



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Internal conflict in Iron Age Europe

Citation for published version:

Fernández-götz, M & Arnold, B 2020, 'Internal conflict in Iron Age Europe: Methodological challenges and possible scenarios', *World Archaeology*, vol. 51, no. 5, pp. 654-672.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00438243.2020.1723682>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1080/00438243.2020.1723682](https://doi.org/10.1080/00438243.2020.1723682)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

World Archaeology

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in World Archaeology on 30/3/2020, available online: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00438243.2020.1723682>

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Internal Conflict in Iron Age Europe: Methodological Challenges and Possible Scenarios

Abstract

Although the nuanced and complex nature of conflict in pre-literate societies like those documented in the West-Central European Iron Age before the arrival of the Romans has been acknowledged for some time, distinguishing between different types of violent interaction almost exclusively on the basis of material remains has been a challenge. The motivations and conditions for external vs. internal conflict have been even more difficult to identify but there is increasing evidence to suggest that bottom-up or factional conflict as well as small-scale raiding between archaeologically indistinguishable groups was at least as important as large-scale pitched battles of the kind documented by later Roman authors. This article reviews the current state of research on conflict in Iron Age West-Central Europe on the basis of several case studies that illustrate the importance of multi-scalar analyses of violent interaction in prehistory and the need to develop suitably contextual approaches for such studies.

Key words

Conflict, Warfare, Iron Age, ‘Princely Seats’, Gaul.

1. Introduction: Reclaiming conflict in early Europe

The study of conflict has recently been gaining momentum in archaeological research in both historic and prehistoric periods (cf. for example Dolfini et al. 2018; Fernández-Götz and Roymans 2018; Guilaine and Sémelin 2016). This paper addresses the issue of internal conflict in Iron Age temperate Europe, which can be broadly defined as non-Mediterranean Europe in the period between c. 800 BCE and the beginning of the Common Era. Rather than providing final answers, the article will focus on highlighting the challenges faced by the analysis of conflict in the Iron Age and on proposing some tentative possibilities.

In European archaeology, early 20th century approaches were often driven by a focus on military interpretations, as exemplified, among other examples, by hillfort research (Ralston 2013). However, in later decades there was a counter-reaction which led many scholars to conceptualise war and collective violence as relatively marginal phenomena in the ancient past. This tendency was clearly influenced by the dominant anti-militaristic ideology in post-WWII

Western Europe. The ‘primitive’ warfare of prehistoric societies was thought to be less practical and more ritualised, with a focus on honour and status. This triggered L. Keeley’s (1996) criticism that the prehistoric past had been ‘pacified’ by archaeologists who adopted a ‘neo-Rousseauian’ social theory of warfare and violence. Keeley’s work symbolically marked the beginning of a new trend of ‘un-pacifying’ the past (Armit et al. 2006; Guilaine and Zammit 2005; James 2007), which has been supported by a rapidly growing corpus of archaeological evidence. The latter ranges from Neolithic massacre sites, such as Talheim in Germany (Wahl and Trautmann 2012), to battlefields with hundreds of estimated casualties, like the Bronze Age discoveries at the Tollense Valley (Lidke et al. 2018). Additionally, regional and supra-regional use-wear analyses of weapons, such as swords and spears, suggest that they were often intensively used for combat (Kristiansen 2002; Horn 2018). Far from being isolated examples, the evidence from spectacular sites such as Talheim and the Tollense Valley presumably represent the ‘tip of the iceberg’ of much wider conflict-related phenomena. Thus, large-scale osteoarchaeological studies suggest that violence in the European Neolithic was endemic and a part of daily life (cf. Fibiger 2018). On the other end of the spectrum, as soon as we have the earliest written sources warfare appears as a dominant and constant theme, something evident in Greco-Roman classical literature (Pitcher 2009), but also in the earliest literature of the so-called Celto-Germanic world (see e.g. Bazelmans 1999). Violence was more common in the everyday life of ancient societies than is often assumed by modern scholars (Pinker 2011), so that we need to make more room for it in our narratives of both the prehistoric and early historic periods (Fernández-Götz and Roymans 2018; Parker-Pearson and Thorpe 2005).

2. Internal or external? Terminological issues and proxy evidence in Iron Age research

Recognising the existence of violent conflict is, however, just a starting point and not a final destination. While some broad overviews can provide interesting insights from a global, long-term perspective (cf. Morris 2014), more contextual work needs to be undertaken in order to understand the character, scale and social implications of conflict across time and space. But what do we mean by this term? Most often, conflict is associated with warfare, which according to Ember and Ember (1992: 248) can be defined as “*socially organised armed combat between members of different territorial units (communities or aggregates of communities)*”. There are, however, other forms of conflict that do not necessarily imply violence between members of different communities, including clashes or disagreements between members of the same community or even the same family group. Based on some references in ancient written sources –for example Caesar’s quote (*BG VI, 11, 2-5*) that in Gaul there were conflicting parties or

factions within every state, canton and even family group–, as well as analogies from anthropological contexts, there are good reasons to think that factionalism (Brumfiel 1994) was an important element in power competitions during the Iron Age. Thus, in Late Iron Age Gaul conflicts often seem to have occurred between different factions led by members of the aristocracy, rather than between commoners and the elite (see e.g. Buchsenschutz and Ralston 2012; Verger 2009).

For the purposes of this paper, an especially challenging task for archaeologists is the differentiation between ‘internal’ and ‘external’ conflict, especially in the absence of written sources for most Iron Age societies and the frequent ambiguity of the material evidence in this regard. The problems begin with the very definition of the nature of the interaction implied by these terms. Taking an extremely broad view, in the case of temperate Europe it could be argued that any conflict within Iron Age societies which was not the result of their confrontation with Mediterranean powers, such as Rome or Carthage, could be classified as internal. For example, the evidence for violence recovered by excavations at the *oppidum* of Manching in Bavaria (Sievers 2013) and the hillfort of Maiden Castle in Dorset (Sharples 1991) was originally attributed to Roman military incursions but is now largely considered the result of intertribal violence. Looking at written sources, disputes such as that between the Aedui and the Sequani for the control of the Saône valley during the first half of the 1st century BCE (cf. Caesar *BG* I, 12, 1; VI, 12, 1-6; Strabo IV, 3, 2) could be considered manifestations of ‘internal’ conflict within Late Iron Age societies. However, it seems unlikely that this perspective would have been shared by the members of these two tribal polities, which would have probably regarded each other as ‘external’ enemies during these confrontations. From that perspective, these interactions could be classified as intertribal warfare rather than internal conflict or civil warfare. In this paper, we define intertribal warfare as an “*armed conflict between communities on a scale surpassing the level of local groups and single villages*”.

