



**Universiteit
Leiden**

The Netherlands

Analecta Praehistorica Leidensia 33/34 / Sacrificial Landscapes : cultural biographies of persons, objects and 'natural' places in the Bronze Age of the Southern Netherlands, c. 2300-600 BC

Fontijn, David R.; Fokkens, Harry; Bakels, Corrie

Citation

Fontijn, D. R. (2002). Analecta Praehistorica Leidensia 33/34 / Sacrificial Landscapes : cultural biographies of persons, objects and 'natural' places in the Bronze Age of the Southern Netherlands, c. 2300-600 BC, 392. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/33737>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)
License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)
Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/33737>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

ANALECTA
PRAEHISTORICA
LEIDENSIA

33/34

PUBLICATION OF THE FACULTY OF ARCHAEOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF LEIDEN

DAVID R. FONTIJN

SACRIFICIAL LANDSCAPES

CULTURAL BIOGRAPHIES OF PERSONS, OBJECTS AND 'NATURAL' PLACES
IN THE BRONZE AGE OF THE SOUTHERN NETHERLANDS, C. 2300-600 BC



UNIVERSITY OF LEIDEN 2002

Editors: Harry Fokkens / Corrie Bakels

Copy editors of this volume: David Fontijn / Harry Fokkens

Copyright 2002 by the Faculty of Archaeology, Leiden

ISSN 0169-7447

ISBN 90-73368-19-7

Also appeared as doctorate thesis, Leiden, March 27, 2003.

Subscriptions to the series *Analecta Praehistorica Leidensia*
and single volumes can be ordered exclusively at:

Faculty of Archaeology
P.O. Box 9515
NL-2300 RA Leiden
the Netherlands

*Non multo post in Cantabriae lacum fulmen decidit repertaeque sunt duodecim
securae, haud ambiguum summae imperii signum.*

(Suetonius, book VII: Galba, Otho, Vitellius)

*Und dast Sterben, dieses Nichtmehrfassen
Jenes Grunds, auf dem wir täglich stehn,
Seinem ängstlichen Sich-Niederlassen -:*

*In die Wasser, die ihn sanft empfangen
Und die sich, wie glücklich und vergangen,
Unter ihm zurückziehn, Flut um Flut*

(R.M. Rilke 'der Schwan')

contents

Preface xvii

PART I PROBLEM, APPROACH, SOURCE CRITISM 1

- 1 Introduction: the problem of bronze deposition and the aim of this study** 3
 - 1.1 Introduction 3
 - 1.2 The social significance of metalwork among European Bronze Age societies 3
 - 1.3 The phenomenon of bronze deposits and its interpretation as ‘ritual consumption’ 5
 - 1.4 Problems in the current interpretation of bronze deposits: ‘selective deposition’ 5
 - 1.5 The southern Netherlands as a promising region for studying ‘selective deposition’ 6
 - 1.6 Research questions and spatial and chronological framework 6
 - 1.7 How the problem will be approached 9

- 2 How archaeology has made sense of object depositions: the distinction between ‘ritual’ and ‘profane’ deposits** 13
 - 2.1 Introduction 13
 - 2.2 Seeing bronze deposits primarily in profane terms: *Verwahrfunde* and *Versteckfunde* 13
 - 2.3 Accepting bronze finds as permanent deposits and interpreting them as ‘ritual’ 15
 - 2.3.1 The distinction between ‘ritual’ and ‘profane’ depositions 15
 - 2.3.2 Levy’s theory: is the Bronze Age ritual-profane distinction supported by ethnographic parallels? 17
 - 2.4 *Explaining* ritual deposition: economic and competitive consumption 18
 - 2.5 How ‘ritual’ is reconciled to assumptions on the universality of rationality 19
 - 2.6 Problems we face when using the ‘ritual/ profane’ distinction for the interpretation of deposits 20
 - 2.6.1 Problems raised by the empirical evidence 20
 - 2.6.2 Epistemological problems 20

