

Based on these facts, the final chapter (pp. 174–185) attempts to determine whether Lossow was a central place. The answer of the author is a definite yes. After a short discussion of the models used to determine centrality in archaeology up to now, a set of criteria such as fortification and a clearly visible differentiation from surrounding settlements, a central role in craft production, intra- as well as interregional trade, a role as a residence of elites and a concentration of ritual activity is defined. The detailed description of the excavation findings given above shows that some of these criteria are clearly fulfilled, others are open to discussion. What this study misses is the answer to a simple question: central to what? There is no study of the surrounding cultural landscape, no indication on where other potential centres may lie. This would clearly be a monograph of its own, however, and could not be expected to be integrated into the volume at hand.

The book concludes with an extensive catalogue of finds and features (pp. 210–256), 17 plates showing excavation profiles and plans and 97 plates with finds. The calibrated radiocarbon dates fill 55 plates, followed by eight more with coring profiles and results of scientific analyses. Whether the graphic reproduction of one calibrated radiocarbon date per plate makes sense or if the pages could have been used better to show some more excavation plans / profiles is arguable, but the contrast to the low amount of published (and publishable) material from the older excavations could not be bigger. In this sense, the two volumes complement each other. While the first monograph holds all data available on the ‘sacrificial pits’ and the Slavic settlement, the second brings forward a rich material from Late Bronze Age / Early Iron Age settlement layers. Both volumes reviewed here finally put discussions regarding Lossow on a secure basis. Although, as always, many questions remain unanswered, finds and features discovered over the time span of more than a century are now presented in a way that allows an in-depth analysis of the site and its functions. The authors undoubtedly have made an important and valuable contribution to research on the late Lusatian Culture and added important material for an archaeology of religious beliefs.

Finally, in times of continuously rising costs for scientific literature the very reasonable pricing of the two volumes discussed here should be highlighted. Fortunately, this comes not at the expense of quality. There are very few typing errors to be spotted in the text, and the illustrations, colour as well as black and white, are of adequate quality as well.

D – 14195 Berlin
Podbielskiallee 69–71
E-Mail: oliver.dietrich@dainst.de

Oliver Dietrich
Deutsches Archäologisches Institut
Orient-Abteilung

ROBERT SCHUMANN, Status und Prestige in der Hallstattkultur. Münchner Archäologische Forschungen Volume 3. Verlag Marie Leidorf GmbH, Rahden / Westf. 2015. € 64.80. ISBN 978-3-86757-153-1. 397 pages, 104 illustrations and 7 tables.

‘Status’ and ‘prestige’ are two all-pervasive buzzwords in social archaeology. A great deal has been written in recent decades about status and prestige, social stratification and societal hierarchies in the Hallstatt period. It is an area in which no consensus has been reached; opinions are too divided, the approaches to studying the topic too heterogenous and regional differences too obvious. The question of social structure cannot be avoided, however; it is essential for an understanding of the Early Iron Age, as of many other epochs. The sources, however, appear to be ambiguous and every relevant argument seems already to have been brought to bear on the discussion. Can we really make any further progress in this subject area? Is there any research which can produce results that do not give the impression of being old content in new packaging? This is the subject area chosen

by Robert Schumann for his dissertation, submitted in 2014 to the Ludwig-Maximilian University of Munich. Whether he has succeeded in this challenging undertaking, and what new impetus, if any, his work has to offer social archaeology in general, and Iron-Age social archaeology in particular, will be the subject of this review.

Robert Schumann's dissertation was published in 2015, just a year after it was completed, as the third volume of the *Münchener Archäologische Forschungen*. It provides a further example of the high production standards of the series, the hallmarks of which are high-quality print, strong binding, appropriate illustrations and careful editing. The volume is divided into 13 chapters.

The introduction makes clear from the outset that the main focus of the research is not so much social structures themselves as the finds and features, on the basis of which the various models of social structure have been constructed. The aim is to interpret these finds within an appropriate theoretical framework. 'Status' and 'prestige' are key concepts, but far from being treated as synonymous, they are perceived as opposites. After discussion of a number of other key considerations, the four geographical areas on which the empirical investigation is based are introduced. These are the lower Altmühl Valley, the Alpine Foreland of western Austria, the area of the Kalenderberg Group and the area of the Dolenjsko Group.

