

Es liegt in der Natur einer Tagung, dass sie ihr Thema nicht umfassend und systematisch ausleuchten kann, zumal die regionalen Forschungsstände sehr unterschiedlich sein können. Es zählt vielmehr, dass hier die archäologischen Schlüsselstellen der Eisenzeit, auf gesamtfranzösischer Ebene offenbar erstmals wieder seit 1982, zur Reflexion gebracht wurden. Die Bündelung dieses Fundus binnen zweier Jahre in dieser Form ist eine hervorragende Leistung und Ausweis einer in jeder Hinsicht die Aufmerksamkeit verdienenden Forschungslandschaft. Chapeau!

DE – 54295 Trier  
Am Herrenbrünnchen 73  
hans.nortmann@outlook.com

Hans Nortmann

**JAN CHRISTOPH BREITWIESER, Frankfurt am Main-Harheim. Die hallstattzeitlichen Gräberfelder.** Erdverbunden. Aktuelle archäologische Forschung in Frankfurt am Main volume 1, edited by the Denkmalamt der Stadt Frankfurt am Main. Verlag Schnell + Steiner, Regensburg 2022. € 79.00. ISBN 978-3-7954-3782-4. 432 pages with 213 (primarily coloured) illustrations (plus colour photographs of the archaeological record in the catalogue), 125 tables, 3 plans, and 2 appendices (tables).

The book reviewed here is Jan Christoph Breitwieser's dissertation, which was submitted at the Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main in 2021 and awarded the Eduard Anthes Prize in 2023. It is the first volume in the newly founded series "Erdverbunden. Aktuelle Forschungen in Frankfurt am Main" published by the Monuments Office of the City of Frankfurt. The unusually timely publication must be emphasised – the work was already available just one year after submission. This is impressive, but perhaps a little more time should have been allowed for the final editing. There are only minor issues, albeit a handful: spelling mistakes, syntactical inconsistencies, inconsistent spelling or the use of old spelling. That brings us to the book itself.

It presents the two Hallstatt cemeteries Harheim-Nord and Harheim-Süd. The introductory chapter 1 (pp. 15–23) is devoted to a brief presentation of the aims (material presentation, [detailed] chronological classification, reconstruction of the burial sequences, determination of the chronological relationship between the necropolises, reconstruction of cultural contacts, and the social structure of those buried in the Harheim cemeteries; cf. also pp. 18f.) and emphasises the exceptional (in a positive sense) initial position, as "both necropolises are of particular importance for the study of Hallstatt burials due to their representative coverage and intactness" (p. 15; here as in the following, all literal quotations have been translated into English by the reviewer to the best of her knowledge). After a brief overview of the history of research on the Hallstatt period in the Frankfurt area, the first chapter concludes with a short topographical classification, the history of finds, the excavation and documentation techniques used, the nomenclature, the whereabouts of finds, and the soil-related preservation conditions, which cannot be described as anything other than poor. They have a negative effect on the preservation of the skeletons – a fact that has a considerable impact on the assessment of the burials. We will come back to this later.

Harheim-Nord yielded 25 burials from the Hallstatt period, and Harheim-Süd 17 Hallstatt burials, in addition to finds from other periods. Chapter 2 (pp. 24–168) begins with an introduction to Harheim-Nord. The author starts by familiarising the reader with the cemetery plan (p. 25

fig. 6). Here, as in the following diagrams, the areas excavated in advance of development work are highlighted in grey, revealing that it is hardly possible to speak of a coherent area that can be assessed with regard to the cemetery topography – several smaller and some larger areas have not been archaeologically excavated. The construction principles of the graves in Harheim-Nord are summarised (any mounding, circular ditches, grave pit size, pit depth, wooden fixtures). Both inhumation and cremation burials were found, with the former outnumbering the three cremation burials with 22 features. The orientation of the graves and the burials corresponds to that usual for the Hallstatt period. Here, as elsewhere, there are also burials with clearly flexed arms. J. Ch. Breitwieser explains this form of body staging as a “majestic gesture of the Early Iron Age elite”, without even referring to the existing debate about it (except for MÜLLER-SCHNEBEL 2008). This is followed by an examination of the cemetery structure. The spatial distance between the graves does not reflect the former cemetery topography – the grave groups A1 and A2, B and C are generated by the excavation activities and hardly correspond to an ancient reality. This makes the following discussions about occupancy dynamics methodologically difficult.