2.7	How can we get round the problems of the ‘ritual/profane’ distinction?	21
2.8	Final remarks	21
3	Theoretical framework for the study of selective deposition	23
3.1	Introduction	23
3.2	The concept of ‘meaning’	23
3.3	Objects as ‘things’ and objects that are ‘like persons’	25
3.4	How meaning comes about: the cultural biography of things	26
3.5	Kinds of biographies: valuables associated with communal versus personal identities	26
3.6	The start of a biography: production	27
3.6.1	The crucial position of the smith as a creator of potential valuables	27
3.6.2	Material and techniques	28
3.6.3	Concept of form and style	28
3.6.4	Functional possibilities	30
3.7	The life of an object	30
3.7.1	Metalwork circulation as an exchange of gifts <i>and</i> commodities; long-term and short-term exchange	31
3.7.2	Transformation of commodities into gifts or valuables and the archaeological indications that they took place	31
3.7.3	The archaeological correlates for circulation	32
3.7.4	The archaeological correlates for ‘use’	32
3.7.5	The deposited objects as a skewed representation of the objects in circulation	33
3.8	Deposition	33
3.8.1	The practice of deposition as constituted by relations between object, people and location	33
3.8.2	Deposition as performance	35
3.8.3	What deposition brings about	35
3.9	Concluding remarks	35
4	Source criticism: limitations and possibilities of the available evidence	37
4.1	Introduction	37
4.2	How to recognize permanent depositions	37
4.3	How the data were collected and evaluated	38
4.3.1	Assessing the reliability of data	39
4.3.2	Retrieving information on find context	41

- 4.4 Explaining presence and absence of finds: post-depositional processes 42
 - 4.4.1 Natural processes 43
 - 4.4.2 Anthropogenetic processes 43
- 4.5 Explaining presence and absence of finds: research factors 45
- 4.6 Conclusion: which set of data is informative on selective deposition? 45

PART II SELECTIVE DEPOSITION THROUGHOUT THE BRONZE AGE 53

5 Late Neolithic B and Early Bronze Age 55

- 5.1 Introduction 56
- 5.2 Late Neolithic and Early Bronze Age societies in the southern Netherlands 57
- 5.3 Discussion of the available evidence 60
- 5.4 Late Neolithic metalwork 60
 - 5.4.1 Local production and the ‘Dutch Bell Beaker metal’ 61
 - 5.4.2 Flat axes 63
 - 5.4.3 The double axe from Escharen 65
 - 5.4.4 Gold ornaments 66
 - 5.4.5 Daggers 67
 - 5.4.6 Conclusion: selective deposition in the Late Neolithic B? 68
- 5.5 Early Bronze Age metalwork 68
 - 5.5.1 Low-flanged axes 68
 - 5.5.2 Halberds 71
 - 5.5.3 The Wageningen hoard 72
 - 5.5.4 Metalwork from burials and settlements 73
 - 5.5.5 Conclusion: selective deposition in the Early Bronze Age? 74
- 5.6 From stone to bronze 75
 - 5.6.1 How metal replaced stone in daily life 75
 - 5.6.2 The cultural attitude towards metals and stones 75
 - 5.6.3 The life of metals and new elements in the cultural biography of things 76
- 5.7 Patterns in the biographies of metalwork: production and circulation 77
 - 5.7.1 Circulation: the importance of being imported 77
 - 5.7.2 Open systems: the interplay between imported objects and local products 78
- 5.8 Deposition: the incorporation of metalwork in Neolithic offering traditions and their subsequent transformation 78
 - 5.8.1 Continuity and change 78
 - 5.8.2 Fluctuations in the rate of deposition 79
 - 5.8.3 Conclusion 79
- 5.9 Deposition: graves and wet places as contrasting depositional contexts 79
 - 5.9.1 The Beaker burial ritual and the significance of objects as valuables of personhood 80
 - 5.9.2 The deposition of axes in wet places 82
- 5.10 Conclusions 83

