

ancestor veneration. In contrast with the central functions of altars in the Greek world, the altars that have been found in inland contexts do not seem to have fulfilled such a central function. In fact full-blown Greek temple complexes are only found on important nodes in the inland infrastructural network and would have been important meeting places where all kinds of knowledge and goods were exchanged and political relationships forged. The presence of Greek architects and craftsmen at these places is more than likely.

The observed changes in material culture are, according to the author, nonetheless indicative of social and cultural change adding up to nothing less than a “Neue Welt” (p. 182) in which traditional lifeways and ritual behaviour had changed profoundly. Besides the evidence for physical changes in the settlement organisation, this is also substantiated by new funerary rites from as early as the start of the 6th century BC (from multiple depositions in chamber tombs to individual fosa-type graves, *enchytrismos* graves and sarcophagi, although their introduction was variable over time and space). The author describes the pace of changes in material culture, however, as “langsame Veränderung der sozialen Strukturen” (p. 186) but eventually leading to the breaking up of the extended families of the Iron Age that had lived in the traditional compounds and a shift towards a social organisation based on the nuclear family. New material expressions did, however, not imply that tradition was outrooted, as adduced by the author in various telling examples. Old ‘compounds’ became venerated places and the author shows how the role of memory in the interpretation of the archaeological record loomed large. The mentality of keeping tradition in esteem while innovating is nicely captured in the characterisation “Sowohl-als-auch”. In regard to this the archaeological record of Monte Polizzello and Sabucina appear in the hands of the author to be exceptionally strong case studies to study this phenomenon. The author ends her insightful book emphasising the heterogeneity of the inland settlements and their cult places as well as the multi-layered reality of cultural exchange. “So lässt sich die alte Welt von der neu entstandenen Welt nicht klar trennen, genauso wie die Grenzen zwischen Tradition und Innovation ineinanderfließen” (p. 193).

This book is a must for all those who engage in the archaeological study of ‘Religion in Action’.

NL-9712 ER Groningen
Poststraat 6
E-Mail: p.a.j.attema@rug.nl

Peter Attema
Groningen Institute of Archaeology

CHRISTIN KELLER, Die Rekonstruktion sozialer Gruppen der Hallstattzeit zwischen Enns und Donau. Eine statistische Analyse. Berliner Archäologische Forschungen volume 14. Marie Leidorf, Rahden / Westf. 2015. € 49.80. ISBN 978-3-89646-524-5. 378 pages with 403 illustrations and 1 table, 1 CD-ROM.

One of the main features of the central European Early Iron Age is the widespread occurrence of sumptuous burials. Size, layout, and grave furniture of those funeral monuments were readily considered to be an ostentatious reflection of social inequality. A socio-archaeological focus was traditionally laid on research on the apparently homogeneous West Hallstatt zone, whereas the highly differentiated East Hallstatt zone (“Osthallstattkreis”) remained a field of regional studies. Christin Keller wants to counteract this inequality in her supra-regional evaluation of burial remains in the eastern Hallstatt zone and, according to the title, aims at “the reconstruction of Hallstatt period social groups between Enns and Danube” (all transl. H. Wendling). She explicitly pursues “a statistical analysis” similar to other, recently published works (C. STEFFEN, Gesellschaftswandel während

der älteren Eisenzeit. Soziale Strukturen der Hallstatt- und Frühlatènekultur in Baden-Württemberg. *Materialh. Arch. Baden-Württemberg* 93 [Stuttgart 2012]; R. SCHUMANN, Status und Prestige in der Hallstattkultur. Aspekte sozialer Distinktion in ältereisenzeitlichen Regionalgruppen zwischen Altmühl und Save. *Münchner Arch. Forsch.* 3 [Rahden / Westf. 2015]). The book is a revised version of her doctoral thesis, which was submitted in 2014 at the Freie Universität Berlin and comprises text with 403 illustrations, and an enclosed CD-ROM. The latter holds the complete metadata (site and grave details, sex determination, and full inventories of graves or burials) in 1957 datasets as recorded by the author. This bonus both fosters traceability and provides valuable information and data for subsequent research.

The book is organised in three main parts: text, catalogue of sites, and tables. The vast amount of numbers and figures in these tables makes a concise reproduction of the data rather difficult. Some of them, as e. g. the ratio of anthropologically and archaeologically determined sexes in figures 168–171, might have gained by additional graphs.

