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**Note on the dates used in this book**

Dates before 50,000 are based on various physical dating techniques, other than radiocarbon, and expressed as 'years ago'.

Dates in the period 50,000-10,000 years ago are based on uncalibrated radiocarbon dates and expressed as 'years ago' or 'years BP' (= Before Present).

Dates in the last 10,000 years are based on calibrated radiocarbon dates and expressed as 'years BC'. Only these dates can be equated with calendar or solar years.

See chapter 1, section 'periods and dates' for the principles of radiocarbon dating.
Chapters 17-19 discussed various aspects of archaeological cultures from the Late Neolithic and the Bronze Age. In those discussions developments in material culture, settlements and burial practices were covered in separate chapters, as though they were more or less unrelated features of culture. But this was done for practical purposes only; in actual fact, these elements are of course all closely linked. In this chapter the emphasis will therefore be on the connection between issues like settlement, subsistence, dwellings, religion and social structure. An attempt will be made to relate the changes observable in the various aspects of the archaeological record to one another and to explain them.

CHANGES AT THE BEGINNING OF THE THIRD MILLENNIUM BC

The early third millennium BC saw the rise of the Beaker cultures over a large part of Northwest Europe. In the Low Countries they succeeded megalithic cultures in the sandy areas, like the TRB culture and the Seine-Oise-Marne culture, and the Vlaardingen group in the western coastal and rivers area. The most conspicuous change in the sandy areas is the replacement of collective burial in a stone tomb by individual burial beneath a barrow. Another noteworthy development is the transition from a diversity of cultural groups to a single, ubiquitous archaeological culture – first the Single Grave culture, then the Bell Beaker culture.

How we are to interpret the emergence of the Single Grave culture has already been briefly discussed in chapter 16. It was argued that this was the consequence of social and economic changes. This is an entirely different view than the traditional immigration theory proposed by Gordon Childe, who was of the opinion that this culture was introduced by cattle-herding invaders from the Pontic steppes. That these people must have been cattle herders he inferred from the absence of remains of houses, and his interpretation of them as belligerent invaders was based on the ‘battle axes’ found in their graves. For a long time pollen analysis seemed to confirm this view.

The migration model still exists today, but a lot has changed since Childe advanced his hypothesis. Over the years, many settlements of the Single Grave culture have come to light, especially in the Netherlands, and they have not yielded any evidence for cultural discontinuity. Now that the theory of itinerant cattle herders is no longer supported by palynological evidence either, archaeologists are searching for alternative explanations for the strikingly rapid transformation in material culture that took place in many parts of Central and Northwest Europe around 2900 BC. One of the alternative explanations that has been proposed for the rapid emergence and diffusion of the Beaker cultures revolves around a combination of ideological and social changes and agricultural and technological innovations.
THE TRANSITION FROM HOE TO PLOUGH AGRICULTURE

Innovations associated with the Single Grave culture are the use of the ard and cart and of oxen as a source of traction. This is not to say that the ard and the wheel had not been used previously (outside the Netherlands), for we have unmistakable evidence that this was indeed the case. The early evidence of their use however fits well into geographical models describing the introduction of innovations. These models show that innovations are adopted on a large scale within a fairly short time only after a long period of hesitant and experimental use. This period could be correlated with the emergence of the Single Grave culture.

The question is: why did the ard imply such a major improvement that people started using it everywhere? The answer probably lies in the development of the landscape under the influence of man. In areas with a forest vegetation an ard is impractical because the trees' root systems are too dense and too thick. But in a more open landscape the ard is an ideal means for breaking up the ground and drawing furrows. The fact that the ard was usually used for cross-ploughing is not surprising: in countries like Turkey, where ards are still being used today, this form of ploughing and sowing is used because it reduces the risk of weeds emerging. It is thought that the use of the ard also implied a change from broadcast sowing to sowing in furrows, which will – probably unintentionally – have led to higher yields.

The use of the ard also had consequences for the composition of the livestock, for it implied a demand for draught animals in addition to manpower. It is likely that oxen were used as a source of traction from the outset. From for example the great care with which pairs of oxen were buried by Late Neolithic groups in eastern Europe we know that oxen had a special meaning in these early times. Besides for pulling ards, oxen could also be used for drawing carts. It hence comes as no surprise that the wheel and the ard were introduced more or less simultaneously. That the wheel was in these early days also regarded as something special is apparent from, for example, the Late Neolithic wheel deposits that have been found in the peat bogs in Drenthe.

