



ALEXANDER GRAMSCH

CULTURE, CHANGE, IDENTITY – APPROACHES TO THE INTERPRETATION OF CULTURAL CHANGE

ABSTRACT: Thinking about culture and cultural change lies at the heart of archaeological interpretation. In a brief overview of traditional archaeological approaches several "prime movers" for the change of culture or society are discussed that tend to externalize the reasons for change. Looking for reasons for change outside archaeological cultures facilitated the understanding of these cultures as homogeneous and static. In a rather pointed juxtaposition dynamic and multifaceted concepts of culture and cultural change are presented. Reference is made to both Neolithic and modern examples.

KEY WORDS: Archaeological culture – Culture change – Identity – Practice – Process – Hybridity

INTRODUCTION

This paper derives from the session "What is changing and when" held at the EAA Annual Meeting in Pilsen 2013. The contributors discussed the nature and timing of changes from the Linear Pottery Culture (Linearbandkeramik, LBK) to successive archaeological cultures from a material point of view. Here, culture (or "Kultur" with a capital K) is understood as being defined by a common *material* culture and other common "culture traits", such as burial customs or house shapes. This is the traditional Central European archaeological paradigm (cf. Sommer, Gramsch 2011) based

upon the archaeological culture concept, including the assumption that archaeological cultures can be understood as historic entities, rather than just analytical ones.

Having been asked by the session organisers to add some general thoughts and theoretical vocabulary to the session's examination of culture and culture change at the end of the 6th millennium BC, much of what this paper discusses refers to the history and paradigms of Central European archaeology, where this archaeological culture concept is deeply rooted. And this paper starts with the notion that there is neither agreement on what culture is nor on what change is.

Received 20 November 2014; accepted 14 January 2015.

© 2015 Moravian Museum, Anthropos Institute, Brno. All rights reserved.

However, it is not the intention of this paper to develop a new definition of culture or culture change (for definitions of culture see, e.g., Kroeber, Kluckhohn 1952); instead, an approach will be developed to access change, diversity and dynamics in prehistoric societies.

This approach will centre upon practice, discussing actions in social, cultural or economic contexts of a society and their interrelationships and how they may interact.

To find a way to access culture change, I will argue

- against looking for external prime movers that cause change within societies,
- for a closer look at different actors within these societies and
- for a non-essentialist and dynamic concept of culture.

"CULTURE" IN TRADITIONAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL THOUGHT

There is a fundamental and often post-colonially grounded critique that argues that the concept of "culture" is an invention of 19th century colonial practice. Ethnology and cultural anthropology, developing in a colonial framework, were trying to precisely delineate foreign, i.e. non-Western cultures as clear-cut entities to be dealt with more easily by colonial administrations. Thus, they invented definite, homogeneous and stable entities. Compared to European nations, these cultures were labelled "primitive", with the inability to progress or to step out of their prehistoric lifestyle. They were defined as the "other", living in a time different from their Western contemporaries (Fabian 1983). While not all ethnological practice served colonial purposes, this notion of a stable and homogeneous culture, which matches with ethnic groups, has influenced much of traditional archaeological thinking (Gramsch 2009, Sommer, Gramsch 2011).

In traditional Central European archaeology, a culture is defined through a shared set of material culture and certain traits: in particular, pottery styles, domestic architecture, and burial practices. It is assumed that a common set of norms and values guided cultural practices and were shared by the community, thus leading to similar material culture.

Generally speaking, such a community was understood as an ethnic community. Thus, the archaeologically-defined cultures have been understood as factual historical actors with a *emic* sense of unity. Moreover, these cultures were perceived as static; change thus required an outside explanation.

APPROACHING CHANGE

Explaining the change of cultures, while maintaining the idea that they were homogeneous, stable and static, required the detection of one or several responsible factors or "prime movers" that provided the catalyst for change. Popular "prime movers" for culture change in traditional, processual and post-processual archaeological thought were migration, diffusion, and environment. Each of these will be discussed in turn.