The text is subdivided into 13 chapters and starts with an elaborate introduction into chronological, spatial, and cultural differentiation of the “Osthallstattkreis” (chapter 1, pp. 17–30). Apart from the desideratum to increase comprehensive studies on this cultural area, Chr. Keller formulates two fundamental prospects of her approach: it first “aims at developing preconditions for an incipient discussion of the socio-political structures and cultural traits of the Early Iron Age between Enns and Danube” (p. 17). In order to avoid a conventional, rather “intuitive” (*ibid.*) designation of distinct cultural units or groups, she employs statistical methods which have not been applied to the eastern Hallstatt zone to date.

Discussing earlier attempts, she offers a description of the separate cultural groups which constitute the eastern Hallstatt zone. This includes the “Kalendarbergkultur”, Horákov group, Sulmtal group and Martijanec-Kaptol, and different sub-groups in today’s Slovenia (p. 23–27). Minor clerical errors like “Ha B3” instead of an apparent “Ha D3” (p. 25) or missing verbs or reflexive pronouns (e. g. p. 37) may well be condoned. However, frequent slips of the pen (e. g. pp. 31–32: “einer Krankheit”; “semoitischer”; “Eingørdnetheit”) are irritating – even more so, if they include site names (p. 36: “des Mont Lassoirs”). Certainly, this does not depreciate the overall quality of this summary. However, some more plans and maps would have enhanced traceability of sites, rivers, and geographical names mentioned in the text. Again, the author stresses the complex chronological and spatial differentiation which exacerbates a concise analysis (p. 28). Thus, the area is heuristically regarded as a heterogeneous unit covering a relative timespan from Ha B3 to Ha D1/2, i. e. c. 880–550 BC (p. 29).

In chapter 2 (pp. 31–38), Keller addresses social-archaeological terminology and theory. A short presentation of socio-political models applied to the western Hallstatt zone is used for cross-cultural comparison (p. 31). She gives an elaborate account of the research history and controversy that unfolded around concepts such as “princely graves” and “princely seats” (pp. 35–38). Certainly, models derived from historical sources, sociology and cultural anthropology might have been assessed in more detail – the important economic approach by S. FRANKENSTEIN and M. J. ROWLANDS (The internal structure and regional context of early Iron Age society in South-Western Germany. *Bull. Inst. Arch.* 15, 1978, 73–112), although deliberately examining prestige goods economy, is not mentioned at all. After questioning the plausibility of interpretations of western Hallstatt societies as ranked or stratified societies, Big Man-societies, (hereditary) chiefdoms, or religious kingdoms, one would surely appreciate a firm stand taken by the author.

Initially, she broaches the issue of “identity as a background of social group definition” (pp. 31 f.). “Identity” is a multi-faceted, alternating entity which is both externally ascribed and

internally appropriated. To a certain degree, Keller seems to miss out some basic sociological and anthropological approaches (e. g. Bourdieu). Yet, she correctly addresses the potential of material culture as a means of identity-related cultural expression in mortuary archaeology. After a short account of processual, post-processual, and semiotic approaches to the significance of material culture in funerary context, she concludes in valid scenarios of testing archaeological classification of identities with external data (p. 32).

The differentiation of “status objects” and “prestige objects” is delicate and fundamental for studies of ancient sepulchral material culture. Frequent confusion and equation in archaeology is counteracted with a profound terminological discussion (p. 32 f.). Status objects display affiliation to a certain social group. Hence, they convey formalised meaning that is intelligible on a broader social level. Prestige goods, in contrast, act as mediators of intra-societal approval and thus operate on a distinct individual level. In funeral context both variables may overlap and thus blur the social position of the buried individual; combined quantitative and qualitative analysis helps to disentangle this intricacy. However, a precise distinction between both categories is not convincingly produced. Therefore, accuracy of discrimination, e. g. of weaponry, is complicated until the very last passages (p. 235).

In order to proceed, Keller formulates prospects of her analytical approach: “Whilst social reality cannot be directly inferred from a grave, its context may reproduce both the variability of socially legitimate status representation and individual treatment of the deceased” (p. 35). Divergent assignments of individual burials may be put in correct perspective on a broader level which integrates a range of burial phenomena: imminent social structures reproduce themselves in the funeral community as a whole – be it as a reflection of real, attributed, or pursued status.