The beginnings of mixed farming

In chapters 16 and 18 it was argued that mixed farming originated in the Bronze Age. In the Late Neolithic, mixed farming, i.e. an agricultural system in which stock keeping and crop cultivation are combined in a mutually beneficiary manner, seems to have still been in a formative phase. No longhouses incorporating cattle stalls – the type of farm typically associated with mixed farming in the lowlands – are for example known from this period. From the Middle Bronze Age onwards this type of building was however to be found all over the Low Countries and their wide surroundings, from northern France to southern Scandinavia, where it has in fact remained in use until the present. The origins of this type of dwelling are difficult to explain. In our temperate region the need to stall cattle in the winter owing to cold weather is hardly a convincing argument. One reason for combining living areas and a byre beneath a single roof may have been that cattle yielded warmth from which human beings could also benefit, but that cannot have been the chief reason for stalling the cattle. Cattle can easily be driven together for milking outside, and giving the animals supplementary food outdoors is no problem either. What is however more difficult when cattle roam around outdoors is collecting manure. One of the explanations for the appearance of stalls is hence that stalling
cattle presented the possibility of collecting manure in sods or litter. That does however not explain why cattle was stalled under the same roof with the people. That has to have also a social meaning: the byre house symbolizes a strong bond between men and cattle. Cattle guaranteed fertile soil and provided traction, food, clothing. But apart from that – through its role in exchange networks – it probably enabled people to enter into social relations like alliances and marriage bonds.

THE SETTLEMENT FORM: SCATTERED FARMSTEADS

The term ‘settlement’ usually conjures up an image of a group of (relatively) closely arranged houses which constitute a unity on account of their spatial clustering, but which are also linked in a social sense – whose occupants, in other words, constitute a village community. In the Low Countries there were, however, hardly any such spatial clusters of houses until in the Late Iron Age. The farmsteads lay scattered across the landscape, rather like the farmsteads that are still to be found here and there in the Dutch Achterhoek region today. So whereas it will have been possible to make out groups from a great height, this was virtually impossible at ground level.

The almost complete absence of spatial clustering does however not imply the absence of feelings of solidarity or group cohesion, or a lack of social control. It could well be that the farms scattered across a particular area were linked by kinship ties, which bound them into a social unit even though that unit was not spatially recognisable in the form of a village. That spatial unity was probably more evident from the long-term use of a particular settlement territory within which the farms were regularly shifted from one location to another.

The size of the farms suggests that married children continued to live with their parents until well into the Middle Bronze Age. The occurrence of annexes may well be associated with this form of cohabitation in so-called extended families. Such cohabitation secured the continuity of the farm in its territory. It may moreover be regarded as a form of safety: a larger unit is better capable of distributing its manpower and is also more resistant to influences from outside. The head of the family will often have been the most powerful individual, but the oldest son also held an important position. Age and sex are in such a simply structured organisation important factors for determining social rank. This picture seems to be confirmed by the information on social organisation that can be inferred from burials. It could be argued that the right of being buried in a primary grave beneath a barrow pertained to the heads kin groups that consisted of a few of such extended families (fig. 20.1).

A LINK BETWEEN BARROWS AND PLOUGH AGRICULTURE?

Chapter 19 gave a detailed account of the meaning of the contents and the shapes of barrows, but it did not explain the transition to the individual barrow as a universal form of burial. This development, which is associated with the Single Grave culture, took place at the beginning of the Late Neolithic. Instead of depositing their dead in a megalithic tomb that was used for collective burial for a relatively long period of time by a large group of individuals, people started to bury them separately, beneath individual barrows or in individual flat graves. This does not mean that everybody was given an archaeologically visible grave. As in the Middle Neolithic, this privilege was reserved for only part of the population. That may
Fig. 10.1
Model showing the relation between household and cemetery. According to this model Middle Bronze Age local communities consisted of a group of 10-25 persons, an extended family comprising parents with their married sons and grandchildren, living together in one long house. Adult deceased were interred as a secondary burial in the barrow of a (direct) ancestor. Infants and grandchildren were not buried in the barrow, with the exception of—in this example—the oldest grandson. Only heads of families were entitled to a burial covered with a mound or with a new mound period.

Incidentally quite possibly have been the same part of the population that was previously buried in the megalithic tombs.