Migration

Migration has been a widely used explanation for culture change, but has remained seriously under-theorized (e.g. Burmeister 2000, 2013). A central line of thought in culture-historical archaeology of the 19th and much of the 20th century, as has been said above, was the assumption that archaeological cultures or "culture provinces" represent factual ethnic entities. In this respect, Kossinna was part of the mainstream. This line of thought was rooted in 19th century philosophy; in particular in romanticism and the ideas of German philosopher Johann Gottfried Herder (1744–1803) concerning the unchanging character of peoples.

Herder considered this character or ethnic spirit ("*Volksgeist*") the essence of a people (Andresen 2004, Brather 2004), and since it would not change over time, changes observed in culture, including material culture, must have resulted from outside influences.

Prehistoric archaeology was strongly influenced by this essentialism, i.e. the idea that culture and *ethnos* have an essential, unchanging core. This made migrations an important "prime mover" to explain culture change: new culture traits must have been introduced from outside. Migrationist interpretations were modeled on Late Antiquity and Migration Period movements – and even transferred to biblical stories (*Figure 1*).

Thus, due to the fact that we had this historic role model and a firm culture-historical paradigm, no theoretical discussion was necessary to define migration (Burmeister 2000: 539). While migration as an explanation for culture change came out of fashion after WWII and in particular due to the Kossinna syndrome (s. Wolfram 2000), it experienced a renaissance in the late 1990s (Anthony 1997, Härke 1998, Burmeister 2000) as part of the intensified discussions in archaeological theory. Migrationist explanations have recently been revived with the possibilities of aDNA analysis. However, the theoretical debate has not been renewed to the same degree, neglecting a discussion of the conceptual assumptions guiding the interpretation of



FIGURE 1: Fernand Cormon's historical painting "Cain" (1880) models the aftermath of the biblical story on the idea of the migration of prehistoric "tribes", speculating on contemporary archaeological finds of early humans (Oil on canvas, Musée d'Orsay; see: http://www.museeorsay.fr/en/collections/works-in-focus/search/commentaire_id/cain-8826.html. Image reproduced as public domain work of art at Wikimedia Commons: http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Cormon,_Fernand_-_Cain_flying_before_Jehovah%27s_Curse.jpg).

aDNA results. Rather than pots or people, today, haplogroups are migrating through Europe, supposedly related to Neolithization or the expansion of cultures, such as the Bell Beaker culture. Again, archaeologically defined cultures are equated with historical actors, but this time, they are also defined by mitochondrial DNA groups (cf. Brotherton *et al.* 2013).

However, even if aDNA does provide evidence for the actual movement of humans, we need to discuss both the character of the movement and its underlying motivations. Migration can be defined as a form of spatial mobility of individuals and groups (e.g. Burmeister 2013). We need to discuss and define both the social and the spatial scale of migration, i.e. who are the actors and how do we define where intra-regional movement ends and inter-regional mobility starts. Do we interpret culture change as the result of an invasion or of a variable and small-scale phenomenon? Can population movement be characterized as a short-term historic event or as a long-term occurrence? Which social groups were involved? Where the motivations are concerned, we need to look into social developments. For example, what are

the social relationships between the different groups involved? Concepts that are useful for this discussion include dominance and resistance, acceptance or rejection, inclusion or exclusion, acculturation or integration. Migrations can be part of long-term social processes within and between the various social, cultural or ethnic groups involved (cf. Anthony 1997). If groups are moving into other regions and thus change both their spatial *and* social relationship to other groups, this not only may spark change, but is itself the result of social dynamics.

We can conclude that migration is not a "prime mover", but is one part of a web of changes, of processes resulting from changes within groups and in their relationships to other groups and resulting in new dynamics.

Diffusion

The migrationist model is counterbalanced by its counterpart, diffusion. Diffusion explains changes in culture traits – such as burial practices or pottery production – as resulting from influences from the

outside, from other cultural (and ethnic?) groups. Innovations thus should be traceable over time across an ever-widening geographic area. For example, the Stroked Pottery Culture as an LBK successor is sometimes understood as a local innovation that diffused from one region in Bohemia or Central Germany to other LBK regions; other suggestions promote a polyfocal diffusion (Link 2012: 115).