6	Middle Bronze Age A	85
6.1	Introduction	86
6.2	The transition from Early to Middle Bronze Age: developments in society and landscape	86
6.3	Discussion of the available evidence	87
6.4	High-flanged and stopridge axes	88
6.4.1	Oldendorf axes	88
6.4.2	Nick-flanged or <i>geknickte</i> axes	91
6.4.3	Atlantic imports? Arreton axes and axes with high-placed short-flanges	93
6.4.4	Two ‘unique’ axes	93
6.4.5	Stopridge axes	96
6.4.6	Conclusion	97
6.5	Spears	97
6.6	‘Swords’ and daggers	100
6.6.1	Dirks, rapiers and daggers of the Sögel, Wohlde, Weizen and Gamprin types	100
6.6.2	The Overloon weapon hoard: the deposition of personal warrior sets	103
6.6.3	Tréboul-St. Brandan swords	103
6.6.4	The ceremonial dirk from Jutphaas	104
6.6.5	Other finds: two daggers of British type	105
6.6.6	Sword biographies	105
6.7	Developments in the structure of the metalwork repertoire	106
6.7.1	The category of specialized weapons and what it implies: the significance of martiality	106
6.7.2	Transformations in existing material culture categories	107
6.8	Metalwork circulation	107
6.8.1	The restructuring of spheres of exchange?	107
6.8.2	The southern Netherlands in the north-west European world	109
6.8.3	Bronze circulation and the problem of the ‘Hilversum culture’	109
6.9	Patterns in metalwork deposition	110
6.9.1	Fluctuations in the rate of deposition	110
6.9.2	Axe deposition	110
6.9.3	Weapon deposition as the surrender of the paraphernalia of personhood	111
6.9.4	Conclusion	112
6.10	Conclusions	112
7	Middle Bronze Age B	115
7.1	Introduction	116
7.2	Landscape and society during the Middle Bronze Age B	116
7.3	Discussion of the available evidence	116

7.4	Palstaves and mid-winged axes	119
7.4.1	Imported palstaves	119
7.4.2	Regional palstaves	121
7.4.3	Mid-winged axes	125
7.4.4	The Goirle axe: the remarkable life-path of an old, much-travelled axe	127
7.4.5	Conclusion: axe biographies	129
7.5	Spearheads	129
7.6	Swords and daggers	131
7.6.1	Rosnoën swords	132
7.6.2	Other <i>Griffplatten</i> - and <i>Griffangelschwerter</i>	133
7.6.3	Reworked sword blades	133
7.6.4	Conclusions: life-cycles of swords	133
7.7	Ornaments	134
7.8	Sickles and other tools	137
7.9	Moulds	137
7.9.1	The bronze mould from Buggenum	138
7.9.2	The clay mould from Cuijk	138
7.9.3	The clay mould from Oss-Horzak	138
7.9.4	Conclusions	141
7.10	Metalwork and contemporary material culture	141
7.11	Regional bronze production	142
7.12	Metalwork circulation	143
7.12.1	General developments: reorientation of exchange networks	143
7.12.2	Patterns of procurement	143
7.13	Deposition	144
7.13.1	Deposition in and around houses	144
7.13.2	Axe and weapon deposits: depositional zones as places of historical significance	147
7.13.3	Deposition of objects in burials	147
7.13.4	Deposition of objects in burial monuments	148
7.14	Conclusions	148
8	Late Bronze Age	151
8.1	Introduction	152
8.2	Society and landscape during the Late Bronze Age	152
8.2.1	North-western Europe	152
8.2.2	Southern Netherlands	154
8.3	Discussion of the available evidence	154