The situation is particularly complicated when addressing purely prehistoric contexts. Thus, in the absence of written information the definition of political entities that transcend settlements and their immediate areas of influence still constitutes one of the biggest challenges of archaeological research. The few attempts made on the basis of the material record alone have not produced satisfactory results. This methodological problem was well expressed by J. Collis when referring to the so-called *Fürstensitze* (‘princely seats’) of Early Iron Age Central Europe: “*How do we envisage the Hallstatt D societies of south-western Germany? Are the Hohenasperg and Heuneburg part of the same political entity, centers competing with one another within a single political entity, or are they centers of independent political entities,*

complex chiefdoms in competition with one another?” (Collis 1995: 77). In the hypothetical case of a military confrontation between the communities of the Heuneburg and the Hohenasperg, would this be considered an example of ‘civil war’ or rather a war between rival polities, similar to the conflict between Athens and Sparta in ancient Greece? While we will probably never have an answer to this type of question, it seems clear from the above reflections that the lines between ‘external’ and ‘internal’ socio-political categories are often extremely difficult to discern.

However, these difficulties in terminology and interpretation regarding internal conflict in the archaeological record should not preclude us from approaching the topic in Iron Age research. While the evidence is often ambiguous and open to multiple interpretations (cf. Fernández-Götz 2017; Müller-Scheeßel 2017), just the act of posing questions, highlighting uncertainties and proposing plausible –although not indisputable– possibilities can contribute to a better understanding of the period. Moving beyond the question of ‘internal’ vs. ‘external’ conflict, the evidence increasingly points towards the importance of violent interactions during the 1st millennium BCE, in much more complex and sometimes subtle ways than traditionally assumed. Despite the voices that were raised in criticism of the traditionally assumed ‘warrior’ character of protohistoric societies, a number of studies have redressed the balance so that it now seems reasonable to think that practically all Iron Age societies must have been involved in warfare activities in one way or another, in different contexts and to varying extents (Armit 2007; Collis 1994; James 2007; González Ruibal 2006-07: 433-435, 440). Anthropology and history clearly show that violence –between communities, ethnic groups and families– is inherent in even the smallest preindustrial societies, although the scale and frequency can present significant variations (Clastres 1980; Otto et al. 2006).

So far, the evidence for temperate European Iron Age battlefields not associated with the Roman conquest is very scarce, although this should not necessarily surprise us: until recently, the same was true for the Bronze Age and only the discoveries from the Tollense Valley began to change this picture. Leaving aside the broader problems associated with identifying –or correctly interpreting– prehistoric battlefields, ample data supports the existence of episodes of intertribal warfare and even massacres in Iron Age Europe (Buchsenschutz et al. 2014; Fernández-Götz and Roymans 2018). In addition to the references –obviously biased and incomplete– recorded in classical written sources, we have an increasing amount of material evidence for conflict between and within pre-Roman Iron Age populations. An extremely well-documented example is the settlement of La Hoya in northern Spain, which was brutally destroyed by an attack of another Iron Age group at some point between the mid-4th and the 3rd

century BCE, probably killing a large number of the inhabitants; the recovered data include osteoarchaeological evidence of decapitations, other postcranial sharp force injuries and arm amputations (Llanos 2005; Quesada-Sanz 2015).

Although the conclusive evidence documented at La Hoya is rather exceptional, there is a large body of proxy data for violent conflict throughout temperate Europe (cf. Wells 2011: 417-422). Among the most important elements that we can cite are: 1) the frequent deposition of weapons in graves and sanctuaries; 2) iconographic depictions of weaponry and soldiers; 3) evidence of violence on human remains (e.g. Redfern 2011); and 4) the construction of heavily fortified hillforts (Ralston 2013). While the appearance of weapons in graves and the construction of fortifications, to name two prominent 1st millennium BCE examples, do not necessarily reflect a period of particular violence or conflict, they do indicate that these weapons and sites were in use at the time and were an important aspect of the status and identity of certain individuals and communities. Moreover, the representation of marching troops with standardised weaponry in certain examples of *situla* art or on a sword scabbard from Hallstatt suggests the existence of some specialised military units (Wells 2011: 418).

While distinguishing between ‘internal’ and ‘external’ forms of conflict archaeologically is frequently very difficult, if not impossible, on other occasions archaeology can contribute to this question, particularly when we have access to material culture that is clearly alien to the local context. This is the case, for example, with many of the so-called ‘Scythian’-type arrowheads discovered in Central Europe that at least in some cases might reflect raids by armed mounted troops (Hellmuth 2014). Thus, while the small number of ‘Scythian’ arrowheads found at the Heuneburg settlement in southwest Germany (Bofinger 2006) are not sufficient to demonstrate the occurrence of this kind of violent destruction, there is little doubt that the hillfort of Smolenice-Molpír in western Slovakia –where nearly 400 arrowheads of this type were recovered, together with evidence for enormous conflagrations and the discovery of human skeletons– was subject to an external attack by ‘foreign’ troops (Dušek and Dušek 1995; Hellmuth 2014: 15-16). Even more prominent and clearly identifiable than the controversial ‘Scythian’ raids are the remains associated with the military conquest of Western Europe by the expanding Roman power. The last few decades have witnessed a fundamental increase in archaeological evidence related to the conquest period in areas such as Gaul, Iberia and Britain, uncovering the most brutal side of Roman imperialism (see, for example, the recent collection of papers in Fernández-Götz and Roymans 2018: chapters 10-18; Fitzpatrick and Haselgrove 2019; Roymans and Fernández-Götz 2019). Traces of the conquest include military installations such as Roman marching camps and a variety of artefactual evidence ranging from

the characteristic hobnails (*caligae*) from the sandals of the Roman legionaries to certain projectiles that we can clearly associate with the Roman army. It is not the purpose of the present paper to discuss this type of evidence, so in what follows we will present two case studies of possible internal conflict in the temperate European Iron Age: the late Hallstatt ‘princely seats’ (late 7th to 5th centuries BCE) in Central Europe and the middle and late La Tène period in Gaul (mid-3rd to 1st centuries BCE).

3. Contested power and labile political structures: The late Hallstatt period

The late Hallstatt period of West-Central Europe (ca. 620-450 BCE) is characterised by the development of fortified settlements, referred to in the scholarly literature as ‘princely seats’. Their precise function and relationships to one another and the mortuary landscapes in their immediate vicinities have been the focus of considerable research over the last decades (e.g. Fernández-Götz and Ralston 2017; Krausse 2010; Krausse et al. 2016; Figure 1). For the purposes of this paper, it is particularly relevant to consider excavated evidence of conflict in the form of destruction horizons, projectiles and skeletal remains. Moreover, indirect evidence of social stress can include less obvious forms of archaeological evidence, including the re-opening of burial mounds, iconoclastic destruction of images and changes in the construction and layout of settlements and fortification systems.