A larger section (pp. 36–146) is devoted to the finds. First, the items of dress (arm rings, anklets, neck rings, items of head dress, pins) are classified typo-chronologically and their comparative finds are presented. The bronze disc with pendant ensemble from grave 12, which is described in detail in its individual elements and whose comparative finds and possible cultural models are presented, should certainly be emphasised. The non-metallic items of dress include amber beads and rings, and glass beads; furthermore, several ensembles and individual parts of toilet utensils (‘ear spoons’, ‘nail cutters’, tweezers) were found, which are generally interpreted as items for personal hygiene. In addition to the typological classification, the position and manner of wearing, the function and, above all, the role as a gender-specific and status-indicating accessory are also examined. This is particularly important in the case of the sword from grave 13, which belongs to the Mindelheim type, and which is the only sword of the burial site. The organic remains found – textiles, wood, and feathers – are discussed by Elke Sichert in a separate article (pp. 424–432). In addition to the sword, several knives and an iron awl were found among the artefacts, as well as fragments of grinding stones, potential smoothing stones, and chunks of red clay. The ceramic artefacts make up the largest part of the finds. At least 88 vessels came from the 25 graves at Harheim-Nord. They are presented in terms of their location, quantity, production techniques, surface treatment and decoration, before being categorised typologically in detail. In fact, Breitwieser is to be agreed that there is no standardised nomenclature to date. He differentiates between conical-necked vessels, funnel-rimmed vessels, bowls, dishes, and beakers as basic forms. The height-width index, which he always determines, only allows conclusions about the chronological development of conical-neck vessels, not for other vessel types. With regard to the gender-specific relevance of the pottery, the insufficient number of vessels does not allow any further conclusions.

The next section is devoted to the “chronological classification and occupation phases in Harheim-Nord” (pp. 146–152). Assuming a “representative recording and uncovering of the cemetery”, Breitwieser’s aim is to take the first opportunity for Hesse to “carry out investigations into the chronology and occupation sequence of a Hallstatt cemetery” (p. 146). However, due to the enormous gaps in the excavated area, it must be asked whether the graves are representative at all and, if so, for what, since an undetermined and indeterminable number of graves are missing. On the other hand, I consider it methodologically very optimistic to be able to work out three occupation phases – and even sub-phases – from the small number of graves that can be determined with sufficient accuracy. Accordingly, I take a critical view on the reconstruction of the occupation sequence (cf. p. 148). In my opinion, dynamic processes cannot be adequately recorded. When reconstructing a sequence of burials and the spatial localisation of the respective graves, the question of the “relationship of

the single individuals to each other comes into focus” (p. 148). Whether the individual data of the Harheim burials are suitable for answering this question is something each reader must answer for themselves. I for myself am sceptical.

Finally, the author comes to the “hierarchical organisation” of the buried individuals (pp. 152–160) as reflected in the findings. It is assumed quite *a priori* that the grave goods indeed reflect *hierarchies*. There are, of course, other parameters which structure society, but the author apparently does not consider them worthy of discussion. In order to track down these hierarchies, a social index is calculated based on the parameters of burial pit size, number of non-ceramic grave goods, number of ceramic vessels, and diversity and exclusivity of the grave goods. What should actually be the *result* – that wealth, power, influence, and involvement in complex and far-reaching communication networks are reflected here – is taken as a *premise*. This is probably also due to the fact that there was no critical examination of the methodological pitfalls of a social index analysis. From the spatial distribution of the different status groups, Breitwieser draws the conclusion that “prosperity in Harheim-Nord increases over time and this is reflected in the material culture” (p. 156). Changing modes of representation, which change also elsewhere during the Hallstatt period, are not discussed, and the social ranking created and the subsequent tripartite division is therefore not surprising – it “results in [...] a clear social pyramid” (p. 161) with a “pyramid top”, an “upper middle class” and a “lower social level” (p. 160). I have rarely come across such an explicit revival of the premise ‘graves – mirror of life’ in recent times: The author sees the given items of dress as “material values *of life*” and the tools as “symbols about certain tasks or influence on production of goods *during life*” (p. 163; emphasis mine).

