

in den beiden letztgenannten Beispielen wird eine frappierende Ähnlichkeit nicht nur der kulturgeschichtlichen Phänomene, sondern mehr noch der in den jeweiligen wissenschaftlichen *communities* diskutierten Fragestellungen und Deutungsansätze sowie deren forschungsgeschichtlicher Entwicklung deutlich. Ohne Zweifel würden von einer Weiterführung des hier begonnenen transdisziplinären Dialogs zum Thema „Diversität“ alle beteiligten Fachgebiete sehr profitieren.

Den Abschluss des Bandes bildet ein Aufsatz von John Barrett (S. 505–515), der unter dem programmatischen Titel „A Possible Political Structure for the Linearbandkeramik?“ versucht, ein interpretierendes Fazit zu ziehen. Was zunächst vielversprechend klingt, ist leider recht enttäuschend. J. Barrett verfolgt in rein deduktiver Manier Überlegungen zu einer neo-evolutionären „archaeology of life“, wobei die Bandkeramik lediglich als Projektionsfläche dient und ein Bezug zum Thema des Bandes wie auch zum allgemeinen wissenschaftlichen Diskurs der Bandkeramikforschung allenfalls auf sehr oberflächlichem Niveau hergestellt wird.

Der vorliegende Sammelband bietet einen Einblick in eines der zentralen Felder der Forschung zur Bandkeramik, ohne den Anspruch einer umfassenden und abschließenden Abhandlung zu verfolgen. Stattdessen will er den aktuellen Diskurs schlaglichtartig durch exemplarische Diskussionsbeiträge beleuchten und Perspektiven für neue Fragestellungen aufzeigen. Dies gelingt zum überwiegenden Teil; jedoch befassen sich leider nicht alle Aufsätze gleichermaßen eng mit dem Thema „Diversity in Uniformity“, wodurch das Profil des Buches etwas an Klarheit einbüßt. Da bei Tagungen und deren Veröffentlichungen eine gewisse thematische Unschärfe und qualitative Streuung der eingereichten Beiträge nie ganz zu vermeiden ist, kann dies den Herausgebern aber kaum angelastet werden. Das Buch stellt ohne Zweifel einen wichtigen Beitrag und eine Bereicherung der Diskussion dar und wird hoffentlich auch in der deutschsprachigen Archäologie und auch außerhalb des engeren Zirkels der Bandkeramikforschung breite Rezeption finden.

D-73728 Esslingen am Neckar  
Berliner Straße 12  
E-Mail: thomas.link@rps.bwl.de

Thomas Link  
Landesamt für Denkmalpflege im  
Regierungspräsidium Stuttgart  
Ref. 82 – Denkmalfachliche Vermittlung

**BRITTA RAMMINGER (ed.), Niederdorfelden "Auf dem Hainspiel". Eine (ganz normale) Siedlung der älteren bis mittleren Bandkeramik im hessischen Main-Kinzig-Kreis.** Universitätsforschungen zur prähistorischen Archäologie volume 274. Rudolf Habelt, Bonn 2015. € 85.00. ISBN 978-3-7749-3993-6. 408 pages, 1 supplement.

This book publishes the results of rescue excavations carried out in 2003–2004 on the Linearbandkeramik (LBK) site of Niederdorfelden "Auf dem Hainspiel", located just north-east of Frankfurt, on the southern edge of the Wetterau loess basin. Attracting settlement from the earliest stage of LBK expansion westwards across central Europe, this region is well known for its high density of sites. However, relatively few have been excavated and opportunities have never arisen for really extensive fieldwork of the kind undertaken in advance of open-cast mining on the Aldenhovener Platte or near Leipzig. Niederdorfelden ranks nonetheless as one of the largest LBK excavations in the region. As B. Ramminger stresses in the foreword, this monograph is the outcome of collaborative work, stemming from research seminars at Hamburg University and a number of masters' dissertations. The latter include the studies of houseplans, lithics, and bone / antler artefacts. The editor herself is the major contributor. The book ends with nineteen plates illustrating finds, followed by over 50 pages of appendices, mainly ceramic geochemical data and inventories of animal

bones and features. On the purely technical side, the volume is weakly bound with glue alone. This reviewer's copy came unstuck about halfway through, so libraries will have to invest in more effective binding if the book is to survive in paper form.

