

Festzuhalten ist, dass Stig Sørensen und Rebay-Salisbury nicht versuchen, die leidige Frage nach dem Ursprung der Brandbestattung neu aufzurollen. Dennoch wird überzeugend dargelegt, dass weder ein starres Paket an Praktiken noch eine einheitliche Ideologie die Einführung der Brandbestattung begleiteten. Die Vielfalt an lokalen Merkmalen spricht dagegen. Die Gemeinschaften waren mal mehr, mal weniger offen für die Idee der Brandbestattung. Ausschlaggebend dafür, dass die Brandbestattung letztendlich weite Teile Europas dominieren sollte, war die Einbettung in bestehende Traditionen und ein Verständnis vom toten Körper und den Umgang mit seinen verbrannten Überresten.

Das Buch von Stig Sørensen und Rebay-Salisbury wendet sich klar an ein Fachpublikum, aber weder ausschließlich noch unbedingt an Spezialist:innen der Bronzezeit in Kontinentaleuropa. Anders als bisherige Studien zur Einführung der Brandbestattungen legen sie den Fokus nicht auf Objekte, sondern auf Praktiken. Eine Herangehensweise, die seit geraumer Zeit in der Fundamentarchäologie an Bedeutung gewinnt und ein vielversprechender Ansatz zur Untersuchung von weitverbreitenden Phänomenen ist. Die Autorinnen versteifen sich nicht auf die Frage „Warum kommt es zu einem Wechsel von Körper- zu Brandbestattungen in der Bronzezeit?“. Vielmehr nutzen sie diese Frage, um bedeutende Aspekte des menschlichen Daseins zu erforschen: Wie liefen Wandel oder Transformationen in Gemeinschaften ab? Welche Vorstellungen über den menschlichen Körper – tot und lebendig – hatten die Menschen? Den Autorinnen gelingt es sowohl diese Fragen reflektiert zu diskutieren als auch ihre Thesen nachvollziehbar zu präsentieren. Daraus resultiert eine sehr lesenswerte Untersuchung zum Welt- und Selbstverständnis der (bronzezeitlichen) Menschen.

Literaturverzeichnis

KRISTEVAS 1982

J. KRISTEVAS, Powers of Horror. An Essay on Abjection (New York 1982).

SOFAER 2006

J. SOFAER, The Body as Material Culture: A Theoretical Osteoarchaeology (Cambridge 2006).

DE – 80539 München

Hofgraben 4

maria.kohle@blfd.bayern.de

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5472-802X>

Maria Kohle

Bayerisches Landesamt für Denkmalpflege

MICHAEL LEGGE, Death in the Iron Age of Eastern England: An Interdisciplinary Analysis of Human Remains from 800 BC–AD 60. BAR British Series 678. Bar Publishing, Oxford 2022. £ 60.00. ISBN 978-1-407360-23-2 (Softcover). ISBN 978-1-407360-24-9 (PDF). doi: <https://doi.org/10.30861/9781407360232>. 248 pages.

This publication is based on a dissertation project carried out by the author and includes material excavated and curated by the Cambridge County Council, the Cambridge Archaeological Unit, the Hertford Museum, the Higgins, North Hertfordshire Museums Service, North Lincolnshire Museum, Maidstone Museum and Verulamium Museum as well as the Duckworth Laboratory, University of Cambridge. In addition to 190 pages of text and numerous figures and tables, raw data files are available online (<https://doi.org/10.30861/9781407360232>). The project involved the compilation and analysis of post-mortem treatment of non-cremated Early (EIA), Middle (MIA) to Late Iron Age (LIA) (ca. 800 BC to AD 60) skeletal material from eight localities in east-

