly supported by the aDNA analysis of a small number of Herxheim physical remains (Blöcher et al. 2019). In addition, and in contrast to the other LBK mass graves of mainly complete dividuals, there were relatively few signs of trauma as a cause of death, even on the skulls. Moreover, the large number of 'victims' in the short timescale

proposed by Zeeb-Lanz makes impossible demands on the regional settlement network, which is thin to the point of disappearance in the Southern and Northern Palatinate in LBK Phase V and consists of one house outside the enclosure at the site itself. The disjunction between the scale of raiding and capture in the Palatinate and its minimal settlement evidence mean that the Zeeb-Lanz 'model' of inter-communal violence is fatally flawed. Moreover, this model has no explanation of the fragment re-fits of many objects deposited at Herxheim, often in different long pits. It is imperative to reach a new understanding of such an important site as Herxheim.

In their views of Herxheim, both Hofmann and Zeeb-Lanz / Gramsch emphasise the dissolution of human individuals and social transformation – the way that bodies change from differentiated to undifferentiated in "an active disintegration of persons". The ontological basis of these views is the Western assumption of the primacy of the complete, undivided, separate body – an assumption now widely questioned and also implicitly by Schreiber in his reply. To put the Herxheim model in the context of dividuality, we offer a commentary in the *chaîne opératoire* of dividuals in LBK Phase V who died somewhere other than Herxheim. The death of a member of their community is, first, traumatic and, secondly, opening up the possibility of change. But the kinship and exchange relationships between community members and dividuals in other settlements meant that one death affected the whole region; this was, after all, what was meant by a social network. Once a regional mortuary centre had been established at Herxheim, the Home Community made a decision whether the newly-dead were to be moved to the centre or buried locally. If death occurred in the snowy, winter season, there would have been body curation, which already created a spatial and emotional distance between the living community and the deceased. Bodies / body parts could also have been curated submerged in water (rivers / streams or ponds) or other types of anorexic environments (e. g., bogs), which, in addition, would have reduced the unpleasant odour of the dead (Brück / Booth 2022). Partial body dismemberment may also have started at that time. Each further step towards Herxheim would have increased that physical and emotional distance between the living and the dead, as well as the likelihood of body fragmentation. Observations that the temporal bone was still articulating with the parietal bones in some of the skull caps should not be used to argue against a dismemberment / production of skull caps prior to the journey to Herxheim from other communities. Although the squamous suture is less strong compared to other cranial sutures, examples from albeit much more recent (19th century) craniotomies have shown that these bones can still remain attached to each other. Nevertheless, simply wrapping the newly produced skulls caps in fabric or leather would prevent the cranial bones from becoming detached from each other. The exchange of body parts with other settlements *en route* for Herxheim further emphasised the dividuality of the corpse, while strengthening the links with the other communities. We could hypothesise that many of the body parts started out as partial limbs that were broken down into small component parts further along the journey to Herxheim. This, and the presence of soft tissue, could explain the abundance of cut marks. The few still articulated body parts might have come from a place closer to Herxheim with fewer opportunities of leaving parts of the body with other communities. Alternatively, these articulated remains might have had better soft tissue preservation, including ligaments and tendons, that allowed the bones to remain articulated. By the time the mourners had reached Herxheim, their social relations had been maintained but the bodily remains of their dead kin may well have shrunk. Above all, Herxheim was a liminal place – a place of transformation from the physical remains of the newly-dead – already probably incomplete – to an even more dispersed, dissolved dividual. But the purpose of smashing the bones still further was not only the dissolution of the physical body – a process that had been going on for some time prior – but the sustaining of enchained links between the ancestors who had already been buried at Herxheim, the Guardian community and any other Home Community represented at the time. Anyone who

has tried to dissect an animal carcase will know how hard it is to break animal bone – and the same would have been true with human bones. But the Herxheim Guardians looked after the process of the final incorporation of the much reduced bodily remains into as many places as was necessary. It was only then that the last voyage of the newly-dead could be considered concluded – and that dividual could become an ancestor in the full sense of a member of a much wider ancestral community, representing themselves, their own community and those other communities who benefited from the exchange of their bodily parts.

The possibility of a greater external contribution to Herxheim – from upland and / or lowland settlements – may be considered as our relational response to the central dilemma of the Herxheim site – the absence of settlement evidence in the Latest LBK when the strontium isotopic signals indicate a non-local origin for the early childhood of three-quarters of the persons whose bones were deposited at Herxheim. A natal age for the first molars sampled is improbable, unless the very tip of the tooth was sampled (Beaumont / Montgomery 2015). It is surely instructive to note that none of the commentators has made any substantive objections to our model of bodily mobility, whether in the details of the varying numbers of body part sets brought to Herxheim or in the basic enchainment principle which underlies this proposed explanation.

We wish to offer three final comments on the debate which our article has engendered, thanks to the *Germania* editorial team and the six commentators: on future research at and around Herxheim; on the widespread evidence for the body mobility model in European prehistory; and on the significance of dividuality.

This debate has underlined the vital need for new research on strontium isotopic measurements and lowland and upland site prospection in the Palatinate. Turck's isotopic studies have unfortunately lacked the transverse micro-sampling of enamel across the tooth which would have allowed not only the signal at birth but also into adolescence (c. 15 years) depending on the type of tooth being sampled to identify potential changes in residency during childhood (Beaumont / Montgomery 2015; Boethius et al. 2022). Such new analyses would reduce the uncertainty of the regions in which the future 'occupants' of Herxheim had lived, which could also be clarified through oxygen and sulphur isotopic analysis.

The more difficult research goal is the extension and intensification of site prospection in both the uplands and the lowlands. In the lowland areas, standard methodology is available for intensive, systematic fieldwalking but, although vital for establishing the precise settlement context of Herxheim, it is time-consuming and expensive. Upland site prospection methods, including LIDAR and drone photography or thermography (Calastrenc et al. 2020), may well miss flimsy site remains such as short-term Early Neolithic settlements, so any development potential, such as the excavation and construction of new roads, railway lines, service trenches or pipelines would be important targets for fieldwork.

Our recent research on Alsónyék as well as Herxheim has demonstrated the likelihood of body transport across the landscape at the local and maybe regional level. What we cannot understand is the almost instantaneous rejection of such models when they are absolutely standard for many areas of Europe in the Neolithic. The most obvious examples concern the dispersed settlement pattern associated with megalithic burials, with their own shifting territories within which movement of complete corpses or body parts was normal across the full area (Whittle 1996, 244). We suspect there may be a perception gap here that we shall seek to bridge in future research.

The other obvious perception gap is how archaeologists conceive of 'dividuals' or partible persons. At one point (here, *p. 42*), a commentator seems to think that a 'dividual' equates to an

incomplete body! Despite the inelegant term, there is strong ontological support for such entities, matched by increasing quantities of archaeological data, often but not necessarily involving deliberate fragmentation and enchained relations. But there still seems to be an issue with thinking through what it meant to be a dividual in the Neolithic – how identity lived on through the person's fragmented body parts and how object fragments associated with that dividual can have the same transformative effect in the establishment and maintenance of relations. Many of the negative comments by our six commentators are related to this issue. We are apparently still in thrall to Western modernist assumptions about the 'individual'. Unless and until we free ourselves from these questionable ontological assumptions, we shall always struggle for a deeper comprehension of social relationships in the Neolithic and beyond.

References

Alaimo 2010
St. Alaimo, Bodily Natures. Science, Environment, and the Material Self (Bloomington 2010).

Andermann 2021
K. Andermann, Transindividuality. The affective continuity of the social in Spinoza. In: H. Rosa / Ch. Henning / A. Bueno (eds), Critical Theory and New Materialisms. Routledge Stud. Social and Political Thought 161 (London 2021) 84–94.

Arbogast 2019
R.-M. Arbogast, Analysis of the faunal assemblages of the LBK site of Herxheim: the larger mammals. In: Zeeb-Lanz 2019a, 139–232.

Bánffy et al. 2016
E. Bánffy / A. Osztás / K. Oross / I. Zalai-Gaál / T. Marton / É. Á. Nyerges / K. Köhler / A. Bayliss / D. Hamilton / A. Whittle, The Alsónyék story: towards the history of a persistent place. Ber. RGK 94, 2013 (2016), 283–318. doi: https://doi.org/10.11588/berrgk.1938.0.37156.

Barley 1981
N. Barley, The Dowayo dance of death. In: S. C. Humphreys / H. King (eds), Mortality and Immortality: The Anthropology and Archaeology of Death (London 1981) 149–159.

Bauer 2019
S. Bauer, Human bones from the research excavation 1996–1999. Examination of selected material (excavation slots 282–100 to 282–107). In: Zeeb-Lanz 2019a, 3–24.

Bayliss et al. 2016
A. Bayliss / N. Beavan / D. Hamilton / K. Köhler / É. Á. Nyerges / Ch. Bronk Ramsay / E. Dunbar / M. Fecher / T. Goslar / B. Kromer / P. Reimer / E. Bánffy / T. Marton / K. Oross / A. Osztas / I. Zalai-Gaal / A. Whittle, Peopling the past: creating a site biography in the Hungarian Neolithic. Ber. RGK 94, 2013 (2016), 23–91. doi: https://doi.org/10.11588/berrgk.1938.0.37150.

Beaumont / Montgomery 2015
J. Beaumont / J. Montgomery, Oral Histories: a simple method of assigning chronological age to isotopic values from human dentine collagen. Ann. Human Biology 42,4, 2015, 407–414. doi: https://doi.org/10.3109/03014460.2015.1045027.

Bentley 2006
R. A. Bentley, Strontium isotopes from the earth to the archaeological skeleton: a review. Journal Arch. Method and Theory 13, 2006, 135–187. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10816-006-9009-x.

Benz / Gramsch 2006
M. Benz / A. Gramsch, Zur sozio-politischen Bedeutung von Festen. Eine Einführung anhand von Beispielen aus dem Alten Orient und Europa. EAZ 47, 2006, 417–437.

Bickle / Whittle 2013
P. Bickle / A. Whittle (eds), The First Farmers of Central Europe. Diversity in LBK Lifeways (Oxford, Oakville 2013).

Blöcher et al. 2019
J. Blöcher / S. Figarska / J. Burger, Genomic analysis of early Neolithic samples from Herxheim, Germany. In: Zeeb-Lanz 2019a, 305–312.

Boethius et al. 2022
A. Boethius / T. Ahlström / M. Kielman-Schmitt / M. Kjällquist / L. Larsson, Assessing laser ablation multi-collector inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry as a tool to study archaeological and modern human mobility through strontium isotope analyses of tooth enamel. Arch. and Anthr. Scienc. 14,97, 2022. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s12520-022-01556-9.

Bogaard et al. 2011
A. Bogaard / R. Krause / H.-Ch. Strien, Towards a social geography of cultivation and plant use in an early farming community: Vaihingen an der Enz, southwest Germany. Antiquity 85,328, 2011, 395–416. doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003598X00067831.

Bogaard et al. 2016
A. Bogaard / R.-M. Arbogast / R. Ebersbach / R.A. Fraser / C. Knipper / Ch. Krahn / M. Schäfer / A. Styring / R. Krause, The Bandkeramik settlement of Vaihingen an der Enz, Kreis Ludwigsburg (Baden-Württemberg): an integrated perspective on land use, economy and diet. Germania 94, 2016 (2017), 1–60. doi: https://doi.org/10.11588/ger.2016.39068.

Bonogofsky 2011
M. Bonogofsky, Contextualizing the human head: an introduction. In: M. Bonogofsky (ed.), The Bioarchaeology of the Human Head: Decapitation, Decoration, and Deformation (Oxford 2011). doi: https://doi.org/10.5744/florida/9780813035567.003.0001.

Booth 2016
Th. J. Booth, An investigation into the relationship between funerary treatment and bacterial bioerosion in European archaeological human bone. Archaeometry 58,3, 2016, 484–499. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/arcm.12190.

Boulestin / Coupey 2015
B. Boulestin / A.-S. Coupey, Cannibalism in the Linear Pottery Culture: The Human Remains from Herxheim (Oxford 2015).

Boulestin et al. 2009
B. Boulestin / A. Zeeb-Lanz / Ch. Jeunesse / F. Haack / R.-M. Arbogast / A. Denaire, Mass cannibalism in the Linear Pottery Culture at Herxheim (Palatinate, Germany). Antiquity 83,322, 2009, 968–982. doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003598X00099282.