Given the evidence for cattle as the main domesticate (Stephan 2016), it is also likely that raiding to capture animals was an endemic aspect of intergroup conflict. Such seasonal forays to abduct herds of cattle are attested historically in the Scottish border region into the 18th century (Fraser 1971) and in medieval Ireland the basic unit of value by which everything else in society was judged, including human life, was measured in cows (Patterson 1994). This kind of intergroup interaction may not typically have involved loss of life, but it could have represented a regular part of life in these societies.

The role played by non-elites in transformative transitions has become a deliberate focus of archaeological research since the early 2000s, investigating how commoners contribute to the social negotiation of dominant discourses through overlapping forms of social interaction, including engagement, avoidance and resistance (e.g. Joyce et al. 2001; Thurston 2019). These categories can be further subdivided into overt and subversive responses to internal as well as external stress. Labile socio-political systems like those of Iron Age Europe are subject to cyclical upheavals (Fernández-Götz 2017; Müller 2016); distinguishing between inter- vs. intragroup responses and identifying the underlying actors as well as motivations behind them can be challenging in the absence of written sources. Whatever motivated these destructive

impulses, it can be assumed that the accompanying changes did not always take place peacefully (Pauli 1985). In the late Hallstatt period in particular there are at least three sources of archaeological evidence for social tension and violent conflict:

1) *Violent destruction of settlements*: Several Central European centres of power of the 6th and 5th centuries BCE experienced large-scale destruction by fire; for example, the Heuneburg suffered from conflagrations on several occasions and the Glauberg has produced evidence for a major fire around 450 BCE. While explanations like accidental fires caused by lightning strikes or by pyrotechnic industries carried out in proximity to flammable structures can sometimes not be ruled out, at least some of the events must have been related to violence triggered by internal or external conflict. At the Heuneburg four destruction horizons involving fire testify to the eventful history of the settlement during its less than 200 years of occupation in the late Hallstatt period (Figure 2). Violent conflict has been invoked to explain the conflagration of ca. 540/530 BCE at the Heuneburg, after which the mudbrick fortification was replaced with a more traditional timber and earth construction, the layout of the hilltop plateau's interior was drastically altered, and the majority of the ca. 100 hectares large outer settlement was abandoned. Possibly this took the form of an attack by an external enemy but internal conflict between rival factions may also have been responsible. Since the mudbrick wall was not rebuilt after the fire but rather was deliberately erased, it is tempting to suggest that there was some kind of iconoclastic reaction against the exotic, Mediterranean-inspired building technique employed in its construction and a drastic reorientation of the power structure has been suggested by some scholars (Arnold 2010; Arnold and Fernández-Götz 2018; Gersbach 1995). The reconstruction of the settlement and fortification system after the great fire suggests an ideological shift based on a wholly different mental template and utilising quite different technology.

Additional evidence for violence at the Heuneburg includes projectile points found both inside and outside the walls, as well as informally deposited bodies on the slope of the hillfort facing the Danube River, although their dating within the Early Iron Age settlement sequence is still not very clear (Krausse et al. 2013). Roughly three generations after the destruction of the mudbrick wall, the fate of the Heuneburg was sealed by another catastrophic fire around the end of Hallstatt D3 (ca. 450 BCE), which almost completely destroyed the fortification and the buildings within the acropolis (Gersbach 1996). The fact that the destruction level was relatively full of finds appears to argue against the idea that the abandonment of the site was planned and suggests violent conflict, although it is not possible to determine if the upheaval originated within or outside the Heuneburg community. This was the terminal point of the Iron

Age occupation at the hillfort and coincides approximately in time with the abandonment of other important sites such as the Mont Lassois in eastern France (Chaume et al. 2012).

2) *Destruction of ancestral images* can be observed at several west Hallstatt sites, including at the sanctuary of Vix 'Les Herbues' (associated with the hillfort of Mont Lassois) and the Glauberg. Stone sculptures interpreted as representing euhemerised ancestors, possibly the individuals buried in the central chambers of burial mounds associated with these settlements, were broken and buried in ways that suggest iconoclasm. At Mont Lassois the heads of the two human statues located at the entrance to the enclosure of Vix 'Les Herbues' were broken off, apparently towards the end of the Hallstatt period in relation to the violent destruction of the sanctuary (Chaume et al. 2012) (Figure 3). The intentional destruction of three of the four anthropomorphic stone sculptures at the Glauberg (Baitinger and Pinsker 2002) illustrates a broadly similar situation. Some authors have interpreted the conscious destruction of ancestral images, which likely depict founding heroes or heroised ancestors (Almagro-Gorbea and Lorrio 2011), as a reaction against the elites following a period of increased social inequalities. Such a response could be summarised with J.-P. Demoule's (1999) expression 'society against the princes'. Similar phenomena of intentional destruction of sculptures appear around the same time in other parts of Iron Age Europe as seen in the south-eastern Iberian Peninsula, probably as a result of deep social changes (Talavera Costa 1998-99).

3) *Grave disturbance/looting*. Significantly, in several cases the chambers of late Hallstatt tumuli were looted within a generation or less of the interment of the elite individuals buried in them (cf. Baitinger 1992; Kümmel 2009). A disturbance shortly after interment is for example suggested by the partially articulated skeletal remains scattered throughout the central chamber in Tumulus 4 of the Giessübel-Talhau mounds next to the Heuneburg (Kurz and Schiek 2002: 118-119), as well as by a row of glass beads found in a tunnel into the Hohmichele central chamber indicating that the string upon which they had been threaded was still intact when they were removed by the looters (Riek and Hundt 1962: 42-43). Likewise, the wooden spades used by the looters of the Magdalenberg central chamber yielded dendrochronological dates relatively close to those of the chamber itself (Driehaus 1978: 27). On the other hand, in the Grafenbühl central chamber grave, associated with the Hohenasperg hillfort near Stuttgart, the skeletal remains indicate a longer period of time had elapsed before the chamber was opened and the contents removed (Driehaus 1978: 24). The researchers who have attempted to address the issue of grave disturbance have wrestled with the problem of identifying the perpetrators as local or non-local in order to determine motivation. In general terms, this identification has been linked to the temporality of the event, i.e. contemporary

disturbance shortly after interment tends to be interpreted as the result of local actors while later disturbances tend to be attributed to non-local actors.

J. Driehaus (1978) provided the first systematic overview of disturbed central burials in the vicinity of the Heuneburg and Hohenasperg hillforts. In his review of the Heuneburg mounds known at that time to have been looted –Hohmichele, Lehenbühl, and Giessübel-Talhau Tumulus 4– he observed that the full spectrum of settlement occupations at the Early Iron Age hillfort, from Hallstatt D1-D3, is represented by the looting episodes. He concluded that the disturbance phenomenon cannot therefore be interpreted as a single episode although the activity is concentrated in a period of about 150 years. The few unlooted tumuli known in southwest Germany, like Hochdorf (Biel 1985), must have been passed over for reasons unrelated to their contents, which would certainly have been well worth the effort. Driehaus (1978: 27-28) distinguished between two types of robber shafts: the funnel-shaped incursion from above, which he associated with looters unconcerned about discovery, and the horizontal shaft dug in from the side, which he interpreted as more likely to be clandestine and only practicable if the mound had not yet reached a height of over two metres.

