

J.A. Bakker

Albert Egges van Giffen Instituut voor Prae- en Protohistorie, Amsterdam, Netherlands

ABSTRACT: The sites of 76 extant and demolished *hunebedden* are known in the Netherlands. *Hunebedden* are the Dutch megalithic tombs of the TRB or Funnel Beaker Culture (c. 3400-2850 cal BC, Brindley, 1986b: pp. 104-106). There are now 53 extant *hunebedden* (section 2), the remnants of 22 demolished tombs have been excavated (section 3), and one probable site of a demolished *hunebed* has not yet been excavated (section 4). Besides these, there are 10 problematic *hunebedden*, and 19 others listed by Smids (1711), which are unreliable (section 4). Several alleged *hunebedden* are rejected as such (section 5). The use of toponymy in tracing otherwise lost *hunebedden* and the varying meanings of the term *grafkelders* are discussed in sections 6-7.

KEYWORDS: Northern Netherlands, Neolithic, megalithic monument, TRB Culture, geographical inventory.

1. INTRODUCTION

The first known record of a *hunebed* detailed enough to allow us to identify its site is a map by an anonymous person dated 1568 (Ortelius, 1570: fol. 20). This map and a manuscript map of c. 1570 by Christiaan Sgrooten show the *hunebed* 'Duvels Kutte' near Tinaarlo, probably D6-Tinaarlo (Bakker, in press; van Es et al., 1988; ill. on p. 212 of Sgrooten's map of c. 1570; Fockema Andreae & van 't Hoff, 1961). Schonhovius' colourful description (1547; Bakker, 1979a: p. 160) of this tomb with its intriguing name – meaning Devil's Cot rather than Devil's Cunt, as he would have it – located it somewhere 'near Rolde'. A systematic search through land deeds and the like could perhaps provide us with earlier records of *hunebedden*.

Picardt (1660) had much to say about Drenthian *hunebedden*, but gave no exact locations. Smids (1694; 1711) then published the first crude lists of *hunebedden*. In the following years several *hunebedden* were specifically referred to in publications and manuscripts (e.g. van Lier, 1760; Camper manuscript 1768-1811). Maps drawn c. 1788-1792 by Hottinger et al. (sheet Emmen; cf. Scholten, 1989 for the date of the map) and 1811-1813 by the French *Ingénieurs-Géographes* under direction of d'Épailly (Koeman, 1983) show several *hunebedden* as landmarks. In 1818 and 1820 the Governor of Drenthe sent questionnaires about antiquities to all mayors, which provide us with the first rather complete descriptive list of the *hunebedden* (Questionnaires 1818-1819, 1820). From then on there are many documents available about most of them (cf.

the references in van Giffen, 1925: pp. 193-229; ten Anscher, 1988).

Van Giffen (1925) surveyed the available information about the extant and demolished Dutch *hunebedden* in great detail (1925: pp. 168-188 and fold out table between pp. 186-187). He compiled information on 26 of them, but that included several unreliable ones, such as tombs mentioned by Smids (1711) and other tombs known from scant, early records that may not be correct. The number grew to 29 in the 1940s (van Giffen, 1943: p. 419; 1944a: p. 421; manuscript 3rd edition: p. 37). J.E. Musch found three new sites of demolished tombs in the 1960s, and corrected some mistakes in van Giffen's lists (Musch, cited by Wieringa, 1968: pp. 152-153; Bakker, 1983).

Although Klok (1979) published a brushed-up version of van Giffen's 1925 survey, to which he added the references to the national geographical grid of the Dutch Ordnance Survey, the need for a thorough re-evaluation remained. I present it here, partly based on numerous detailed data and critical remarks provided by Lanting. I have not taken over Lanting's suggestion to change van Giffen's code for the sites of demolished tombs in sections 3 and 4, because, although a more logical coding system would be helpful for the beginner, too much confusion might result.^{1,2}

2. EXTANT *HUNEBEDDEN*

Van Giffen (1925) named the extant tombs by a province letter and a serial number. Their present

number and designation is: Groningen 1 (G1) and Drenthe 52 (D1-D32, D34-D47, D49-D54).