Britnell / Whittle 2022
W. Britnell / A. Whittle (eds), The First Stones: Penywyrlod, Gwernvale and the Black Mountains Neolithic Long Cairns of South-East Wales (Oxford 2022).

Brittain / Harris 2010
M. Brittain / O. J. T. Harris, Enchaining arguments and fragmenting assumptions: reconsidering the fragmentation debate in archaeology. World Arch. 42,4, 2010, 581–594.

Brück / Booth 2022
J. Brück / Th. J. Booth, The power of relics: the curation of human bone in British Bronze Age burials. European Journal Arch. 25,4, 2022, 440–462. doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/eaa.2022.18.

Budd et al. 2000
P. Budd / J. Montgomery / B. Barreiro / R. G. Thomas, Differential diagenesis of strontium in archaeological human dental tissues. Applied Geochemistry 15,5, 2000, 687–694. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/s0883-2927%2899%2900069-4.

Calastrenc et al. 2020
C. Calastrenc / F. Balexu / N. Poirier / Ch. Rendu, Thermographie aéroportée par drone. Nouvelle procédure pour la détection archéologique en haute montagne. Archeo-Scienc. 44,1, 2020, 81–96. doi: https://doi.org/10.4000/archeosciences.7426.

Carvalho et al. 2019
A. F. Carvalho / D. Gonçalves / F. Alves Cardoso / R. Granja, Till death us do part? Human segmentation in funerary practices in the Middle Neolithic cemetery cave of

Bom Santo (Montejunto Mountain range, Portugal). In: Valera 2019, 71–83.

Chapman 1996
J. Chapman, Enchainment commodification and gender in the Balkan Copper Age. Journal European Arch. 4, 1996, 203–242. doi: https://doi.org/10.1179/096576696800688114.

Chapman 2000
J. Chapman, Fragmentation in Archaeology. People, Places and Broken Objects in the Prehistory of South Eastern Europe[1] (London 2000).

Chapman 2010
J. Chapman, 'Deviant' burials in the Neolithic and Chalcolithic of Central and South Eastern Europe. In: K. Rebay-Salisbury / M. L. Stig Sørensen / J. Hughes (eds), Body Parts and Bodies Whole. Changing Relations and Meanings (Oxford 2010) 30–45.

Chapman 2016
J. Chapman, The negotiation of place value in the landscape. In: J. K. Papadopoulos / G. Urton (eds), The Construction of Value in the Ancient World (Los Angeles 2016) 66–89. doi: https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvdjrrxf.8.

Chapman 2020
J. Chapman, Forging Identities in the Prehistory of Old Europe. Dividuals, Individuals and Communities 7000–3000 BC (Leiden 2020).

Chapman 2022
J. Chapman, The fragmentation of place: towards an integrated theory of fragmentation. In: M. Grygiel / P. J. Obst (eds), Walking among Ancient Trees. Studies in Honour of Ryszard Grygiel and Peter Bogucki on the 45th Anniversary of their Research Collaboration (Łódź 2022) 635–648.

Chapman 2023
J. Chapman, Fragmentation research and the fetishisation of independence. In: A. Sörman / A. Noterman / M. Fjellström (eds), Broken Bodies, Places and Objects (London 2023) 289–309. doi: https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003350026.

Chapman / Gaydarska 2007
J. Chapman / B. Gaydarska, Parts and Wholes. Fragmentation in Prehistoric Context (Oxford 2007).

Chapman / Gaydarska 2019
J. Chapman / B. Gaydarska, The pilgrimage model for Trypillia mega-sites: the case of Nebelivka, Ukraine. In: V. Stîrbu / A. Comşa (eds), Digging in the Past of Old Europe. Studies in Honor of Cristian Schuster at his 60th Anniversary (Târgu Jiu, Brăila 2019) 73–102.

Chapman / Gaydarska 2022
J. Chapman / B. Gaydarska, The meaning of deliberate figurine fragmentation: insights from the Old and New Worlds. In: G. Miniaci (ed.), Breaking Images: Damage and Mutilation of Ancient Figurines 2 (Oxford 2022) 14–50.

Chapman et al. in press
J. Chapman / B. Gaydarska / T. Jakob, New perspectives on deliberate fragmentation. In: M. Gligor / D. Diaconescu (eds), The Prehistory of Central and South-Eastern Europe: Chronology, Settlements, Artefacts and Cultural Networks. In honorem Florin Drașovean for the Celebration of the 65th Anniversary (Alba Iulia 2023).

Chapman et al. 2010
J. Chapman / M. Gillings / R. Shiel / E. Magyari / B. Gaydarska / Ch. Bond, The Upper Tisza Project. Studies in Hungarian Landscape Archaeology. Book 3: Settlement Patterns in the Zemplén Block. BAR Internat. Ser. 2088 (Oxford 2010).

Chapman et al. 2013
J. Chapman / R. Wallduck / S. Triantaphyllou, Disarticulated human bone disposal during the Mesolithic, Neolithic and Chalcolithic in the Balkans and Greece. In: M. Gligor (ed.), Archaeothanatology: An Interdisciplinary Approach on Death from Prehistory to the Middle Ages. Ann. Univ. Apulensis. Ser. Hist. 18,2, 2013, 11–46.

Coffin et al. 2022
J. Coffin / A. E. Dolphin / M. Jackes / Ch. Yakymchuk / Th. Perrin, Exploring child-

hood mobility in Neolithic Southern France (Roquemissou) using incremental analyses of Sr isotope ratios in tooth enamel. Journal Arch. Scien. Reports 42, 2022, 103417. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jasrep.2022.103417.

de Becdelièvre et al. 2020
C. de Becdelièvre / J. Jovanović / Z. Hofmanová / G. Goude / S. Stefanović, Direct insight into dietary adaptations and the individual experience of Neolithisation: comparing subsistence, provenance and ancestry of Early Neolithic humans from the Danube Gorges, c. 6200–5500 cal BC. In: K. J. Gron / L. Sørensen / P. Rowley-Conwy (eds), Farmers at the Frontier. A Pan-European Perspective on Neolithisation (Oxford 2020) 45–75.

DeLanda 2006
M. DeLanda, A New Philosophy of Society. Assemblage Theory and Social Complexity (London, New York 2006).

Demján / Pavúk 2020
P. Demján / P. Pavúk, Clustering of calibrated radiocarbon dates: site-specific chronological sequences identified by dense radiocarbon sampling. Radiocarbon 63,2, 2020, 429–438. doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/RDC.2020.129.

Denaire 2019
A. Denaire, Pottery refits and connections from Herxheim. In: Zeeb-Lanz 2019a, 25–40.

Denaire et al. 2017
A. Denaire / Ph. Lefranc / J. Wahl / Ch. Bronk Ramsey / E. Dunbar / T. Goslar / A. Bayliss / N. Beavan / P. Bickle / A. Whittle, The cultural project: formal chronological modelling of the Early and Middle Neolithic sequence in Lower Alsace. Journal Arch. Method and Theory 24,4, 2017, 1073–1149. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10816-016-9307-x.

Depaermentier et al. 2020
M. L. C. Depaermentier / A. Osztás / E. Bánffy / K. W. Alt / M. Kempf, Neolithic land-use, subsistence, and mobility patterns in Transdanubia: a multiproxy isotope and environmental analysis from Alsónyék-Bátaszék and Morágy-Tűzkődomb. Journal Arch. Scien. Reports 33, 2020, 102529. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jasrep.2020.102529.

Díaz-Zorita Bonilla et al. 2018
M. Díaz-Zorita Bonilla / J. Beck / H. Bocherens / P. Díaz-del-Río, Isotopic evidence for mobility at large-scale human aggregations in Copper Age Iberia: the megasite of Marroquíes. Antiquity 92,364, 2018, 991–1007. doi: https://doi.org/10.15184/aqy.2018.33.

Díaz-Zorita Bonilla et al. 2020
M. Díaz-Zorita Bonilla / J. Beck / G. Aranda Jiménez / L. Milesi García / M. Sánchez Romero / A. Lozano Medina / J. Escudero Carrillo / C. Knipper, The deposition of human remains inside Chalcolithic ditched enclosures: ditch 5 at Marroquíes (Jaén, Spain). European Journal Arch. 23,3, 2020, 330–355. doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/eaa.2020.4.

Dietler 2011
M. Dietler, Feasting and fasting. In: T. Insoll (ed.), The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of Ritual and Religion (Oxford, New York 2011) 179–194. doi: https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199232444.013.0014.

Ebersbach et al. 2017
R. Ebersbach / Th. Doppler / D. Hofmann / A. Whittle, No time out. Scaling material diversity and change in the Alpine foreland Neolithic. Journal Anthr. Arch. 45, 2017, 1–14. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaa.2016.10.001.

Elster et al. 2016
E. S. Elster / E. Isetti / J. Robb / A. Traverso, The Archaeology of Grotta Scaloria. Ritual in Neolithic Southeast Italy. Mon. Arch. 38 (Los Angeles 2016). doi: https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvdjrqn4.

Ensor 2021
B. E. Ensor, The not very Patrilocal European Neolithic. Strontium, aDNA, and Archaeological Kinship Analyses (Oxford 2021).

Evangelista / Valera 2019
L. S. Evangelista / A. C. Valera, Segmenting and depositing: the manipulation of the human body in ditched enclosures seen from Perdigões. In: Valera 2019, 47–70.

Fernández-Götz et al. 2023
M. Fernández-Götz / C. Nimura / Ph. W. Stockhammer / R. Cartwright (eds), Rethinking Migrations in Late Prehistoric Eurasia. Proc. British Academy 254 (Oxford 2023).

Fetsch 2012
S. Fetsch, Herxheim bei Landau – Bandkeramik außerhalb der Grubenanlage. Arch. Korrbl. 42, 2012, 15–30. doi: https://doi.org/10.11588/ak.2012.1.18558.

Fibiger et al. 2023
L. Fibiger / T. Ahlström / Ch. Meyer / M. Smith, Conflict, violence, and warfare among early farmers in northwestern Europe. Proc. Nat. Acad. Scien. USA 120,4, 2023, e2209481119. doi: https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2209481119.

Fowler 2004
Ch. Fowler, The Archaeology of Personhood. An Anthropological Approach. Themes in Arch. 1 (London, New York 2004).

Fowler 2008
Ch. Fowler, Fractal bodies in the past and present. In: D. Borić / J. Robb (eds), Past Bodies. Body-centered Research in Archaeology (Oxford 2008) 47–57.

Fredengren 2021
Ch. Fredengren, Bodily entanglements: gender, archaeological sciences and the more-than-ness of archaeological bodies. Cambridge Arch. Journal 31,3, 2021, 525–531. doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774321000226.

Frei / Price 2012
K. M. Frei / Th. D. Price, Strontium isotopes and human mobility in prehistoric Denmark. Arch. and Anthr. Sciences 4, 2012, 103–114. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s12520-011-0087-7.

Galloway et al. 2014
A. Galloway / L. Zephro / V. L. Wedel, Diagnostic criteria for the determination of timing and fracture mechanism. In: A. Galloway / V. L. Wedel (eds), Broken Bones: Anthropological Analysis of Blunt Force Trauma[2] (Springfield, IL 2014) 47–58.

Gaydarska 2020
B. Gaydarska (ed.), Early Urbanism in Europe. The Trypillia Mega-sites of the Ukrainian Forest-steppe (Berlin 2020). doi: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110664959.

Gaydarska et al. 2021
B. Gaydarska / A. Bayliss / V. Slavchev, Contemporary Copper Age burials from the Varna mortuary zone, Bulgaria. Ant. Journal 101, 2021, 1–15. doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003581521000032.

Gaydarska / Chapman 2009
B. Gaydarska / J. Chapman, The fragmentation premise in archaeology: from the Paleolithic to more recent times. In: W. Tronzo (ed.), The Fragment. An Incomplete History (Los Angeles 2009) 131–153.

Gaydarska / Chapman 2022
B. Gaydarska / J. Chapman, Megasites in Prehistoric Europe. Where Strangers and Kinsfolk Met. Cambridge Elements: Arch. Europe (Cambridge 2022). doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009099837.

Gehlen et al. 2022
B. Gehlen / J. Affolter / W. Schön / S. Scharl / F. Siegmund / A.-L. Fischer / M. Grunert / Ch. Meiborg / D. Mischka / E. Treude / Th. Uthmeier, A diachronic perspective on lithic raw material procurement strategies and mobility: case studies from the Final Palaeolithic, Mesolithic and Neolithic in Central Europe. Journal Maps 18,4, 2022, 686–696. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/17445647.2022.2150572.