ern England: Lincolnshire, Cambridgeshire, Bedfordshire, Hertfordshire, Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex and Kent. The analysis includes age-at-death estimation, age and sex determination, evaluation of trauma and disease patterns and the development of approaches to disarticulated and commingled remains as well as taphonomic patterns. The data were drawn from various sources, including excavation reports, secondary sources, grey literature and HERs (Historic Environment Records) and were organised into three analytical categories based on treatment: inhumations, articulated bone groups and disarticulated remains. LIA cremations are included in the discussion where the context demands, but they are not an integral part of the analysis due to extensive treatment elsewhere. The temporal scope of the project begins in what is technically still the Late Bronze Age and ends with the Boudiccan revolt ca. AD 60 in order to note changes that took place about a generation after the arrival of the Romans. In addition to more formal treatments such as individual burials in cemeteries, all identifiable human remains from pits and other deposits of unburned skeletal material in the study region were included in the analysis, the first time such a comprehensive assessment has been carried out for this region and cultural context. Material that could not be securely dated, was insufficiently recorded or no human remains could be confirmed was not included in the statistical analysis but was recorded in the data base and can be accessed in the appendices. The goal of the project was to increase the data set available for study, to identify regional mortuary traditions, if any, and to test commonly held assumptions about the Iron Age burial traditions in the study region, including the relative invisibility of mortuary ritual and the expedient nature of pit deposits and disarticulated skeletal remains. The author acknowledges that a PhD thesis project completed 2019 by Andres LAMB (Iron Age Mortuary Practices in Southern England 550 BC to AD 70: A Study of Ritual Frameworks within an Insular and Near-Continental Context. Oxford: British Archaeological Reports [in prep.]) overlaps with his study to some extent but focuses more on the MIA/LIA and connections with continental Europe and devotes more time to cremation practices. He reviews the existing literature on pit burials, excarnation, definitions of ritual and burial, identity and embodiment theory as applied to mortuary contexts and the social context of burial traditions. The volume dedicates chapter 4–8 to the pit burial phenomenon, focusing not only on the human remains but on the pits as features, adding significantly to the debate on this aspect of Iron Age Britain.

The theoretical themes section of chapter 2 is relatively cursory given the complexity of concepts such as identity, ritual and gender configurations but later chapters revisit these ideas as they relate to the study area. The author approaches identity from a holistic perspective that takes into account variables such as class, gender, age and sexual orientation. Recent studies focusing on applying an intersectional lens to mortuary analysis are not referenced here but the current volume adds another geographic and temporal context to that body of literature.

Chapter 3 lays out the classification system used to record the data, which consisted of five main categories: complete inhumations, partial inhumations / burials / skeletons, articulated limbs, skulls, and single bones. All analysis was macroscopic and non-destructive and included the recording of evidence for age, sex, stature, trauma, and pathologies. The sample consisted of 997 individuals / deposits from 161 sites; 425 were inhumations, 44 were classified as deposits, and 528 consisted of disarticulated bone. The problem of the so-called “invisible dead” in Iron Age Britain (and elsewhere in Europe) is addressed in a detailed discussion that ranges from excavator bias and modern population density as it relates to development and correspondingly greater levels of excavation to reuse of sites and the relative paucity of radiocarbon dates for the region. The osteological methods and recording system follow accepted standards and protocols for the variables listed above.

Chapters 4–6 discuss the available burial data for inhumations across the study region divided into three chronological phases: chapter 4 covers the Early Iron Age (c. 800–400 BC), chapter 5