8.4	Socketed and end-winged axes	157
8.4.1	Regional socketed axes	157
8.4.2	Imported socketed axes	161
8.4.3	End-winged axes	164
8.4.4	Iron axes	164
8.4.5	Conclusions	165
8.5	Weapons: spears, swords, chapes and daggers	166
8.5.1	Early <i>Griffzungenschwerter</i>	166
8.5.2	The <i>Vielwulstschwert</i> from Buggenum	166
8.5.3	The weapon hoard from Pulle	169
8.5.4	<i>Griffzungen-</i> and <i>Vollgriffschwerter</i> from the Ha B2/3 phase	170
8.5.5	Gündlingen swords	171
8.5.6	Mindelheim swords	172
8.5.7	Conclusion: sword biographies	172
8.6	Ornaments and dress fittings	172
8.6.1	Deposition in major rivers	175
8.6.2	Deposition of ceremonial ornaments: the giant <i>Bombenkopfnadel</i> of type Ockstadt	175
8.6.3	Ornaments in multiple-object hoards	178
8.6.4	Conclusion: selective deposition of ornaments	182
8.7	Other tools	182
8.8	The place of metalwork among contemporary material culture	184
8.9	Regional bronze production	186
8.10	Metalwork circulation	186
8.11	Deposition	187
8.11.1	Axe and tool deposition	187
8.11.2	Weapon and ornament deposition: evidence for a structured sacrificial landscape?	188
8.11.3	New places for deposition?	191
8.11.4	Change and tradition in the practice of deposition	192
8.12	Conclusions	193
9	Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age: metalwork from burials	197
9.1	Introduction	197
9.2	Discussion of the available evidence	197
9.3	The urnfield burial ritual and the provision of artefacts	197
9.4	Ornaments and toilet articles in urnfield graves	198
9.5	Deposition of weaponry	201
9.6	Stages in the burial ritual and the inclusion of artefacts	203

9.7	The decorated dead	204
9.8	Local and supra-local personal identities	206
9.9	Conclusions	207
PART III UNDERSTANDING SELECTIVE DEPOSITION 209		
10	Selective deposition: its characteristics, development and structure	211
10.1	Introduction	211
10.2	Some general characteristics of metalwork deposition	211
10.3	The long-term patterns of selective deposition	215
10.4	Selective deposition as an indication that different objects had different meanings	215
10.5	How objects became meaningful: the significance of their cultural biography	217
10.6	Depositions in burials versus depositions in natural places	217
10.7	Long-term history of selective deposition	218
10.8	Development of the argument in the next chapters	219
11	Weapons, the armed body and martial identities	221
11.1	Introduction	221
11.2	The distinction between multifunctional tools and weapons before the Middle Bronze Age	221
11.3	Weapons of the Middle and Late Bronze Age	221
11.4	The nature of Bronze Age conflicts and warfare	224
11.5	Warfare as ideology	226
11.6	Warrior identities	226
11.6.1	Sword fighting and becoming a person	227
11.6.2	The evidence of warriors' graves	227
11.6.3	Warrior identities and 'imagined communities'	229
11.7	Weapon deposits as graveless grave goods?	229
11.8	Warriorhood as an ambiguous, temporary identity	231
11.9	The shift from rivers to graves	232
11.9.1	Ha C chieftains' graves as reflecting a different kind of elite?	232
11.9.2	How did a shift to burial deposition become socially acceptable?	233
11.9.3	Conclusion: the continuing ambiguity of warrior statuses	236
11.10	Conclusions	236