The first section concludes with remarks on anthropology (with a separate contribution by biologist Erwin Hahn, pp. 407–423). Some comments on the animal remains (p. 168), with which the presentation of the finds and features from Harheim-Nord ends, are preceded by a section on anthropology and archaeological sex determination (pp. 163–167). It is emphasised at the beginning that “for the first time in Hesse, it was possible to compare archaeological and anthropological sex determination” (p. 18). Apart from the fact that the data basis does not permit this in purely quantitative terms, a methodological discussion is required at this point. However, this is not done here or later. Instead, the individual from grave 11, anthropologically determined as »probably male«, is categorised as a woman on the basis of the grave goods (cf. also the comments on this by E. Hahn p. 410). By no means do I want to argue in favour of the biological data – on the contrary. But I would like to call for a differentiated discussion of complex interrelationships. There is not a single reference to the archaeological discourse on this topic that takes place in the discipline.

Chapter 3 (pp. 169–227) is dedicated to the Harheim-Süd cemetery and corresponds in structure to the model of Harheim-Nord. For this reason, a more detailed description can be omitted at this point; only individual points should be pointed out. In addition to features from other periods, including Urnfield period settlement features, the 17 graves from the Hallstatt period – this time ten inhumations and seven cremations – are of particular interest. In Harheim-Süd we again have widely separated areas (cf. p. 170 fig. 151), which in my opinion do not allow an assessment of the cemetery structure. Breitwieser, however, assumes that the structure of the burial ground can be assessed on the basis of the geomagnetic survey carried out in Harheim-Süd – about which he says earlier (p. 169) that it shows “a number of clear disturbances” and that only the circular ditches can be interpreted (p. 182). The cemetery could be considered “at least representatively recorded” (p. 182). Breitwieser works out group formations and understands them as a spatial reflection of social structures, especially family relationships (cf. p. 232–233, chapter “Family structures”). As before, the findings are then presented. A second pendant ensemble with a bronze disc

from grave 16 and another grave with a sword (grave 3) should be mentioned, as these two objects, especially the latter, will play a role in the later interpretation. Breitwieser again emphasises the interpretative potential of the burial site here: “In Harheim-Süd, too, investigations into the chronology and occupation sequence are possible due to the complete recording of the cemetery” (p. 216). In Harheim-Süd, however, only four of 17 graves can actually be finely dated – how can one reconstruct an occupation sequence? Nevertheless, four occupation phases are reconstructed. The result is a different occupation than in Harheim-Nord: Harheim-Süd begins earlier and still shows some reminiscences of the Urnfield period. This will play a role again later in the assessment of the two cemeteries. Before that, however, the author is focussing on the reconstruction of hierarchical structures. Even though nine of the 17 graves could not be included in the analysis due to the state of preservation, i. e. no statistically significant statements can be expected, a social index analysis was carried out. Since the value 0 is only represented once, one seems to have to deal with the burial place of the elite. Furthermore, an analysis of the relationship between age at death and grave goods was carried out. The data are obviously not representative – they relate exclusively to women’s graves. And even though Breitwieser himself points out that “the database [...] is small with four individuals” (p. 221), he comes to the conclusion that “the social status, which is expressed in the material culture, [...] therefore *obviously* does not dependent on age here either” (emphasis mine). In any case, it is interesting that the sword graves from both cemeteries are dated close together. The question of the connection between the two individuals rightly arises. This is dealt with explicitly in chapter 5, before the anthropological results are presented. Seven out of 17 graves yielded human remains – i. e. not even half – and only one out of nine inhumation graves yielded material. Statements on the average age at death or the subadult deficit (p. 225) are obsolete against this background.

Chapter 4 (pp. 228–229) consists of one and a half pages on the statistical frequency of ceramic types from the two cemeteries in comparison. The differences observed above all in the bowls are explained in chronological terms. In this respect, chapter 4 could also have been included in chapter 5 (pp. 230–231), which is devoted to the chronological relationship between the two cemeteries. Breitwieser reconstructs a relocation of the burial site of one and the same community. The sword bearers, who date chronologically close, play a key role here. One represents the termination grave of Harheim-Süd, so to speak, and the other the founder’s grave of Harheim-Nord. What is particularly remarkable here is the reconstruction of gender relations and power structures – the situation encountered documents the “retention of the male leadership role” (p. 233). If the later male graves are less richly furnished, but the contemporaneous female graves all the more, then (if I understand the author correctly) this does not mean that the rich furnishings of the women refer to *their* influence and power, but to “an affiliation to a powerful man or a corresponding family” (p. 233).