Chapters 1 and 2 (B. Ramminger, pp. 1–9) describe the local context and set out in honest terms the far from ideal excavation conditions, largely the result of the site being discovered after the start of construction work on a housing development, and the ensuing shortcomings in the detailed observation and recording of finds and features. Due to time constraints, many of the pits had to be dug by machine, which is regrettable but understandable in this situation. Despite the difficult conditions, a surface area of 1.2 ha was excavated, revealing 22 houseplans and a large number of pits producing about two tons of finds, including quite well preserved faunal remains. Surprisingly, no botanical samples were taken.

Chapter 3 (S. Kloth, pp. 11–70) describes and discusses features and houseplans. One is pleased to see that lateral pits ("Längsgruben") are given special attention and the author evokes the problem of their function and duration of fill. Information on finds distribution within the fills is largely missing here for reasons already mentioned, but at least the right questions are being asked. The discussion here relies almost entirely on the German literature. For the description of houseplans, the choice is made to use the Modderman and von Brandt classificatory systems (P. J. R. MODDERMAN, *Linearbandkeramik aus Elsloo und Stein*. *Analecta Praehist. Leidensia* 3 [Leiden 1970]; D. VON BRANDT, *Häuser*. In: U. Boelicke / D. von Brandt / J. Lüning / P. Stehli / A. Zimmermann, *Der bandkeramische Siedlungsplatz Langweiler 8, Gemeinde Aldenhoven, Kreis Düren*. Rhein. Ausgr. 28, 1 [Köln 1988] 36–289). Ten houseplans are considered sufficiently complete to be attributed to Modderman's types and all are classed as type 1 (mostly 1b). In some cases, for example houses 2, 3 and 12, this attribution is debatable. One could also argue that the assignment of the 42 m house 1 and the 17 m house 4 to the same 'type' does not make much sense in terms of the overall interpretation of the settlement, since major variation in house length is surely the key issue here. The data presentation could have been improved by illustrating all the houseplans in the text at the same scale and it would have been helpful to have indicated the house numbers on the 1 : 500 general plan of the site!

Chapter 4 (A. Markus, pp. 71–84) deals with so-called "Schlitzgruben" and includes an overview of functional hypotheses. It is interesting to note here that these features reflect activity on the settlement area after the houses had been abandoned. A possible function is suggested for damp storage of light branches, for use in building walls and / or ovens.

Chapter 5 (B. Ramminger and collaborators, pp. 85–114) analyses the ceramic finds, comprising over 19 000 sherds for a total weight of 282 kg. Altogether, 4215 vessel units were identified. The study examines successively preservation, vessel shape and wall thickness, decoration and technological attributes, limited here to surface treatment and tempering materials. The preservation and fragmentation of sherds in relationship to the various kinds of feature is analysed in some detail, concluding that there are no significant differences here between lateral pits and other pits in this respect. Vessel shape and decoration are described using the system well-established for LBK sites in Germany (for example: J. KNEIPP, *Bandkeramik zwischen Rhein, Weser und Main*. *Studien zu Stil und Chronologie der Keramik*. *Universitätsforsch. Prähist. Arch.* 47 [Bonn 1998]). Readers interested in ceramic chronology could be advised here to move straight on to Chapter 11, where seriations are presented and the site phasing is discussed. The section dealing with temper ("Magerung") is not easy to follow, partly because this term is not restricted to materials deliberately added to the clay by the potters, but also includes inclusions that are naturally present. All vessel units were examined macroscopically or at x 10 magnification. Basically, the study seems to distinguish two main kinds of ware, one finer and the other coarser. These are examined in relation