deals with the Middle Iron Age (400–100 BC) and chapter 6 covers the Late Iron Age – Conquest (100 BC–c. 60 AD). Of the 425 inhumations included in the study, 68 are discussed in chapter 4, with the majority (almost three quarters) coming from settlements or settlement-adjacent areas in Kent and Cambridgeshire. Detailed site and feature maps as well as excavation photos, when available, accompany the site descriptions. Maps are well-designed and clearly labeled and provide additional information relevant to the interpretive sections of the text. Burial orientation is discussed in some detail as well, accompanied by effective figures. In general Iron Age burials in Britain are accompanied by few grave goods and only six individuals in the EIA sample were buried with objects ranging from jet and iron ring beads to iron bracelets and ceramic beads, and a triple burial of an adult female with a child and an infant interred with animal bone pendants that included the foot phalanx of an eagle. Three of the six burials with grave goods were deposited in storage pits, a feature of mortuary practices in Iron Age Britain that has traditionally been interpreted as expedient or casual but which this volume, among other recent studies, demonstrates was an intentional and formalised aspect of the burial program. Status was clearly not a deciding factor in such deposits, given that one of the burials contained a copper alloy neck ring, a pan-European Iron Age status marker. What the author categorizes as “domestic waste” appears to have routinely been deposited both above and below many of the pit burials in the sample, suggesting that at least some of this material might also be associated with the mortuary program in ways that are not yet clear. Unfortunately, earlier excavations frequently neglected to record or describe such material in detail, complicating statistical analyses of potentially significant depositional patterns. Unmodified natural objects, such as stones selected for colour or shape, and the bodies of whole animals are also discussed in some detail, categories of burial inclusions that are increasingly gaining attention in Iron Age European mortuary studies more generally. The demographic breakdown is suggestive if not statistically significant for all of the study regions presented; overall adults comprise the majority of individuals in the sample, with slightly more female than male individuals; differential preservation by region complicates this pattern, however. Only three subadults were buried with deliberate grave goods and the number of neonates buried in storage pits with domestic waste was statistically significantly higher than all other age groups, suggesting that age was a primary organizing principle in the Iron Age burial program in the study region. Although the Early Iron Age represents the longest period included in the study, sites with inhumations dating to this period are less numerous overall, especially in Hertfordshire and Lincolnshire, where no inhumations are known for this period. This suggests a shift in the burial program over time.

Chapter 5 covers the same study area during the Middle Iron Age (400–100 BC), which included 118 inhumations out of the total sample of 425 individuals analysed, most of which were again recovered in Kent and Cambridgeshire while Norfolk and Suffolk produced relatively few sites dating to this period. More radiocarbon dates were available for MIA sites and several cemeteries are included in the sample, providing more precise temporal and geographic parameters for this period compared to the EIA sample. Although most of the individuals in the MIA sample were still recovered from settlement contexts, the number of individuals in cemeteries increased as compared to the EIA sample, albeit concentrated in two counties, Lincolnshire and Kent. A large MIA-LIA cemetery from the Isle of Thanet site could not be included in the analysis because the data were not yet available at the time of the study. The MIA in the study region was characterised by a shift from burials in pits as the dominant depositional context to individual graves, suggesting a change in practice and possibly associated beliefs. A small number of individuals were deposited in ditches and in disused domestic structures; these are interpreted as site specific rather than structured disposals, some of which may have been the result of internecine violence. Extended inhumations increase in number and proportion relative to crouched or flexed burials in the MIA as compared

to the EIA, another indication of a change in mortuary ritual in the study region during this time, while orientation remains broadly N–S with bodies facing east, consistent with the EIA. Grave goods were similarly limited, with only twelve individuals from eleven sites buried with more than one category of object and fewer than in the EIA with multiple personal ornaments. A burial from Cambridgeshire containing three bronze fibulae, one decorated bronze bracelet and probable harness fittings represents the richest metalwork assemblage in the MIA sample. There was only one weapon grave in the MIA sample; it contained a sword with an anthropomorphic hilt and the remains of two silver objects, possibly a ring and a box. Animal bone inclusions include partial horse or cattle skulls and skeletons and ceramic vessels, often deliberately broken or modified, were the second most common grave good after personal ornaments. The majority of burials in the sample contained no intentionally placed grave goods at all, however. The age distribution is demographically normal, although individuals under three years of age are underrepresented and are without exception not found in formal burial contexts. In contrast to the EIA sample, males outnumber females in nearly every age category, although sex appears to have had no bearing on the inclusion of grave goods, with equal numbers of male and female burials.