In the second chapter, the terminological framework is discussed. Here, the focus is on the concepts of 'status' and 'prestige'. These are differentiated from one another and anchored within a theoretical context. 'Status' is defined as position within the social system or, more accurately, as the level of that position on a vertical social axis. Status is thus seen as synonymous with rank. 'Prestige' is defined as social prominence or esteem. Schumann points out that the same finds are often addressed as both status symbols and prestige objects. In fact, however, prestige objects indicate, not social status, but a claim to respect or prominence within society. Schumann shows, using numerous examples, that these two categories are usually confused in the archaeological debate. In only a few research papers are they adequately differentiated and correctly applied. The distinction, however, is extremely relevant. While status symbols indicate a largely complete and therefore static social differentiation, prestige objects are signs of a type of differentiation which is dynamic and constantly changing. Status symbols thus confirm and reinforce a social stratification, while the function of prestige objects is to exert influence and bring about change. Here, Schumann highlights a highly significant factor in the development of societies. But how can status and prestige be identified in archaeology and, in particular, how can they be distinguished? According to Schumann there are no general indicators. The function of objects must be worked out on a case-by-case basis from their context and use. Only then can conclusions be drawn as to whether they are status symbols or prestige items. Schumann demonstrates this procedure using the example of a young girl's grave near the Heuneburg. An important argument in the discussion revolves around whether certain phenomena are observed only in high-status burials or are also found in lesser-status burials. Only if they are exclusively observed in high-status burials are they interpreted as status symbols, and only then does the structure inherent in the observations made allow for status symbols to be correlated, and the interpretation to be derived from the archaeological material itself. If a potential status symbol occurs in a grave where there are no other finds indicative of high status, then the grave could belong to a lower-status category, and the observed phenomenon is therefore not a status symbol. If, on the other hand, the grave is a high-status grave, then the find in question may be a status symbol. Since it is impossible to tell from the archaeological material itself whether or not an object is a status symbol, however, there must always be doubts about potential status symbols if they also occur in poorer burials. Schumann rightly emphasises that a phenomenon excluded as a definite status symbol by this process of argumentation may still very well be one; the interpretation, however, is not supported by the available sources. Following this strict

procedure, Schumann's analysis is constructed on the firm foundation of scientifically proven knowledge, without in principle excluding other interpretative possibilities. If other studies adopted a similar approach, we would avoid the dreadful circular arguments which arise when archaeology strays from the firm ground of proven fact.

The case studies begin with the third chapter. The first area addressed is the lower Altmühl Valley. The analysis begins with an overview of the research history, a discussion of chronology, and a description of the cemeteries and their selection. Schumann discusses numerous observations with respect to their possible interpretation as status symbols, including elements of dress, stepped bowls, types of grave, meat offerings and the placing of the deceased's arms in a flexed position. While two status groups can be recognised from the grave type, few of the other observations can be similarly interpreted. These are waggons, horse harness, meat offerings and weapons. In conclusion, Schumann recognises the celebration of status as one undoubted component of the funerary rites, but believes the negotiation of prestige to have been more important.

The fourth chapter is devoted to the Alpine Foreland of western Austria, including, amongst other sites, Hallstatt and Dürrenberg. While the previous chapter focused on individual finds in their contexts, this one concentrates on spatial distribution. Here again there is a discussion of basic issues, with a review of the research history and an analysis of the sources. There is also a discussion of methodology. The main argument of the chapter is that the distribution of status symbols differs from that of prestige objects. The discussion is followed by an analysis of relevant find groups, including bronze vessels, gold artefacts, waggons and swords. Swords are recognised as a potential status symbol. Here the possibilities offered by spatial analysis and representation are touched on, but only briefly; as Schumann himself puts it, we are offered merely an introduction to the topic. Not only for this reason, but mainly because of the nature of the sources, the conclusions remain somewhat vague. The decision to employ relatively robust spatial analyses in this situation is no doubt correct, but the potential of that decision is not fully explored.