The third chapter (pp. 39–41) gives a short critical assessment of the archaeological data and describes the criteria for the selection of the burials. The internal and external evaluation of the quality of burial structures and funeral inventories (e. g. undisturbed / disturbed archaeological record, documentation, publication, etc.) leads to a classification of several categories of grave features (p. 40 f.). The use of the German term “Fundqualität” (p. 41) according to the overall quality of the grave context might be misleading in the first place, but enables a distinction of three units. Only “Befundklasse 1” is sufficiently well preserved and documented to unanimously support statistical analyses.

The imperative spatial and temporal differentiation of the huge area that comprises the eastern Hallstatt cultural complexes follows in chapter 4 (pp. 43–50). A micro-regional approach is convincingly rejected in favour of an analysis combining small groups of burials with larger geographical entities. To some degree, these units correlate roughly with those cultural groups described in detail in chapter 1. In some cases, the integration of some rather isolated graves remains ambiguous: two minor clusters at the Drava-Danube confluence and in south-western Hungary are separately assigned to different major clusters (p. 44 f. figs 5; 6).

Chapter 5 (pp. 51–98) presents a detailed outline of the archaeological finds in grave context. Keller develops distinct categories according to functional and thematic criteria which are further substantiated with regard to particular object material. The description of the single categories includes spatial and chronological settings as well as previous socio-cultural interpretations (p. 51). As one of the main functional categories, “jewellery and elements of costume” are discussed in detail (pp. 51–54). However, a short review of the ethnological concept of “Tracht” (i. e. formalised traditional costume) and its challenges would have been appropriate regarding its fundamental role in social representation (e. g. K. VON KURCYNski, “... und ihre Hosen nennen sie bracas” – Textilfunde und Textiltechnologie der Hallstatt- und Latènezeit und ihr Kontext. *Internat. Arch.*

22 [Rahden / Westf. 1996] 81–84; St. BURMEISTER, Zum sozialen Gebrauch von Tracht. Ausagemöglichkeiten hinsichtlich des Nachweises von Migrationen. *Ethnogr.-Arch. Zeitschr.* 38, 1997, 177–203; S. BRATHER, Von der “Tracht” zur “Kleidung”. *Neue Fragestellungen und Konzepte in der Archäologie des Mittelalters. Zeitschr. Arch. Mittelalter* 35, 2007, 185–206). Minor inconsistencies regarding the use of the terms “prestige objects” and “status objects” (pp. 56; 59) do not fundamentally reduce the value of the classification. The frequent use of the term “Ton-” (i. e. “clay”; p. 67 f.) is in some way confusing. Most of the “Tonobjekte” (“clay-objects”) are in fact fired items and hence ceramics. Thus, the differentiation between ceramic balls, a ceramic prism, and an unfired trapezoidal clay object would be more tangible (p. 67 f.).

Ceramic and metal vessels are assigned to two different functional groups: Common ceramics (“Gebrauchskeramik”) represent the bulk of pottery in burials whereas special vessels (“Sondergefäß”) are classified separately (pp. 70–76). To a certain degree, this inhibits the danger of (quantitatively) anticipating the functional role of certain items and might thus distort a subsequent social interpretation. The same accounts for an implicit pre-interpretation of roasting spits, bronze vessels, and meat hooks, which supposedly were used in communal feasting, according to the author. However, the functional attribution to an elite *symposium* (p. 69) implies an assignment to a socio-functional context that prematurely surpasses a mere statistical assessment. Some other, mostly singular objects like bells, rattles, snail shells, keys or jingle bobs might have been summarised as amulets and thus eventually assigned to the class of cult objects (pp. 66–69; cf. L. PAULI, *Keltischer Volksglaube. Amulette und Sonderbestattungen am Dürrenberg bei Hallein und im eisenzeitlichen Mitteleuropa. Münchner Beitr. Vor- u. Frühgesch.* 28 [München 1975]).

Chapter 6 (pp. 99–139) describes the methods and mathematical premises which lead to a statistical distinction of archaeologically defined social groups. The itinerary consists of a multi-level approach that comprises several interlinked analytical steps (p. 100 fig. 44). The differentiation according to sex, gender, and – biotic and cultural – age forms the background of proceeding analyses and is well substantiated (pp. 99–103).