The *hunebedden* D33-Valthe and G5-Heveskesklooster were removed (cf. section 3). D48-Noordbarge is a large boulder and not a *hunebed*, which van Giffen, although he knew this, unfortunately included in his list. *Hunebed* D53-Havelte was removed by the German *Wehrmacht* in 1945, but restored by van Giffen in 1948-1949 (van Giffen & Glasbergen, 1949; ten Anscher, 1988: p. 41; van Giffen, 1951: p. 104 probably gives the wrong date of 1949-1950). A complete list of extant *hunebedden* with their code names, national grid references and photographs can be found in Klok (1979).

3. DESTROYED HUNEBEDDEN, EXCAVATED

According to Lanting's reconstruction (pers. comm.), van Giffen (1925) coded the demolished Drenthe *hunebedden* by combining the code of a nearby extant *hunebed* and a letter ('D37a'). If there was an extant *hunebed* within the same *marke* (village grounds; usually there are several *marken* in one *gemeente*, municipality), the demolished tomb was named after it, even if an extant tomb in another *marke* was closer. If no *hunebed* was extant within the same *marke*, but there was one within the same *gemeente*, its code was used. Demolished tombs in *gemeenten* without extant *hunebedden* received the number of D54, the highest code number given to an extant Drenthe *hunebed*. This explains the codes for D54a-Spier, D54b-Hooghalen, and D54c-Hooghalen, which are closer to D52-Diever and D18-Rolde than to D54-Havelte.

3.1. Province of Friesland

F1-Rijs was discovered and demolished in 1849; it was excavated by van Giffen in 1922 (van Giffen, 1927: pp. 323-337). Re-excavation and installation of 'plombes' at the place of the orthostat extraction holes, done too schematically and regularly, took place in 1958.

3.2. Province of Groningen

G2-Glimmen was discovered 1966 by Musch and excavated in 1969-1970 by Lanting (1975; Brindley, 1986a).

G3-Glimmen was discovered 1966 by Musch and excavated in 1971 by Lanting (1975; Brindley, 1983).

G5-Heveskesklooster, the only known Dutch dolmen, was discovered in 1982. It was excavated by Lanting in 1983 and following years. It was removed in 1987 to make way for industrial expansion and reconstructed in Museum 'De Noordhorn' in Delf-

zijl. It is a matter of definition whether it should be called a short 'grand dolmen' (*Grossdolmen*) or an 'expanded dolmen' (*erweiterter Dolmen*) with three instead of two pairs of sidestones.

3.3. Province of Drenthe

D6e-Tinaarloos was discovered in 1927 and excavated in 1928 by van Giffen (1944b).

D13b-Exxt was discovered and excavated in 1927 (van Giffen, 1944d; Jager, 1985: No. 45).

D13c-Exxt was discovered and excavated in 1927 (van Giffen, 1944d; Jager, 1985: No. 46).

D31a-Exloo/Hunsow was excavated by J.S. Magnin et al. in 1843. The last boulders must have been removed between 1855 and 1875 (van Giffen, 1925: pp. 177-178; 1927: p. 54). The site is shown on the *Topographische en Militaire kaart* (Ordnance survey map) which was surveyed in 1852. Wieringa (1968: p. 152) could not find it in a young fir plantation, but now it is clearly visible as a large oval elevation with a central depression below the trees (pers. comm. Lanting).

D32a-Odoorn was destroyed in 1854-1869 and excavated in 1983 by Lanting (Taayke, 1985). Wieringa (1968: pl. II) shows Janssen's sketch of the grave in 1847.

D32c-Odoorn was destroyed in the 19th century and excavated in 1984 by Lanting (Taayke, 1985). Wieringa 1968: Pl. I is a photograph of the typical patch of granite grit in the ploughed field indicating the site of this tomb before its excavation.

D32d-Odoorn was destroyed in the 19th century and excavated by E. Taayke in 1984 (Taayke, 1985).

D33-Odoorn, an entirely ruined *hunebed*, was excavated in 1954 by van Giffen (report, cited in Bakker & Waterbolk, 1980), the stones were used for the restoration of D49-Papeloze Kerk in 1955/-1958 (van Giffen, 1961), and the reserve was sold in 1969.

D35a-Valther Spaan was first recorded by Reuvs (1833, ed. Brongers, 1973a: p. 25 (8), Pl. 11-12) and excavated in 1920 by van Giffen (1925: pp. 178, 181; 1927: pp. 271-275). Wieringa (1968: Pl. III) shows Janssens's sketch of the *hunebed* in 1847.