Could reopening a tumulus have been done to gain access to the power of origins and identity through the human remains and objects associated with the founding event of the mound? This might be an indication of the type of internal social stress also reflected in the destruction events at settlements of this period. The idea that some of the plundered objects in Early Iron Age burials could have been removed by family or community members after a certain period of time has also been suggested (Baitinger 1992), but if this had been an accepted and widespread ritual practice far more burials should show signs of such disturbance.

Another important point is that in numerous cases objects were not just removed, they were destroyed or broken into pieces, with some of the fragments being left behind. This is especially notable in the case of the Grafenbühl near Hohenasperg, where metal drinking vessels were shattered and the feet of a Greek tripod had literally been hacked off. Unless the main goal was simply to retrieve metal in its raw material form, which seems unlikely for a number of reasons, such destruction appears less like looting and more like iconoclasm or some other practice in which the unmaking of the objects was as important as their removal from the grave. None of the main works that have dealt with the phenomenon of grave disturbance in the Early Iron Age engage except in passing with the possibility that the disturbance/manipulation of tumuli may have been an expression of internal unrest and disaffection comparable to the iconoclastic destruction of images associated with elite mortuary contexts. However, we suggest that this possibility should be seriously considered, particularly given the other evidence for internal

conflict during this period.

In sum, despite the attempts towards centralisation and integration represented by many of the so-called ‘princely seat’ sites, evidence clearly indicates that power relations were fluid, negotiated and often contested (Fernández-Götz and Ralston 2017). In fact, the process of early urbanisation manifested in the development of these sites came to an end in the course of the 5th century BCE (Krause 2008, 2010). Although each settlement presents its own biography and characteristics, around 400 BCE all of them had been either abandoned, violently destroyed or were in marked decline. The late Hallstatt process of centralisation was followed by a period of decentralisation with a return to more dispersed settlement patterns and, apparently in many regions, a reduction of the population probably due to migration. Population fission could have served as a reaction to the increasing inequalities of the 6th and 5th centuries BCE and as a way to manage growing tensions derived from intra- and intergroup competition for power and resources (Arnold 2011; Demoule 2006; Fernández-Götz 2014: Chapter 5). While the exact reasons for the phenomenon of decentralisation are difficult to determine and probably included a combination of factors, there is increasing evidence that the changes were not generally peaceful and were part of a larger framework of social tensions and occasionally violent conflict.

This example of the non-linear character of history could be viewed as an expression of ‘instability’ or ‘fragility’, but it can also be interpreted as a demonstration of the resilience of so-called tribal political systems whose very lability and resistance to institutionalised control make them simultaneously resistant to internal power plays and less able to respond effectively to external threats (cf. Arnold forthcoming). Similar perspectives on resistance to increasing social division have been proposed, for example, for the Iron Age of north-western Iberia (González-García et al. 2011).

4. Internal conflict in Late Iron Age Gaul

Our second case study concerns Gallic societies during the middle and late La Tène periods, from ca. 250 BCE to the Roman conquest. For the later part of this period we have some accounts by Greek and Roman authors who, despite their biases and imprecisions, represent an enriching additional source of information about indigenous communities and their power dynamics. According to written sources –particularly Caesar– 1st century BCE Gallic societies were structured in different levels of socio-political aggregation, from households and extended families at the bottom to the large subtribal and tribal groupings to which Caesar refers using the Latin terms *pagi* and *civitates*. Finally, at the top there were even larger and probably looser

confederations such as Belgae and Aquitani (see discussion in Fernández-Götz 2014: chapter 2; Fichtl 2012; Roymans 1990: chapter 3). To give an example of the complexity of social formations, around sixty *civitates* (understood in this context as tribal polities, cf. Gerritsen and Roymans 2006) appear to have existed in Gaul at the time of the Roman conquest (Figure 4), and each of them would have been in turn subdivided into different *pagi* (Caesar, for example, notes four *pagi* composing the Helvetii; *BG* I, 12, 4-6).

According to C. Peyre (1996), in the context of pre-Roman Gaul the Latin word *pagus* would have been the result of the transposition of the Gallic word *corios*, which derived from **kowiriyos*, and originally meant ‘meeting of men’ or ‘meeting of warriors’. This etymology of a ‘grouping or assembly of armed men’ seems to be the one that best reflects the character of the Gallic *pagi* in the pre-Roman period. We find a good example in the ethnic names *Tricorii* (‘the three troops’) and *Petrocorii* (‘the four troops’), both referring to groups of men at arms and which can be respectively understood as ‘the three *pagi*’ and ‘the four *pagi*’ (Fichtl 2012: 21-22). Based on literary evidence it has been proposed that the pre-Roman Gallic *pagi* operated as military recruiting centres and formed their own armies, acting as separate combat units during military operations. The Helvetian army, for example, marched in *pagi* (Caesar, *BG* I, 12), which implies that each Gallic *pagus* formed an independent division.

Written sources also provide some indications for internal tensions within *civitates*. Thus, it is reported that both the Aulerci Ebuovices and the Lexovii killed the members of their respective aristocratic senates for refusing to go to war against the Romans (Caesar, *BG* III, 17, 3). Conflicts could also arise between different *pagi* of the same *civitas*: in the case of the Morini in 55 BCE, some of the *pagi* sent ambassadors to meet Caesar and reach an agreement with him while others refused to do so (Caesar, *BG* IV, 22). This is a clear example of the notable measure of political autonomy enjoyed by the *pagi*, even in even in matters of external politics (Fernández-Götz 2013). As mentioned at the beginning of this article, competition and tensions between different factions or interest groups existed even within the same family units. In the context of the Caesarian conquest, this often adopted the form of ‘pro’ and ‘anti’ Roman factions, as exemplified by the dispute between Diviciacus and his brother Dumnorix among the Aedui or Cingetorix vs. his father-in-law Indutiomarus among the Treveri. The existence in Gaul of opposing factions at different levels, while it may have been exacerbated by the pressure of Roman expansionism as part of a phenomenon of ‘tribalisation’ (Ferguson and Whitehead 1992), should not be interpreted solely in terms of the latter, since it is characteristic of the internal dynamics of many traditional societies. In this sense, the comparisons drawn by

S. Verger (2009) between Late Iron Age Gallic societies and communities in the Maghreb seem particularly enlightening.

In any case, when attempting to explain material evidence of violence not related to the Roman conquest, we face the problems outlined at the beginning of the article about the distinction between ‘internal’ and ‘external’ tensions. Even in contexts where the material traces of conflict can be identified, we must still determine whether the data should be interpreted as the result of a confrontation between *civitates*, different *pagi* within the same *civitas*, or even smaller subgroups or factions within it. In some cases, however, archaeology can provide interesting clues about the nature and scale of conflict. Numerous sites in Late Iron Age Gaul have produced evidence either directly or indirectly related to warfare (see e.g. Bataille et al. 2014; Deyber 2009). The widespread erection of fortifications can most notably be seen at the *oppida*, with the building of defensive works that were well suited for siege tactics and warfare (cf. Moret 2018). Additionally, we should acknowledge votive offerings at public sanctuaries to war deities, the deposition of weapons in graves, and the potential for some public spaces to have hosted war assemblies.