Chr. Keller’s statistical method fundamentally rests on two factors which can be mathematically deduced from the archaeological record. These factors are: 1. “Beigabewerte”; i. e. a numerical value assigned to every single group of objects that occur in funeral context. This implies a complex mathematical correlate of exclusiveness, variability, and ratio of object forms (p. 105). 2. “Inventarwert”; i. e. a numerical index value which is determined on basis of the associated objects in single graves. This index creates a relative hierarchy of grave units according to variability, different materials, and exclusiveness of grave inventories. The method is certainly well defined but quite sophisticated in terms of full traceability of mathematical procedures (p. 105 f.). The analysis was supported by the “statistical advisory team ‘fu:stat’ of the FU Berlin” (p. 17). Occasionally, ingenuous readers might wish to gain equal support, especially when it comes to statistical significance testing and the overwhelming presentation of data in tables and graphs (pp. 265–366).

A further step integrates the entirety of graves into a broader scheme of clusters according to associated functional object categories (p. 123 f.). Three subsequent statistical calculations (single-linkage, Ward’s procedure, and discrimination analysis) produce ten clusters of graves which are differentiated according to quality and quantity of object categories (pp. 123–139).

The regional analysis separately combines object values according to phasing of the burial, to sex and age of the deceased, in order to create distinct inventory indices of the graves associated in geographical units. This results in the quantification of graves according to statistically valid criteria and thus transcends any intuitive or selective approach. Irrespective of any palpable interpretation, this objectification represents the most sustainable and significant contribution of Keller’s

work. Further analysis enables a diachronic assessment of potential social structures and processes of social evolution. The ratio of “low-level indices or clusters” and “high-quality burials” allows for interpretations of highly differentiated, but gradually structured, non-ranked societies. Variation of “high-quality graves” is interpreted as a sign of hierarchisation and temporal establishment and concentration of elite power at single sites (p. 164). Analyses and interpretations of other geographical samples are presented accordingly and result in a comparative description of eastern Hallstatt social complexes and equivalents in the western Hallstatt zone (chapter 11; pp. 233–241). The statistical data substantiates certain aspects of elite representation, mirroring a martial ideology or the quantitative incorporation of “exotic” extra-cultural commodities (p. 235 f.). Moreover, the ideological role of gender-specific objects and the complementary social role of women and men can be further corroborated (*ibid.*). Both prestige goods and status objects convey social information and visualise power and social distinction in burial context. They contribute to the definition of “elite attitudes” (pp. 160; 183; 217–218). These can be distinguished in the different cultural areas according to the use of social markers and the “overprovision” and “over-sizing” of certain objects (p. 222). “Flexibility in object composition” and lack of regular furnishing (p. 237 f.) are regarded as a sign of social permeability. However, this might also be a statistical result of index-definition which always produces a continuous ascent without significant breaks.

Chr. Keller’s work combines different approaches to social differentiation of funeral remains. Qualification and quantification of material-index groups of grave inventories tend to objectify hierarchies of sepulchral entities. A further step employs multivariate analysis to develop clusters of graves which are interpreted as representations of distinct social (and identity) groups. The number and variability of social markers, i. e. prestige goods or status objects, eventually allows for a social definition of those different groups. Criticism on similar (statistical) approaches generating social hierarchies by ranking objectified qualities of material culture has occasionally been put forward. Matthias JUNG (*Zum Verhältnis hermeneutischer und statistischer Verfahren in ihrer Anwendung auf materielle Kultur. Rundbrief Theorie AG 2,2, 2003, 11–19, 15–16*) states that apparent objectivity of “material-imminent index-approaches” is inconclusive. In fact, social-index types rather result from prior subjective choice of objects, subjective classification, and mathematical miscalculation. The latter, he argues, inevitably implies a loss of semantic cultural information and thus inappropriately simplifies cultural conditions and blurs social relations (*ibid.* 13–15; 18). Admittedly, some aspects of Keller’s classification are prone to discussion and do not satisfactorily categorise material culture according to imminent social value. Furthermore, value as a culturally ascribed emblematic measure might not be adequately quantified. The vertical dimension of the indices might reflect hierarchical social grouping in ranked or stratified societies, but does not illustrate horizontal social differentiation beyond age or sex in equal measure, as the author suggests (p. 237). Even profession (i. e. tools) as one of many identity-related criteria is quite conventionally interpreted as a reflection of vertical social stratification (e. g. p. 221). Keller very briefly considers previous critique and argues that her approach is a reproducible approximation to an ancient reality. It thus represents an appropriate tool of classification both with regards to content and material (p. 106). However, a “thoughtful interpretation”, as Keller suggests, does not sufficiently dispel doubts about objectified statistical data.