D37a-Weerdinge was discovered and excavated in 1837, and re-excavated in 1925 by van Giffen (1925: p. 182; 1927: pp. 52-54, 285-310).

D43a-Emmen was first recorded in 1819 (Questionnaire), destroyed after 1869. Although there is no written evidence for this assumption, the stones were possibly used for the 'restoration' of D43-Emmen in 1870. Its remnants were excavated by B. Kamlag in 1985. Wieringa (1986: Pl. III) shows Janssen's sketch of the tomb in 1847.

D44a-Zaalhof was described by Picardt (1660: p. 80), Reuvs (1833, ed. Brongers, 1973a: p. 23) and Janssen (1848: pp. 117-120, Pl. 1, fig. 13). Reuvs

recognized it as a *hunebed*, and Janssen excavated it in 1847. The floor measured 5.5x2 m. Two boulders stood 3 m apart. Only 13 decorated sherds were recovered (R.M.O.L.). At present the site is part of the town of Emmen and nothing is left of the two stones present in 1833-1848. It is interesting to note that Picardt (1660: p. 80) described the boulders, but did not recognize them as the remnants of a *hunebed*:

Oock isser soodanigen Saal geweest in Drenth, tot Emmen, dat noch op den dagh van heden genaemt wert den Sael-hof, zijnde geweest een groot Palleys / maer gantschelijck geruineert / also dat 'er niet meer van overgebleven is als de naem / het Pleyn / de oude Grachten / eenenige groote gemerckte Keselingen / sonder dat 'er eenige andere memorie van over-gebleven is.

'A few large marked boulders' (*eenige groote gemerckte Keselingen*) undoubtedly refers to the stones of the *hunebed*, one of which bore medieval wedge marks in the days of Reuvens and Janssen, and, apparently, also as early as 1660. Picardt was, however, not aware of the technique of wedge cleaving boulders; he thought that granite blocks in the walls of churches that were cut by that technique were sawn (*door-gesaeght*, 1660: p. 24).

D52a-Wapse/Pottiesbargien was destroyed in 1735 by official permission (Bakker, 1979b: pp. 167, 169) and excavated in 1929 by van Giffen (1946) and by Lanting in 1988.

D54a-Spier was discovered in 1921 by W. Beijerinck. Van Giffen dug trial trenches in 1923 (1927: pp. 281-285) and excavated the site completely in 1949 (van Giffen & Glasbergen, 1950: p. 429; Meeûsen, 1983).

D54b-Hooghalen was discovered and excavated in 1947 by van Giffen (van Giffen & Glasbergen, 1948), who describe this and the following tomb as a small *hunebed* and a stone cist).

D54c-Hooghalen was discovered and excavated in 1947 by van Giffen (van Giffen & Glasbergen, 1948).

3.4. Province of Overijssel

O1-De Eeze was drawn by Petrus Camper in 1781 (manuscript; Bakker, 1979b: fig. 7), destroyed c. 1840, and excavated in 1918 by van Giffen (1927: pp. 311-322) and in 1984 by Lanting. Van Giffen describes the confusion between it and a non-existent tomb at Finkega, Friesland (cf. Bakker, 1979b; 1989).

O2-Mander was discovered and excavated in 1957 by C.C.W.J. Hijzeler (1957; 1966; Bakker, 1979a: p. 155).

Thus, the plans of 22 destroyed *hunebedden* were excavated: 1 in Friesland, 3 in Groningen, 16 in Drenthe, and 2 in Overijssel.

The site of, probably, another destroyed *hune-*

bed, G4-Onnen, is known, but this has not yet been proven by excavation (section 4). If we include this site, the number of extant *hunebedden* and of demolished *hunebedden*, the site of which is known, is $53 + 22 + 1 = 76$.