The most striking category of data consists of post-battle ritual depositions and memorials. In this regard, two key sites are the sanctuaries of Gournay-sur-Aronde and Ribemont-sur-Ancre, both founded in the 3rd century BCE and located in the region of Picardy in northern Gaul (for a recent synthesis, see Brunaux 2018; Rose and Fernández-Götz 2019, with a partial reinterpretation). For about a century, the sanctuary at Gournay was the site of regular cult activity, which was dominated by cattle sacrifices and weapon dedications. The trench of the enclosure has produced evidence of complex rituals in the form of more than 2,000 metal finds and 2,800 animal bones (Brunaux et al. 1985; Brunaux and Rapin 1988). Most of the identified metal finds are weapons and equipment belonging to the three standard elements of the Late Iron Age Gallic warrior’s panoply: swords, shields and spears. The primary aspect of the dedicatory ritual seems to have been display, with groups of weapons and structured cattle bone deposits on either side of the entrance. Weapons were also ritually mutilated and then deposited in the enclosure trench. Interestingly, the weapons dedicated at Gournay display forms originating from throughout Gaul, which suggests that plunder from intertribal conflicts might have been brought back and dedicated at the sanctuary (Brunaux and Rapin 1988).

The Iron Age sanctuary at Ribemont consisted of a circular and a quadrangular enclosure (Brunaux 2018; Brunaux et al. 1999; Fercoq du Leslay 2017; Rose and Fernández-Götz 2019: 179-185) (Figure 5). The circular enclosure had a palisade wall and partially paved interior within which cult activity was hosted and at least 30 warriors and their weapons were exposed

in the open air. Analysis of the bones has revealed that the men were tall, robust, and free of significant pathology. This enclosure has been interpreted as a funerary monument for a group of high-status warriors who had been killed in a nearby battle.

The quadrangular enclosure was established to the immediate north of the circular enclosure around the same time. It served as a ritual space for a few decades until it received a massive influx of vanquished warriors' corpses and a large quantity of weapons and equipment, from a battle or battles believed to have taken place nearby. Ossuary 82 and the undisturbed 3rd century BCE contexts along the eastern interior of the quadrangular enclosure have been instrumental in understanding the ritual treatment of the approximately 350 men, 40 horses, and almost 1,400 pieces of armament found in the enclosure (Figure 6). After the men and horses were exposed in the open air until they were reduced to bones and ligaments, their bodies were dismembered and used to build the bone frames around the ritual pits. Weapons and equipment, some ritually mutilated before being deposited, were arranged around the ossuaries. Once the ritual activity was complete, the quadrangular enclosure was largely abandoned.

The mass grave at Ribemont, just outside the quadrangular enclosure, formed at the same time as the massive influx of warriors' corpses and armament. It was composed of a 40 cm thick layer of human bones and nearly 300 pieces of armament. The human bones represent a minimum of 114 individuals, nearly all robust males in the prime of life (Ricard 2014). They were preserved in large fragments (torso fragments and complete limbs), and parts of the body are represented relatively evenly with the exception of a total absence of crania. Based on the osteoarchaeological evidence pointing to decapitation, these men may be confidently identified as enemy warriors. They were not given the two-stage ritual treatment accorded to the individuals in the circular and quadrangular enclosures. Instead, they seem to have been collected from the battlefield, deposited *en masse*, and left to decay.

The site of Ribemont has provided more than 3,000 iron finds, around 60% of which are weapons and military equipment. It seems that Ribemont was both a martial sanctuary and a commemorative and funerary monument, whilst Gournay was a regional warrior sanctuary that played an important role as a sacred site. The significant differences in the distribution of weapon types from both sites and their dating suggests that at Gournay, weapon and equipment deposits represented dedications of groups of arms over the course of a century, while the quadrangular enclosure and the mass grave at Ribemont contained an immense assemblage of armament collected from a battlefield and dedicated over a relatively short period of time. At both Gournay and Ribemont, we are confronted with clear evidence for warfare among Gallic societies long before the Roman conquest.

5. Conclusion

While the extent to which violence was endemic in Iron Age societies remains difficult to determine based on the available archaeological evidence, there are reasons to suppose that at least some of the signs for upheaval and instability, as exemplified by the destruction horizons at the end of the late Hallstatt/beginning of the La Tène periods and the rejection of certain forms of elite hegemony, were the result of internal societal stresses. In their analysis of the Late Classic to Post-Classic archaeological record of the lower Río Verde valley on the Oaxaca coast of Mexico, Joyce et al. (2001: 372-373) conclude that the reuse of carved stones, dismantling of public buildings and occupation of previously sacred spaces were indications that “the hidden transcript of Late Classic resistance had become public”. The Hallstatt D/La Tène A destruction of sculptural representations of euhemerised ancestors, the burning, razing and replacement of non-local fortification systems, and the opening and selective removal of objects associated with elite status from some central chamber burials in tumuli may likewise be overt expressions of a previously subversive resistance to the dominant ideology and its enforcers. Moreover, what may have begun as episodes of internal upheaval could well have resulted in increasing inter-territorial conflict as neighbouring groups took advantage of the temporary leadership disarray to engage in more frequent and intensive raiding for animals, women or slaves (Arnold 1988). Networks of interregional communication that had legitimated the system of elite domination in the late Hallstatt period may also have been the way knowledge of the vulnerability of the nobility and state institutions spread in a cascade effect during the early La Tène and again in the late La Tène period. We can further hypothesise that, as in the case of the Late Classic Río Verde Valley of Mexico (Joyce et al. 2001), both secondary elites and commoners were the active agents of social change due to the growing awareness of the fragility of rulers and institutions that had hitherto appeared literally sacrosanct. More frequent and extensive intertribal warfare certainly seems indicated by the later La Tène sites such as Manching, Gournay or Ribemont as well as the site of La Tène itself, which was located on the boundary between two tribal territories and may have served as a place where the trophies of war were displayed by alternating victorious groups engaged in regional conflicts (Müller 2007). In short, the Iron Age of West-Central Europe seems a suitable location in which to test ideas regarding the archaeological visibility of contested systems of power and control, one of several areas of the world where institutional transformation and collapse can be documented in pre-literate societies.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the Leverhulme Trust for its support during the preparation of this paper, and Rachel Cartwright, David Rose and two anonymous reviewers for their comments on an earlier draft of the article.