The fifth chapter deals with the Kalenderberg Group. Again, thorough reviews of the research history and the sources provide an important basis for the discussion. There is a particularly detailed analysis of the cemetery at Satzendorf, where Schumann detects a clear horizontal social stratification; in fact, a gender divide. On the other hand, there is almost no evidence of status symbols, indicative of vertical stratification. Weapons offer the only evidence pointing in this direction, but it is difficult to interpret. Kalenderberg pottery is discussed in detail. It clearly has symbolic meaning, but the social aspect of this remains unclear. This case study, too, finds status to be clearly of secondary importance to the negotiation of prestige.

The sixth chapter is devoted to the Dolensko Group in the south-eastern Alps. Here situla art, grave goods and large barrows are discussed. Much of the chapter is devoted to an iconographic analysis of situla art as a social marker. Despite some ambiguity, it would seem that weapons, certain features of clothing, and headgear may be candidates for interpretation as status symbols. The second part of the chapter is devoted to an analysis of the finds. This confirms, in particular, that weapons were status symbols and concludes that diadems belong in the same category.

The seventh chapter is not devoted to any particular geographical area but investigates the social significance of bronze vessels. These are interpreted as prestige goods. According to Schumann, they do not impart a 'particular character' to burials, in the same way as, for example, waggons do. By the Late Hallstatt period in the West Hallstatt zone, on the other hand, bronze vessels can definitely be interpreted as status symbols.

The eighth chapter is devoted to a trans-regional synthesis, and Schumann starts with the West Hallstatt zone. There is a very detailed discussion of richly furnished graves and southern imports.

Schumann believes the richly furnished graves can be primarily explained in terms of prestige. He suggests that they may have been an expression, not so much of changes in the social system, as of fluctuating social tensions which caused social status to be bolstered by symbols of prestige. Next, he turns to the settlements. In the absence of any status symbols or indications of trade, Schumann does not see the southern Bavarian settlements enclosed by ditches, usually known as manorial farmsteads, as evidence of a settlement hierarchy. The development of the richly furnished graves does not correlate with that of the settlements. Schumann interprets this as evidence that the construction of impressive graves was probably a temporary rather than an on-going phenomenon and not indicative of any change in social structures. On the contrary, he believes that social stratification may have remained unchanged. He sees the richly furnished grave tumuli of the Early Hallstatt period as being defined by the same characteristics as the Late Hallstatt 'princely' graves, the only difference being the appearance of gold artefacts and objects of Mediterranean provenance. Both of these, however, Schumann interprets as prestige objects. Thus, neither the richly furnished graves nor the 'princely' graves were indicators of social change. Rather, they appeared in certain situations to emphasise social differences. With this interpretation, Schumann is closer to the ideas of Kossack than to those of Kimmig. Schumann also believes that the hypothesis of a concentration of power has been disproved.

These conclusions – whether one follows all the details or not – do not amount to a new social model of the Hallstatt period, nor does Schumann make any conclusive statements about status and prestige. Nevertheless, he does, amongst other things, sound a warning against the often all-too-careless social interpretation of finds. It is certainly a pity that Schumann is unable to offer any hard criterion for differentiating between status symbols and prestige objects. That is not a weakness of his research, however, but a problem inherent in the subject. In scenarios where no primary statements can be made, conclusions can be drawn either functionally or from patterns in the observed phenomena. The scope for either of these possibilities is very restricted when it comes to differentiating between status and prestige, since the same objects can be indicators of both. It is a matter of judgement, but the answers can be very different depending on regional or even local circumstances and the data therefore do not yield any clear patterns. There is no doubt that the approach adopted by Schumann is the correct one, even if individual interpretations certainly leave room for debate.

The work comprises a comprehensive text, very detailed footnotes and a brief but adequate compilation of the archaeological sources in the form of lists and tables. The text contains a great deal of extraneous detail, which swells it considerably, but does make information available where it can be useful.