Gillis 2019
R. E. Gillis, Age-at-death analysis of animals from the ditches and settlement pits at Herxheim. In: Zeeb-Lanz 2019a, 257–266.

Govier / Steel 2021
E. Govier / L. Steel, Beyond the 'thingification' of worlds: archaeology and the new materialisms. Journal Mat. Culture 26,3, 2021, 298–317. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/13591835211025559.

Gramsch 2012
A. Gramsch, Prestige durch rituelle Handlungen – *cui bono*? In: B. Christiansen / U. Thaler (eds), Ansehenssache. Formen von Prestige in Kulturen des Altertums (München 2012) 355–384.

Gramsch / Grosskopf 2023
A. Gramsch / B. Grosskopf, Das "Itinerarium des menschlichen Körpers". Eine interdisziplinäre Spurensuche. In: N. Balkowski / K. P. Hofmann / I. A. Hohle / A. Schülke (eds), Mensch – Körper – Tod. Der Umgang mit menschlichen Überresten im Neolithikum Mitteleuropas (Leiden 2023) 91–117. doi: https://doi.org/10.59641/kaf31bd9.

Green / Schultz 2017
A. E. Green / J. J. Schultz, An examination of the transition of fracture characteristics in long bones from fresh to dry in central Florida: evaluating the timing of injury. Journal Forensic Scien. 62,2, 2017, 282–291. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/1556-4029.13260.

Haack 2016a
F. Haack, The early Neolithic ditched enclosure of Herxheim – architecture, fill formation processes and service life. In: Zeeb-Lanz 2016, 15–118.

Haack 2016b
F. Haack, The early Neolithic ditched enclosure of Herxheim – plates and tables. In: Zeeb-Lanz 2016, 153–end.

Haack 2020
F. Haack, Tracing LBK ritual traditions: the depositions at Herxheim and their origins. In: Hofmann 2020a; 53–82.

Hajdas 2019
I. Hajdas, Radiocarbon dating of human bones from Herxheim. In: Zeeb-Lanz 2019a, 277–283.

Harris 2014
O. J. T. Harris, Revealing our vibrant past: science, materiality and the Neolithic. In: A. Whittle / P. Bickle (eds), Early Farmers: The View from Archaeology and Science (Oxford 2014) 327–346. doi: https://doi.org/10.5871/bacad/9780197265758.003.0017.

Helms 1998
M. W. Helms, Access to Origins. Affines, Ancestors and Aristocrats (Cambridge 1998). doi: https://doi.org/10.7560/731196.

Hirschauer 2008
St. Hirschauer, Die Empiriegeladenheit von Theorien und der Erfindungsreichtum der Praxis. In: H. Kalthoff / St. Hirschauer / G. Lindemann (eds), Theoretische Empirie. Zur Relevanz qualitativer Forschung (Frankfurt a. M. 2008) 165–187.

Hofmann 2012
D. Hofmann, Bodies, houses and status in the Western Linearbandkeramik. In: T. L. Kienlin / A. Zimmermann (eds), Beyond Elites. Alternatives to Hierarchical Systems in Modelling Social Formations. Universitätsforsch. Prähist. Arch. 215 (Bonn 2012) 183–196.

Hofmann 2020a
D. Hofmann, Not going anywhere? Migration as a social practice in the early Neolithic Linearbandkeramik. Quaternary Internat. 560–561, 2020, 228–239. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2020.04.002.

Hofmann 2020b
D. Hofmann, LBK structured deposits as magical practices. In: D. Hofmann (ed.), Magical, Mundane or Marginal? Deposition Practices in the Early Neolithic Linearbandkeramik Culture (Leiden 2020) 113–147.

Honch et al. 2013
N. V. Honch / T. Higham / J. Chapman / B. Gaydarska / H. Todorova / V. Slavchev / Y. Yordanov / B. Dimitrova, West Pontic diets: a scientific framework for understanding the Durankulak and Varna I cemeteries, Bulgaria. Interdisciplinaria Arch. 4,2, 2013, 147–162. doi: https://doi.org/10.24916/iansa.2013.2.2.

Hujić 2009
A. Hujić, Paläodontologische Untersuchungen an menschlichen Skelettresten der bandkeramischen Grubenanlage von Herxheim / Pfalz. In: R. de Beauclair / S. C. Münzel / H. Napierala (eds), Knochen pflastern ihren Weg. Festschrift für Margarethe und Hans-Peter Uerpmann. BioArch. 5 (Rahden / Westf. 2009) 113–122.

Ingold 2011
T. Ingold, Being Alive: Essays on Movement, Knowledge and Description (London, New York 2011).

Janjua / Rogers 2018
M. A. Janjua / T. L. Rogers, Bone weathering patterns of metatarsal v. femur and the postmortem interval in Southern Ontario. Forensic Scien. Internat. 178,1, 2018, 16–23. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2008.01.011.

Janssens et al. 2019
L. A. A. Janssens / R.-M. Arbogast / A. Zeeb-Lanz, Dogs of the final Bandkeramik at Herxheim: refitting and pathology. In: Zeeb-Lanz 2019a, 233–246.

Jervis 2019
B. Jervis, Assemblage Thought and Archaeology (London, New York 2019).

Jeunesse 2011
Ch. Jeunesse, Enceintes à fossé discontinu et enceintes à pseudo-fossé dans le Néolithique d'Europe central et occidentale. In: A. Denaire / Ch. Jeunesse / Ph. Lefranc (eds), Nécropoles et enceintes danubiennes du Ve millénaire dans le Nord-East de la France et la Sud-Ouest de l'Allemagne. Rhin, Meuse, Moselle (Strasbourg 2011) 31–72.

Johnson 2019
E. Johnson, Taphonomic analysis of the animal remains in the settlement pits and enclosure ditches at Herxheim. In: Zeeb-Lanz 2019a, 247–256.

Jones 2012
A. M. Jones, Prehistoric Materialities. Becoming Material in Prehistoric Britain and Ireland (Oxford 2012). doi: https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:osobl/9780199556427.001.0001.

Joyce / Gillespie 2015
R. A. Joyce / S. D. Gillespie, Making things out of objects that move. In: R. A. Joyce / S. D. Gillespie (eds), Things in Motion. Object Itineraries in Anthropological Practice (Santa Fe 2015) 3–19.

Kienlin / Bussmann 2022
T. L. Kienlin / R. Bussmann (eds), Sociality – Materiality – Practice / Sozialität – Materialität – Praxis. Universitätsforsch. Prähist. Arch. 377 (Bonn 2022).

King 2003
M. P. King, Unparalleled Behaviour: Britain and Ireland during the 'Mesolithic' and 'Neolithic'. BAR British Ser. 356 (Oxford 2003).

Laffoon et al. 2017
J. E. Laffoon / T. F. Sonnemann / T. Shafie / C. L. Hofman / U. Brandes / G. R. Davies, Investigating human geographic origins using dual-isotope ($^{87}Sr/^{86}Sr$, $\delta^{18}O$) assignment approaches. PloS one 12,2, 2017, e0172562. doi: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0172562.

Leary 2014
J. Leary, Past mobility: An introduction. In: J. Leary (ed.), Past Mobilities. Archaeological Approaches to Movement and Mobility (Farnham 2014) 1–19.

Lefranc et al. 2021
Ph. Lefranc / J. Affolter / R.-M. Arbogast / F. Cheval / F. Jodry / M. Mauvilly / E. Rollinger / N. Schneider, Achenheim: a fortified settlement from the last third of the fifth millennium (Bruebach-Oberbergen group) in Lower Alsace. Gallia Préhist. 61 (Online), 2021, doi: https://doi.org/10.4000/galliap.2625.

Mathieson et al. 2018
I. Mathieson / S. Alpaslan-Roodenberg / C. Posth / A. Szécsényi-Nagy / N. Rohland / S. Mallick / I. Olalde / N. Broomandkhoshbacht / F. Candilio / D. Reich et al., The genomic history of southeastern Europe. Nature 555, 2018, 197–203. doi: https://doi.org/10.1038/nature25778.

Marciniak et al. 2022
A. Marciniak / J. Pyzel / M. Krueger / M. Lisowski / Ch. Bronk Ramsey / E. Dunbar / A. Barclay / A. Bayliss / B. Gaydarska / A. Whittle, A history of the LBK in the central Polish lowlands. Praehist. Zeitschr. 97,2, 2022, 377–408. https://doi.org/10.1515/pz-2022-2041.

McAnany 2014
P. A. McAnany, Living with the Ancestors. Kinship and Kingship in Ancient Mayan So-

ciety[2] (Austin, TX 2014). doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139017190.

Mecking 2019
O. Mecking, Clay analysis of the pottery from Herxheim. In: Zeeb-Lanz 2019a, 41–54.

Merton 1968
R. K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (New York 1968).

Montgomery et al. 2000
J. Montgomery / P. Budd / J. Evans, Reconstructing the lifetime movements of ancient people: A Neolithic case study from southern England, European Journal Arch. 3, 2000, 370–385.

Montgomery 2010
J. Montgomery, Passports from the past: investigating human dispersals using strontium isotope analysis of tooth enamel. Ann. Human Biol. 37, 2010, 325–346. doi: https://doi.org/10.3109/03014461003649297.

Morin et al. 2021
E. Morin / A. Boileau / E. Ready, A refitting experiment on long bone identification. Internat. Journal Osteoarch. 31,4, 2021, 650–662. doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/oa.2980.

Muntoni et al. 2022
I. M. Muntoni / F. Micheletti / N. Mongelli / M. Pallara / P. Acquafredda, First evidence in Italian mainland of Pantelleria obsidian: highlights from WD-XRF and SEM-EDS characterization of Neolithic artefacts from Galliano necropolis (Taranto, Southern Italy). Journal Arch. Scien. Reports 45, 2022, 103553. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jasrep.2022.103553.

Nehlich et al. 2009
O. Nehlich / J. Montgomery / J. Evans / S. Schade-Lindig / S. L. Pichler / M. P. Richards / K. W. Alt, Mobility or migration: a case study from the Neolithic settlement of Nieder-Mörlen (Hessen, Germany). Journal Arch. Science 36,8, 2009, 1791–1799. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2009.04.008.

Neil 2022
S. Neil, 'Local' or 'non-local'? Interpreting isotope results from the Black Mountains long cairns. In: Britnell / Whittle 2022, 207–214.

Olalde et al. 2018
I. Olalde / S. Brace / M. E. Allentoft / I. Armit / K. Kristiansen / Th. Booth / N. Rohland / S. Mallick / A. Szécsényi-Nagy / D. Reich et al., The Beaker phenomenon and the genomic transformation of north-west Europe. Nature 555, 2018, 190–196. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature25738.

Orschiedt / Haidle 2006
J. Orschiedt / M. N. Haidle, The LBK enclosure at Herxheim: theatre of war or ritual centre? References from osteoarchaeological investigations. Journal Conflict Arch. 2,1, 2006, 153–167. doi: https://doi.org/10.1163/157407706778942330.

Orschiedt / Haidle 2012
J. Orschiedt / M. N. Haidle, Violence against the living, violence against the dead on the human remains from Herxheim, Germany. Evidence of a crisis and mass cannibalism? In: R. Schulting / L. Fibiger (eds), Sticks, Stones, and Broken Bones: Neolithic Violence in a European Perspective (Oxford 2012) 121–138. doi: https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:osobl/9780199573066.003.0007.

Osterholtz 2018
A. J. Osterholtz, Interpreting and reinterpreting sacred ridge: placing extreme processing in a larger context. Journal Southwestern Anthr. and Hist. 84,4, 2018, 461–479. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/00231940.2018.1533197.

Osztás et al. 2016
A. Osztás / I. Zalai-Gaál / E. Bánffy / T. Marton / Á. É. Nyerges / K. Köhler / K. Somogyi / Zs. Gallina / Ch. Bronk Ramsey / E. Dunbar / B. Kromer / A. Bayliss / D. Hamilton / P. Marshall / A. Whittle, Coalescent community at Alsónyék: the timings and duration of Lengyel burials and settlement. Ber. RGK 94, 2013 (2016), 179–282. doi: https://doi.org/10.11588/berrgk.1938.0.37154.

Pechtl 2020
J. Pechtl, Constant change of LBK settlement in the upper Danube region. Quaternary Internat. 560–561, 2020, 240–247. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2020.04.016.

Pétrequin et al. 2017
P. Pétrequin / E. Gauthier / A.-M. Pétrequin (eds), Jade. Objets-signes et interprétations sociales des jades alpins dans l'Europe néolithique. Tomes 3–4 (Ledoux 2017).