The solid material and statistical basis established in this broad approach will undoubtedly stimulate further research. This should transcend common interpretations which were regularly suggested in previous “traditional” and “intuitive” approaches and indeed continuously turn up in the present work (pp. 233–241). Further investigation on indexed material culture of adjacent cultures might enhance knowledge on culturally specific object values and support cross-cultural comparison. Similarly, cultural anthropological data will confront social organisation of “living communities” with archaeological structures gained by statistical analysis. Hence, present models might

explain ancient, yet reconstructed patterns or at least serve as a means of testing preconceived interpretations. The present work offers a valid dataset not only for this purpose.

A-5400 Hallein
 Pflegerplatz 5
 A-5020 Salzburg
 Alpenstraße 75
 E-mail: holger.wendling@salzburgmuseum.at

Holger Wendling
 Keltenmuseum Hallein /
 Salzburg Museum

LUDWIG WAMSER, Mauenheim und Bargaen. Zwei Grabhügelfelder der Hallstatt- und Frühlatènezeit aus dem nördlichen Hegau. Compiled by Andrea Bräuning, with contributions by Wolfgang Löhlein, Corina Knipper, Marcus Stecher, Elisabeth Stephan and Joachim Wahl. *Forschungen und Berichte zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte in Baden-Württemberg* volume 2. Dr. Ludwig Reichert, Wiesbaden 2016. € 59.00. ISBN 978-3954902163. 500 pages with 58 plates, some in colour, 7 maps.

Excavations frequently have long trajectories from fieldwork to publication, particularly when they involve mortuary complexes with many burials and hundreds of skeletal and material remains. This 500 page comprehensive report of the excavations conducted in the important Hallstatt and early La Tène cemeteries of Immendingen-Mauenheim and Engen-Bargaen between 1958 and 1969 in the Tuttlingen and Konstanz districts of Baden-Württemberg is no exception. Twelve of the tumuli at Mauenheim were excavated by Edward Sangmeister and Rolf Dehn in 1957/58 and were initially published by Jörg AUFDERMAUER in 1963 (*Ein Grabhügelfeld der Hallstattzeit bei Mauenheim, Ldkr. Donaueschingen. Bad. Fundber., Sonderh. 3 [Freiburg i. Br. 1963]*). Ludwig Wamser's 1972 dissertation provided a comparative analysis of both cemeteries, including the first publication of the finds from the 1967–69 excavation seasons at Mauenheim and the 1969 investigation of Bargaen. Although frequently cited, for more than 40 years L. Wamser's groundbreaking discussion of chronology and mortuary ritual was represented by photocopied versions of the thesis that circulated within the scholarly community until Andrea Bräuning, past director of the State Monuments Office in Freiburg, took on the task of publishing it in its current form. A. Bräuning and Wolfgang Löhlein, who contributed a section on the socio-economic basis of the communities represented by the cemeteries as well as a discussion of their importance in early Iron Age scholarship, worked together with Ludwig Wamser on editing the original text. New contributions include specialist analyses that could not have been carried out 30 years ago but add materially to the scholarly value of the monograph: Marcus Stecher and Joachim Wahl (human osteology), Elisabeth Stephan (faunal analysis), Corina Knipper and Michael Maus (isotopic analysis), and a brief report on amber finds subjected to infrared spectroscopy by Curt W. Beck, C. Kuhbach and J. Ives. Research questions addressed by these reports include individual mobility, social organisation, especially gender and status configurations, mortuary ritual practice, and chronology.

The Mauenheim-Bargaen mortuary complex was one of the first to reveal the existence of burials between mounds and on the margins of Iron Age tumulus cemeteries, leading to the routine investigation of the terrain in the immediate vicinity of such sites. In addition, the burials of Mauenheim and Bargaen, which span a period of about 400 years, clearly did not belong to the "paramount elite" category and provided scholars with a better sense of the broad range of social personae existing in this region during the early Iron Age.