Sehr gut bebildert ist diese Publikation ein Musterbeispiel dafür, wie vielschichtig, kenntnisreich und detailliert heute Auswertungen von paläolithischen Fundstellen sein können. Natürlich gibt es hier und da kleine Kritikpunkte, etwa wenn auf den Kartierungen der Kunst Fundstellen fehlen, die man hätte kennen können. Außerdem (lieber Romain Pigeaud, bitte nicht böse sein) hat uns die Bearbeitung der Kunst der Grotte des Gorges in Amange gelehrt, dass vermutlich nicht jede der vorgelegten Nachzeichnungen der Gravierungen absolut für bare Münze zu nehmen ist. Hier scheint oft der Wunsch Vater des Gedankens zu sein, zum Beispiel können wir bei der Interpretation der vermeintlichen Frauendarstellung nicht ganz folgen. Insgesamt möchten wir dieses sehr schöne Buch nur aus vollen Tönen loben. Natürlich wird es im deutschsprachigen Raum, wo es kein Solutréen gibt, nicht gerade zu einem Bestseller werden; das ist aber nicht die Schuld der Autorinnen und Autoren. Ich denke, dass die vorliegende Publikation mit vereinten Kräften die Grenze dessen erreicht, was heute in der Auswertung einer Fundstelle wissenschaftlich erreichbar ist. Wenn dann dennoch hier und da ein schales Gefühl verbleibt, was mit dieser nun doch sehr naturwissenschaftlich orientierten Vorgehensweise erreichbar ist und was eben nicht, liegt dies vermutlich in der Natur der Sache. Mir vermittelt diese Art von Publikationen zuweilen den Eindruck einer gewissen Uniformität, wie man die Dinge eben heute zu machen habe. Ein wenig mehr Mut, auch einmal unkonventionelle Wege in den Methoden und im Stil zu wählen, würde gut tun.

DE–72070 Tübingen
Schloss Hohentübingen
Burgsteige 11
harald.floss@uni-tuebingen.de
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3256-5156

Harald Floss
Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen
Institut für Ur- und Frühgeschichte
und Archäologie des Mittelalters Abteilung
Ältere Urgeschichte und Quartärökologie

Juraj Pavúk / Aneta Bakamska, Die neolithische Tellsiedlung in Gălăbnik. With a contribution by Elka Christova Anastasova. Mitteilungen der Prähistorischen Kommission volume 91. Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna 2021. € 169.00. ISBN 978-3-7001-8557-4 (Paperback). € 135,20. ISBN 978-3-7001-8924-4 (E-book). 435 pages, numerous black-and-white and colour figures.

More often than not, the application of novel methodologies in archaeology depends on well documented and published materials from museum collections rather than on new field research. In times when legacy data is becoming increasingly important in research, the long-awaited publication of key archaeological assemblages from the Neolithic site of Gălăbnik in western Bulgaria is both timely and pertinent.

The Neolithic settlement mound of Gălăbnik is located in the valley of Struma in southwest Bulgaria, about 50 km south of the capital city of Sofia. Gălăbnik has been a well-known site for decades. Excavations at the Neolithic site took place in 14 excavation campaigns and were concluded in 1993. Since then, a number of articles have been published on different aspects of its material culture, economy and on its place in debates about the introduction and spread of farming in southeast Europe (M. Čochadžiev, Neolithische Tellsiedlung bei Gălăbnik in Westbulgarien (Grabungsbericht der Jahre 1980–1982). Slovenská Arch. 32, 1984, 195–228; J. Pavúk / A. Bakamska, Beitrag der Ausgrabung in Gălăbnik zur Erforschung des Neolithikums in Südosteuropa. In: S. Bökönyi [ed.], Neolithic of Southeastern Europe and its Near Eastern Connections. International Conference Szolnok-Szeged. Varia Arch. Hungarica 2 [Budapest 1989] 223–231; J. Pavúk / A. Bakamska, Typologie und Stratigraphie der verzierten monochromen Keramik aus

der neolithischen Tellsiedlung in Gălăbnik. In: St. Hiller / V. Nikolov [eds], Karanovo 3. Beiträge zum Neolithikum in Südosteuropa [Vienna 2000] 263–272).

Gălăbnik is no doubt one of the key sites for understanding the Early Neolithic period in southeast Europe. It is located in a main geographic corridor leading from the Aegean into the interior of the Balkans and has a well-preserved and long stratigraphic sequence dating to the very beginning of the Neolithic period (the early centuries of the 6th millenium BC) in this part of Europe. The idiosyncratic pottery assemblage from its early occupation levels, the so-called "Gălăbnik group", plays a central role in discussions about relative chronology and culture history in the Balkans (J. Pavúk, Die Entstehung und Gliederung der neolithischen Kulturen auf dem Zentralbalkan: Fallbeispiel Gălăbnik. In: Ch. Todorova et al. (eds), The Struma / Strymon River Valley in Prehistory [Sofia 2007] 165–174). Perhaps most importantly, Gălăbnik is one of the very few Early Neolithic villages in this pivotal region that have been investigated through open-area excavations. And with the publication of the present site-based monograph, Gălăbnik is now the only comprehensively published site among these early settlements.