Radovanović 1996
I. Radovanović, The Iron Gates Mesolithic. Internat. Monogr. Prehist., Arch. Ser. 11 (Ann Arbor, MI 1996).

Regenye et al. 2020
J. Regenye / E. Bánffy / P. Demján / J. Ebert / A. Osztás / Ch. Bronk Ramsey / E. Dunbar / R. Friedrich / A. Bayliss / N. Beavan / B. Gaydarska / A. Whittle, Narratives for Lengyel funerary practice. Ber. RGK 97, 2016 (2020), 5–80. doi: https://doi.org/10.11588/berrgk.2016.0.76630.

Renfrew 2015
C. Renfrew, Evidence for ritual breakage in the Cycladic Early Bronze Age. The special deposit south at Kavos on Keros. In: K. Harrell / J. Driessen (eds), THRAVSMA: Contextualising the Intentional Destruction of Objects in the Bronze Age Aegean and Cyprus (Louvain 2015) 81–98.

Renfrew et al. 2013
C. Renfrew / O. Philaniotou / N. Brodie / G. Gavalas / M. J. Boyd (eds), The Settlement at Dhaskalio. The Sanctuary on Keros and the Origins of Aegean Ritual Practice 1 (Cambridge 2013).

Renfrew et al. 2015
C. Renfrew / O. Philaniotou / N. Brodie / G. Gavalas / M. J. Boyd (eds), Kavos and the Special Deposits. The Sanctuary on Keros and the Origins of Aegean Ritual Practice 2. The Excavations of 2006–2008 (Cambridge 2015).

Riedhammer 2019
K. Riedhammer, The radiocarbon dates from Herxheim and their archaeological interpretation. In: Zeeb-Lanz 2019a, 285–303.

Rosell et al. 2019
J. Rosell / M. Modesto-Mata / M. C. Fernández-Laso / M. Modolo / R. Blasco, Refitting bones to reconstruct the diversity in Middle Palaeolithic human occupations: the case of the Abric Romaní site (Capellades, Barcelona, Spain). Arch. and Anthr. Scien. 11, 2019, 4601–4619. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s12520-019-00887-4.

Rosendahl / Wieczorek 2011
W. Rosendahl / A. Wieczorek (eds), Schädelkult. Kopf und Schädel in der Kulturgeschichte des Menschen. Begleitband zur Sonderausstellung „Schädelkult – Kopf und Schädel in der Kulturgeschichte des Menschen". Publ. REM 41 (Regensburg 2011).

Schade-Lindig 2002
S. Schade-Lindig, Idol- und Sonderfunde der bandkeramischen Siedlung von Bad Nauheim – Nieder-Mörlen "Auf dem Hempler" (Wetteraukreis). Germania 80,1, 2002, 47–114. doi: https://doi.org/10.11588/ger.2002.60517.

Schade-Lindig / Schwitalla 2003
S. Schade-Lindig / G. Schwitalla, Die Kreispalisadenanlage des bandkeramischen Zentralortes Bad Nauheim-Nieder Mörlen (Wetteraukreis). In: J. Eckert / U. Eisenhauer / A. Zimmermann (eds), Archäologische Perspektiven. Analysen und Interpretationen im Wandel. Festschrift für Jens Lüning zum 65. Geburtstag. Internat. Arch. Stud. Honoraria 20 (Rahden / Westf. 2003) 351–358.

Schilz 2006
F. Schilz, Molekulargenetische Verwandtschaftsanalysen am prähistorischen Skelettkollektiv der Lichtensteinhöhle / Molecular genetic kinship analyses of the prehistoric skeletal collective from the Lichtenstein cave. PhD thesis, University of Göttingen (Göttingen 2006). doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.53846/goediss-638.

Schimmelpfennig 2019
D. Schimmelpfennig, The lithic material from Herxheim with special emphasis on the 2005–2008 excavations and the latest LBK phase (the "ritual phase" at Herxheim). In: Zeeb-Lanz 2019a, 81–138.

Schreiber 2018
St. Schreiber, Wandernde Dinge als Assemblagen. Neo-materialistische Perspektiven zum ‚römischen Import' im ‚mitteldeutschen Barbaricum'. Berlin Stud. Ancient World 52 (Berlin 2018). doi: https://doi.org/10.17171/3-52.

Schreiber 2022
St. Schreiber, Die Praxis der Materialität. Zur Kontroverse nicht-menschlicher Handlungsfähigkeit (nicht nur) in den Archäologien. In: Kienlin / Bussmann 2022, 337–374.

Schreiber / Rotermund 2023
St. Schreiber / S.-M. Rotermund, Transkorporalität in der Archäologie: Subjektkörper diesseits und jenseits ‚des Menschen'. In: M. Renger / St. Schreiber / A. Veling (eds), Theorie Archäologie Reflexion 1. Kontroversen und Ansätze im deutschsprachigen Diskurs. Theoriedenken Arch. 1 (Heidelberg 2023) 249–291. doi: https://doi.org/10.11588/propylaeum.1092.c15027.

Seregély 2012
T. Seregély, Neolithic settlements and forgotten finds. News about the Jungfernhöhle near Tiefenellern. In: F. Falkenstein (ed.), Hohler Stein, Rothensteine and Jungfernhöhle. Archaeological Research on the Prehistoric Use of Naturally Sacred Places on the Northern Franconian Alb (Scheinfeld 2012) 64–73.

Singer 1984
C. A. Singer, The 63-kilometer fit. In: J. E. Ericson / B. A. Purdy (eds), Prehistoric Quarries and Lithic Production (Cambridge 1984) 35–48.

Smith 2012
K. Smith, From dividual and individual selves to porous subjects. Australian Journal Anthr. 23,1, 2012, 50–64. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1757-6547.2012.00167.x.

Smith / Brickley 2009
M. Smith / M. Brickley, People of the Long Barrows. Life, Death and Burial in the Earlier Neolithic (Stroud 2009).

Smits et al. 2013
E. Smits / A. R. Millard / G. Nowell / D. G. Pearson, Isotopic investigation of diet and residential mobility in the Neolithic of the Lower Rhine Basin. European Journal Arch. 13,1, 2013, 5–31. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/1461957109355040.

Steel 2022
L. Steel, Agencement, matter flows and itinerary of object in the Bronze Age East Mediterranean. A new materialities approach to globalization. In: S. Autiero / M. A. Cobb (eds), Globalization and Transculturality from Antiquity to the Pre-Modern World (Abingdon, New York 2022) 81–102.

Strathern 1988
M. Strathern, The Gender of the Gift. Problems with Women and Problems with Society in Melanesia. Studies Melanesian Anthr. 6 (Berkeley 1988).

Symes et al. 2012
St. A. Symes / E. N. L'Abbé / E. N. Chapman / I. Wolff / D. C. Dirkmaat, Interpreting traumatic injury to bone in medicolegal investigations. In: D. C. Dirkmaat (ed.), A Companion to Forensic Anthropology (Oxford 2012) 340–389. doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118255377.ch17.

Tafuri et al. 2016a
M. A. Tafuri / T. Ch. O'Connell / J. Robb / Ch. Knüsel / P. Fullagar, Mobility, landscape and the function of the cave: evidence from strontium isotopes. In: Elster et al. 2016, 139–144.

Tafuri et al. 2016b
M. A. Tafuri / T. Ch. O'Connell / E. Souter / N. Libianchi / J. Robb, Diet during life: paleoeconomic studies of human diet using stable carbon and nitrogen isotopes. In: Elster et al. 2016, 131–138.

Turck 2019
R. Turck, Where did the dead from Herxheim originate? Isotope analyses of human individuals from the find concentrations in the ditches. In: Zeeb-Lanz 2019a, 313–421.

Valera 2019
A. C. Valera (ed.), Fragmentation and Depositions in Pre And Proto-Historic Portugal (Lisbon 2019).

Valera et al. 2020
A. C. Valera / I. Žalaité / A. F. Maurer /

V. Grimes / A. M. Silva / S. Ribeiro / J. F. Santos / C. Barrocas Dias, Addressing human mobility in Iberian Neolithic and Chalcolithic ditched enclosures: the case of Perdigões (S. Portugal). Journal Arch. Scien. Reports 30, 2020, 102264. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jasrep.2020.102264.

Veling 2022
A. Veling, Outline of an archaeology of practices. In: Kienlin / Bussmann 2022, 151–162.

Vodanović et al. 2011
M. Vodanović / J. Dumančić / I. Galić / I. S. Pavičin / M. Petrovečki / R. Cameriere / H. Brkić, Age estimation in archaeological skeletal remains: evaluation of four non-destructive age calculation methods. Journal Forensic Odonto-Stomatology 29,2, 2011, 14–21.

Walker et al. 1988
Ph. L. Walker / J. R. Johnson / P. M. Lambert, Age and sex biases in the preservation of human skeletal remains. Am. Journal Physical Anthr. 76,2, 1988, 183–188. doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.1330760206.

Wallduck 2013
R. Wallduck, The Iron Gates Mesolithic – Neolithic. In: Chapman et al. 2013, 15–23.

Whittle 1996
A. Whittle, Europe in the Neolithic. The Creation of New Worlds (Cambridge 1996).

Whittle 2018
A. Whittle, The Times of Their Lives: Hunting History in the Archaeology of Neolithic Europe (Oxford 2018).

Wieberg / Wescott 2008
D. A. M. Wieberg / D. J. Wescott, Estimating the time of long bone fractures: correlation between postmortem interval, bone moisture content, and blunt force trauma fracture characteristics. Journal Forensic Scien. 53,5, 2008, 1028–1034. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1556-4029.2008.00801.x.

Witmore 2014
Ch. L. Witmore, Archaeology and the New Materialisms. Journal Contemporary Arch. 1, 2014, 203–224. doi: https://doi.org/10.1558/jca.v1i2.16661.

Wysocki 2022
M. P. Wysocki, Neolithic people of the Black Mountains: human remains from Penywyrlod, Pipton and Ty Isaf. In: Britnell / Whittle 2022, 157–206.

Zeeb-Lanz 2009
A. Zeeb-Lanz, Gewaltszenarien oder Sinnkrise? Die Grubenanlage von Herxheim und das Ende der Bandkeramik. In: A. Zeeb-Lanz (ed.), Krisen – Kulturwandel – Kontinuitäten. Zum Ende der Bandkeramik in Mitteleuropa. Beiträge der Internationalen Tagung in Herxheim bei Landau (Pfalz) vom 14.–17.06.2007. Internat. Arch. 10 (Rahden / Westf. 2009) 87–102.

Zeeb-Lanz 2016
A. Zeeb-Lanz (ed.), Ritualised Destruction in the Early Neolithic – the Exceptional Site of Herxheim (Palatinate, Germany). Vol. 1. Forsch. Pfälzische Arch. 8,1 (Speyer 2016).

Zeeb-Lanz 2019a
A. Zeeb-Lanz (ed.), Ritualised Destruction in the Early Neolithic – the Exceptional Site of Herxheim (Palatinate, Germany). Vol. 2. Forsch. Pfälzische Arch. 8,2 (Speyer 2019).

Zeeb-Lanz 2019b
A. Zeeb-Lanz, The Herxheim ritual enclosure – a synthesis of results and interpretative approaches. In: Zeeb-Lanz 2019a, 423–466.

Zeeb-Lanz 2019c
A. Zeeb-Lanz, Anthropomorphic and theriomorphic figurine fragments and other small clay finds from the ritual enclosure of Herxheim. In: Zeeb-Lanz 2019a, 55–80.

Zeeb-Lanz / Haack 2016
A. Zeeb-Lanz / F. Haack, History of research at Herxheim – an "interpretative thriller". In: Zeeb-Lanz 2016, 1–13.

Zeeb-Lanz / Haack 2020
A. Zeeb-Lanz / F. Haack, Ritual und Gewalt in Herxheim (Pfalz). In: H. Meller / R. Risch / K. W. Alt / F. Bertemes / R. Micó (eds), Rituelle Gewalt – Rituale der Gewalt / Ritual Violence – Rituals of Violence. Tagungen Landesmus. Vorgesch. Halle 22 (Halle / Saale 2020) 181–196.

Zeeb-Lanz et al. 2007
A. Zeeb-Lanz / F. Haack / R.-M. Arbogast / M. N. Haidle / Ch. Jeunesse / J. Orschiedt / D. Schimmelpfennig, Außergewöhnliche Deponierungen der Bandkeramik – die Grubenanlage von Herxheim. Germania 85,2, 2007, 199–274. doi: https://doi.org/10.11588/ger.2007.95473.