4. DESTROYED GENUINE, PROBLEMATIC AND DUBIOUS *HUNEVEDDEN*, NOT EXCAVATED

The Amsterdam physician, antiquarian and playwright Ludolf Smids published the first list of *steenhopen* (*hunebedden*) in his antiquarian encyclopaedia (1711: pp. 324-325), which he wrote in Amsterdam, where he lived since 1685, after having spent his youth in Groningen, Westphalia and Leiden (Bakker, 1985). Smids did not aim at completeness ('They are found, for example, at') and seems to have based himself on hearsay evidence, which must have been incorrect in several cases. He probably travelled very little in Drenthe himself. Barrows, or *hunebergen*, *hunebelten*, or *hunepölle*, were formerly sometimes also called *hunebedden* (Picardt, 1660: p. 44), especially in Twente and Bentheim, but apparently also in Drenthe, even by the specialist J. Hofstede in a report of 1809 (van Giffen, 1927: p. 49; Janssen, 1848: p. 154). Some of the *hunebedden* listed by Smids may actually have been earthen barrows, because his informants were unaware of the difference between them. It is impossible to assess the accuracy of Smids' record. Between 1694/1711 and 1819, and especially before the legal prohibition in 1734/1735 (Bakker, 1979b), many *hunebedden* may have disappeared. Even in the 1750s stone digging and demolition of small *hunebedden* and cists was in full swing (cf. van Lier, 1760). It continued into the 19th century.

Smids' brief notes are not always clear to us. What did he mean by *binnen een bolwerkje geslooten* (surrounded by a bulwark)? Musch thought that he was referring to 'a stone enclosure' or peristalith (pers. comm. 1968-1975), but Lanting is convinced that earthen ramparts were concerned, i.e. dykes of the type used to fence off the arable land from the heathlands that also enclosed single parcels (*kampen*). As we will see below, he is inclined to think that those '*hunebedden*' *binnen een bolwerkje* at Tinaarloos ('D6a-d'), Annen ('D9a'), and Drouwen ('at least sixteen in a rampart' according to Smids, which are difficult to accept), were tumuli surrounded by a dyke, whereas Musch preferred to think that they were real *hunebedden* with a kerb.

4.1. Province of Groningen

G4-Onnen. Smids (1711: p. 325) recorded 'ONNEN; one [*huinebed*] of the usual kind', but did not

mention G1-Noordlaren that was well-known at the time because it lay on a road from Groningen to the south. Van Giffen named the Onnen tomb 'G1a' in his table (1925) on the basis of Smids' list and without knowing the site location. Later on, Lanting supposed that Smids has named the Noordlaren tomb 'Onnen'. Musch, however, took Smids' text literally and actually discovered a probable site in 1966-1968 on the basis of fieldnames such as Steenbergerveen and Steenberg (Bakker, 1983: pp. 117, 182). Although there is every reason to believe that a genuine *hunebed* site is located there, this can only be proven by excavation, which has not yet taken place.

4.2. Province of Drenthe

D5b-Ide. Leemans and Janssen (1845: p. 43), in their edition of the archaeological map of the Netherlands, mainly based on the notes of C.J.C. Reuvs, who had died in 1834, state "Ide or Yde ...: *Hunnebed*, report from *Staatsraad* Mr. P.A. Brugmans". It is possible that P.A. Brugmans, who lived at Amsterdam and was a member of the Royal Institute (the later Royal Academy of Sciences) in that town, has told this to Janssen or Leemans. He died in 1851. Like his elder brother, the Leiden Professor S.J. Brugmans who died already in 1819, he had a vivid interest in antiquities. Both were born in Groningen and S.J. Brugmans told Reuvs on 8 December 1818 many interesting details about *hunebedden* and the geological history of the boulders ('deposited on a reef below the sea'). At that time Reuvs did not yet know much about *hunebedden*, but collected all information he could get about them from the Camper manuscript (1768-1811) and from a tour through a part of Drenthe in April, 1819. The Ide *hunebed*, if it ever existed, cannot have been generally known because neither the Camper manuscript (c. 1769-c. 1806), nor the large-scale map made under d'Épailly (1811-1813), nor Westendorp's book (1815; 1822), nor Reuvs' notes from 1818-1819 (Reuvs archives C1, 22-70, R.M.O.L.) and 1833 (Brongers, 1973) mention this tomb.

The information was presumably not checked afterwards by Leemans or Janssen (1845), but Janssen (1848: p. 9) wrote that "even in our age (*nog in onzen leeftijd*), as far as I know, four *hunebedden* have been entirely demolished, at Eeze, at Exlo, at Ide, and in the heath at Steenwijk near Finkega in Friesland". 'In the heath at Steenwijk near Finkega' is O1-De Eeze once more (cf. section 3.4). 'Eeze' is an otherwise unknown tomb at Ees, *gemeente* Borger (cf. below). 'Exlo' is possibly D31a-Exloo. Janssen's manuscript notes on archaeological finds do not mention Ide (Kramer-Clobus, 1978 and pers. comm.).