For a long time this change was related to an immigration of Beaker peoples who brought the custom of burial beneath barrows along with them. As already mentioned above, there is however no concrete evidence to support this. And since the archaeological remains on the contrary seem to suggest cultural continuity, it is better to search for a different explanation. Something that should be pointed out in this context is that such drastic changes in cultural patterns cannot be explained with the concept of ‘fashion’. They were without doubt associated with changes in ideology, which is understood to include issues like religion, views on ‘proper’ behaviour, taboos and also the burial rite.

The ideological development reflected by the changing burial rite at the beginning of the Late Neolithic could be characterised as a shift in emphasis from the collective to smaller units forming part of it, such as kinship groups and families. This shift can possibly be understood by relating it to the changes in the economy outlined above and assuming that the stone tombs belonged to ‘corporations’, groups of people who had the customary right of using the land in a particular area. The collective tomb was the symbol of such a group and probably served as a ceremonial centre for all kinds of rituals. It is believed that the system of shifting cultivation assumed for these groups involved very little awareness of personal ‘possession’ of fields or other plots of land, because only little time and material were invested in preparing the land for use, and it is moreover assumed that sufficient land was available for small-scale crop cultivation.

All this probably changed with the introduction of the plough: farmers then
had to invest more time, energy and 'capital' in tilling the soil. They had to remove stumps and plough the soil, they needed a team of oxen, the soil had to be manured after some time, etc. It is quite conceivable that these increased investments in the soil led to an increasingly tighter bond with the tilled land, which ultimately resulted in the farmer who tilled the soil with the help of his relatives claiming exclusive rights of use.

The 'corporations' consequently disintegrated into smaller units like kinship groups. This also implied the end of the use of the collective tombs, the hunebedden. They came to be seen as symbols of the old system, and were probably also respected as such, but they were no longer used as burial monuments. Instead, people buried their dead beneath barrows. The location of those barrows was probably very important to the deceased's relatives. Thrown up in abandoned fields in the territory over which the relatives claimed the right of use, the barrows symbolised the relatives' ties with the land (fig. 20.2).

The barrows were hence boundary markers, as it were, in a 'land of the ancestors' which at first probably bore a fairly close resemblance to the actual territorial division. After some time people presumably forgot to what person, group or territory a particular barrow belonged, but it is also possible that the memory was kept alive for a fairly long time by passing the information on from generation to generation. This was almost certainly the case with the family barrows of the Middle Bronze Age (see chapter 19), which probably represented more than ties with the tilled land alone. The positions of the secondary burials seem to reflect the contemporary hierarchical relations within the kinship groups: the primary graves contain predominantly the remains of older men, the secondary burials those of women and also children. All this changed in the Late Bronze Age, when this hierarchy seems to have been deliberately negated in the urnfields, as suggested by the many separate burials. This again indicates an important change in ideology. The emphasis seems to have reverted to the individual again, to an even greater extent than in the past. But the great variation in the shapes and dimensions of the burial monuments shows that the degree of equality had by no means increased.

The question as to how we are to interpret this trend towards even further fragmentation of the social units, and apparently also towards greater differences between the individual units, brings us to an aspect of culture that has received virtually no attention so far: the economic and social use of metal.

THE BRONZE TRADE: ITINERANT SMITHS OR EXCHANGE NETWORKS?

One of the most influential - technical and social - developments in later prehistory was without doubt the discovery of metals like copper, gold and iron. In the Low Countries, the use of copper and bronze was introduced during the Bell Beaker period, by which time these metals had already been in use for a long time elsewhere. As already discussed in chapter 17, copper and bronze started to be used on a relatively large scale in the Early Bronze Age, when the development of alloys and casting techniques widened the range of products and applications for which these metals could be used.

Until fairly recently, great emphasis was placed on the technologically innovative aspect of the use of copper and bronze. Even today, a distinction is in many countries still made between a Copper and a Bronze Age, as though they were clearly distinct periods. Research, especially settlement research, has however
Schematic models showing changes in social organisation and the associated settlement structure in the Middle Neolithic B, the Late Neolithic and the Bronze Age.

1. The focus of the hunebed corporations of the Middle Neolithic was a single hunebed or a different type of megalith. It is assumed that extended families lived together in single houses.

2. In the Late Neolithic the corporations fell apart into kinship groups, which buried their deceased beneath a barrow in the area they regarded as their ancestors' traditional territory. Such groups are defined as 'local communities'. The dotted lines mark very vague limits, which will in the past probably have been primarily natural boundaries (streams, valleys, low-lying areas, etc.).