Zeeb-Lanz et al. 2016
A. Zeeb-Lanz / R.-M. Arbogast / S. Bauer / B. Boulestin / A.-S. Coupey / A. Denaire / F. Haack / Ch. Jeunesse / D. Schimmelpfennig / R. Turck, Human sacrifices as "crisis management"? The case of the Early Neolithic site of Herxheim, Palatinate, Germany. In: C. A. Murray (ed.), Diversity of Sacrifice. Form and Function of Sacrificial Practices in the Ancient Word and Beyond. SUNY Ser., Inst. European and Mediterranean Arch. Distinguished Monogr. Ser. 5 (New York 2016) 171–189. doi: https://doi.org/10.1515/9781438459967-011.

Addresses of the authors:

John Chapman
Bisserka Gaydarska
Tina Jakob
Durham University
Department of Archaeology
UK–Durham DH1 3LE
j.c.chapman@durham.ac.uk
b_gaydarska@yahoo.co.uk
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6236-872X
betina.jakob@durham.ac.uk

Alexander Gramsch
Römisch-Germanische Kommission
des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts
Palmengartenstr. 10–12
DE–60325 Frankfurt a. M.
alexander.gramsch@dainst.de
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2979-8792

Daniela Hofmann
University of Bergen
Department of Archaeology, History,
Cultural Studies and Religion
Øysteinsgate 3
Postboks 7805
NO–5020 Bergen
Daniela.Hofmann@uib.no
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4502-9651

Stefan Schreiber
Leibniz-Zentrum für Archäologie
Ludwig-Lindenschmit-Forum 1
DE–55116 Mainz
stefan.schreiber@leiza.de
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1065-5003

Rouven Turck
Universität Zürich
Institut für Archäologie
Fachbereich Prähistorische Archäologie
(PRA)
Karl-Schmid-Str. 4
CH–8006 Zürich
turck@archaeologie.uzh.ch
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9534-6570

Alasdair Whittle
Department of Archaeology
and Conservation
Cardiff University
UK–Cardiff
Whittle@cardiff.ac.uk

Andrea Zeeb-Lanz
Generaldirektion Kulturelles Erbe
Rheinland-Pfalz
Direktion Landesarchäologie
Kleine Pfaffengasse 10
DE–67346 Speyer
zeeblanz@outlook.de
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9081-9244

References of figures

Fig. 1: J. Chapman / B. Gaydarska / T. Jakob. – *Fig. 2:* re-drawn by L. Woodard from authors' multiple sources. – *Fig. 3:* B. Gaydarska. – *Fig. 4:* Zeeb-Lanz / Haack 2016, fig. 2. – *Fig. 5:* Haack 2016a, pl. 66. – *Fig. 6:* Denaire 2019, fig. 10. – *Fig. 7a:* re-drawn by L. Woodard from Zeeb-Lanz 2019b, fig. 6. – *Fig. 7b:* re-drawn by L. Woodard from Turck 2019, fig. 56, modified by L. Hies (RGK). – *Fig. 8:* re-drawn by L. Woodard from original by J. Chapman, B. Gaydarska and T. Jakob. – *Fig. 9:* A. Häußer, GDKE Außenstelle Speyer. – *Fig. 10:* Haack 2016b, pl. 66,1; 67,2. – *Fig. 11:* Haack 2016b, pl. 71,3. – *Fig. 12:* A. Zeeb-Lanz, GDKE Außenstelle Speyer. – *Fig. 13:* Turck 2019, fig. 59. – *Fig. 14:* Turck 2019, fig. 51. – *Tab. 1:* J. Chapman / B. Gaydarska / T. Jakob, layout: L. Hies (RGK).

References

Alaimo 2010
St. Alaimo, Bodily Natures. Science, Environment, and the Material Self (Bloomington 2010).

Andermann 2021
K. Andermann, Transindividuality. The affective continuity of the social in Spinoza. In: H. Rosa / Ch. Henning / A. Bueno (eds), Critical Theory and New Materialisms. Routledge Stud. Social and Political Thought 161 (London 2021) 84–94.

Arbogast 2019
R.-M. Arbogast, Analysis of the faunal assemblages of the LBK site of Herxheim: the larger mammals. In: Zeeb-Lanz 2019a, 139–232.

Bánffy et al. 2016
E. Bánffy / A. Osztás / K. Oross / I. Zalai-Gaál / T. Marton / É. Á. Nyerges / K. Köhler / A. Bayliss / D. Hamilton / A. Whittle, The Alsónyék story: towards the history of a persistent place. Ber. RGK 94, 2013 (2016), 283–318. doi: https://doi.org/10.11588/berrgk.1938.0.37156.

Barley 1981
N. Barley, The Dowayo dance of death. In: S. C. Humphreys / H. King (eds), Mortality and Immortality: The Anthropology and Archaeology of Death (London 1981) 149–159.

Bauer 2019
S. Bauer, Human bones from the research excavation 1996–1999. Examination of selected material (excavation slots 282–100 to 282–107). In: Zeeb-Lanz 2019a, 3–24.

Bayliss et al. 2016
A. Bayliss / N. Beavan / D. Hamilton / K. Köhler / É. Á. Nyerges / Ch. Bronk Ramsay / E. Dunbar / M. Fecher / T. Goslar / B. Kromer / P. Reimer / E. Bánffy / T. Marton / K. Oross / A. Osztas / I. Zalai-Gaal / A. Whittle, Peopling the past: creating a site biography in the Hungarian Neolithic. Ber. RGK 94, 2013 (2016), 23–91. doi: https://doi.org/10.11588/berrgk.1938.0.37150.

Beaumont / Montgomery 2015
J. Beaumont / J. Montgomery, Oral Histories: a simple method of assigning chronological age to isotopic values from human dentine collagen. Ann. Human Biology 42,4, 2015, 407–414. doi: https://doi.org/10.3109/03014460.2015.1045027.

Bentley 2006
R. A. Bentley, Strontium isotopes from the earth to the archaeological skeleton: a review. Journal Arch. Method and Theory 13, 2006, 135–187. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10816-006-9009-x.

Benz / Gramsch 2006
M. Benz / A. Gramsch, Zur sozio-politischen Bedeutung von Festen. Eine Einführung anhand von Beispielen aus dem Alten Orient und Europa. EAZ 47, 2006, 417–437.

Bickle / Whittle 2013
P. Bickle / A. Whittle (eds), The First Farmers of Central Europe. Diversity in LBK Lifeways (Oxford, Oakville 2013).

Blöcher et al. 2019
J. Blöcher / S. Figarska / J. Burger, Genomic analysis of early Neolithic samples from Herxheim, Germany. In: Zeeb-Lanz 2019a, 305–312.

Boethius et al. 2022
A. Boethius / T. Ahlström / M. Kielman-Schmitt / M. Kjällquist / L. Larsson, Assessing laser ablation multi-collector inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry as a tool to study archaeological and modern human mobility through strontium isotope analyses of tooth enamel. Arch. and Anthr. Scienc. 14,97, 2022. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s12520-022-01556-9.

Bogaard et al. 2011
A. Bogaard / R. Krause / H.-Ch. Strien, Towards a social geography of cultivation and plant use in an early farming community: Vaihingen an der Enz, southwest Germany. Antiquity 85,328, 2011, 395–416. doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003598X00067831.

Bogaard et al. 2016
A. Bogaard / R.-M. Arbogast / R. Ebersbach / R.A. Fraser / C. Knipper / Ch. Krahn / M. Schäfer / A. Styring / R. Krause, The Bandkeramik settlement of Vaihingen an der Enz, Kreis Ludwigsburg (Baden-Württemberg): an integrated perspective on land use, economy and diet. Germania 94, 2016 (2017), 1–60. doi: https://doi.org/10.11588/ger.2016.39068.

Bonogofsky 2011
M. Bonogofsky, Contextualizing the human head: an introduction. In: M. Bonogofsky (ed.), The Bioarchaeology of the Human Head: Decapitation, Decoration, and Deformation (Oxford 2011). doi: https://doi.org/10.5744/florida/9780813035567.003.0001.

Booth 2016
Th. J. Booth, An investigation into the relationship between funerary treatment and bacterial bioerosion in European archaeological human bone. Archaeometry 58,3, 2016, 484–499. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/arcm.12190.

Boulestin / Coupey 2015
B. Boulestin / A.-S. Coupey, Cannibalism in the Linear Pottery Culture: The Human Remains from Herxheim (Oxford 2015).

Boulestin et al. 2009
B. Boulestin / A. Zeeb-Lanz / Ch. Jeunesse / F. Haack / R.-M. Arbogast / A. Denaire, Mass cannibalism in the Linear Pottery Culture at Herxheim (Palatinate, Germany). Antiquity 83,322, 2009, 968–982. doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003598X00099282.

Britnell / Whittle 2022
W. Britnell / A. Whittle (eds), The First Stones: Penywyrlod, Gwernvale and the Black Mountains Neolithic Long Cairns of South-East Wales (Oxford 2022).

Brittain / Harris 2010
M. Brittain / O. J. T. Harris, Enchaining arguments and fragmenting assumptions: reconsidering the fragmentation debate in archaeology. World Arch. 42,4, 2010, 581–594.

Brück / Booth 2022
J. Brück / Th. J. Booth, The power of relics: the curation of human bone in British Bronze Age burials. European Journal Arch. 25,4, 2022, 440–462. doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/eaa.2022.18.

Budd et al. 2000
P. Budd / J. Montgomery / B. Barreiro / R. G. Thomas, Differential diagenesis of strontium in archaeological human dental tissues. Applied Geochemistry 15,5, 2000, 687–694. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/s0883-2927%2899%2900069-4.

Calastrenc et al. 2020
C. Calastrenc / F. Balexu / N. Poirier / Ch. Rendu, Thermographie aéroportée par drone. Nouvelle procédure pour la détection archéologique en haute montagne. Archeo-Scienc. 44,1, 2020, 81–96. doi: https://doi.org/10.4000/archeosciences.7426.

Carvalho et al. 2019
A. F. Carvalho / D. Gonçalves / F. Alves Cardoso / R. Granja, Till death us do part? Human segmentation in funerary practices in the Middle Neolithic cemetery cave of

Bom Santo (Montejunto Mountain range, Portugal). In: Valera 2019, 71–83.

Chapman 1996
J. Chapman, Enchainment commodification and gender in the Balkan Copper Age. Journal European Arch. 4, 1996, 203–242. doi: https://doi.org/10.1179/096576696800688114.

Chapman 2000
J. Chapman, Fragmentation in Archaeology. People, Places and Broken Objects in the Prehistory of South Eastern Europe[1] (London 2000).

Chapman 2010
J. Chapman, 'Deviant' burials in the Neolithic and Chalcolithic of Central and South Eastern Europe. In: K. Rebay-Salisbury / M. L. Stig Sørensen / J. Hughes (eds), Body Parts and Bodies Whole. Changing Relations and Meanings (Oxford 2010) 30–45.

Chapman 2016
J. Chapman, The negotiation of place value in the landscape. In: J. K. Papadopoulos / G. Urton (eds), The Construction of Value in the Ancient World (Los Angeles 2016) 66–89. doi: https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvdjrrxf.8.

Chapman 2020
J. Chapman, Forging Identities in the Prehistory of Old Europe. Dividuals, Individuals and Communities 7000–3000 BC (Leiden 2020).

Chapman 2022
J. Chapman, The fragmentation of place: towards an integrated theory of fragmentation. In: M. Grygiel / P. J. Obst (eds), Walking among Ancient Trees. Studies in Honour of Ryszard Grygiel and Peter Bogucki on the 45th Anniversary of their Research Collaboration (Łódź 2022) 635–648.

Chapman 2023
J. Chapman, Fragmentation research and the fetishisation of independence. In: A. Sörman / A. Noterman / M. Fjellström (eds), Broken Bodies, Places and Objects (London 2023) 289–309. doi: https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003350026.

Chapman / Gaydarska 2007
J. Chapman / B. Gaydarska, Parts and Wholes. Fragmentation in Prehistoric Context (Oxford 2007).

Chapman / Gaydarska 2019
J. Chapman / B. Gaydarska, The pilgrimage model for Trypillia mega-sites: the case of Nebelivka, Ukraine. In: V. Stîrbu / A. Comşa (eds), Digging in the Past of Old Europe. Studies in Honor of Cristian Schuster at his 60th Anniversary (Târgu Jiu, Brăila 2019) 73–102.