The material culture of Gălăbnik is presented in its full spectrum (pottery, small finds of clay, bone tools, polished stone artefacts), the only missing category is the chipped stone industry. However, rather than comprehensively presenting all primary data, the chapters on different categories of artefacts focus on the results of their typological analysis and their comparisons with materials from other synchronous sites. Indeed, the book is not intended as a fully-fledged site monograph. It does not feature specialist reports on botanical and faunal remains or radiocarbon dating, neither does it include catalogues of archaeological contexts and finds. Its two main aims instead are to present the results of typo-chronological analysis of material culture, anchoring Gălăbnik in space and time, and to explore the implications of this analysis for the timing and mechanisms of farming expansion in the Balkans. Given the 30 years since the end of the excavations and the fact that Juraj Pavúk turned 85 recently, the result is an admirable contribution to Neolithic research.

In relation to its main aims, the Gălăbnik monograph is divided into two parts. The first part (chapters 1–6, 286 pages) presents the history of the site, the excavation methodology as well as the archaeological contexts, architectural remains and artefacts. The second part (chapters 7–12, 97 pages) situates the material culture of Gălăbnik in its broader setting and explores the results of its typological analysis and classification for solving a major historical problem – the emergence of the first farming societies in southeast Europe.

Chapter 1 "Introduction" (pp. 21–66, 46 pages) presents the history of the archaeological investigations at the settlement mound of Gălăbnik. The Early Neolithic settlement was recognized in 1975 by Mikhail Čochadžiev from the Historical Museum in Pernik, who also undertook the earliest rescue and test excavations at Gălăbnik in 1979. The settlement site proved to be extremely promising, boasting an exceptionally long stratigraphic sequence of Early Neolithic layers with characteristic white-painted pottery, followed by materials with parallels in the central Balkan "Starčevo group". Systematic excavations began in 1980 under the direction of M. Čochadžiev (Historical Museum in Pernik) and J. Pavúk (Archaeological Institute of the Slovak Academy of Sciences in Nitra). Following the sudden and unexpected death of Čochadžiev, Aneta Bakamska from the Historical Museum in Pernik co-directed the excavations from 1986 to 1993. After briefly presenting the excavation areas and activities in the different campaigns between 1979 and 1993, chapter 1 provides information about the development of the settlement and situates Gălăbnik within the Early Neolithic settlement system of the Upper Struma valley and its neighbouring regions. The most important synchronous sites in the Upper Struma and Radomir valleys, Kjustendil and Sofia basins, and in the Skopje area, are briefly presented. This is followed by a description of the stratigraphy and the architectural remains at Gălăbnik according to habitation

levels ("construction horizons"). The stratigraphic sequence encompasses 5 m of cultural strata, from which six levels (I–VI) were attributed to the "Gălăbnik group" and four levels (VII–X) to the "Starčevo group". The authors observe that houses were demolished and re-built on the same spot over and over again, and assume that such episodes of destruction and rebuilding took place simultaneously over the whole settlement area. A remarkable achievement of the Gălăbnik expedition was the excavation of cultural strata below the ground-water level. This work involved huge efforts which paid off by the recovery of amazingly well-preserved wooden artefacts. Chapter 1 includes a number of black-and-white and colour photographs of the excavation areas as well as clearly drawn plans of the architectural remains from the different levels of occupation.

Chapter 2 "Pottery of the Gălăbnik Group and Starčevo culture" (pp. 67–188, 122 pages) is the most extensive chapter and the central piece of the book. The ceramic technology at Gălăbnik, presented briefly at the beginning of this chapter, is relatively uniform across the occupation phases. The authors subdivide the ceramic material in three wares – fine, intermediate and coarse – and discuss their proportions within the pottery assemblages. The main part of this chapter deals with the forms and decoration of the ceramic vessels, presented in two units – Gălăbnik group and Starčevo. The typological analysis and classification of the ceramic material emphasises its chronologically sensitive features. The exceptionally rich ceramic assemblage from Gălăbnik is illustrated with numerous drawings and high-quality colour photographs.