to the undecorated / decorated vessel categories, but it might have been useful to integrate vessel shape and size in the analysis as well. This remark also applies to the analysis of surface treatment. Finally, two shortcomings in the presentation of the ceramic data must be underlined. The first is that relatively few vessels are actually illustrated. Plates 1–9 contain a ‘selection’ of 69 vessel units, but no selection criteria are mentioned. Why for example is only one vessel illustrated from feature 378 (plate 3) and none at all from feature 540? These pits provided two of the largest ceramic assemblages on the site. The second shortcoming is that the publication does not provide a systematic inventory of vessel units. Some quantitative data on decoration motifs can be found in tables in Chapter 12, but a complete list of vessels with their contexts and typological / technological attributes ought to have been included as an appendix. Surely this information is at least as worthy of publication as the mass of ceramic geochemical data listed at the end of the book!

Chapter 6 (B. Ramminger, pp. 115–137) presents the results of geochemical analysis (X-ray fluorescence) on a sample of 100 vessel units and petrographic analysis (thin-sections) of 30 units. Most of the vessels sampled are finer wares. A few fragments of burnt daub were analysed as well. The main conclusion is that at least two local clay sources were exploited off-site, with the loessic subsoil available on-site being mainly used for daub. Only three of the vessel units sampled were made from an exogenous clay source. Interestingly, these three decorated vessels all appear local in stylistic terms. Another conclusion, incidentally clarifying the section on “Magerung” mentioned in the previous chapter, is that the finer wares mostly contain no added temper, although grog or plant temper was occasionally observed.

Chapter 7 (A. Markus, pp. 139–190) tackles the difficult task of studying all categories of lithic finds, dealing successively with adzes, querns, polishers / abraders, hematite fragments and, last but not least, small knapped stone artefacts. A thorough description is provided in the text for all this material, together with many tables showing data on numbers, weight and dimensions. Grindstones and polishers are made from several varieties of sandstone, as well as from basalt. For both materials, the probable sources lie within 30 km of the settlement. Adze raw materials are treated separately in Chapter 8 (pp. 191–199). Most small knapped artefacts are in quartzite locally available in alluvial terraces, although there is some flint, including a few pieces identified as the Rijckholt variety. Very few of the grinding and polishing tools are illustrated. Adzes and adze fragments are illustrated by black and white photographs in plates 11 and 12. Only one side of each artefact is shown and no profiles have been drawn. Knapped stone artefacts are simply illustrated in the text with over-reduced black and white photographs, which will be of little use to lithics specialists. Thus, the quality of the illustration here is often below the standard one would expect for a publication of this kind.

Chapter 8 (B. Ramminger, pp. 191–199) provides a geochemical study of the adzes, again using X-ray fluorescence. Three out of 29 adzes are identified as amphibolite, probably from regional sources in the hills to the South-East of the Wetterau basin. The others are determined as actinolite-hornblende-schist. The probable sources are either the east Bavarian Fichtel mountains or the Jizera range on the northern Czech border. The latter source is considered more likely, as extraction sites dating to the LBK have been found there.

Chapter 9 (J. Ewersen, pp. 201–231) reports on the faunal remains, as well as a small number of human bone fragments. Preservation was generally quite good, but recent breakage (presumably due to machine digging of pits) brought the identification rate down to around 20 %, with a total of almost 1600 bones identified to species. All are listed in an appendix. The largest number of bones are of cattle, although it was often not possible to distinguish domestic from wild. The same applies to pig, in second position, followed closely by sheep / goat. There is a wide range of wild animals, predominated by red deer and including beaver and wild-cat. A few bird and fish bones

are reported too. As can be seen elsewhere in LBK contexts, slaughter patterns generally reveal an emphasis on younger animals for cattle and pig, and rather older individuals for sheep / goat. However, the lengthy bibliography listed with this chapter includes very little reference to comparable work on LBK fauna, whether carried out in Germany or elsewhere.