Chapman / Gaydarska 2022
J. Chapman / B. Gaydarska, The meaning of deliberate figurine fragmentation: insights from the Old and New Worlds. In: G. Miniaci (ed.), Breaking Images: Damage and Mutilation of Ancient Figurines 2 (Oxford 2022) 14–50.

Chapman et al. in press
J. Chapman / B. Gaydarska / T. Jakob, New perspectives on deliberate fragmentation. In: M. Gligor / D. Diaconescu (eds), The Prehistory of Central and South-Eastern Europe: Chronology, Settlements, Artefacts and Cultural Networks. In honorem Florin Drașovean for the Celebration of the 65th Anniversary (Alba Iulia 2023).

Chapman et al. 2010
J. Chapman / M. Gillings / R. Shiel / E. Magyari / B. Gaydarska / Ch. Bond, The Upper Tisza Project. Studies in Hungarian Landscape Archaeology. Book 3: Settlement Patterns in the Zemplén Block. BAR Internat. Ser. 2088 (Oxford 2010).

Chapman et al. 2013
J. Chapman / R. Wallduck / S. Triantaphyllou, Disarticulated human bone disposal during the Mesolithic, Neolithic and Chalcolithic in the Balkans and Greece. In: M. Gligor (ed.), Archaeothanatology: An Interdisciplinary Approach on Death from Prehistory to the Middle Ages. Ann. Univ. Apulensis. Ser. Hist. 18,2, 2013, 11–46.

Coffin et al. 2022
J. Coffin / A. E. Dolphin / M. Jackes / Ch. Yakymchuk / Th. Perrin, Exploring child-

hood mobility in Neolithic Southern France (Roquemissou) using incremental analyses of Sr isotope ratios in tooth enamel. Journal Arch. Scien. Reports 42, 2022, 103417. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jasrep.2022.103417.

de Becdelièvre et al. 2020
C. de Becdelièvre / J. Jovanović / Z. Hofmanová / G. Goude / S. Stefanović, Direct insight into dietary adaptations and the individual experience of Neolithisation: comparing subsistence, provenance and ancestry of Early Neolithic humans from the Danube Gorges, c. 6200–5500 cal BC. In: K. J. Gron / L. Sørensen / P. Rowley-Conwy (eds), Farmers at the Frontier. A Pan-European Perspective on Neolithisation (Oxford 2020) 45–75.

DeLanda 2006
M. DeLanda, A New Philosophy of Society. Assemblage Theory and Social Complexity (London, New York 2006).

Demján / Pavúk 2020
P. Demján / P. Pavúk, Clustering of calibrated radiocarbon dates: site-specific chronological sequences identified by dense radiocarbon sampling. Radiocarbon 63,2, 2020, 429–438. doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/RDC.2020.129.

Denaire 2019
A. Denaire, Pottery refits and connections from Herxheim. In: Zeeb-Lanz 2019a, 25–40.

Denaire et al. 2017
A. Denaire / Ph. Lefranc / J. Wahl / Ch. Bronk Ramsey / E. Dunbar / T. Goslar / A. Bayliss / N. Beavan / P. Bickle / A. Whittle, The cultural project: formal chronological modelling of the Early and Middle Neolithic sequence in Lower Alsace. Journal Arch. Method and Theory 24,4, 2017, 1073–1149. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10816-016-9307-x.

Depaermentier et al. 2020
M. L. C. Depaermentier / A. Osztás / E. Bánffy / K. W. Alt / M. Kempf, Neolithic land-use, subsistence, and mobility patterns in Transdanubia: a multiproxy isotope and environmental analysis from Alsónyék-Bátaszék and Morágy-Tűzkődomb. Journal Arch. Scien. Reports 33, 2020, 102529. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jasrep.2020.102529.

Díaz-Zorita Bonilla et al. 2018
M. Díaz-Zorita Bonilla / J. Beck / H. Bocherens / P. Díaz-del-Río, Isotopic evidence for mobility at large-scale human aggregations in Copper Age Iberia: the megasite of Marroquíes. Antiquity 92,364, 2018, 991–1007. doi: https://doi.org/10.15184/aqy.2018.33.

Díaz-Zorita Bonilla et al. 2020
M. Díaz-Zorita Bonilla / J. Beck / G. Aranda Jiménez / L. Milesi García / M. Sánchez Romero / A. Lozano Medina / J. Escudero Carrillo / C. Knipper, The deposition of human remains inside Chalcolithic ditched enclosures: ditch 5 at Marroquíes (Jaén, Spain). European Journal Arch. 23,3, 2020, 330–355. doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/eaa.2020.4.

Dietler 2011
M. Dietler, Feasting and fasting. In: T. Insoll (ed.), The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of Ritual and Religion (Oxford, New York 2011) 179–194. doi: https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199232444.013.0014.

Ebersbach et al. 2017
R. Ebersbach / Th. Doppler / D. Hofmann / A. Whittle, No time out. Scaling material diversity and change in the Alpine foreland Neolithic. Journal Anthr. Arch. 45, 2017, 1–14. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaa.2016.10.001.

Elster et al. 2016
E. S. Elster / E. Isetti / J. Robb / A. Traverso, The Archaeology of Grotta Scaloria. Ritual in Neolithic Southeast Italy. Mon. Arch. 38 (Los Angeles 2016). doi: https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvdjrqn4.

Ensor 2021
B. E. Ensor, The not very Patrilocal European Neolithic. Strontium, aDNA, and Archaeological Kinship Analyses (Oxford 2021).

Evangelista / Valera 2019
L. S. Evangelista / A. C. Valera, Segmenting and depositing: the manipulation of the human body in ditched enclosures seen from Perdigões. In: Valera 2019, 47–70.

Fernández-Götz et al. 2023
M. Fernández-Götz / C. Nimura / Ph. W. Stockhammer / R. Cartwright (eds), Rethinking Migrations in Late Prehistoric Eurasia. Proc. British Academy 254 (Oxford 2023).

Fetsch 2012
S. Fetsch, Herxheim bei Landau – Bandkeramik außerhalb der Grubenanlage. Arch. Korrbl. 42, 2012, 15–30. doi: https://doi.org/10.11588/ak.2012.1.18558.

Fibiger et al. 2023
L. Fibiger / T. Ahlström / Ch. Meyer / M. Smith, Conflict, violence, and warfare among early farmers in northwestern Europe. Proc. Nat. Acad. Scien. USA 120,4, 2023, e2209481119. doi: https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2209481119.

Fowler 2004
Ch. Fowler, The Archaeology of Personhood. An Anthropological Approach. Themes in Arch. 1 (London, New York 2004).

Fowler 2008
Ch. Fowler, Fractal bodies in the past and present. In: D. Borić / J. Robb (eds), Past Bodies. Body-centered Research in Archaeology (Oxford 2008) 47–57.

Fredengren 2021
Ch. Fredengren, Bodily entanglements: gender, archaeological sciences and the more-than-ness of archaeological bodies. Cambridge Arch. Journal 31,3, 2021, 525–531. doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774321000226.

Frei / Price 2012
K. M. Frei / Th. D. Price, Strontium isotopes and human mobility in prehistoric Denmark. Arch. and Anthr. Sciences 4, 2012, 103–114. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s12520-011-0087-7.

Galloway et al. 2014
A. Galloway / L. Zephro / V. L. Wedel, Diagnostic criteria for the determination of timing and fracture mechanism. In: A. Galloway / V. L. Wedel (eds), Broken Bones: Anthropological Analysis of Blunt Force Trauma[2] (Springfield, IL 2014) 47–58.

Gaydarska 2020
B. Gaydarska (ed.), Early Urbanism in Europe. The Trypillia Mega-sites of the Ukrainian Forest-steppe (Berlin 2020). doi: https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110664959.

Gaydarska et al. 2021
B. Gaydarska / A. Bayliss / V. Slavchev, Contemporary Copper Age burials from the Varna mortuary zone, Bulgaria. Ant. Journal 101, 2021, 1–15. doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003581521000032.

Gaydarska / Chapman 2009
B. Gaydarska / J. Chapman, The fragmentation premise in archaeology: from the Paleolithic to more recent times. In: W. Tronzo (ed.), The Fragment. An Incomplete History (Los Angeles 2009) 131–153.

Gaydarska / Chapman 2022
B. Gaydarska / J. Chapman, Megasites in Prehistoric Europe. Where Strangers and Kinsfolk Met. Cambridge Elements: Arch. Europe (Cambridge 2022). doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009099837.

Gehlen et al. 2022
B. Gehlen / J. Affolter / W. Schön / S. Scharl / F. Siegmund / A.-L. Fischer / M. Grunert / Ch. Meiborg / D. Mischka / E. Treude / Th. Uthmeier, A diachronic perspective on lithic raw material procurement strategies and mobility: case studies from the Final Palaeolithic, Mesolithic and Neolithic in Central Europe. Journal Maps 18,4, 2022, 686–696. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/17445647.2022.2150572.

Gillis 2019
R. E. Gillis, Age-at-death analysis of animals from the ditches and settlement pits at Herxheim. In: Zeeb-Lanz 2019a, 257–266.

Govier / Steel 2021
E. Govier / L. Steel, Beyond the 'thingification' of worlds: archaeology and the new materialisms. Journal Mat. Culture 26,3, 2021, 298–317. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/13591835211025559.

Gramsch 2012
A. Gramsch, Prestige durch rituelle Handlungen – *cui bono*? In: B. Christiansen / U. Thaler (eds), Ansehenssache. Formen von Prestige in Kulturen des Altertums (München 2012) 355–384.

Gramsch / Grosskopf 2023
A. Gramsch / B. Grosskopf, Das "Itinerarium des menschlichen Körpers". Eine interdisziplinäre Spurensuche. In: N. Balkowski / K. P. Hofmann / I. A. Hohle / A. Schülke (eds), Mensch – Körper – Tod. Der Umgang mit menschlichen Überresten im Neolithikum Mitteleuropas (Leiden 2023) 91–117. doi: https://doi.org/10.59641/kaf31bd9.

Green / Schultz 2017
A. E. Green / J. J. Schultz, An examination of the transition of fracture characteristics in long bones from fresh to dry in central Florida: evaluating the timing of injury. Journal Forensic Scien. 62,2, 2017, 282–291. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/1556-4029.13260.

Haack 2016a
F. Haack, The early Neolithic ditched enclosure of Herxheim – architecture, fill formation processes and service life. In: Zeeb-Lanz 2016, 15–118.

Haack 2016b
F. Haack, The early Neolithic ditched enclosure of Herxheim – plates and tables. In: Zeeb-Lanz 2016, 153–end.

Haack 2020
F. Haack, Tracing LBK ritual traditions: the depositions at Herxheim and their origins. In: Hofmann 2020a; 53–82.

Hajdas 2019
I. Hajdas, Radiocarbon dating of human bones from Herxheim. In: Zeeb-Lanz 2019a, 277–283.

Harris 2014
O. J. T. Harris, Revealing our vibrant past: science, materiality and the Neolithic. In: A. Whittle / P. Bickle (eds), Early Farmers: The View from Archaeology and Science (Oxford 2014) 327–346. doi: https://doi.org/10.5871/bacad/9780197265758.003.0017.

Helms 1998
M. W. Helms, Access to Origins. Affines, Ancestors and Aristocrats (Cambridge 1998). doi: https://doi.org/10.7560/731196.

Hirschauer 2008
St. Hirschauer, Die Empiriegeladenheit von Theorien und der Erfindungsreichtum der Praxis. In: H. Kalthoff / St. Hirschauer / G. Lindemann (eds), Theoretische Empirie. Zur Relevanz qualitativer Forschung (Frankfurt a. M. 2008) 165–187.

Hofmann 2012
D. Hofmann, Bodies, houses and status in the Western Linearbandkeramik. In: T. L. Kienlin / A. Zimmermann (eds), Beyond Elites. Alternatives to Hierarchical Systems in Modelling Social Formations. Universitätsforsch. Prähist. Arch. 215 (Bonn 2012) 183–196.

Hofmann 2020a
D. Hofmann, Not going anywhere? Migration as a social practice in the early Neolithic Linearbandkeramik. Quaternary Internat. 560–561, 2020, 228–239. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2020.04.002.

Hofmann 2020b
D. Hofmann, LBK structured deposits as magical practices. In: D. Hofmann (ed.), Magical, Mundane or Marginal? Deposition Practices in the Early Neolithic Linearbandkeramik Culture (Leiden 2020) 113–147.