Chapters 3–6 (pp. 189–286, 98 pages) are dedicated to various artefact categories, including unusual pottery vessels, anthropomorphic and zoomorphic figurines, pottery "altars" and various other small finds (clay seals, sling bullets, loom weights, tools of bone and antler, beads of stone and shell, wooden artefacts, polished stone tools). These chapters summarise the results of typological analysis, presenting a wealth of comparisons from other Early Neolithic sites in the wider area. Like in Chapter 2, the main focus is on the chronologically and culturally significant characteristics of the artefacts and on their potential to serve as "guide fossils" in a culture-historical framework.

The remaining chapters 7–12 (pp. 287–384, 98 pages) constitute the second, synthetic part of the book, which offers discussion and interpretation of the materials from Gălăbnik within their wider cultural context. This synthetic part starts with a detailed definition of the "Protostarčevo culture" (an overarching cultural unit comprising the Gălăbnik, Nevestino, Slatina groups and other synchronous phenomena) in chapter 7 and of the "Starčevo culture" in chapters 8–10. Chapter 11 deals with the spatial distribution of the defined archaeological groups and expands on the question of their origins. As it is impossible to discuss the full complexity of these issues here, I will only outline the authors' main theses. According to Pavúk and Bakamska, extensive and continuously occupied settlement mounds such as Gălăbnik indicate the existence of large and stable populations from the very beginning of the Early Neolithic period onwards. Such large populations, the authors argue, could hardly have emerged by means of colonisation. Cultural units such as the "Gălăbnik group" and other synchronous phenomena are clearly confined in space. Within the boundaries defined through pottery typology, one group follows the other forming a continuous regional cultural sequence. Based on these observations, the authors reject all models of population movement, such as immigration, demic diffusion, pioneer colonisation, "leapfrogging" and movable borders. Instead, they postulate that each cultural unit, defined by ceramic typology, has developed continuously within a demarcated territory and in relative isolation from the cultural units surrounding it. The gradual diffusion of ideas and technologies, as well as the exchange of goods and the transfer of agricultural practices between farmers and foragers, is therefore the only feasible mechanism for the dispersal of farming in southeast Europe. Based on the results of typological analysis and classification, the authors postulate that this technological transfer progressed in two chronological stages:

initial establishment of Early Neolithic groups in the southern and central Balkans (Stage 1), and subsequent spread of the farming technology towards the northern Balkans and the Danube basin (Stage 2).

These conclusions are predetermined by the theoretical framework and assumptions adopted by Pavúk and Bakamska. The investigations at Gălăbnik are firmly embedded in the culture-history paradigm. Similarities and differences in material remains, mainly pottery, are assumed to indicate spatial and temporal units, the so-called archaeological "cultures". The authors are fully explicit about their assumption that the Early Neolithic "cultures" defined on the basis of pottery typology and comparisons reflect "socially organised communities". How did these pottery assemblages *cum* societies originate? If each typologically separate assemblage demarcates a culturally distinct and spatially bounded farming society, then these cannot have feasibly emerged through colonisation. Consequently, the first farming societies in southeast Europe must have developed through adoption of farming by pre-existing local forager populations. This is a compelling and internally coherent model which nevertheless needs to be confronted with other lines of evidence, such as palaeogenomic and radiocarbon data. In fact, the most important contribution of the Gălăbnik monograph is the way it directly feeds back into debates that have been recently revolutionised by the application of novel and highly sophisticated interdisciplinary methodologies.

A fast-growing body of radiocarbon dates from Early Neolithic sites in southeast Europe allows to test the model of farming dispersal in two consecutive stages which is proposed in the Gălăbnik monograph on typological grounds. Already in 2002, Alasdair Whittle and colleagues observed with a small number of dated sites and radiocarbon dates that farming in the northern Balkans began around 6000 cal BC, more or less simultaneously with its onset in the central Balkans (A. W. R Whittle et al., In the beginning: new radiocarbon dates for the Early Neolithic in northern Serbia and south-east Hungary. Antaeus 25, 2002, 63–117). The recent publication of a large series of new radiocarbon dates from Serbia clearly supports this conclusion (M. Porčic et al., The timing and tempo of the Neolithic expansion across the Central Balkans in the light of the new radiocarbon evidence. Journal Arch. Scien. Reports 33, 2020, 102528. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jasrep.2020.102528). The combined old and new radiocarbon dates show a slight south-north gradient rather than a two-stage pattern. Importantly, a cluster of dates from Serbia falls between 6200 and 6000 cal BC (95 % confidence intervals), demonstrating that early farming sites on the Danube were not later than Gălăbnik and other "Protostarčevo" groups (such as Slatina). In fact, there is currently no direct radiocarbon evidence for a significant delay in the introduction of farming to central and northern Serbia. The first farming communities established themselves there as early as 6250–6200 cal BC and reached the Great Pannonian Plain by 6000 cal BC.