In culture-historical archaeology, little thought was given as to *why* certain practices or innovations should be adopted in other cultures or societies. Where technical innovations were concerned, it seemed to be obvious that new and supposedly better tools or techniques would be introduced and implemented in other cultures considered "backward" or more "primitive". However, this concept implicitly assumes that our own "technicist" and modernist paradigm, which says "newer is better", is valid for all cultures. It explains neither why nor how ideas or practices moved between different social or cultural contexts. Who benefits from adopting or refusing them? Which social, economic or cultural groups are involved? Can we describe the processes of adoption and integration, or of resistance? "All material and technological practices are inscribed with social and symbolic meaning ... [and sometimes] innovations are resisted if they cannot be integrated within existing social and cosmological frameworks" (Kristiansen 2005: 153sq.)

Just like migration, diffusion seems to offer the "advantage" of explaining changes in a defined region by simply describing the new material culture elements or culture traits in this region and linking them to other regions, drawing arrows across a map; the visualization of migrations and diffusions, like the spread of the Neolithic, is strikingly similar. However, this "prime mover" again only transfers the explanation for culture change to somewhere outside.

Acculturation and Colonization

Two concepts related to migration and diffusion are colonization and acculturation, because they involve the movement of groups or their influence on others, and the take-over of certain culture traits. The application of these concepts usually rests on the assumption of the supremacy of one culture over the other, politically, economically or both, causing acculturation or resulting in colonization. Again, these concepts are largely based upon colonial thinking (see Gramsch 2009).

Historical examples suggest that culture contact leads to changes on both sides, resulting from accelerated processes or intensified practices rather than simple imitation. For example, regional or social groups within

a society or culture may see a political advantage in *accommodation*, i.e. in adopting and adapting a certain habitus from an outside group that is politically or economically powerful. Adaption and reinterpretation of practices is powerful in public contexts such as feasts (Benz, Gramsch 2006).

Examples are the "Romanization" and "Hellenization" of other cultures. Here, too, scholars recently started to ask, *why* societies dominated by Roman politics or Greek economics would start to imitate or adopt such elements. Michael Dietler, for example, through his research in Iron Age Rhône valley, analyzed the exchange processes between local and Greek groups and criticized the notion that the acceptance of Greek elements was an obvious choice for a "backward", "barbarian", less developed culture. Dietler (2005, 2006) instead focused on the internal politics *within* these societies. He made clear that imitation or adoption is not an inevitable cultural practice but needs a closer look at the social, cultural and economic context on both sides. According to Dietler, the adoption of Greek wine is linked to feasting and, thus, to an internal mechanism for forming social relationships and dependencies within an elite and separating it from other social actors. Greek wine not only has been adopted, but *adapted* to the sociopolitical environment in the Rhône valley.

If we see culture as something stable, homogeneous, and essential, change is initiated only through "prime movers" coming from the outside. However, we need to take into account the internal social, cultural and economic context that enables, favours or restrains changes. Thus, we need to discuss how to conceptualize culture as a *dynamic* and *complex* framework that allows or restrains change. Before discussing dynamic culture concepts, one more "prime mover" for culture change needs to be considered briefly, one that is not external, but still not part of internal social processes.

Environment

The relationship between cultures or societies and their environment was one of the main topics of processual archaeology. To explain historical change, environmental data and climate in particular played a prominent role. In the last two decades, the application of new scientific methods and data applicable for archaeology gives rise to a better understanding of prehistoric environmental change (e.g. Maise 1998, Gronenborn 2007). In this volume, Detlef Gronenborn presents an approach that relies on models that were developed for biological systems, and which he transfers

to societies – his so-called "complexity cascades" with cycles of equilibrium, growth, crisis, collapse. Here, cultural change is induced through climate change, i.e. social actors are *reacting* to outside changes rather than acting and changing things through individual and group agency.

However "societies" reactions towards environmental changes are neither uniform nor predictable, but again historically contingent and context-driven. Adaptation to new challenges is an interplay between social practices within a certain historical framework and possible innovation. Again, we need to look at the inside rather than to concentrate on outside "prime movers". A consideration of technical reaction needs to be complemented with a consideration of how collective action emerges or is hampered (Gramsch 2009: 13). This requires thinking about dynamic culture concepts, about deliberate actions and social actors, and about hybridity.