Honch et al. 2013
N. V. Honch / T. Higham / J. Chapman / B. Gaydarska / H. Todorova / V. Slavchev / Y. Yordanov / B. Dimitrova, West Pontic diets: a scientific framework for understanding the Durankulak and Varna I cemeteries, Bulgaria. Interdisciplinaria Arch. 4,2, 2013, 147–162. doi: https://doi.org/10.24916/iansa.2013.2.2.

Hujić 2009
A. Hujić, Paläodontologische Untersuchungen an menschlichen Skelettresten der bandkeramischen Grubenanlage von Herxheim / Pfalz. In: R. de Beauclair / S. C. Münzel / H. Napierala (eds), Knochen pflastern ihren Weg. Festschrift für Margarethe und Hans-Peter Uerpmann. BioArch. 5 (Rahden / Westf. 2009) 113–122.

Ingold 2011
T. Ingold, Being Alive: Essays on Movement, Knowledge and Description (London, New York 2011).

Janjua / Rogers 2018
M. A. Janjua / T. L. Rogers, Bone weathering patterns of metatarsal v. femur and the postmortem interval in Southern Ontario. Forensic Scien. Internat. 178,1, 2018, 16–23. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forsciint.2008.01.011.

Janssens et al. 2019
L. A. A. Janssens / R.-M. Arbogast / A. Zeeb-Lanz, Dogs of the final Bandkeramik at Herxheim: refitting and pathology. In: Zeeb-Lanz 2019a, 233–246.

Jervis 2019
B. Jervis, Assemblage Thought and Archaeology (London, New York 2019).

Jeunesse 2011
Ch. Jeunesse, Enceintes à fossé discontinu et enceintes à pseudo-fossé dans le Néolithique d'Europe central et occidentale. In: A. Denaire / Ch. Jeunesse / Ph. Lefranc (eds), Nécropoles et enceintes danubiennes du Ve millénaire dans le Nord-East de la France et la Sud-Ouest de l'Allemagne. Rhin, Meuse, Moselle (Strasbourg 2011) 31–72.

Johnson 2019
E. Johnson, Taphonomic analysis of the animal remains in the settlement pits and enclosure ditches at Herxheim. In: Zeeb-Lanz 2019a, 247–256.

Jones 2012
A. M. Jones, Prehistoric Materialities. Becoming Material in Prehistoric Britain and Ireland (Oxford 2012). doi: https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:osobl/9780199556427.001.0001.

Joyce / Gillespie 2015
R. A. Joyce / S. D. Gillespie, Making things out of objects that move. In: R. A. Joyce / S. D. Gillespie (eds), Things in Motion. Object Itineraries in Anthropological Practice (Santa Fe 2015) 3–19.

Kienlin / Bussmann 2022
T. L. Kienlin / R. Bussmann (eds), Sociality – Materiality – Practice / Sozialität – Materialität – Praxis. Universitätsforsch. Prähist. Arch. 377 (Bonn 2022).

King 2003
M. P. King, Unparalleled Behaviour: Britain and Ireland during the 'Mesolithic' and 'Neolithic'. BAR British Ser. 356 (Oxford 2003).

Laffoon et al. 2017
J. E. Laffoon / T. F. Sonnemann / T. Shafie / C. L. Hofman / U. Brandes / G. R. Davies, Investigating human geographic origins using dual-isotope ($^{87}Sr/^{86}Sr$, $\delta^{18}O$) assignment approaches. PloS one 12,2, 2017, e0172562. doi: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0172562.

Leary 2014
J. Leary, Past mobility: An introduction. In: J. Leary (ed.), Past Mobilities. Archaeological Approaches to Movement and Mobility (Farnham 2014) 1–19.

Lefranc et al. 2021
Ph. Lefranc / J. Affolter / R.-M. Arbogast / F. Cheval / F. Jodry / M. Mauvilly / E. Rollinger / N. Schneider, Achenheim: a fortified settlement from the last third of the fifth millennium (Bruebach-Oberbergen group) in Lower Alsace. Gallia Préhist. 61 (Online), 2021, doi: https://doi.org/10.4000/galliap.2625.

Mathieson et al. 2018
I. Mathieson / S. Alpaslan-Roodenberg / C. Posth / A. Szécsényi-Nagy / N. Rohland / S. Mallick / I. Olalde / N. Broomandkhoshbacht / F. Candilio / D. Reich et al., The genomic history of southeastern Europe. Nature 555, 2018, 197–203. doi: https://doi.org/10.1038/nature25778.

Marciniak et al. 2022
A. Marciniak / J. Pyzel / M. Krueger / M. Lisowski / Ch. Bronk Ramsey / E. Dunbar / A. Barclay / A. Bayliss / B. Gaydarska / A. Whittle, A history of the LBK in the central Polish lowlands. Praehist. Zeitschr. 97,2, 2022, 377–408. https://doi.org/10.1515/pz-2022-2041.

McAnany 2014
P. A. McAnany, Living with the Ancestors. Kinship and Kingship in Ancient Mayan So-

ciety[2] (Austin, TX 2014). doi: https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139017190.

Mecking 2019
O. Mecking, Clay analysis of the pottery from Herxheim. In: Zeeb-Lanz 2019a, 41–54.

Merton 1968
R. K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (New York 1968).

Montgomery et al. 2000
J. Montgomery / P. Budd / J. Evans, Reconstructing the lifetime movements of ancient people: A Neolithic case study from southern England, European Journal Arch. 3, 2000, 370–385.

Montgomery 2010
J. Montgomery, Passports from the past: investigating human dispersals using strontium isotope analysis of tooth enamel. Ann. Human Biol. 37, 2010, 325–346. doi: https://doi.org/10.3109/03014461003649297.

Morin et al. 2021
E. Morin / A. Boileau / E. Ready, A refitting experiment on long bone identification. Internat. Journal Osteoarch. 31,4, 2021, 650–662. doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/oa.2980.

Muntoni et al. 2022
I. M. Muntoni / F. Micheletti / N. Mongelli / M. Pallara / P. Acquafredda, First evidence in Italian mainland of Pantelleria obsidian: highlights from WD-XRF and SEM-EDS characterization of Neolithic artefacts from Galliano necropolis (Taranto, Southern Italy). Journal Arch. Scien. Reports 45, 2022, 103553. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jasrep.2022.103553.

Nehlich et al. 2009
O. Nehlich / J. Montgomery / J. Evans / S. Schade-Lindig / S. L. Pichler / M. P. Richards / K. W. Alt, Mobility or migration: a case study from the Neolithic settlement of Nieder-Mörlen (Hessen, Germany). Journal Arch. Science 36,8, 2009, 1791–1799. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2009.04.008.

Neil 2022
S. Neil, 'Local' or 'non-local'? Interpreting isotope results from the Black Mountains long cairns. In: Britnell / Whittle 2022, 207–214.

Olalde et al. 2018
I. Olalde / S. Brace / M. E. Allentoft / I. Armit / K. Kristiansen / Th. Booth / N. Rohland / S. Mallick / A. Szécsényi-Nagy / D. Reich et al., The Beaker phenomenon and the genomic transformation of north-west Europe. Nature 555, 2018, 190–196. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature25738.

Orschiedt / Haidle 2006
J. Orschiedt / M. N. Haidle, The LBK enclosure at Herxheim: theatre of war or ritual centre? References from osteoarchaeological investigations. Journal Conflict Arch. 2,1, 2006, 153–167. doi: https://doi.org/10.1163/157407706778942330.

Orschiedt / Haidle 2012
J. Orschiedt / M. N. Haidle, Violence against the living, violence against the dead on the human remains from Herxheim, Germany. Evidence of a crisis and mass cannibalism? In: R. Schulting / L. Fibiger (eds), Sticks, Stones, and Broken Bones: Neolithic Violence in a European Perspective (Oxford 2012) 121–138. doi: https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:osobl/9780199573066.003.0007.

Osterholtz 2018
A. J. Osterholtz, Interpreting and reinterpreting sacred ridge: placing extreme processing in a larger context. Journal Southwestern Anthr. and Hist. 84,4, 2018, 461–479. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/00231940.2018.1533197.

Osztás et al. 2016
A. Osztás / I. Zalai-Gaál / E. Bánffy / T. Marton / Á. É. Nyerges / K. Köhler / K. Somogyi / Zs. Gallina / Ch. Bronk Ramsey / E. Dunbar / B. Kromer / A. Bayliss / D. Hamilton / P. Marshall / A. Whittle, Coalescent community at Alsónyék: the timings and duration of Lengyel burials and settlement. Ber. RGK 94, 2013 (2016), 179–282. doi: https://doi.org/10.11588/berrgk.1938.0.37154.

Pechtl 2020
J. Pechtl, Constant change of LBK settlement in the upper Danube region. Quaternary Internat. 560–561, 2020, 240–247. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2020.04.016.

Pétrequin et al. 2017
P. Pétrequin / E. Gauthier / A.-M. Pétrequin (eds), Jade. Objets-signes et interprétations sociales des jades alpins dans l'Europe néolithique. Tomes 3–4 (Ledoux 2017).

Radovanović 1996
I. Radovanović, The Iron Gates Mesolithic. Internat. Monogr. Prehist., Arch. Ser. 11 (Ann Arbor, MI 1996).

Regenye et al. 2020
J. Regenye / E. Bánffy / P. Demján / J. Ebert / A. Osztás / Ch. Bronk Ramsey / E. Dunbar / R. Friedrich / A. Bayliss / N. Beavan / B. Gaydarska / A. Whittle, Narratives for Lengyel funerary practice. Ber. RGK 97, 2016 (2020), 5–80. doi: https://doi.org/10.11588/berrgk.2016.0.76630.

Renfrew 2015
C. Renfrew, Evidence for ritual breakage in the Cycladic Early Bronze Age. The special deposit south at Kavos on Keros. In: K. Harrell / J. Driessen (eds), THRAVSMA: Contextualising the Intentional Destruction of Objects in the Bronze Age Aegean and Cyprus (Louvain 2015) 81–98.

Renfrew et al. 2013
C. Renfrew / O. Philaniotou / N. Brodie / G. Gavalas / M. J. Boyd (eds), The Settlement at Dhaskalio. The Sanctuary on Keros and the Origins of Aegean Ritual Practice 1 (Cambridge 2013).

Renfrew et al. 2015
C. Renfrew / O. Philaniotou / N. Brodie / G. Gavalas / M. J. Boyd (eds), Kavos and the Special Deposits. The Sanctuary on Keros and the Origins of Aegean Ritual Practice 2. The Excavations of 2006–2008 (Cambridge 2015).

Riedhammer 2019
K. Riedhammer, The radiocarbon dates from Herxheim and their archaeological interpretation. In: Zeeb-Lanz 2019a, 285–303.

Rosell et al. 2019
J. Rosell / M. Modesto-Mata / M. C. Fernández-Laso / M. Modolo / R. Blasco, Refitting bones to reconstruct the diversity in Middle Palaeolithic human occupations: the case of the Abric Romaní site (Capellades, Barcelona, Spain). Arch. and Anthr. Scien. 11, 2019, 4601–4619. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s12520-019-00887-4.

Rosendahl / Wieczorek 2011
W. Rosendahl / A. Wieczorek (eds), Schädelkult. Kopf und Schädel in der Kulturgeschichte des Menschen. Begleitband zur Sonderausstellung „Schädelkult – Kopf und Schädel in der Kulturgeschichte des Menschen". Publ. REM 41 (Regensburg 2011).

Schade-Lindig 2002
S. Schade-Lindig, Idol- und Sonderfunde der bandkeramischen Siedlung von Bad Nauheim – Nieder-Mörlen "Auf dem Hempler" (Wetteraukreis). Germania 80,1, 2002, 47–114. doi: https://doi.org/10.11588/ger.2002.60517.

Schade-Lindig / Schwitalla 2003
S. Schade-Lindig / G. Schwitalla, Die Kreispalisadenanlage des bandkeramischen Zentralortes Bad Nauheim-Nieder Mörlen (Wetteraukreis). In: J. Eckert / U. Eisenhauer / A. Zimmermann (eds), Archäologische Perspektiven. Analysen und Interpretationen im Wandel. Festschrift für Jens Lüning zum 65. Geburtstag. Internat. Arch. Stud. Honoraria 20 (Rahden / Westf. 2003) 351–358.

Schilz 2006
F. Schilz, Molekulargenetische Verwandtschaftsanalysen am prähistorischen Skelettkollektiv der Lichtensteinhöhle / Molecular genetic kinship analyses of the prehistoric skeletal collective from the Lichtenstein cave. PhD thesis, University of Göttingen (Göttingen 2006). doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.53846/goediss-638.