Another two pages, chapter 6 (pp. 232–233), deal with family structures at both cemeteries. Chapter 7 (p. 234) devotes just one page to the relationship between cemetery and settlement, before going on to compare the cemeteries of Frankfurt-Harheim with selected burial sites of the Hallstatt period in the Rhine-Main region in chapter 8 (pp. 235–238). The focus is in particular on cemeteries with sword goods. Of course, the well-known grave from the Eichlehen group should be emphasised here (for this grave see WILLMS 2002). The cemetery of Nidderau-Windecken, which has been analysed by Wolfram Ney and has not yet been finally published, is particularly suitable for comparison. The grave furnishings of all three cemeteries are said to point to direct contacts between the burial communities, as well as to shared contacts to the Italic area. Finally, chapter 9 (pp. 239–240) summarises the work (in German only). It is completed by a bibliography (pp. 241–244), a section with a catalogue and plates (pp. 245–400), and plans (pp. 401–403). There are also two appendices (pp. 404–406; one table listing all cemeteries and barrow groups with Hallstatt

period burials, another listing all sword burials in the Frankfurt area). The work concludes with the aforementioned separate contributions to anthropology by E. Hahn and on textiles and organic remains by E. Sichert. The catalogue is informative, clearly structured, and visually appealing. A short description with an excavation photo is followed by a list of the finds, the results of the anthropology and, where applicable, the archaeozoology, the chronological classification, and the whereabouts of the finds. The plates contain the redrawn grave plan, plus drawings of the finds. The pottery in particular is characterised by technically good drawings, whereas small finds often do not come out well in print and appear washed out. I also find the schematic representations of the reconstructed costume furnishings instructive (pp. 388–400; pl. 101–125).

What remains to be said in conclusion? The mix of photos and drawings of finds works and the material is clearly presented. What I find irritating, however, is the use of clichés: women's graves are highlighted in pink in the graphic representations, men's graves in blue. This seems to be fallen out of time in 2022. And there's another reason why I am not entirely happy with the book. It is because everything is so (too) simple: hierarchies, gender relations, occupancy dynamics. There are no shades of grey, no variance, no scopes. Contradictions and ambivalences in the data, which certainly exist, are not discussed. In the summary, Breitwieser once again emphasises "the good results of the anthropological analysis on gender and the age at death of individuals" (p. 240). This surprises me once again, because in my opinion he overestimates the significance of the data here. This applies to the assessment of the preference for inhumation or cremation burial, the gender specificity of finds, principles of grave construction as well as a reconstruction of burial dynamics, group formation, and family structures. The data are not suitable for such statements. And the anthropological analyst Hahn is also sceptical. There is talk of "chance results due to the small number of individuals" (p. 415), the "rather meagre finds in terms of numbers and preservation" (p. 407), the explicitly poor preservation of the inhumations and the low informative value of the data, for example with regard to life expectancy. Above all, however, the social archaeological statements lack a methodological-theoretical basis. Instead, positivist premises are utilised: 'many things in the grave' = rich = power and influence and far-reaching relationships. A more differentiated reconstruction of Hallstatt society(ies) comes up too short. In fact, Breitwieser's dissertation is a very traditional work with very traditional themes, roughly speaking "hierarchical structures" and "cultural contacts". However, one could take this most recent publication of Hallstatt graves as an opportunity to ask 'Quo vadis, Hallstatt archaeology?'. While Manfred EGGERT's (1991 [2011], 177) former postulate "Hallstatt archaeology is cultural anthropology or it is nothing" is long outdated, there are alternatives, such as a focus on practice rather than on (simple unilinear) hierarchies, as it has been established, e. g., by a group of colleagues at Leiden University (e. g. FONTIJN et al. 2013; VAN DER VAART-VERSCHOOF 2017). The discussion of the two Harheim cemeteries surely would have gained from including such broader perspectives.

## References

- EGGERT 1991(2011)  
M. K. H. EGGERT, Die konstruierte Wirklichkeit. Bemerkungen zum Problem der archäologischen Interpretation am Beispiel der Späten Hallstattzeit. *Hephaistos* 10, 1991, 5–20. Reprinted in: M. Augstein / St. Samida (eds), Manfred K. H. Eggert. *Retrospektive – Archäologie in kulturwissenschaftlicher Sicht* (Münster, New York 2011) 169–182.
- FONTIJN et al. 2013  
D. FONTIJN / S. VAN DER VAART-VERSCHOOF / R. JANSEN (eds), *Transformation Through Destruction. A Monumental and Extraordinary Early Iron Age Hallstatt C Barrow from the Ritual Landscape of Oss-Zevenbergen* (Leiden 2013).