DYNAMIC CULTURE CONCEPTS: IDENTITY AND PRACTICE

First, it should be remembered that the concept of "archaeological culture" is itself a construct, with Kossinna and Childe as its key proponents, and not necessarily an ancient reality. Whether or not an archaeological culture such as the LBK can be understood as a historical actor needs to be discussed rather than assumed. It *can* be a valid analytical unit, for certain questions, while other questions may require other units.

Second, the normative culture concept, i.e. the idea that a culture is defined by a homogeneous set of common norms and values shared by the individual members of that culture, increasingly poses problems, as current debates concerning "deviant" burials make clear. Most of the contributors to a recent volume on so-called "deviant" burials (Müller-Scheeßel 2013) agree that these practices were also part of the ritual practices of a certain cultural group, even if rarely practiced. The LBK, for example, seems to be characterized by a clear-cut burial norm: cemetery inhumations of individuals buried in a crouched position.

However, at a closer look, it becomes clear that this norm is not as normative as it seems, since we would expect a much higher number of burials in general, and because there have been a high number of individuals found who were not buried in a crouched position in a cemetery, but either lying extended on their back, within a settlement, or not being buried in the "normal"

sense at all – e.g. at sites such as Kilianstädten, Herxheim and other late LBK sites (see Meyer *et al.* 2013, Pechtl, Hofmann 2013). Then, the question is: how do we define a norm? How many criteria may be "deviant" or occurring rarely to still be considered part of the cultural normative practice – one criterion, such as burial inside a settlement, or two criteria, such as intra-settlement burial *and* the body's extended position, or more? For example, Meyer *et al.* (2013) argue that settlement burials are part of the LBK norm. On the other hand, they consider burials without grave goods as "deviant", although such burials comprise of 35% of all burials. Such an interpretation reveals more about our own values and our own ideas of correct behaviour than those of the prehistoric actors.

We should accept that not all actors within a society accept the norms and values of "their" culture in the same way. Rather than taking "norm" and "deviation" as our starting point, we can move beyond the normative culture concept and beyond the attempt to look into people's heads to understand their norms and values. There is an alternative to normative and homogenizing concepts of culture that is less concerned with norms and postulated prehistoric thinking and more with what social actors actually *did*.

Identity and practice

An approach concerned with actions and agency focuses on the effects of social practice (cf. Gramsch 2010: 123). It acknowledges that change is immanent to societies and induced by actions. If we understand culture as *process*, change is not an exception that needs an extra-cultural impetus.

Culture as process means to conceptualize social actions as both historically contingent and reproducing social identity. For example, Paul Ricoeur replaced the famous Cartesian thought "*cogito ergo sum*" by saying: I am doing, therefore I am (e.g. Ricoeur 1971, cf. Ricoeur 1991). The individual gains identity through what she/he is doing. Turning from the individual to social groups, Hanna Arendt (1958) promoted the concept of *vita activa*, saying that a society, too, is constituted, maintained and changed through collective action, through praxis.

Arendt discerns three dimensions of human activity: labour, work, and action. While labour means continuous reproduction of both the individual body and the outer world, and work means production of the material world, action is communicative, such as speaking, and constructs a place of participation, of interaction, and of negotiation for a plurality of social actors (Arendt 1958).

Burials are probably the best way to study prehistoric practice, because we know that the actions comprising the funeral have been deliberate (Gramsch 2010, 2013). However, we are also able to reconstruct actions within settlements and in depositional practices. To trace culture change, I suggest recording these actions and their changes through time and to consider who are the responsible social actors – beyond archaeological cultures. Using the actual procedures comprising, e.g., a funeral ritual as a starting point, we may then consider how these actions changed the relationships between or within the social groups involved in the ritual and the historical impact of these actions.

Rituals are an important and archaeologically accessible field for identifying social action (Gramsch, Meier 2013). Rituals act upon social actors in a number of ways, in that they are:

- public and highly visible;
- repetitive and nevertheless open to individual adaption;
- involving a number of different social actors, such as the deceased, his or her relatives, the local or wider regional group, the society as a whole;
- potentially able to transform social reality.