Schimmelpfennig 2019
D. Schimmelpfennig, The lithic material from Herxheim with special emphasis on the 2005–2008 excavations and the latest LBK phase (the "ritual phase" at Herxheim). In: Zeeb-Lanz 2019a, 81–138.

Schreiber 2018
St. Schreiber, Wandernde Dinge als Assemblagen. Neo-materialistische Perspektiven zum ‚römischen Import' im ‚mitteldeutschen Barbaricum'. Berlin Stud. Ancient World 52 (Berlin 2018). doi: https://doi.org/10.17171/3-52.

Schreiber 2022
St. Schreiber, Die Praxis der Materialität. Zur Kontroverse nicht-menschlicher Handlungsfähigkeit (nicht nur) in den Archäologien. In: Kienlin / Bussmann 2022, 337–374.

Schreiber / Rotermund 2023
St. Schreiber / S.-M. Rotermund, Transkorporalität in der Archäologie: Subjektkörper diesseits und jenseits ‚des Menschen'. In: M. Renger / St. Schreiber / A. Veling (eds), Theorie Archäologie Reflexion 1. Kontroversen und Ansätze im deutschsprachigen Diskurs. Theoriedenken Arch. 1 (Heidelberg 2023) 249–291. doi: https://doi.org/10.11588/propylaeum.1092.c15027.

Seregély 2012
T. Seregély, Neolithic settlements and forgotten finds. News about the Jungfernhöhle near Tiefenellern. In: F. Falkenstein (ed.), Hohler Stein, Rothensteine and Jungfernhöhle. Archaeological Research on the Prehistoric Use of Naturally Sacred Places on the Northern Franconian Alb (Scheinfeld 2012) 64–73.

Singer 1984
C. A. Singer, The 63-kilometer fit. In: J. E. Ericson / B. A. Purdy (eds), Prehistoric Quarries and Lithic Production (Cambridge 1984) 35–48.

Smith 2012
K. Smith, From dividual and individual selves to porous subjects. Australian Journal Anthr. 23,1, 2012, 50–64. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1757-6547.2012.00167.x.

Smith / Brickley 2009
M. Smith / M. Brickley, People of the Long Barrows. Life, Death and Burial in the Earlier Neolithic (Stroud 2009).

Smits et al. 2013
E. Smits / A. R. Millard / G. Nowell / D. G. Pearson, Isotopic investigation of diet and residential mobility in the Neolithic of the Lower Rhine Basin. European Journal Arch. 13,1, 2013, 5–31. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/1461957109355040.

Steel 2022
L. Steel, Agencement, matter flows and itinerary of object in the Bronze Age East Mediterranean. A new materialities approach to globalization. In: S. Autiero / M. A. Cobb (eds), Globalization and Transculturality from Antiquity to the Pre-Modern World (Abingdon, New York 2022) 81–102.

Strathern 1988
M. Strathern, The Gender of the Gift. Problems with Women and Problems with Society in Melanesia. Studies Melanesian Anthr. 6 (Berkeley 1988).

Symes et al. 2012
St. A. Symes / E. N. L'Abbé / E. N. Chapman / I. Wolff / D. C. Dirkmaat, Interpreting traumatic injury to bone in medicolegal investigations. In: D. C. Dirkmaat (ed.), A Companion to Forensic Anthropology (Oxford 2012) 340–389. doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118255377.ch17.

Tafuri et al. 2016a
M. A. Tafuri / T. Ch. O'Connell / J. Robb / Ch. Knüsel / P. Fullagar, Mobility, landscape and the function of the cave: evidence from strontium isotopes. In: Elster et al. 2016, 139–144.

Tafuri et al. 2016b
M. A. Tafuri / T. Ch. O'Connell / E. Souter / N. Libianchi / J. Robb, Diet during life: paleoeconomic studies of human diet using stable carbon and nitrogen isotopes. In: Elster et al. 2016, 131–138.

Turck 2019
R. Turck, Where did the dead from Herxheim originate? Isotope analyses of human individuals from the find concentrations in the ditches. In: Zeeb-Lanz 2019a, 313–421.

Valera 2019
A. C. Valera (ed.), Fragmentation and Depositions in Pre And Proto-Historic Portugal (Lisbon 2019).

Valera et al. 2020
A. C. Valera / I. Žalaité / A. F. Maurer /

V. Grimes / A. M. Silva / S. Ribeiro / J. F. Santos / C. Barrocas Dias, Addressing human mobility in Iberian Neolithic and Chalcolithic ditched enclosures: the case of Perdigões (S. Portugal). Journal Arch. Scien. Reports 30, 2020, 102264. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jasrep.2020.102264.

Veling 2022
A. Veling, Outline of an archaeology of practices. In: Kienlin / Bussmann 2022, 151–162.

Vodanović et al. 2011
M. Vodanović / J. Dumančić / I. Galić / I. S. Pavičin / M. Petrovečki / R. Cameriere / H. Brkić, Age estimation in archaeological skeletal remains: evaluation of four non-destructive age calculation methods. Journal Forensic Odonto-Stomatology 29,2, 2011, 14–21.

Walker et al. 1988
Ph. L. Walker / J. R. Johnson / P. M. Lambert, Age and sex biases in the preservation of human skeletal remains. Am. Journal Physical Anthr. 76,2, 1988, 183–188. doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.1330760206.

Wallduck 2013
R. Wallduck, The Iron Gates Mesolithic – Neolithic. In: Chapman et al. 2013, 15–23.

Whittle 1996
A. Whittle, Europe in the Neolithic. The Creation of New Worlds (Cambridge 1996).

Whittle 2018
A. Whittle, The Times of Their Lives: Hunting History in the Archaeology of Neolithic Europe (Oxford 2018).

Wieberg / Wescott 2008
D. A. M. Wieberg / D. J. Wescott, Estimating the time of long bone fractures: correlation between postmortem interval, bone moisture content, and blunt force trauma fracture characteristics. Journal Forensic Scien. 53,5, 2008, 1028–1034. doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1556-4029.2008.00801.x.

Witmore 2014
Ch. L. Witmore, Archaeology and the New Materialisms. Journal Contemporary Arch. 1, 2014, 203–224. doi: https://doi.org/10.1558/jca.v1i2.16661.

Wysocki 2022
M. P. Wysocki, Neolithic people of the Black Mountains: human remains from Penywyrlod, Pipton and Ty Isaf. In: Britnell / Whittle 2022, 157–206.

Zeeb-Lanz 2009
A. Zeeb-Lanz, Gewaltszenarien oder Sinnkrise? Die Grubenanlage von Herxheim und das Ende der Bandkeramik. In: A. Zeeb-Lanz (ed.), Krisen – Kulturwandel – Kontinuitäten. Zum Ende der Bandkeramik in Mitteleuropa. Beiträge der Internationalen Tagung in Herxheim bei Landau (Pfalz) vom 14.–17.06.2007. Internat. Arch. 10 (Rahden / Westf. 2009) 87–102.

Zeeb-Lanz 2016
A. Zeeb-Lanz (ed.), Ritualised Destruction in the Early Neolithic – the Exceptional Site of Herxheim (Palatinate, Germany). Vol. 1. Forsch. Pfälzische Arch. 8,1 (Speyer 2016).

Zeeb-Lanz 2019a
A. Zeeb-Lanz (ed.), Ritualised Destruction in the Early Neolithic – the Exceptional Site of Herxheim (Palatinate, Germany). Vol. 2. Forsch. Pfälzische Arch. 8,2 (Speyer 2019).

Zeeb-Lanz 2019b
A. Zeeb-Lanz, The Herxheim ritual enclosure – a synthesis of results and interpretative approaches. In: Zeeb-Lanz 2019a, 423–466.

Zeeb-Lanz 2019c
A. Zeeb-Lanz, Anthropomorphic and theriomorphic figurine fragments and other small clay finds from the ritual enclosure of Herxheim. In: Zeeb-Lanz 2019a, 55–80.

Zeeb-Lanz / Haack 2016
A. Zeeb-Lanz / F. Haack, History of research at Herxheim – an "interpretative thriller". In: Zeeb-Lanz 2016, 1–13.

Zeeb-Lanz / Haack 2020
A. Zeeb-Lanz / F. Haack, Ritual und Gewalt in Herxheim (Pfalz). In: H. Meller / R. Risch / K. W. Alt / F. Bertemes / R. Micó (eds), Rituelle Gewalt – Rituale der Gewalt / Ritual Violence – Rituals of Violence. Tagungen Landesmus. Vorgesch. Halle 22 (Halle / Saale 2020) 181–196.

Zeeb-Lanz et al. 2007
A. Zeeb-Lanz / F. Haack / R.-M. Arbogast / M. N. Haidle / Ch. Jeunesse / J. Orschiedt / D. Schimmelpfennig, Außergewöhnliche Deponierungen der Bandkeramik – die Grubenanlage von Herxheim. Germania 85,2, 2007, 199–274. doi: https://doi.org/10.11588/ger.2007.95473.

Zeeb-Lanz et al. 2016
A. Zeeb-Lanz / R.-M. Arbogast / S. Bauer / B. Boulestin / A.-S. Coupey / A. Denaire / F. Haack / Ch. Jeunesse / D. Schimmelpfennig / R. Turck, Human sacrifices as "crisis management"? The case of the Early Neolithic site of Herxheim, Palatinate, Germany. In: C. A. Murray (ed.), Diversity of Sacrifice. Form and Function of Sacrificial Practices in the Ancient Word and Beyond. SUNY Ser., Inst. European and Mediterranean Arch. Distinguished Monogr. Ser. 5 (New York 2016) 171–189. doi: https://doi.org/10.1515/9781438459967-011.

Addresses of the authors:

John Chapman
Bisserka Gaydarska
Tina Jakob
Durham University
Department of Archaeology
UK–Durham DH1 3LE
j.c.chapman@durham.ac.uk
b_gaydarska@yahoo.co.uk
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6236-872X
betina.jakob@durham.ac.uk

Alexander Gramsch
Römisch-Germanische Kommission
des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts
Palmengartenstr. 10–12
DE–60325 Frankfurt a. M.
alexander.gramsch@dainst.de
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2979-8792

Daniela Hofmann
University of Bergen
Department of Archaeology, History,
Cultural Studies and Religion
Øysteinsgate 3
Postboks 7805
NO–5020 Bergen
Daniela.Hofmann@uib.no
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4502-9651

Stefan Schreiber
Leibniz-Zentrum für Archäologie
Ludwig-Lindenschmit-Forum 1
DE–55116 Mainz
stefan.schreiber@leiza.de
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1065-5003

Rouven Turck
Universität Zürich
Institut für Archäologie
Fachbereich Prähistorische Archäologie
(PRA)
Karl-Schmid-Str. 4
CH–8006 Zürich
turck@archaeologie.uzh.ch
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9534-6570

Alasdair Whittle
Department of Archaeology
and Conservation
Cardiff University
UK–Cardiff
Whittle@cardiff.ac.uk

Andrea Zeeb-Lanz
Generaldirektion Kulturelles Erbe
Rheinland-Pfalz
Direktion Landesarchäologie
Kleine Pfaffengasse 10
DE–67346 Speyer
zeeblanz@outlook.de
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9081-9244

References of figures

Fig. 1: J. Chapman / B. Gaydarska / T. Jakob. – *Fig. 2:* re-drawn by L. Woodard from authors' multiple sources. – *Fig. 3:* B. Gaydarska. – *Fig. 4:* Zeeb-Lanz / Haack 2016, fig. 2. – *Fig. 5:* Haack 2016a, pl. 66. – *Fig. 6:* Denaire 2019, fig. 10. – *Fig. 7a:* re-drawn by L. Woodard from Zeeb-Lanz 2019b, fig. 6. – *Fig. 7b:* re-drawn by L. Woodard from Turck 2019, fig. 56, modified by L. Hies (RGK). – *Fig. 8:* re-drawn by L. Woodard from original by J. Chapman, B. Gaydarska and T. Jakob. – *Fig. 9:* A. Häußer, GDKE Außenstelle Speyer. – *Fig. 10:* Haack 2016b, pl. 66,1; 67,2. – *Fig. 11:* Haack 2016b, pl. 71,3. – *Fig. 12:* A. Zeeb-Lanz, GDKE Außenstelle Speyer. – *Fig. 13:* Turck 2019, fig. 59. – *Fig. 14:* Turck 2019, fig. 51. – *Tab. 1:* J. Chapman / B. Gaydarska / T. Jakob, layout: L. Hies (RGK).