12	Ornament deposition: the construction and deconstruction of personhood	239
12.1	Introduction	239
12.2	Ornament deposition in natural places versus deposition in burials	239
12.3	Selective deposition of ornaments and dress fittings during the Middle Bronze Age	239
12.4	The significance of supra-regional ornament styles: the implications of the Oss mould	240
12.5	Selective deposition of ornaments and dress fittings during the Late Bronze Age	241
12.5.1	Ornaments and the construction of local identities in urnfield graves	241
12.5.2	Placing ornaments and pins in rivers and sources	241
12.5.3	Deposition of special ornament types in hoards: the Lutlommel hoard	242
12.6	Conclusion: the contrast between local and non-local identities	244
13	The cultural biographies of axes	247
13.1	Introduction	247
13.2	The significance of imported adzes and axes for non- or semi-agrarian communities	247
13.3	The deposition of single, used bronze axes: the generalized biography of an axe	248
13.4	There is more to axes than just the tool	250
13.5	Late Bronze Age axe hoards	252
13.6	Axe hoards as representing deliberate permanent deposits	252
13.7	Linking 'ritual' deposition to the flow of metal	253
13.7.1	How gift and commodity exchange are linked	254
13.7.2	Object deposition as a way to transform items from commodities into gifts	255
13.8	What happened at the transition from the Late Bronze Age to Iron Age?	255
13.8.1	Understanding lavish hoards in relation to a collapsing bronze circulation	256
13.8.2	Changes within the depositional practices themselves	256
13.9	Conclusions	257
14	The landscape of deposition	259
14.1	Introduction	259
14.2	Deposition in a historical landscape	259
14.2.1	The system of selective deposition as reflecting structured perceptions of the land	259
14.2.2	Multiple-deposition zones and the landscape of memory	260
14.2.3	What does the difference between adjacent multiple deposition zones imply?	263

14.3	Deposition and the landscape of daily life	264
14.3.1	Depositional zones as remote and peripheral areas	264
14.3.2	Depositional zones as natural, unaltered places	264
14.4	Depositional zones in a social landscape	265
14.5	Depositional zones in a cosmological landscape	266
14.5.1	Wet zones as cosmological boundaries	266
14.5.2	Deposition in watery places: gifts to gods?	267
14.6	Deposition and cultural attitudes towards the land	268
14.6.1	Exploitative and communalist attitudes	268
14.6.2	Depositions and notions on reciprocal relations with the land	269
14.6.3	Depositions and the logic of taking and giving	269
14.7	Depositional practices and the construction of communities	270
14.8	Conclusions	271
15	Final reflections: what is selective deposition and what does it bring about?	273
15.1	Introduction	273
15.2	Circulation of foreign materials and social realities	273
15.3	Bronzes and the significance of non-local identities	274
15.4	Accepting <i>their</i> logic: a sacrificial economy	274
15.5	Deposition as a practice	275
15.6	Deposition as ritual	276
15.7	What does selective deposition bring about?	277
	epilogue	281
	references	285
	appendices	305
1	List of all hoards from the study region	305
2.1	Flat axes	310
2.2	Low-flanged axes	311
2.3	Oldendorf axes	312
2.4	Other MBA A axes	314
2.5	Imported palstaves and other axes	315
2.6	Regional palstaves, midribbed	317
2.7	Regional palstaves, plain sinuous-shaped and those with trapeze outline	318
2.8	Unclassified palstaves	320

2.9	Mid-winged axes	321
2.10	Socketed axes of the Niedermaas type	322
2.11	Socketed axes of the Helmeroth type	324
2.12	Socketed axes of the Geistingen type	325
2.13	Socketed axes of the Plainseau type	326
2.14	Socketed axes of type Wesseling	328
2.15	Other socketed axes, Early Iron Age axes, iron axes	329
2.16	End-winged axes	332
3	Sickles, knives, chisels, gouges from the Middle and Late Bronze Age	333
4.1	Ornaments mainly from the MBA B	335
4.2	Ornaments from the LBA/EIA from other contexts than graves	336
5.1	Swords and daggers from the MBA A	338
5.2	Swords and daggers from the MBA B	339
5.3	Swords from the Ha A2 (A1) until Ha B1 phases	341
5.4	Swords from the Ha B2/3 phase	342
5.5	Swords from the Early Iron Age (made of bronze and iron)	343
5.6	MBA swords from the Netherlands and Belgium: deposition in graves versus deposition in watery places	345
6.1	Spearheads from the MBA A	348
6.2	Spearheads from the MBA B	349
6.3	Spearheads without precise dating (plain pegged spearheads) and arrowheads	350
7.1	Daggers, knives, halberds and ornaments from the LN B/EBA, mainly from burials	356
7.2	Burial gifts from the MBA and deposits in barrows (metalwork and other materials)	358
7.3	Metalwork from urnfield graves in the Dutch part of the research region	361
7.4	Metalwork from urnfield graves in the Belgian part of the research region	370
8	Indications for metalworking (Middle and Late Bronze Age)	373
9	Metalwork finds from settlements	374
10.1	Metal types distinguished by Butler and Van der Waals	376
10.2	Metal analyses of flat and low-flanged axes	376
10.3	Metal analyses of tanged daggers and awls from burials	377
10.4	Metal analyses of halberds, riveted knives and an awl	377
10.5	Metal analyses of objects from the Wageningen hoard	378