Burial rituals not only *present* the ideals of identities and relationships between the social actors, i.e. are "models of" identities and relationships, but they are also "models for" these, they *enact* identities and relationships (Geertz 1987: 52). They help social groups to generate and re-generate and to present, maintain and negotiate differences in social identities and social relationships (Bell 1997); they are communicative social actions (Gramsch 2013). This transformative power derives from the dialectics of ritual practice. As public and repetitive actions, rituals are governed by existing structures; at the same time, they create and change these structures (Bell 1997: 88 sq.).

Social actors can be defined through social (age, gender, social relationships, e.g. peer groups), cultural (commonalities in ritual practice, producing and preparing food, architecture, etc.), or regional identities (settlement community, settlement area or core-periphery-relationships). These identities constitute themselves according to the context of their actions. Where these actions, e.g. the renegotiation of peer group relationships during feasting or burial rituals, lead to change, this change may affect only the social or the economic sphere, not the total archaeological culture as such. A non-normative and dynamic concept of culture allows the acceptance of continuities and discontinuities at the same time (Gramsch 2009). A fine example for such

a simultaneity of persistence and change is Clifford Geertz's "Thick description" of a Javanese burial ritual that failed because the economic sphere of the social actors had changed, while the cultural-religious sphere had not (Geertz 1957, cf. Gramsch 2009): Geertz concludes that "the disruption of Paidjan's funeral may be traced to a single source: an incongruity between the cultural framework of meaning and the patterning of social interaction, an incongruity due to the persistence in an urban environment of a religious symbol system adjusted to peasant social structure"; continuing, he criticizes that a static functionalism is unable to understand such an incongruity "because it fails to realize that cultural structure and social structure are not mere reflexes of one another but independent, yet interdependent, variables" (Geertz 1957: 53).

Another example is Hanna Kowalewska-Marczałek's (2012) research, which scrutinized the shift from LBK to the "Lengyel Cycle" in the Sandomierz region of Poland. She emphasized that continuity and change on the micro- and macro-scale do not oppose each other; rather, they are complementary. In this vein, on the micro- and macro-scale, group decisions regarding where to create and maintain settlements can be understood as actions constituting and changing society. Rather than trying to detect the shift from one stable archaeological culture to another, we can now discern many changes in different social actors and among different contexts.

Hybrid Communities

If we accept the concept of different social actors rather than stable, homogeneous and bounded cultures, we also can accept the notion of hybrid communities, a concept developed in post-colonial theory (e.g. Bhabha 2000). Bhabha defines a "third space", where actors meet and create ambiguity; this may result from the necessity to express identity to others differently than identity would be expressed within one's peer group.

Modern migration groups are hybrid when they continue their traditions in a more private framework (inner sphere) and adopt cultural elements from the "host society" when they are in direct contact with it (outer sphere). Thus, we may see both conservative, traditional, and progressive, changing elements at the same time. One reason may be that keeping traditions means maintaining self-identification – trying to reassure oneself and maintain one's identity in a partly unknown, new cultural setting. Another reason can be found in Bourdieu's concept of *habitus*. *Habitus* means that many practices and predispositions of individuals and groups

are not an objective reaction to the actual social and cultural surroundings, but are learned and embodied and thus will be maintained (Bourdieu 1979, cf. Burmeister 2013: 43 sq.).

According to Burmeister (2013: 40 sq.), the wooden block house can be considered a typical material culture trait of the 17th century colonization of Northern America that was frequently built by European pioneers all over the continent, despite the fact that the pioneers came from different European countries. The homogeneity of the block house architecture thus does not reflect the heterogeneity of the cultural groups producing it. This newly-introduced material culture trait was adopted by various immigrant groups because of its high functionality in the new environment. Moreover, not only is the immigrant culture a hybrid of different European origins, but also of European and Native American cultural sources.

Understanding cultures / societies as ambivalent and hybrid allows us to accept incongruities and the simultaneity of continuity and change; moreover, it directs our attention to the continuous creation and negotiation of social and cultural identities through communicative action. It allows archaeological interpretation to move away from external "prime movers" to the interpretation of the interplay of social actors within and between societies. It allows understanding culture as process and practice, such as practicing rituals or establishing settlements, as a form of communication and a driving force for creating and changing identities.