Chapter 10 (M. Wilke, pp. 233–262) examines the bone, antler and tooth artefacts, the latter including one or two ornaments. Unlike the previous chapter, reference is made to some comparable studies on other LBK sites. A small proportion of the material is identified as waste from bone tool manufacture. Identifiable bones are predominately from sheep / goat. The most common tools are points on split metapodials. Larger bone tools include an axe or pick with shaft-hole partly preserved. Another large and apparently unfinished hafted implement is made from red-deer antler. The study is noteworthy for use-wear analysis of a selection of the bone tools, with leather-working featuring prominently in the interpretation. In comparison with Chapter 7, the overall quality of the illustration is much improved, with drawings and / or black and white photographs of the whole corpus of over 90 objects in plates 13–18. Specialists would no doubt recommend that transverse sections could usefully be added to many of the drawings. Examples of use-wear are illustrated by colour photographs.

Chapter 11 (B. Ramminger, pp. 263–281) investigates the spatial structure and chronological development of the settlement. The interpretative framework preferentially applied in this study is the yard (“Hofplatz”) model, well-known to LBK research in Germany (U. BOELICKE / D. VON BRANDT / J. LÜNING / P. STEHLI / A. ZIMMERMANN, *Struktur und Entwicklung des Siedlungsplatzes*. In: U. Boelicke et al., *Der bandkeramische Siedlungsplatz Langweiler 8, Gemeinde Aldenhoven, Kreis Düren. Rhein. Ausgr. 28, 1 [Köln 1988] 891–913*). Chronological sequence is established in classic manner through seriation of pits using ceramic decoration attributes, combined with analysis of the relationships between features, whether actually observed as inter-cuts or deduced from the spacing of features relative to one another. Around 90 pit assemblages, including most of the lateral pits, were seriated with correspondence analysis. A seriation integrating other sites from Hessen showed that the Niederdorfelden sequence begins in the earlier LBK (Flomborn stage, Meier-Arendt II), with a majority of pits dating to the middle LBK (Meier-Arendt III) and a few outliers in the later LBK (W. MEIER-ARENDRT, *Die Bandkeramik im Untermaingebiet [Bonn 1966]*). Further correspondence analyses were performed on the Niederdorfelden pits alone, the main factor plots being illustrated in over-reduced form (figs 11.2–11.4). No contingency tables are provided, so the basic dataset is unavailable to the reader. The seriation results enable pits to be attributed to five ceramic phases, numbered IIa, IIb, IIIa, IIIb, IV for coherence with the Meier-Arendt scheme. Ten houses can be dated by their lateral pits. The remaining houses are attributed a chronological position as best as possible, mostly on the basis of spatial relationships between features. The whole sequence of houses is divided into four main phases (termed house generations), two of which are sub-divided as there are structures considered too close to be strictly contemporary. The house generations are thus numbered 1, 2, 3a, 3b, 4a, 4b. All the well-dated houses belong to generations 3 and 4. In a final interpretation, all but four of the 22 excavated houseplans are grouped spatially into four possible “Hofplätze”, each occupied continuously through the four phases. Although one might not necessarily find this last interpretation pertinent, the chronological sequence is generally convincing. Table 11.2 summarises the dating evidence, but it would have been helpful to have also shown the ceramic phases here. Ultimately, the main chronological difficulties arise from the houses either with no identifiable lateral pits or with pits containing very low numbers of decorated ceramics. Looking at the evidence in detail, one might question the dating of houses 10 and 15. House 10, attributed tentatively to house generation 2, is closely flanked to the east and west by pits (features 372 and 355) which are not interpreted here as lateral pits but contain ceramic finds dating to ceramic phases 3 and 4. House 15 is attributed to

house generation 4 on the basis of ceramics from a pit (feature 842) that is located some distance to the west of the house and is very clearly not one of its lateral pits. Of course, a further difficulty stems from the unknown extent of the site. The settlement could well extend some distance beyond the southern edge of the excavated area. This drawback also affects the studies described in the next chapter.