samenvatting (Dutch summary) 379

acknowledgements for the figures 389

acknowledgements 391

Epilogue: Ending with questions

This book started with the recent find of a socketed axe in Susteren. The story of this find is similar to that of so many other bronzes. Although professional archaeological excavations were carried out nearby, the axe was a stray find done by a metal-detectorist. The excavation and survey results give little or no information on any activity during the Bronze Age, and nothing therefore seemed to prepare the excavators for the find of this axe. Since we are now at the end of an entire book on such finds, it is useful to return to the Susteren axe. How does it fit into the general theories on bronze deposition unfolded in this book? On a general level, it can now be said that it fits well into the general patterns of axe deposition recognized. On the other hand, it also exemplifies the many things we still do not understand.

The peripheral position of the Susteren axe was considered a problem when it was found. It is now clear, however, that it was deposited into the stream valley of the Roode Beek. Dozens of other axes described in this book appear to have ended their life in a similar way and it was argued that they represent deliberate single-axe deposits in watery places. From the point of view of settlement location, the find spot is peripheral indeed. However, for bronze deposits such a location is the rule rather than the exception. On closer inspection, questions remain: does the absence of Bronze Age settlement traces really indicate that the area was a remote place, far beyond the location where people lived? Did a deposition involve a special journey to a secluded area? And at what time and on what occasion was it thought necessary to offer an axe? Which people were involved, and which were excluded? In this case, it is even unclear where precisely the axe was placed: was it thrown in flowing water, or placed in the waterlogged backswamp of the stream?

This book may have revealed something of the structure of depositional practices. It has also evoked many questions, some old, some new. It seems appropriate to end with some of these, as I hope they will stimulate further research.

When, how and why did selective deposition like we know it emerge?

The roots of the depositional practices we have studied here can be traced back to the Late Mesolithic/Early Neolithic (chapter 5), but these earliest deposits seem very different

from the Bronze Age system of selective deposition. However, this selective deposition of personal and communal valuables was no Bronze Age invention. Deposition of axes with a biography of exchange existed as early as the Early Neolithic (the *Rössener Breißeile*, for example; chapter 13) and gathered momentum during the Middle Neolithic when in some regions massive axe hoards were deposited in peat bogs. The selective deposition of personal valuables was recognized as a feature already significant to the Single Grave Culture before the adoption of metalwork (chapter 5). The fundamental question to be answered is how the much-varied Early Neolithic system of deposition of pots, animal bones, antler etc. should be understood, and how it was gradually transformed or expanded to become the system of selective deposition of valuables studied in this book. The prospects for studying the long-term history of Neolithic deposits are promising for the northern Netherlands, north Germany and south Scandinavia. The crucial point is that Neolithic 'stray finds' should be approached, just like the later bronze items, with a keen interest in the question how they ended up in the place where we found them. In chapter 5, we saw that our discussion on Neolithic axe finds from the southern Netherlands was hampered because they were never studied from such a point of view.