When we approach cultures as a dynamic and hybrid entity with various social actors, whose identities are also fluid, based upon gender, age, or regional groups etc., we will be able to ask: *Cui bono?* Who benefits from either maintaining a system or changing it? Who benefits from introducing (adopting, imitating, etc.) cultural or ritual practices or resisting them? The benefit may be in the form of economic advantages, prestige, power or a combination of these. For example, the introduction and acceptance of new pottery styles displayed in ritual or feasting by the host (i.e. the individual or group responsible for the feast), linked with the feeding of a number of guests (i.e. "outside" social actors), may both enhance prestige and enable the establishment of new exchange connections with these other, external groups, leading to economic advantages for the host. It may also result in the enhancement of social tensions, thus accelerating change.

A hybrid understanding of the LBK may also facilitate the understanding of the divergence between

the rather continuous development of culture change at the end of the LBK in the east with the emergence of the SBK and the contrastingly sharp break of the LBK in the west.

CONCLUSION

With a necessarily brief overview of the terms and models that are often applied to explain culture change, this paper attempts to highlight some of the problems and deficiencies involved. What strikes me most is that it is very common to look for a single source of culture change, a "prime mover" that starts to destabilize a previously stable culture. Where cultures are perceived as stable, existing in an "equilibrium", such a "prime mover" is exogenous, coming from the outside, usually from other cultures or induced by climate and environment. Moreover, the traditional culture concept assumed a homogenous historical unit, where change is an exception.

The approach advocated here starts from the assumption that societies are dynamic and culture itself is a process. Societies comprise different social actors that manifest in different contexts and follow different agendas (Gramsch 2009: 22).

Change is the interplay between historical contingency, context, and communication between these social actors or cultures. Ritual and feasting are forms of communication that are based on public action, and which are detectable archaeologically. An archaeology of action and agency centres on the constant establishment, negotiation and transformation of social identities through action. An important question to interpret these transformations is: who benefits?

Thus, culture change is not something affecting a homogenous culture, resulting from a single and external source, or an exception requiring explanation. In recent years, the discussion of the LBK has also turned from an emphasis on homogeneity, uniformity and stability to an understanding of diversity and change (cf. the session at the EAA Pilsen meeting "Something out of the ordinary? Interpreting the diversity in the uniformity of the Early Neolithic LBK in Central and Western Europe" See: <http://proposal.eaa2013.cz/programme/session-abstract.php?id=61>). This allows us to better understand the various *internal* social reasons for change at the end of the LBK, even if induced by external social actors – reasons such as struggle for regional or social identity or political hegemony.