Bibliography

Almagro-Gorbea, M. and A. Lorrio (2011): *Teutates. El Héroe Fundador y el culto heroico al antepasado en Hispania y en la Keltiké*. Real Academia de la Historia, Madrid.

Armit, I. (2007): Hillforts at War: From Maiden Castle to Taniwaha Pā. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 73: 25-37.

Armit, I., C. Knüsel, J. Robb and R. Schulting (2006): Warfare and Violence in Prehistoric Europe: an Introduction. *Journal of Conflict Archaeology* 2(1): 1-11.

Arnold, B. (1988): Slavery in late prehistoric Europe: recovering the evidence for social structure in Iron Age society. In M.N. Geselowitz and D.B. Gibson (eds.), *Tribe and Polity in Late Prehistoric Europe*. Plenum, New York: 179-192.

Arnold, B. (2010): Eventful Archaeology, the Heuneburg Mudbrick Wall, and the Early Iron Age of Southwest Germany. In D. Bolender (ed.), *Eventful Archaeologies: New Approaches to Social Transformation in the Archaeological Record*. SUNY Press, Albany: 100-114.

Arnold, B. (2011): The Illusion of Power, the Power of Illusion: Ideology and the Concretization of Social Difference in Early Iron Age Europe. In R. Bernbeck and R. McGuire (eds.), *Ideologies in Archaeology*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson: 151-174.

Arnold, B. (forthcoming): “And Make Some Other Man Our King”: Labile Elite Power Structures in Early Iron Age Europe. In T.L. Thurston and M. Fernández-Götz (eds.), *Power from Below: Commoners and Elites in the Archaeological Record*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge/New York.

Arnold, B. and M. Fernández-Götz (2018): Agency in architectural choice: the Heuneburg hillfort as monument and metaphor. In A. Ballmer, M. Fernández-Götz and D.P. Mielke (eds.), *Understanding Ancient Fortifications: Between Regionality and Connectivity*. Oxbow, Oxford: 147-156.

Baitinger, H. (1992): Zur Beraubung hallstattzeitlicher Gräber in Süddeutschland. Dittigheim Grab 607. *Fundberichte in Baden-Württemberg* 17(1): 327-346.

Baitinger, H. and B. Pinsker (eds.) (2002): *Das Rätsel der Kelten vom Glauberg. Glaube – Mythos – Wirklichkeit. Ausstellungskatalog Frankfurt*. Theiss, Stuttgart.

- Bataille, G., J. Kaurin, J. and S. Marion (2014): Une archéologie de la guerre au second âge du Fer (fin du IV^e siècle av. – début du I^{er} siècle ap. J.-C.). In O. Buchsenschutz, O. Dutour and C. Mordant (eds.), *Archéologie de la violence et de la guerre dans les sociétés pré et protohistoriques*. Éditions du CTHS, Paris: 129-141.
- Bazelmans, J. (1999): *By Weapons Made Worthy. Lords Retainers and Their Relationship in Beowulf*. Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam.
- Biel, J. (1985): *Der Keltenfürst von Hochdorf*. Theiss, Stuttgart.
- Bofinger, J. (2006): Kelten – Skythen – Griechen: Bemerkungen zu den dreiflügligen Pfeilspitzen von der Heuneburg, Kr. Sigmaringen. In H.-P. Wotzka (ed.), *Grundlegungen. Beiträge zur europäischen und afrikanischen Archäologie für Manfred K. H. Eggert*. Francke, Tübingen: 551-562.
- Brumfiel, E. M. (1994): Factional competition and political development in the new world: An introduction. In E.M. Brumfiel and J.W. Fox (eds.), *Factional Competition and Political Development in the New World*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 3-14.
- Brunaux, J.-L. (2018): A battle between Gauls in Picardy. The tropaion of Ribemont-sur-Ancre. In Fernández-Götz & Roymans (eds.): 79-87.
- Brunaux, J.-L. et al. (1999): Ribemont-sur-Ancre (Somme). Bilan préliminaire et nouvelles hypothèses. *Gallia* 56: 177-283.
- Brunaux, J.-L., P. Méniel and F. Poplin (1985): *Gournay I: les fouilles sur le sanctuaire et l'oppidum (1975-84)*. Revue Archéologique de Picardie, n° sp., Amiens.
- Brunaux, J.-L. and A. Rapin (1988): *Gournay II: Boucliers et Lances, Dépôts et Trophées*. Errance, Paris.
- Buchsenschutz, O., O. Dutour and C. Mordant (eds.) (2014): *Archéologie de la violence et de la guerre dans les sociétés pré et protohistoriques*. Éditions du CTHS, Paris.
- Buchsenschutz, O. and I. Ralston (2012): Urbanisation et aristocratie celtiques. In S. Sievers and M. Schönfelder (eds.), *Die Frage der Protourbanisation in der Eisenzeit. La question de la proto-urbanisation à l'âge du Fer*. Habelt, Bonn: 347-364.
- Cadoux, J.-L. (1984): L'ossuaire gaulois de Ribemont-sur-Ancre (Somme): Premières observations, premières questions. *Gallia* 42: 53-78.
- Chaume, B., N. Nieszery and W. Reinhard (2012): Der Mont Lassois – ein frühkeltischer Fürstensitz im Burgund. In: *Die Welt der Kelten. Zentren der Macht – Kostbarkeiten der Kunst*. Jan Thorbecke Verlag, Ostfildern: 132-138.
- Clastres, P. (1980): *Recherches d'anthropologie politique*. Seuil, Paris.