MÜLLER-SCHEESEL 2008

N. MÜLLER-SCHEESEL, Auffälligkeiten bei Armhaltungen hallstattzeitlicher Körperbestattungen: Postdeponale Eingriffe, funktionale Notwendigkeiten oder kulturelle Zeichen? In: Ch. Kümmel/B. Schweizer/U. Veit (eds), Körperinszenierung – Objektsammlung – Monumentalisierung: Totenritual und Grabkult in frühen Gesellschaften. Archäologische Quellen in kulturwissenschaftlicher Perspektive. Tübinger Arch. Ta-

schenbücher 6 (Münster, New York, München, Berlin 2008) 517–535.

VAN DER VAART-VERSCHOOF 2017

S. VAN DER VAART-VERSCHOOF, Fragmenting the Chieftain. A Practice-Based Study of Early Iron Age Hallstatt C Elite Burials in the Low Countries. Papers Arch. Leiden Mus. Ant. 15 (Leiden 2017).

WILLMS 2002

CH. WILLMS, Der Keltenfürst aus Frankfurt. Macht und Totenkult um 700 v. Chr. Arch. R. 19 (Frankfurt a. M. 2002).

DE – 26382 Wilhelmshaven  
Viktoriastr. 26/28  
melanie.augstein@nihk.de  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3793-9404>

Melanie Augstein  
Niedersächsisches Institut  
für historische Küstenforschung

**ARIANE BALLMER / KATHARINA SCHÄPPI / PHILIPPE DELLA CASA, Der Westabhang des Mont Lassois (Vix / F). Befestigung, Unterstadt und Kultplatz der Eisenzeit. Ausgrabungen der Universität Zürich 2009–2014. Befunde und Kleinfunde.** Librum Publishers & Editors LLC, Basel, Frankfurt a. M. 2022. € 48.50 (édition imprimée). ISBN 978-3-906897-66-0. Accès libre. doi: <https://www.doi.org/10.19218/3906897660>. 224 pages y compris 138 illustrations et 5 annexes.

L'habitat fortifié du mont Lassois à Vix (dép. Côte d'Or) fait partie des sites hallstattiens les plus connus en France. Occupé dès le Bronze final, c'est surtout l'occupation du Premier Âge du Fer qui a attiré l'attention des chercheurs. Les premières fouilles ont déjà eu lieu entre 1930 et 1974, notamment sous la direction de René JOFFROY (1954; 1960). Après 17 années d'interruption, les fouilles ont été reprises en 1991 dans le cadre du projet de recherche franco-allemand « Keltische Fürstensitze westlich des Rheins », portant d'abord sur les nécropoles protohistoriques situées sur la première terrasse de la Seine au pied du mont Lassois. Dès 2001, le système de fortification et le plateau sommital du mont Lassois sont étudiés dans un cadre programmatique de type Projet collectif de recherche, intitulé « Vix et son environnement », qui est dirigé par Bruno Chaume (CNRS, Université de Bourgogne, UMR 6298 ARTeHIS). Parmi les équipes internationales qui participent à ce projet figure celle de l'Institut de Préhistoire de l'Université de Zurich, qui a fouillé entre 2009 et 2014 sous la direction de Philippe della Casa et d'Ariane Ballmer la pente ouest du mont Lassois, au lieu-dit « Champ Fossé » (l'auteur du présent compte-rendu a participé à la première campagne de fouille en 2009 et pris part à la rédaction du rapport de fouille). Les résultats de ces fouilles font l'objet de la publication « Der Westabhang des Mont Lassois (Vix / F). Befestigung, Unterstadt und Kultplatz der Eisenzeit » (« La pente ouest du mont Lassois [Vix / F]. Fortification, ville basse et lieu de culte de l'âge du Fer ») qui est présentée ici. Cette publication est la première qui traite des nouveaux travaux réalisés au mont Lassois dans le cadre du PCR Vix.

Le volume, publié comme livre relié et en accès libre chez Librum Publishers & Editors (<https://edoc.unibas.ch/87763/> [dernier accès : 26.04.2024]), comporte 224 pages. Il est divisé en six par-