REFERENCES

- ANDRESEN M., 2004: *Studien zur Geschichte und Methodik der archäologischen Migrationsforschung*. Münster.
- ANTHONY D., 1997: Prehistoric migration as social process. In: J. Chapman, H. Hamerow (Eds.): *Migrations and invasions in archaeological explanation*. Pp. 21–32. BAR Int. S. 664. Oxford.
- ARENDT H., 1958: *The human condition*. Chicago.
- BELL C., 1997: *Ritual. Perspectives and dimensions*. Oxford.
- BENZ M., GRAMSCH A., 2006: Zur soziopolitischen Bedeutung von Festen. Eine Einführung in Beispiele aus dem Alten Orient und Europa. *Ethnographisch-Archäologische Zeitschrift* 47: 417–437.
- BHABHA H., 2000: *Die Verortung der Kultur*. Tübingen.
- BOURDIEU P., 1979: *La distinction. Critique sociale du jugement*. Éditions de Minuit, Paris.
- BRATHER S., 2004: *Ethnische Interpretationen in der frühgeschichtlichen Archäologie. Geschichte, Grundlagen und Alternativen*. RGA Ergänzungsbd. 42. Berlin, New York.
- BROTHERTON P., HAAK W., TEMPLETON J., BRANDT G., SOUBRIER J., ADLER J. CH., RICHARDS S. M., DER SARKISSIAN C., GANSLMEIER R., FRIEDERICH S., DRESELY V., VAN OVEN M., KENYON R., VAN DER HOEK M. B., KORLACH J., LUONG K., HO S. Y. W., QUINTANA-MURCI L., BEHAR D. M., MELLER H., ALT K. W., COOPER A., ADHIKARLA S., PRASAD A. K. G., PITCHAPPAN R., SANTHAKUMARI A. V., BALANOVSKA E., BALANOVSKY O., BERTRANPETIT J., COMAS D., MARTÍNEZ-CRUZ B., MELÉ M., CLARKE A. C., MATISOO-SMITH E. A., DULIK M. C., GAIESKI J. B., OWINGS A. C., SCHURR T. G., VILAR M. G., HOBBS A., SOODYALL H., JAVED A., PARIDA L., PLATT D. E., ROYYURU A. K., JIN L., LI S., KAPLAN M. E., MERCHANT N. C., MITCHELL R. J., RENFREW C., LACERDA D. R., SANTOS F. R., HERNANZ D. F. S., WELLS R. S., SWAMIKRISHNAN P., TYLER-SMITH CH., VIEIRA P. P., ZIEGLE J. S., 2013: Neolithic mitochondrial haplogroup H genomes and the genetic origins of Europeans. *Nature Communications* 4, <http://www.nature.com/ncomms/journal/v4/n4/full/ncomms2656.html>.
- BURMEISTER S., 2000: Archaeology and Migration. Approaches to an archaeological proof of migration. *Current Anthropology* 41: 539–553.
- BURMEISTER, S. 2013: Migration – Innovation – Kulturwandel. Aktuelle Problemfelder archäologischer Investigation. In: E. Kaiser, W. Schier (Eds.): *Mobilität und Wissenstransfer in diachroner und interdisziplinärer Perspektive*. Topoi – Berlin Studies of the Ancient World vol. 9. Pp. 35–58. De Gruyter, Berlin/Boston.
- DIETLER M., 2005: *Consumption, and Colonial Interaction in the Rhône Basin of France: A Study of Early Iron Age Political Economy*. Monographies d'Archéologie Méditerranéenne. Lattes.
- DIETLER M., 2006: Feasting und kommensale Politik in der Eisenzeit Europas. Theoretische Reflexionen und empirische Fallstudien. *Ethnographisch-Archäologische Zeitschrift* 47: 541–568.
- FABIAN J., 1983: *Time and the other. How anthropology makes its object*. Columbia University Press, New York.
- GEERTZ C. 1957: Ritual and social change: a Javanese example. *American Anthropologist* 59, 1: 32–53. Also available at http://hypergeertz.jku.at/GeertzTexts/Ritual_Change.htm
- GEERTZ C., 1987: *Dichte Beschreibung. Beiträge zum Verstehen kultureller Systeme*. Suhrkamp, Frankfurt am Main.
- GRAMSCH A., 2009: Die Gleichzeitigkeit des Ungleichzeitigen. Überlegungen zum Kulturwandel. In: A. Zeeb-Lanz (Ed.): *Krisen – Kulturwandel – Kontinuitäten: Zum Ende der Bandkeramik in Mitteleuropa. Beiträge der internationalen Tagung in Herxheim bei Landau (Pfalz) vom 14.–17. 06. 2007*. Internationale Archäologie. Arbeitsgemeinschaft, Symposium, Tagung, Kongress vol. 10. Pp. 9–25. Verlag Marie Leidorf, Rahden / Westfalen.
- GRAMSCH A., 2010: *Ritual und Kommunikation. Altersklassen und Geschlechterdifferenz im spätbronze- und früheisenzeitlichen Gräberfeld Cottbus Alvensleben-Kaserne (Brandenburg)*. Universitätsforschungen zur Prähistorischen Archäologie vol. 181. Habelt, Bonn.
- GRAMSCH A., 2013: Treating bodies. Transformative and communicative practices. In: S. Tarlow, L. Nilsson Stutz (Eds.): *The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of Death and Burial*. Pp. 459–474. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- GRAMSCH A., MEIER Th., 2013: An archaeological outline of ritual dynamics and social space. In: S. Bergerbrant, S. Sabatini (Eds.): *Counterpoint: Essays in Archaeology and Heritage Studies in Honour of Professor Kristian Kristiansen*. BAR S2508. Pp. 193–198. Archaeopress, Oxford.
- GRONENBORN D., 2007: Climate change and socio-political crises: some cases from Neolithic Central Europe. In: T. Pollard, I. Banks (Eds.): *War and Sacrifice. Studies in the Archaeology of Conflict*. Pp. 13–32. Leiden/Boston.
- HÄRKE H., 1998: Archaeologists and Migrations: A Problem of Attitude? *Current Anthropology* 39: 19–45.
- KOWALEWSKA-MARCZALEK H., 2012: Linear Pottery and Lengyel settlement structures on the Sandomierz Upland (Little Poland) – continuity or change? In: Landesamt für Archäologie Sachsen (Ed.): *Siedlungsstruktur und Kulturwandel in der Bandkeramik. Beiträge der internationalen Tagung "Neue Fragen zur Bandkeramik oder alles beim Alten?!" Leipzig, 23. bis 24. September 2010*. Arbeits- und Forschungsberichte zur sächsischen Bodendenkmalpflege, Beiheft 25. Pp. 284–294. Landesamt für Archäologie, Dresden.
- KRISTIANSEN K., 2005: Innovation and invention – Independent event or historical process? In: C. Renfrew, P. Bahn (Eds.): *Archaeology: The key concepts*. Pp. 151–155. London/New York.
- KROEBER A. L., KLUCKHOHN C., 1952: *Culture. A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*. Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology 47, 1. Cambridge/Massachusetts.
- LINK Th., 2012: Stilwandel contra Siedlungskontinuität – Zum Übergang von der Linien- zur Stichbandkeramik in Sachsen. In: R. Gleser, V. Becker (Eds.): *Mitteleuropa im 5. Jahrtausend vor Christus*. Beiträge zur Internationalen Konferenz in Münster 2010. Pp. 115–131. Berlin.