Chapter 6 presents the LIA-Conquest Period (ca. 100 BC–AD 60) burial sample, which consists of 223 individuals out of the 425 analysed. This means that almost half the total sample derives from only 150 years of the time frame encompassed by the study and reflects the wide-ranging transformations that accompanied the arrival of the Romans in Britain. Cambridgeshire and Kent still account for most of the burials from this period but the number of individuals from Hertfordshire increased dramatically as compared to the EIA and MIA sample. There is an increase in large cemeteries during this time and some of the sites that are listed separately may in fact belong to larger burial grounds that were not completely excavated in the course of discontinuous rescue projects. The cemetery at Mill Hill in Kent, with 39 burials, represents the largest single assemblage for the whole Iron Age in the study region. A much larger number of individuals were radiocarbon dated in this group than in the EIA or MIA sample and cemetery burial accounts for the majority of the sample. Hillfort finds appear in larger numbers both in the form of individual burials and isolated skeletal remains and overall this context produced the most evidence for violence, a pattern that is discussed in more detail in chapter 10. Grave burial is the dominant disposal category in this sample, with a further reduction in pit burials (only 5.4% of the LIA total) as compared to the EIA and MIA samples. There are also more multiple burials in this sample as compared to the earlier periods. Most inhumations were extended supine, with a much smaller number in the crouched/flexed category, and there is some evidence for violent and/or punitive treatment, including decapitation and possible binding of the hands behind the back. Even though the LIA sample is represented by the smallest time frame (at 260 years) it includes the largest number of burials in the data set, with 223 inhumations; all ages are represented and the sample is evenly split between identifiably male and identifiably female individuals. An increase in personal ornament compared to preceding periods was also noted.

Chapter 7 presents 44 human skeletal deposits from 23 sites in five counties ranging across the Iron Age with a concentration in the MIA. These deposits represent partial inhumations, articulated but incomplete human remains and bone bundles. The material was assessed based on the skeletal elements present, the level of articulation and evidence of manipulation, truncation and violence to address the question of post-mortem processing during the Iron Age in the study area. More than half of the examples are from Cambridgeshire, primarily from domestic settlements, although they are found across the study area. Pit deposits account for just over half of the sample, with ditches as the next most common depositional context; there is an association between human remains and watery contexts, including one deposition in a well. The majority of the sample are

adults and the most common elements were long bones. The author interprets what he refers to as bone bundles as *pars pro toto* deposits of a single individual; this group represents the majority of the skeletal deposits that are not formal burials but he concludes that apart from their incomplete nature, there is no common denominator for this category of deposit.

Chapter 8 presents a macroscopic taphonomic analysis of the disarticulated remains from 91 sites representing all eight counties in the study sample. Cambridgeshire and Kent once again account for the majority of the material but the largest assemblage came from Station Road, Puckeridge, in Hertfordshire. 66 of the 91 sites yielded one to five bone fragments and settlements, especially pits, and “ritual”/votive sites account for most of the material, with cranial elements the largest single group, at 37% of the sample. The remains of known age consist of almost equal numbers of neonates and young adults, a very different profile from the breakdown presented in chapter 7. Weathering, trampling, gnawing and human modification are all assessed in detail. Human cranial elements in particular exhibit evidence for violence, including chop marks and blunt force trauma. Worked bone is also present, with 39 elements showing evidence of use as tools or transformation into objects such as bowls, amulets or combs.

Chapter 9 presents the evidence for demographic, health and trauma trends in the study sample, from a total of 1,042 individuals/deposits, only some of which could be aged or sexed. Young adults and mature adults combined account for the majority of the sample and males outnumber females in the combined data set as well as the various subcategories (subdivided by degree of accuracy etc.). The discussion of trauma includes sharp-force, blunt-force and indirect trauma, with ribs accounting for the majority of injuries, followed by clavicles and tibiae. Degenerative pathologies include osteoarthritis, which was unsurprisingly common given the demographic emphasis on adults in the sample. The nutrition and health related conditions identified include *cribra orbitalia*, porotic hyperostosis, DISH, possible tuberculosis and septic arthritis. Oral health was observed to be generally poor, with extensive antemortem tooth loss, heavy calculus build-up, linear enamel hypoplasia and periodontal disease all represented, but was not analysed in greater detail. So-called third hand use, in which the teeth are used as tools, was documented in six instances and involved the anterior teeth.

Chapter 10 presents a discussion of results and attempts to summarise the observations presented in previous chapters. The sample reflects a demographically normal population with an expected “missing dead” hiatus in the LBA-EIA transition, which is compared to previous work conducted in Wessex.