The demographic assumptions put forward in the Gălăbnik monograph also can be tested against the radiocarbon evidence. Techniques of geostatistical interpolation of ^{14}C dates allow to actually explore and measure oscillations in regional population sizes and their significance in processes of dispersal. Marc Vander Linden and Fabio Silva, for example, use radiocarbon dates to jointly investigate changes in speed and population size linked to the introduction of farming in the Balkans (M. Vander Linden / F. Silva, Dispersals as demographic processes: testing and describing the spread of the Neolithic in the Balkans. Phil. Transact. Royal Soc. B 376,1816, pArt. 20200231, 2020. doi: https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2020.0231). Their analysis of radiocarbon dates for the Mesolithic-Neolithic transition in the Balkans indicates the existence of a human dispersal process contemporary with the spread of domestic plants and animals. The summed density of radiocarbon dates shows that the main episode of growth began shortly before 6000 cal BC in the Danube basin. The dispersal across the Danube basin was spatially extensive and rapid, with early sites scattered over the entire area. The positive deviation of the empirical SPDs (summed probability

distributions) from the exponential model shows that the shift to farming was characterised by faster than predicted demographic growth, indicating that the expected demographic development of the local forager populations cannot account for the observed signal.

Finally, the thesis of dispersal through adoption ("technological transfer") of farming by forager groups in the Balkans is not corroborated by the palaeogenomic evidence. The genomic evidence for population movement in this region is of high resolution, sound and consistent (I. Mathieson et al., The genomic history of southeastern Europe. Nature 555, 2018, 197–203. doi: https://doi.org/10.1038/nature25778; A. Szécsény-Nagy et al., Tracing the genetic origin of Europe's first farmers reveals insights into their social organization. Proc. Royal Soc. B 282,1805, pArt. 20150339, 2015. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2015.0339). In southeast Europe, the advent of farming is clearly associated with a new genetic component, related to farming populations in the Aegean and ultimately to ancestral populations in Anatolia. The evidence for genetic admixture of incoming farmers and local foragers, in contrast, is insignificant. Thus, radiocarbon and aDNA data are mutually reinforcing, adding to an even stronger case for population dispersal and colonisation at the dawn of farming in southeast Europe.

This brief discussion highlights the complexity and pertinence of the debates to which the comprehensive publication of Gălăbnik is contributing. The publication of primary archaeological materials and, above all, of models based on these materials are absolutely fundamental for the advancement of research on the spread of farming in Europe. In the coming years, we will be facing the challenge to test models developed within different theoretical frameworks and to juxtapose the results of different approaches to arrive at the most likely scenarios for this pivotal event in prehistory. These are exciting times for research on the farming dispersal in Europe.

AT–1190 Vienna
Franz-Klein-Gasse 1
maria.ivanova@univie.ac.at

Maria Ivanova
University of Vienna
Vienna Institute for Archaeological Science (VIAS)

Lamys Hachem (Hrsg.), Tinqueux « la Haubette » (Marne, France). Un site exceptionnel du Néolithique ancien. Mit Beiträgen von Lissandre Bedault, Solène Denis, Nicolas Fromont, Caroline Hamon, Yolaine Maigrot, Katia Meunier und Jean-Marie Pernaud. Archaeopress, Oxford 2021. £ 45,–. ISBN 978-1-78969-976-0 (Paperback). £ 0,–. ISBN 978-1-78969-977-7 (e-PDF). https://www.archaeopress.com/Archaeopress/download/9781789699760 (letzter Zugriff: 20.03.2023). 219 Seiten mit 92 Abbildungen und 30 Tabellen.

Die Vielzahl extensiver Präventionsgrabungen hat in den letzten Jahrzehnten in Frankreich, zumindest in den Regionen mit intensiver Bautätigkeit, zu einer beachtenswerten Verbesserung unserer Kenntnis der prähistorischen Zeiten geführt. Leider werden aus Zeit- und Kostengründen nur wenige dieser Rettungsgrabungen monographisch vorgelegt. Dies ist insofern vertretbar, als die Ausgrabungsleiter*innen verpflichtet sind, ausführliche Grabungsberichte abzugeben, in denen neben der üblichen Fund- und Befunddokumentation auch detaillierte Studien zu finden sind. In wenigen Jahrzehnten hat sich so eine beträchtliche Zahl zumeist qualitätsvoller Dokumentationen angesammelt, die als PDF-Dateien über Internet-Portale bzw. direkt bei den Autor*innen bezogen werden können. Dennoch ist es zu begrüßen, dass hin und wieder die Ergebnisse mancher Rettungsgrabungen synthetisiert werden und den Weg in eine klassische Publikation finden, wie dies der Fall bei der hier zu besprechenden Veröffentlichung ist.