Chapter 12 (B. Ramminger, pp. 283–313) analyses the distribution of all categories of finds. Initially, the overall distribution of finds is examined in relation to categories of feature, opting for numbers rather than weights and for raw counts rather than density calculations using pit volume. The results are not particularly conclusive. A possible production area for different categories of lithic artefacts is identified in the central part of the excavated area on the basis of quantities of finds and manufacturing waste in features 378 and 395, neither of which are lateral pits. The dating evidence suggests that this activity was in fact taking place after nearby houses had been abandoned. A substantial part of this chapter, however, is devoted to a detailed comparison of house inventories (as represented by houses with lateral pits), looking successively at ceramic decoration motifs, animal bones, lithic artefacts and bone / antler tools. The hypothetical "Hofplätze" are brought into the discussion as well. This is arguably the most original part of the whole publication, not only drawing on all the material described separately in previous chapters, but also raising issues of social and economic nature. Ceramic decoration, for example, is examined as a possible indicator of relations between households. Here, secondary motifs are especially interesting, although only seven houses could be compared. Table 12.3 lists secondary motifs by house, as an ordered qualitative matrix. This shows that over half of these motifs are house-specific. As underlined in the text, two pairs of chronologically successive houses (1, 5; 4, 6) have the most motifs in common, and as each pair is located in a different "Hofplatz", this would suggest some continuity in tradition across generations within the "Hofplätze". On the other hand, a third pair of chronologically successive buildings, the so-called 'twin-houses' 2 and 3, have no secondary motifs in common with one another, nor with any other house, despite their close proximity within the same "Hofplatz". The main decoration motifs are significantly more variable and more houses can be compared. However, there is little evidence here for "Hofplatz"-related particularities and the discussion shifts more towards chronological questions. The comparison of faunal remains is limited by the relatively low numbers of identified bones available for most houses. The two largest inventories (houses 1 and 12) hint at differences in consumption of sheep / goat and pig. No significant differences between houses emerge from data relating to lithic and bone / antler artefacts, suggesting that households were more or less autonomous units in this respect.

Chapter 13 (B. Ramminger, pp. 315–326) concludes the publication by addressing the question of the status of the site in terms of regional settlement organisation and lithic distribution networks. The lithic evidence offers an intriguingly contrasting picture, with predominant use of local quartzite for knapped stone tools, very minor import of flint from the west and major reliance on long distance networks to the east for adze blades. In the absence of evidence for earliest LBK features on the site, Niederdorfelden cannot be seen as a pioneer settlement. Furthermore, as the occupation appears to be relatively short-lived and there is no evidence for special activities relating, for example, to surplus lithic production, Niederdorfelden is not seen as a 'central place' in the local settlement hierarchy. Although there are three LBK settlements with ditched enclosures within 10 km of the site, no traces of a massive feature of this kind were observed at Niederdorfelden.

One finally realises here why the title of the book refers to a 'quite normal' settlement. Most researchers would agree, however, that it will be through the repeated excavation and analysis of 'normal' sites of this kind, in different regions of Europe, that progress will be made in understand-

ing how the LBK world functioned. Thus, B. Ramminger and her team must be congratulated on this monographic publication that undoubtedly represents a significant contribution to knowledge of LBK settlement at regional level.