The dichotomy between burial deposition and deposition in natural places

Among the earliest indications for a system of selective deposition is the case of the difference between the kinds of objects deposited in burials and those placed in natural places. In the study region, the earliest indications were found for the Late Neolithic B. It was suggested that valuables instrumental in the construction of specific communal identities were treated differently from those related to the construction of specific personal identities. Throughout the European Bronze Age, items related to the construction of a specific kind of personhood continue to be treated in quite specific ways, but these are generally not well understood. Many European rivers and bogs have yielded dozens of ornaments and other items of personal appearance (for example: Kubach 1977; Sørensen 1987; Warmenbol 1996). So far, interpretation of such finds has focussed on whether

they represent badly preserved river burials or not (see the discussion in section 11.7). In this book it was argued that the empirical evidence of ornament or weapon depositions represents a much more complex practice than their current interpretation as 'graveless grave goods' allows (see chapters 11 and 12). One of the alternatives offered in this book is to see ornament deposition as a practice related to the deconstruction of personal identities during life (chapter 11 and 12). It should be mentioned, however, that the evidence on weapon and ornament deposition of the southern Netherlands is modest when compared with the lavish deposits known from many German rivers or Irish or south Scandinavian bogs. There are indications that the current 'graveless grave goods' interpretation cannot explain the depositional patterns found in those regions either. It may therefore be rewarding to test the ideas developed in this book on this much richer material, thus allowing a better understanding of the widespread phenomenon of ornament and weapon deposition.

What did a depositional location look like?

The present research may have traced some of the general features of depositional locations, but it failed to give detailed information on what such places looked like and how they were used. We have seen that they were mainly 'natural' places, often with similar characteristics (for an example from the Meuse valley: elongated marshes defined by the slope of the high terrace on one side and the dryer part of the middle terrace on the other, chapter 14). But did the natural environment have specific characteristics as well (specific vegetation, absence of trees, natural sources, flowing or standing water, and so on)? And what about the place of depositional sites in the cultivated landscape? Were they located nearby settlements, near communication routes, fords, or in areas that were virtually inaccessible? In chapter 14, some broad generalizations could be made, but what is persistently lacking is detailed information on two levels, that of the depositional site itself and that of its wider environment ('micro-region'). For the first, we need a good excavation of a depositional site, or rather, 'zone' (see chapter 14). For the second we need an area that has been outstandingly surveyed and holds good potential for the reconstruction of the Bronze Age natural and cultural environment. The central river area in general and the 'Betuwe' in particular is an area that meets such demands.

How was a depositional site used?

There is an acute need for detailed information on Bronze Age depositional 'zones'. Admittedly, if they were mainly unaltered places chances are that such excavations would not yield much in the way of man-made features. This will undoubtedly make it difficult to find funding for the excavation of such a site, but it is vital to realize that even

the outcome that human constructions were indeed lacking will contribute to our knowledge. On the other hand, the few examples of excavated multiple-deposition sites like Flag Fen (Britain; Coombs 1996; Pryor 1991) indicate that even such natural places knew man-made constructions like trackways or platforms. An excavation would also make clear whether the predominance of metalwork reflects a prehistoric reality. In the cave of Han sur Lesse (southern Belgium), for example, there are also indications that pottery and human remains were deposited together alongside the metalwork (Warmenbol 1996).

The continuation of depositional traditions into the Iron Age

To me, one of the most startling phenomena of depositional practices is the sharp decrease in metalwork deposition in natural places in the Early Iron Age and its re-emergence a few centuries later. I offered arguments to diminish the oddness of this remarkable shift (chapter 10, 11 and 13 in particular), emphasizing that it was not at all the abrupt change we generally think it was. I also argued that there are clear elements of continuity. Still, a feeling of uneasiness remains. This may be caused by the fact that the present research has tried to capture the long-term history of depositional practices up until the period of change in the Early Iron Age, but was unable to study Iron Age deposition as a phenomenon in itself. Yet, pilot studies like the one carried out by Ball (1999) on Ha D metalwork deposits in the Netherlands indicate that we cannot just see Ha C as the apex of a long tradition of metalwork deposition. Rather, it is something that should be studied in its own right. One of the interesting phenomena to be studied in depth may be the repeatedly found deposits of (gold) ornaments in combination with coins in our region (Van Impe 1997). Are such finds comparable to the typical axe-ornament hoards of the Late Bronze Age (chapter 13)?