This volume shows the direction in which German-language Iron Age research is currently developing, based on the comprehensive publication of material which has been its great strength over the past 50 years. The tradition of material-based research is being carried forward by Schumann and others, making purposeful use of the material published in recent decades. Moreover, based on a confident and profound knowledge of the theoretical and methodological background, research history is being critically examined and new approaches developed, with an open mind regarding the potential results these could achieve. Unpolemical, yet still espousing firmly-held opinions, these studies are energetically taking issue with untenable premises and overblown generalisations. These are also the strengths of Schumann's work; strengths which provide a clear answer to the question posed at the start of this review. Yes, it is possible to come to new conclusions and this volume definitely does not offer old content in new packaging. Instead, it presents an original research approach successfully pursued.

The work radically questions the basis of Iron-Age social archaeology, submitting it to a systematic analysis. The results, above all the conclusion that prestige clearly played a much greater role than status, will have a lasting impact on social archaeology. When Schumann concludes his remarkable study with the words that we are only at the start of our investigation of the social structures of the Hallstatt period, this is surely a realistic assessment, with which we can only agree. It is to be hoped that it will be continued with the same systematic approach, care and open-mindedness that characterises Schumann's work.

Translated by Sandy Hämmerle.

D – 24118 Kiel
 Johanna-Mestorf-Straße 2–6
 E-Mail: oliver.nakoinz@ufg.uni-kiel.de

Oliver Nakoinz
 Institut für Ur- und Frühgeschichte
 Christian-Albrechts-Universität

GEORG TIEFENGRABER / KARIN WILTSCHKE-SCHROTTA, Der Dürrenberg bei Hallein. Die Gräbergruppe Hexenwandfeld. With a contribution by Mona Abd El Karem. Dürrenberg-Forschungen volume 7. Verlag Marie Leidorf, Rahden / Westf. 2014. € 54.80. ISBN 978-3-89646-757-7. 260 pages with 102 (primarily coloured) illustrations, 16 tables, 43 plans incl. 53 plates, and 7 inserts.

The publication of the “Hexenwandfeld” is the seventh of ten volumes of “Dürrenberg-Forschungen” (Dürrenberg Studies) issued by now. It belongs to the section “Grave Studies” (“Gräberkunde”) – one of four sections, next to “Mining”, “Natural sciences” and “Settlement” – which also incorporates the grave groups of “Kammelhöhe” and “Sonneben” (published in 2012), “Moserfeld-Osthang” (published in 2012), “Lettenbühl” and “Friedhof” (published in 2015) and “Römersteig” (published in 2015).

The introduction (pp. 9–15) by Georg Tiefengraber already shows clearly that the “Hexenwandfeld” has a long and inhomogeneous research history. Therefore, volume 7 of “Dürrenberg-Forschungen” pursues two major aims: On the one hand, it focuses on the revision of the eastern grave group situated in the forest – the “Hexenwandwald” –, excavated early on and published in “Dürrenberg-Forschungen” 1 and 2. Further information is added by new excavations as well as by the results of physical anthropology and archaeozoology. On the other hand, the volume focuses on the 22 graves excavated in the 1990s in a meadow area, the so-called “Hexenwandwiese”. For reasons of manageability, both areas are united under the term “Hexenwandfeld”. Altogether, 29 graves with at least 72 burials are known by now, including the old finds from the 19th century.

None of the persons involved in the writing of this volume took part in the excavations – however, one has to agree with Tiefengraber that this distance also permits a more neutral, critical scrutinisation of the documentation. The participation of the anthropologist Karin Wiltschke-Schrotta on all volumes of the section “grave studies” is supposed to direct the different authors to a compatible “*modus operandi*” (p. 13).

Chapter 2 (pp. 16–21) deals with “Methodical and Source-critical Preliminary Notes”. Due to the chequered excavation history of the “Hexenwandfeld”, we are dealing with an inhomogeneous documentation. There are descriptions of the archaeological record from the early excavations conducted by Olivier Klose 1928–1932, but no drawings exist. During the excavation of grave XVI (later grave 112), the one with the famous bronze beak-spouted jug (“Schnabelkanne”), photo-