3. From around 1000-900 BC onwards people no longer lived in longhouses in an extended-family context, but as separate households in different parts of the territory. The urnfields symbolized the unity of the local community and were usually laid out in relation to older burial monuments. All three models represent a hypothetical area measuring at least 20 km² and comprising at least 60 occupants.
shown that neither settlements nor cemeteries show any signs of the divisions suggested by the technological model. 6 The earliest occurrence of copper and bronze can be dated via grave goods and hoards, but that is not the time when these materials came into common use. As already mentioned above, most prehistoric innovations were universally accepted only after a relatively long period of tentative use, which is in the archaeological record often associated with special persons or locations, after which the novelties started to be used by all the members of the community within a relatively short time. This probably also holds for copper and bronze. This model for the introduction of novelties may also explain the rapid diffusion of the so-called Bell Beaker assemblage, a term often used to indicate the fairly uniform association of grave goods in Bell Beaker graves. The range of metal objects was limited at first, comprising small daggers, axes and a few ornaments. However, the discovery of the techniques of alloying and casting copper greatly widened the field of application and all kinds of weapons, implements and ever more ornaments started to be made of bronze.

Objects of bronze were undoubtedly highly coveted, especially in view of the metal’s scarcity. As almost everywhere else in Europe, all the copper and bronze had to be imported, and this is one of the reasons why we assume that these metals came to play important parts in a social context. Under the influence of Gordon Childe it was assumed until the 1970s that bronze objects were distributed by itinerant traders who were also smiths 7 and who were given food and drink in exchange for their services. Some objects were thought to have been distributed by means of barter: a bronze axe was bartered for, say, a cow’s skin or a sheep. But anthropological research has shown that this is a typically Western interpretation. 8 In societies without a market economy people are mainly dependent on good contacts with other groups for obtaining goods from outside the community; barter not involving relations is extremely rare in moneyless economies. In such economies barter is almost always based on a complex network of relations, with each community having its own agreements as to who can and may exchange goods with one another, what may be bartered for what and what (social) obligations the transactions involve.

We assume that similar exchange networks existed in prehistory, too. Much research is currently being devoted to this issue, but it is of course a topic that excites many discussions because it is difficult to infer such networks from the available evidence. In the Netherlands, few articles have yet been published on this topic, because our research tradition has offered little scope for such studies. But research into exchange networks could throw an interesting light on social aspects of prehistoric communities and this question therefore deserves attention.

Exchange networks in the Low Countries: the differences between the north and the south

Although there is little evidence to prove it, we may assume that the nature and composition of the existing networks changed at the beginning of the Bronze Age, for the exchange of flint, hitherto one of the most important raw materials for tools and weapons, did not necessarily take place in the same network as that of bronze. New contacts were required and different principles came to govern the exchanges. This is not to say that flint disappeared from daily life at the beginning of the Bronze Age; on the contrary, flint was for a long time to remain an important raw material for certain tools, such as sickles, and weapons, such as arrowheads. So it is unlikely that the existing networks suddenly collapsed; instead,
they probably changed in character and content over the years, with new networks emerging alongside them.

The research into burials in particular has shown that the diffuse boundary between the northern and southern parts of the Netherlands observable in the Late Neolithic persisted until in the Middle Bronze Age: the northeastern part of the country formed part of the networks oriented towards Scandinavia, while the southern and central parts focused on Belgium, France and Britain. The ranges of products that circulated in the two networks were almost the same, but there were clear regional differences in types.

**Gift exchange: a brief theoretical introduction**

The bronze 'trade' will certainly have been an important aspect of exchange networks, but the networks will have had a much wider function. Anthropological research among present-day communities suggests that their most important function may have been as a means for establishing and maintaining contacts with other groups. Contacts can be important in times of need, for example during a famine or war, but they can of course also be used as a source of prestige.

We assume that the exchange of gifts was one of the most important mechanisms for creating and maintaining networks; the presentation of a gift creates a bond between the donor and the recipient. What this bond exactly implies, and what form the gifts should take, will vary from one community to another. In theory the 'debt' can be redeemed by returning the gesture with a gift of a similarly standardised form. Such behaviour is known to us from the Kula exchange system among the people of the Trobriand Islands. In some communities the debt is
however never redeemed, but is constantly reversed by returning the gesture with a gift of a greater value. This is known as ‘competitive gift exchange’.