- Collis, J. (1994): *Reconstructing Iron Age Society*. In K. Kristiansen and J. Jensen (eds.), *Europe in the First Millennium BC*. J. R. Collis Publications, Sheffield: 31-39.
- Collis, J. (1995): States without centers? The Middle La Tène period in temperate Europe. In B. Arnold and D.B. Gibson (eds.), *Celtic Chieftdom, Celtic State. The Evolution of Complex Social Systems in Prehistoric Europe*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 75-80.
- Demoule, J.-P. (1999): La société contre les princes. In P. Ruby (ed.), *Les princes de la protohistoire et l'émergence de l'État*. Centre Jean Bérard/École Française de Rome, Naples/Rome: 125-134.
- Demoule, J.-P. (2006): Migrations et théories migratoires aux époques préhistoriques et protohistoriques. In Vitali, D. (ed.), *Celtes et gaulois, l'archéologie face à l'histoire, 2: La protohistoire des celtes*. Collection Bibracte 12(2), Glux-en-Glenne: 17-28.
- Deyber, A. (2009): *Les Gaulois en guerre. Stratégies, tactiques et techniques. Essai d'histoire militaire (IIe – Ier siècles av. J.-C.)*. Errance, Paris.
- Dolfini, A., R.J. Crellin, C. Horn and M. Uckelmann (eds.) (2018) *Prehistoric Warfare and Violence: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. Springer, New York. 2018.
- Driehaus, J. (1978): Der Grabraub in Mitteleuropa während der älteren Eisenzeit. Zum Grabfrevel in vor- und frühgeschichtlicher Zeit. *Abhandlungen der deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften Göttingen*. Philologisch-Historische Klasse 3, Volume 113: 18-47.
- Dušek, M. and S. Dušek (1995): *Smolenice-Molpír – Befestigter Fürstensitz der Hallstattzeit II*. Materialia Archaeologica Slovaca 13, Nitra.
- Ember, C.R. and M. Ember (1992): Resource Unpredictability, Mistrust and War: A Cross-Cultural Study. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 36: 242-262.
- Fercoq du Leslay, G. (2017): *Ribemont-sur-Ancre: Hommes et dieux dans la Somme, il y a 2000 ans*. EPCC Somme Patrimoine, Amiens.
- Ferguson, R.B. and N.L. Whitehead (eds.) (1992): *War in the Tribal Zone. Expanding States and Indigenous Warfare*. School of American Research Press, Santa Fe.
- Fernández-Götz, M. (2013): Ethnicité, politique et échelles d'intégration: réflexions sur les « pagi » gaulois avant la Conquête. *Études Celtiques* 39: 7-29.
- Fernández-Götz, M. (2014): *Identity and Power: The Transformation of Iron Age Societies in Northeast Gaul*. Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam.
- Fernández-Götz, M. (2017): Contested Power: Iron Age Societies against the State? In S. Hansen and J. Müller (eds.), *Rebellion and Inequality in Archaeology*. Habelt, Bonn: 271-287.
- Fernández-Götz, M. and I. Ralston (2017): The Complexity and Fragility of Early Iron Age Urbanism in West-Central Temperate Europe. *Journal of World Prehistory* 30 (3): 259-279.

- Fernández-Götz, M. and Roymans, N. (eds.) (2018): *Conflict Archaeology: Materialities of Collective Violence from Prehistory to Late Antiquity*. Routledge, New York/Abingdon.
- Fibiger, L. (2018): Conflict and Violence in the Neolithic of Central-Northern Europe. In Fernández-Götz & Roymans (eds.): 13-22.
- Fichtl, S. (2012): *Les peuples gaulois. IIIe-Ier siècle av. J.-C.* Errance, Paris.
- Fitzpatrick, A. and C. Haselgrove (eds.) (2019): *Julius Caesar's Battle for Gaul: New Archaeological Perspectives*. Oxbow, Oxford.
- Fraser, G.M. (1971): *The Steel Bonnets: The Story of the Anglo-Scottish Border Reivers*. Harper Collins, New York.
- Gerritsen, F. and N. Roymans (2006): Central places and the construction of tribal identities. The case of the Late Iron Age Lower Rhine region. In C. Haselgrove (ed.), *Celtes et Gaulois, l'Archéologie face à l'Histoire. 4: Les mutations de la fin de l'âge du Fer*. Collection Bibracte 12/4, Glux-en-Glenne: 251-266.
- Gersbach, E. (1989): *Ausgrabungsmethodik und Stratigraphie der Heuneburg*. Römisch-Germanische Forschungen 45, Mainz.
- Gersbach, E. (1995): *Baubefunde der Perioden IVc-IVa der Heuneburg*. Römisch-Germanische Forschungen 53, Mainz.
- Gersbach, E. (1996): *Baubefunde der Perioden IIIb-Ia der Heuneburg*. Römisch-Germanische Forschungen 56, Mainz.
- González-García, F.J., C. Parcero-Oubiña and X. Ayán Vila (2011): Iron Age societies against the state: An account of the emergence of the Iron Age in North-western Iberia. In T. Moore and X.-L. Armada (eds.), *Atlantic Europe in the First Millennium BC: Crossing the Divide*. Oxford University Press, Oxford: 285-301.
- González-Ruibal, A. (2006-07): *Galaicos. Poder y comunidad en el Noroeste de la Península Ibérica*. Brigantium 18/19, A Coruña.
- Guilaine, J. and J. Sémelin (eds.) (2016): *Violences de guerre, violences de masse. Une approche archéologique*. La Découverte, Paris.
- Guilaine, J. and J. Zammit (2005): *The Origins of War. Violence in Prehistory*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Hellmuth, A. (2014): Horse, Bow and Arrow – A Comparison between the Scythian Impact on the Mediterranean and on Eastern Middle Europe. *Mediterranean Review* 7(1): 1-38.
- Horn, C. (2018): Die by the Sword... or the Spear? – Early Bronze Weapons in Scandinavia. In Fernández-Götz & Roymans (eds.): 51-60.

- James, S. (2007): A Bloodless Past: The Pacification of Early Iron Age Britain. In C. Haselgrove and R. Pope (eds.), *The Earlier Iron Age in Britain and the Near Continent*. Oxbow, Oxford: 160-173.
- Joyce, A.A., L. Arnaud Bustamente and M.N. Levine (2001): Commoner Power: A Case Study from the Classic Period Collapse on the Oaxaca Coast. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 8(4): 343-385.
- Keeley, L. (1996): *War Before Civilization: The Myth of the Peaceful Savage*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Krause, D. (2008): Etappen der Zentralisierung nördlich der Alpen: Hypothesen, Modelle, Folgerungen. In D. Krause (ed.), *Frühe Zentralisierungs- und Urbanisierungsprozesse: Zur Genese und Entwicklung frühkeltischer Fürstensitze und ihres territorialen Umlandes*. Theiss, Stuttgart: 435-450.
- Krause, D. (ed.) (2010): „Fürstensitze“ und Zentralorte der frühen Kelten. Theiss, Stuttgart.
- Krause, D., M. Fernández-Götz, C. Steffen, J. Wahl and P. Otte-Scheschkewitz (2013): Vom Burgberg zur Donau: Neue Untersuchungen zur Heuneburg (2008-2012). *Archäologisches Korrespondenzblatt* 43 (2): 195-213.
- Krause, D., M. Fernández-Götz, L. Hansen and I. Kretschmer (2016): *The Heuneburg and the Early Iron Age Princely Seats: First Towns North of the Alps*. Archaeolingua, Budapest.
- Kristiansen, K. (2002): The tale of the sword – swords and swordfighters in Bronze Age Europe. *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 21 (4): 319-332.
- Kümmel, C. (2009): *Ur- und frühgeschichtlicher Grabraub. Archäologische Interpretation und kulturanthropologische Erklärung*. Waxmann, Münster.
- Kurz, S. and S. Schiek (2002): *Bestattungsorte im Umfeld der Heuneburg*. Theiss, Stuttgart.
- Lidke, G., D. Jantzen, S. Lorenz and T. Terberger (2018): The Bronze Age Battlefield in the Tollense Valley, Northeast Germany – Conflict Scenario Research. In Fernández-Götz & Roymans (eds.): 61-68.
- Llanos, A. (2005): *Mil años de vida en el poblado berón de La Hoya (Laguardia, Álava)*. Diputación Foral de Álava, Vitoria-Gasteiz.
- Moret, P. (2018): The Purpose of Gallic Oppida Ramparts: A Reappraisal. In A. Ballmer, M. Fernández-Götz and D.P. Mielke (eds.), *Understanding Ancient Fortifications: Between Regionality and Connectivity*. Oxbow, Oxford: 171-180.
- Morris, I. (2014): *War! What Is It Good For? Conflict and the Progress of Civilization from Primates to Robots*. Straus and Giroux, Farrar.