F-92023 Nanterre  
23 Allée de l'Université  
E-Mail: michael.ilett@univ-paris1.fr

Michael Ilett  
Université Paris 1 – Panthéon-Sorbonne  
UMR 8215 Trajectoires  
Maison de l'Archéologie et de l'Ethnologie

**ANDREA ZEEB-LANZ (Hrsg.), Ritualised Destruction in the Early Neolithic. The Exceptional Site of Herxheim (Palatinate, Germany).** Forschungen zur Pfälzischen Archäologie Band 8,1. Generaldirektion Kulturelles Erbe, Direktion Landesarchäologie, Außenstelle Speyer, Speyer 2016. € 39,90. ISBN 978-3-936113-09-9. 152 Seiten, 139 Tafeln, durchgängig farbig.

Es ist der wohl berühmteste Fundplatz der Linearbandkeramischen Kultur (kurz Bandkeramik, LBK). Über kaum einen anderen wurde und wird so kontrovers debattiert wie über die Grubenanlage von Herxheim in Rheinland-Pfalz. Die herausragende Sonderstellung Herxheims ergibt sich aus den Tausenden, überwiegend zerschlagenen Menschenknochen und Artefakten, die sich, meist als Fundkonzentrationen (darunter auch mehrere Schädelkalotten), in den beiden Grubenwerken fanden, die die Siedlung ringförmig umgaben. In jüngster Zeit sind nun zwei umfangreiche Publikationen zu Herxheim erschienen. Das von Andrea Zeeb-Lanz herausgegebene Buch wird im Folgenden besprochen. Dabei wird auch das bereits 2015 veröffentlichte Buch von Bruno BOULESTIN und Anne-Sophie COUPEY (*Cannibalism in the Linear Pottery Culture. The Human Remains from Herxheim [Oxford 2015]*) in die Rezension mit einbezogen.

Das vorliegende Buch ist das erste von bisher zwei geplanten Monografien zu Herxheim. Der Titel „Ritualised Destruction in the Early Neolithic – The Exceptional Site of Herxheim (Palatinate, Germany)“ lässt inhaltlich eine Auseinandersetzung mit der ritualisierten Zerstörung menschlicher Überreste und Artefakte erwarten. Der Leser muss sich jedoch diesbezüglich noch bis zum Erscheinen des zweiten Bandes gedulden. Jenseits der zeitweise sehr angeregten Diskussion um das Thema Kannibalismus schafft der vorliegende Band somit zunächst Grundlagen.

Band 1 ist in drei große Kapitel unterteilt: In Kapitel 1 (S. 1–14) gibt A. Zeeb-Lanz einen Überblick zur Forschungsgeschichte des Fundortes. Den umfangreichsten Teil bildet der Beitrag von Fabian Haack in Kapitel 2 (S. 15–118), der hier die Ergebnisse seiner Dissertation zum Grubenwerk veröffentlicht, das aus sich überlappenden Langgruben besteht. Hierzu gehören ein umfangreicher Tafelteil mit zahlreichen Abbildungen der einzelnen länglichen Gruben (Grabenabschnitte) und einer Auswahl von Funden (überwiegend Keramik) sowie Tabellen mit Fundauflistungen und der Aufstellung von Zusammengehörigkeiten und Anpassungen von Funden aus den einzelnen Grabenabschnitten. Beigefügt sind der Monografie Pläne der Plana und Profile der Grabenabschnitte bzw. Langgruben. Abschließend stellt A. Zeeb-Lanz im dritten Kapitel (S. 115–153) eine Auswahl der Fundkonzentrationen vor, deren knappe Einordnung bereits die Interpretation und Bedeutung des Fundortes andeutet.

Die bandkeramische Siedlung mit Grubenanlage wurde im Zuge einer im Vorfeld von Bauarbeiten durchgeführten Rettungsgrabung vor etwa 20 Jahren entdeckt und teilweise untersucht. Anschließende Forschungsgrabungen wurden unter der Leitung von F. Haack zwischen 2005 und 2008 unternommen. Von A. Zeeb-Lanz wurde das Projekt Herxheim („Bandkeramische Siedlung mit Grubenanlage von Herxheim bei Landau [Pfalz]“) ins Leben gerufen, das von der Deutschen