As exchange based on such mechanisms involves more than economic transactions alone, the exchange acts themselves are often accompanied by ceremonies. Those ceremonies may involve only a small number of individuals, but sometimes they may extend to entire families, kinship groups, villages or even tribes. The protagonists are often the dominant male members of those groups: village chiefs or tribal or lineage heads, who gain prestige from their prominent roles.

Besides the presentation of gifts, their destruction may also be a source of prestige. The recipient may accept the offered gifts to then, for example, break or burn them. Such an act symbolises his great disdain of property and the strength of his spirit (as in the case of the ‘potlatch’ discussed in chapter 29). At the same time, it grants him prestige. The effect of this ceremonial destruction may be to put an end to an escalated cycle of competitive gift exchange. After the destruction ritual a new cycle starts, but with gifts of a much lesser value than those with which the previous cycle ended.

So besides the giving of gifts, their exchange—often referred to as consumption—may also have an important social function. A special form of destruction is to irrevocably part with valuable goods by depositing or discarding them in inaccessible places like peat bogs, springs or rivers, as offerings to deities or ancestors. In the archaeological record we find only the traces of gifts thus ‘consumed’. Some of the bronzes that have come to light may of course represent tools or ornaments that were lost or that were deposited in a pit as waste after they had fragmented, but the cases in which such a form of deposition can be demonstrated are rare. Bronze objects are for example only very rarely found in settlement contexts, in the Low Countries at least, while most fragmented bronzes are recovered from contexts that show that they were deliberately buried there. That fragmented bronze was not readily discarded is no cause for surprise: the material was scarce and could be easily melted down for reuse. The study of bronze hoards has therefore become an important means for investigating exchange networks and the ideological aspects of the custom of depositing bronzes.

SOCIAL ASPECTS OF THE USE AND DISCARDING OF COPPER AND BRONZE

In what ways were copper and bronze used and discarded in the Low Countries? We must ask ourselves this question in order to find out something about the social aspects of the use of metal. The trends reflected by the grave goods have already been discussed with reference to the burial rite in chapter 19. It seems that from the Late Neolithic onwards the deceased were accompanied by predominantly items of personal gear: copper daggers, a few bronze axes or swords, sometimes a bracelet or a neck ring (pottery is here left out of consideration). Judging from the grave goods, the personal gear was fairly sober, but this impression is of course greatly influenced by traditions and taboos associated with the burial rite. Apparently bronzes were virtually not removed from circulation in the form of grave goods.

An entirely different picture emerges from the finds that have been recovered from swamps, rivers and river valleys (chapter 29). The practice of depositing objects at watery locations seems to have existed since the Neolithic. From the distribution of the finds we may infer that swamps, springs and other places where water seeps to the surface, the sources of rivers and points where rivers flow to-
gether were particularly popular locations for ‘offering’ objects. The offerings even included objects that were made specifically for the deposition ritual, such as the swords from Lutphaas and Ommerschans (chapter 17). Especially from the Late Bronze Age onwards, such categories of objects were not deposited in graves. We know nothing about the size of the groups who witnessed such depositions, but from the many rock engravings showing processions that have been found in Scandinavia we may infer that fairly large gatherings attended these events.

We get the impression that bronze thus came to play an increasingly important part in manipulating social relations. But if the social structure described above is correct, only a select group of individuals will have been 'entitled' to participate in the transactions in the exchange networks. The challenging of these individuals' monopoly positions may ultimately have led to the disintegration of the existing social structure of autonomous kinship groups led by a lineage head. The evidence obtained in excavations of settlements and cemeteries suggests that from the Late Bronze Age onward, the family came to play a more important part as the smallest social unit. From this perspective it is easy to understand why the number of primary burials beneath a barrow increased in the course of the Middle Bronze Age, and why, in the Late Bronze Age, this form of burial subsequently gave way to burial in an urnfield, in which (almost?) everybody was entitled to a ‘primary’ grave.

**WHAT NEXT?**

On the preceding pages an attempt has been made to present a coherent picture of the social and economic developments that took place in the Late Neolithic and the Middle Bronze Age. In some cases it has been briefly mentioned along what lines these developments continued in the subsequent Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age. Although the appearance of the urnfields is often regarded as a major turning point, marking the end of the Middle Bronze Age, it is very likely that this change can also be traced back to developments that started in the Middle Bronze Age already. What we do know for certain is that it, too, represents an important ideological transformation and not a new fashion or the immigration of a foreign people.