- Müller, F. (2007): Beutegut, Opfergaben und Trophäen bei den antiken Kelten. In H. Birkman (ed.), *Kelten–Einfälle an der Donau*. Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna: 361-378.
- Müller, J. (2016): From the Neolithic to the Iron Age – Demography and Social Agglomeration: The Development of Centralized Control? In M. Fernández-Götz and D. Krause (eds.), *Eurasia at the Dawn of History: Urbanization and Social Change*. Cambridge University Press, New York: 106-124.
- Müller-Scheeßel, N. (2017): Social Unrest in the Early Iron Age of central Europe: An Essay in Possibilities. In S. Hansen and J. Müller (eds.), *Rebellion and Inequality in Archaeology*. Habelt, Bonn: 289-302.
- Otto, T., H. Thrane and H. Vandkilde (eds.) (2006): *Warfare and Society: Archaeological and Social Anthropological Perspectives*. Aarhus University Press, Aarhus.
- Pauli, L. (1985): Early Celtic society: two centuries of wealth and turmoil in central Europe. In T.C. Champion and J.V.S. Megaw (eds.), *Settlement and Society. Aspects of West European Prehistory in the first Millenium B. C.* Leicester University Press, Leicester: 23-43.
- Parker-Pearson, M. and I.J.N. Thorpe (eds.) (2005): *Warfare, Violence and Slavery in Prehistory*. Archaeopress, Oxford.
- Patterson, N. (1994): *Cattle Lords and Clansmen: the Social Structure of Early Ireland*. Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame.
- Peyre, C. (1996): Preface to L.-P. Delestrée, *Monnayages et peuples gaulois du Nord-Ouest*. Errance, Paris: 5-8.
- Pinker, S. (2011): *The Better Angels of Our Nature*. Penguin, New York/London.
- Pitcher, L.V. (2009): Classical War Literature. In K. McLoughlin (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to War Writing*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 71-80.
- Quesada-Sanz, F. (2015): Genocide and Mass Murder in Second Iron Age Europe. Methodological issues and case studies in the Iberian Peninsula. In C. Carmichael and R.C. Maguire (eds.), *The Routledge History of Genocide*. Routledge, London/New York: 9-22.
- Ralston, I. (2013): *Celtic Fortifications*. The History Press, Stroud.
- Redfern, R. (2011): A Re-appraisal of the Evidence for Violence in the Late Iron Age Human Remains from Maiden Castle Hillfort, Dorset, England. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 77: 111-138.
- Ricard, J. (2014): *Représentation du guerrier gaulois à travers les restes osseux découverts dans le sanctuaire de Ribemont-sur-Ancre*. PhD Thesis, Université Lumière Lyon 2.

- Riek, G. and H.-J. Hundt (1962): *Der Hohmichele. Ein Fürstengrabhügel der späten Hallstattzeit bei der Heuneburg*. Römisch-Germanische Forschungen 25, Berlin.
- Rose, D. and M. Fernández-Götz (2019): Memoryscapes in Late Iron Age northern Gaul: Warfare and sacrifice from Ribemont to Titelberg. In T. Romankiewicz, M. Fernández-Götz, G. Lock and O. Buchsenschutz (eds.), *Enclosing Space, Opening New Ground: Iron Age Studies from Scotland to Mainland Europe*. Oxbow, Oxford: 175-189.
- Roymans, N. (1990): *Tribal Societies in Northern Gaul. An Anthropological Perspective*. Cingula 12, Amsterdam.
- Roymans, N. and M. Fernández-Götz (eds.) (2019): Advances in the archaeology of the Roman conquest (journal special section). *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 32.
- Sharples, N.M. (1991): *Maiden Castle: Excavations and Field Survey 1985-6*. Archaeological Report 19, English Heritage.
- Sievers, S. (2013): Manching: un champ de bataille? In S. Krausz, A. Colin, K. Gruel, I. Ralston, T. Dechezleprêtre (eds.), *L'âge du fer en Europe: Melanges offerts à Olivier Buchsenschutz*. Ausonius Éditions, Bordeaux: 645-649.
- Stephan, E. (2016): Faunal Remains at the Heuneburg and its Rural Environs. In D. Krausse et al.: 68-70.
- Talavera Costa, J. (1998-99): Las destrucciones de la estatuaria ibérica en el levante peninsular. *Lucentum* 17-18: 117-130.
- Thurston, T.L. (2019): 'Can you hear me now?' Heterarchy as an instrument and outcome of collective action in Iron Age and Medieval Europe. In C. Ray and M. Fernández-Götz (eds.), *Historical Ecologies, Heterarchies and Transtemporal Landscapes*. Routledge, New York/Abingdon: 55-79.
- Verger, S. (2009): Société, politique et religion en Gaule avant la Conquête. Éléments pour une étude anthropologique. *Pallas* 80: 61-82.
- Wahl, J. and I. Trautmann (2012): The Neolithic massacre at Talheim: a pivotal find in conflict archaeology. In R. Schulting and L. Fibiger (eds.), *Sticks, Stones, and Broken Bones. Neolithic Violence in a European Perspective*. Oxford University Press, Oxford: 77-100.
- Wells, P. (2011): The Iron Age. In S. Milisauskas (ed.), *European Prehistory. A Survey*. Springer, New York: 405-460.

Figure Captions

Figure 1: Distribution of main 'princely seats' north of the Alps and selected sites in Mediterranean Europe, 6th-5th centuries BCE (after Fernández-Götz and Ralston 2017).

Figure 2: Settlement at the Heuneburg: chronological sequence from the Neolithic to the Middle Ages, with indication of four important fire events which occurred during the late Hallstatt period (after Gersbach 1989, modified by authors).

Figure 3: Mutilated stone sculptures of a man and a woman located at the entrance to the sanctuary of Vix 'Les Herbues' near Mont Lassois (after Chaume et al. 2012).

Figure 4: Proposed tribal cartography of Gaul at the time of Caesar (after Fichtl 2012, modified by authors).

Figure 5: The 3rd century BCE enclosures at Ribemont (illustration G. Fercoq du Leslay, translated by D. Rose).

Figure 6: Ossuary 82 at Ribemont with bone frame and weapon deposits (illustration B. Foucray and V. Vergne, after Cadoux 1984 and modified by Rose and Fernández-Götz 2019).