The discussion of health, sickness and violence is especially detailed and includes mention of the evidence for fosterage and the importance of martial prowess in Iron Age Britain. An extensive review of pit burials and their interpretation is presented that includes the use of this context in sacrificial rituals that should be considered normative rather than exceptional. Although artefacts are rare in most of the burials and deposits in the study sample, a discussion of barrow burials includes an evaluation of this category of material culture as well. The evidence for animal inclusions, in the form of four horses and three dogs, is also discussed, as is the restricted evidence for excarnation, sometimes referred to as “sky burial”. Alternative disarticulation pathways are also considered, including an excursus into the problem of the “invisible rite” that characterises many Iron Age European communities but may have involved deposition in bodies of water as well as cremation after exposure. The “cult of the head” is addressed in considerable detail, given the preponderance of cranial elements in the sample, although long bones were the second-most common skeletal element recorded.

Occasional odd sentence structures or incomplete sentences (for example, p. 9: “The nature of burial itself, the extent of ‘ritual activity’, ideas of identity, the role of death in Iron Age society, and ideas of change, transformation and objectification which are especially pertinent to the dis-articulated remains”). The occasional use of internment vs. interment (p. 49) is a common error but one that should have been corrected before the volume went to press. The charts and graphs are presented in grayscale, which occasionally makes them hard to read; colour would have been helpful. These are minor issues, however, and the study can be considered to have met its primary goals of providing a detailed analysis of an understudied area of Britain that can now be compared to contiguous regions while contributing to our understanding of Iron Age post-mortem processes. The online data sets alone are a major contribution. As a source of data and a useful synthesis of the current state of the study of human remains in this enigmatic period of time in Britain this volume undoubtedly will have a place in the research libraries of individuals and institutions where scholarship is carried out that deals with death and its material manifestations in the past.

USA – Milwaukee, WI 53201
PO Box 413
barnold@uwm.edu
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3359-8152>

Bettina Arnold
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Department of Anthropology

PETRA GOLÁŇOVÁ (Hrsg.), *Oppidum as an Urban Landscape. A Multidisciplinary Approach to the Study of Space Organisation at Bibracte*. Collection Bibracte Band 33. BIBRACTE – Centre archéologique européen, Glux-en-Glenne 2023. 45,00 €. ISBN 978-2-490601-14-1. 461 Seiten mit 319 Abbildungen (hauptsächlich) in Farbe.

Die vorliegende Publikation erschien als mittlerweile 33. Band der Reihe *Collection Bibracte* des *Centre archéologique européen*. Herausgegeben von Petra Goláňová in Zusammenarbeit mit Peter Milo und Mária Hajnalová, vereint der Band Beiträge von insgesamt 23 Autorinnen und Autoren, überwiegend aus Tschechien, aber auch aus der Slowakei, Polen und Großbritannien.

Die Beiträge des Bandes widmen sich zweifellos mit einer beeindruckenden methodischen Vielfalt einem bislang noch zu wenig erforschten Aspekt der Oppida: Diese Siedlungen der jüngeren Latènezeit zeichnen sich durch ihre oft beträchtliche Größe und ihre komplexe innere Gliederung aus, die neben dicht besiedelten Arealen auch größere Freiflächen *intra muros* einschließen. Ein Verständnis der Oppida als Landschaften, die sowohl urbane als auch ländliche Elemente integrieren, wie es der rezensierten Publikation zugrunde liegt, eröffnet neue Perspektiven für die Oppida-Forschung.

Die großen unbebauten Areale innerhalb der mit aufwändigen Befestigungsanlagen eingefassten Innenflächen der Oppida, ja in einigen Fällen sogar das völlige Fehlen einer signifikanten Innenbebauung, haben insbesondere die ältere Forschung lange Zeit vor große Probleme gestellt, da man noch nicht über das notwendige Methodenspektrum verfügte. Stattdessen konzentrierte sich die Forschung verständlicherweise vor allem auf die obertägig sichtbaren Befestigungsanlagen und die dichter bebauten Areale mit einem entsprechend hohen Fundniederschlag. Wie Goláňová in ihrer Einleitung ausführt (S. 15–16), war die Zielsetzung des Forschungsprojektes „*Oppidum as an urban landscape: multidisciplinary approach to the study of space organisation ,intra muros‘*“ (2019–22) daher, erstmals gezielt und intensiv die „leeren“ bzw. unbebauten Flächen („empty