Depositional sites and heritage management: what should be done?

In June 2002, I visited the site where the Kronenberg sword (chapter 7; fig. 7.13) was found, guided by the family of the original finder. This visit impressed me for a number of reasons. One of them was that I now had the opportunity to visit such a place on the basis of first-hand knowledge. Although the find was done in the 1930s, the sword and its story had been taken care of in an excellent way. The Mulder family could still show me the original place where it was found: a small but never reclaimed marsh in woodland. In addition to that, they could also tell me a number of stories that had not gone into the documented records but which seem very intriguing. They told me that next to the find spot of the sword there was also a wooden construction found: a pathway or platform? In addition, another metal object,

now lost, was found a few metres further. I am not really inclined to believe that this wooden construction or the lost metal item may have had something to do with the deposition of the sword (they seem to be of later date), but they are significant in another way. Since this marsh was never drained, it is still possible to excavate the depositional site, to sample the wooden construction and determine whether it may be contemporary to the sword and perhaps see whether other things were deposited as well. In other words: this site is one of the wet depositional locations that is still there and this brings me to the crucial discussion of heritage management.

Heritage management is a difficult business in a densely populated country as the Netherlands, and it is understandable that only those sites are selected for official protection of which we can reasonably suggest that they are worth it. Depositional sites, it is thought, are *terra incognita*: archaeologists do not seem to know where they are situated and what they are. In discussing this, specialists of archaeological heritage management often raise questions like: are we only protecting a 'natural' unaltered place where once a sword was deposited, or can we reasonably expect to find many more items and even some man-made constructions when it will be excavated? Their doubts and questions are valid ones, but I want to argue that they should not lead us to disregard depositional sites altogether in heritage issues.

With regard to the places where we may expect metalwork deposits, it occurred to me that many amateurs/metal-detectorists repeatedly find Bronze Age metalwork. They apparently know where to look for them! Also, the present book (chapter 14) may have shown that depositional sites have some general characteristics. Could not these serve as first indications for building models predicting site locations? Such models should be tested and this brings me to the second point: we do not know much about the details of depositional sites simply because we have never tried to

excavate them (see above). Current models used for predicting site locations are primarily based on the logic of subsistence economies. They have their value but they seem to ignore that the logic of subsistence strategies is only one factor explaining why people did certain things in certain places. Watery sites are generally disregarded as of no archaeological interest since they are not likely to yield settlement or burial traces. In this book we have seen that many of them do yield tangible traces of human practices. What is more, many have yielded the most splendid items of Bronze Age material culture, totally unknown from any other context. They tell us about themes that we will never know about when we continue to focus on burials and settlement sites. Difficult as their interpretation still is, depositional sites tell us about the significance of martial values, about the involvement of local societies in long-distance exchange networks, about issues of local and supra-local identities, and about the ideological way in which fully-agrarian societies approached the 'natural' environment. Recent cases underline the necessity of re-adjusting existing approaches to modelling site location. Ignoring the poor expectations indicated on the map that is generally used as an instrument for predicting and evaluating site locations (IKAW), a team of Leiden University decided to excavate in a former channel of the river Meuse. Their labour was rewarded, for they uncovered what probably was a Late Iron Age deposition site on a river bank containing an *in situ* complex of a large number of well-preserved deposited items (Jansen *et al.* 2002).

Depositional sites may be among the most important places in the world of prehistoric communities. If we take them seriously it is inconceivable that natural depositional sites are almost entirely lacking from the prehistoric landscape that we, 21st century archaeologists, try to preserve for the future.