Many aspects of the picture presented in the previous sections require further research. Although we are reasonably well-informed about house construction and settlement layout in the Middle Bronze Age, our knowledge of these issues in the Early Bronze Age and the Late Neolithic is still poor. A few chance discoveries have given us some idea of the settlements, but the evidence is too scanty to enable us to construct a sound model. It is hoped that the research in West-Friesland will alter this situation (feature J).

Although the Dutch model of shifting farmsteads for Bronze Age settlement is well founded, much research still remains to be done in the field of settlement archaeology. For example, no attention – other than in a technological sense – has yet been paid to the dynamics of the movements of the farmsteads. This topic requiring further study is the ways in which settlements, cemeteries and ritual sites were viewed in relation to the surrounding landscape and the ways in which they acquired new meanings over the years. This question could be approached by studying for example how settlements and cemeteries were treated after they had been abandoned: were they respected or did groups who later arrived at the site take them into use again or erect new buildings over their remains and, if so, in what period? There where it is found that the site of a
former settlement was reused for occupation shortly after it had been abandoned, as took place at, for example, Elp and, on several occasions, Oss, we may assume that the farmsteads had remained recognisable as such.\textsuperscript{17} Research into this topic is currently being carried out on a settlement level and a (micro)regional level.\textsuperscript{18}

The realization that landscape has cultural as well as physical aspects seems to be an important discovery that will certainly lead to new ideas on people’s attitudes towards the organisation of their surroundings and the meanings they attached to their surroundings. Research into large adjoining areas within a restricted region is important for gaining a better understanding of this issue.

An important source of information which has by no means been exhausted yet is metal. While most research so far has focused on the provenance of the various materials, future studies will have to concentrate on the context of deposition. Only such research may provide information on the social and ideological aspects of the ways in which metal was used and discarded. An interesting area of research in this context is that of the dynamics of the exchange networks, in which due attention should be paid to the fact that the Netherlands occupied a special position at the border of two spheres of exchange, the Atlantic and the Scandinavian.

Another field, finally, in which much still remains to be done is palaeoecology. Although we are now reasonably well-informed about the range of foodstuffs consumed by the Late Neolithic and Bronze Age occupants of the Netherlands, we still have much to learn about farming practices. Too little attention is still being paid to issues like forms of manuring, the cultivation methods employed, the situation and size of the fields, the relation between crop cultivation and cattle keeping, the origins and nature of the Celtic field system (chapter 22), etc. Such research is especially important if we wish to make well-founded statements on the meaning of the landscape and man’s conscious shaping of his surroundings. These issues in fact present a new communal area of research for palaeoecologists and archaeologists.

### NOTES

2. The curious thing, incidentally, is that a migration model has recently been advanced in Scandinavia (Kristiansen 1990), where a model based on continuous developments has hitherto always been used. It has however not yet gathered a following.
3. See e.g. Champion \textit{et al.} 1986 for a survey.
4. Slicher van Bath (1978, 37) writes that in the Middle Ages sowing in furrows led to higher yields than broadcasting.
7. Which is not to say that no flat graves are known from the period before the Single Grave culture.
10. See Bloch 1971.
13. Some archaeologists assume that the hunebedden were also territorial markers. It is however difficult to assume a one-to-one relation between a hunebed and the surrounding territory for the developed phase of the TRB culture, because the distribution area of the settlements is then much larger than that of the hunebedden (Fokkens 1986; 1991a, 102; 1998).
15. In 1978 Brongers and Woltering, for example, wrote (p. 86): 'There is only little piece of evidence for continuity from Late Neolithic Bell Beaker metallurgy to the Early Bronze Age'.
22. Gregory 1982, 60. Gregory is here quoting Boas, the ethnographer who first described the Kwakiutl potlatch.
23. Malinowski 1922; Weiner, 1988. Malinowski (1922, 83) puts this as follows: 'The ceremonial exchange of the two articles is the main, fundamental aspect of the Kula. But associated with it, and done under its cover, we find a great number of secondary activities and features. There, side by side with the ritual exchange of arm-shells
and necklaces, the natives carry on ordinary trade, bartering from one island to another a great number of utilities, often inprocurable in the district to which they are imported and indispensable'.

25 For a social explanation see Gerritsen 2001.  
27 Fokkens 1993, 42.  
28 See for example Roymans 1995.