- MAISE Chr., 1998: Archäoklimatologie – Vom Einfluss nacheiszeitlicher Klimavariabilität in der Ur- und Frühgeschichte. *Jahrbuch der Schweizerischen Gesellschaft für Ur- und Frühgeschichte* 81: 197–235.
- MEYER Chr., LOHR Chr., STRIEN H.-Chr., GRONENBORN D., ALT K. W., 2013: Interpretationsansätze zu "irregulären" Bestattungen während der linearbandkeramischen Kultur: Gräber *en masse* und Massengräber. In: N. Müller-Scheeßel (Ed.): *"Irreguläre" Bestattungen in der Urgeschichte: Norm, Ritual, Strafe...?* Akten der Internationalen Tagung in Frankfurt am Main vom 3. bis 5. Februar 2012. Kolloquien zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte vol. 19. Pp. 111–122. Habelt, Bonn.
- MÜLLER-SCHIEßEL N., (Ed.) 2013: *"Irreguläre" Bestattungen in der Urgeschichte: Norm, Ritual, Strafe...?* Akten der Internationalen Tagung in Frankfurt a. M. vom 3. bis 5. Februar 2012. Kolloquien zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte vol. 19. Habelt, Bonn.
- PECHTL J., HOFMANN D., 2013: Irregular Burials in the LBK – All or none? In: N. Müller-Scheeßel (Ed.): *"Irreguläre" Bestattungen in der Urgeschichte: Norm, Ritual, Strafe...?* Akten der Internationalen Tagung in Frankfurt am Main vom 3. bis 5. Februar 2012. Kolloquien zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte vol. 19. Pp. 123–138. Habelt, Bonn.
- RICOEUR P., 1971: The model of the text: Meaningful action considered as a text. *Social Research* 38, 3: 529–562.
- RICOEUR P., 1991: *From text to action. Essays in hermeneutics II*. Northwestern Univ. Press, Evanston.
- SOMMER U., GRAMSCH A., 2011: German archaeology in context. An introduction to history and present of Central European archaeology. In: A. Gramsch, U. Sommer (Eds.): *A history of Central European archaeology. Theory, methods, and politics*. Pp. 7–39. Archaeolingua, Budapest.
- WOLFRAM S., 2000: "Vorsprung durch Technik" or "Kossinna-Syndrome"? Archaeological theory and social context in post-war West Germany. In: H. Härke (Ed.): *Archaeology, ideology and society. The German experience*. Pp. 180–201. Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main.

Alexander Gramsch
Museum Herxheim
Untere Hauptstr. 153, D-76863 Herxheim
Germany
E-mail: gramsch@museum-herxheim.de