Van Giffen (1925: pp. 170-172 and table) named this possible former tomb at Ide 'D5b'. He and others sought the site locality repeatedly in vain, but local informers stated several times that 'pure-bred Iders' knew absolutely nothing about a former *hunebed* (letters from R. Schaap at Ide, 14.1.1924 and from S.A. Haadsma at Vries, 2.4.1936, in B.A.I. files). In 1968 van Giffen pointed out to Lanting (pers. comm.) that part of *Sectie F* of the cadastral map of the *gemeente* Vries was named 'Hunnebed'. It is situated around the *dobbe/pingo* (map refs. 12W: 236/87/568.60) in the *marke* Tinaarlo, immediately across the boundary to the *marke* of Ide, directly west of the Grijze Steen ('Grey Stone'), a *marke* boundary stone. This area has not yet been surveyed in view of a possible *hunebed* site. Huiskes, on the other hand, found a *steen* toponyme, possibly indicating a former *hunebed* (cf. section 6), on the Zuides of Ide (pers. comm.). Presently the site is grassland and nothing can be found, but Lanting (pers. comm.) does not exclude the possibility that the Ide *hunebed* was located here and was immediately destroyed at its discovery.

D6a, b, c, d-Tinaarlo. Four *hunebedden* were extant "just outside the *ess* (arable fields) within a *bolwerkje*; but the fifth lies at some distance from there" (Smids, 1711: p. 325). The sites have not been rediscovered. Van Giffen (1925: p. 170) named them D6a, b, c, d-Tinaarlo and the extant tomb, which he considered to be the fifth of Smids, D6-Tinaarlo. The discovery of the demolished D6e-Tinaarlo (cf. section 3) did not alter this interpretation; apparently Smids did not know D6e. Musch (pers. comm.) thought that the four unidentified *hunebedden* named by Smids were peristalithic *hunebedden*, but Lanting is convinced that a group of earthen barrows later enclosed by a dyke was concerned.

D9a-Annen. Smids (1711: p. 325) recorded that this village "has one at the end of the *ess* (arable fields) and one *even aan de brinke*". The former must be D9-Annen, which lies at the former *es* of Noordloo and was drawn by Petrus Camper in 1768 (cf. Bakker, 1989: p. 91 and note 8, about the date of this drawing). The site of the latter tomb, which may be called D9a-Annen, has not been discovered. *Brinke* refers to the village green in present-day Drenthe, as it did in the late 18th century (*Tegenwoordige Staat van het Landschap Drenthe I*, 1792: p. 94) and probably in Smids' days as well. *Even aan den brinke* is, perhaps, best translated by 'just at' or 'nearby the village green'. Musch (pers. comm.) suggested a site for 'D9a-Annen', where the usual *haarpodzol* soil type for *hunebed* sites touches the *brinke* area. Lanting, however, commented that an earthen barrow, or at least a barrow-like hillock extant in the centre of the village may have been referred to.

D13a-Eext was discovered and destroyed in 1923

(van Giffen, 1927: pp. 275-281; 1944c; Jager, 1985: No. 49). When van Giffen's field technician arrived, he saw a pit and a large heap of stones (ten cartloads of stone, diameter less than 50 cm). Van Giffen (1944c) called it a *steenkeldertje* (cist) and compared it to the TRB cists of Diever and the stone-lined earth grave below Barrow II at Zeijen. The decorated pottery (van Giffen, 1944c: ill. 7, esp. ills. 7: 2d, 2j, 2e) belongs to Horizon 3 (Brindley, 1986b). Two undecorated pots, however, are typical of Horizons 7 or 6 (Brindley, 1986b), a bowl with remnants of a lug and, especially, a necked bowl (*randkom*) (van Giffen, 1944c: ills. 7: k, f). Brindley and Lanting (pers. comm.) checked this typological assignment and concluded the same. Because the presence of pottery from two such distant horizons in the same cist is difficult to understand, I suggested: "it is perhaps the remains of a *hunebed* which had already been dismantled long before 1923" (Bakker, 1979a: p. 155). In that case it would be strange, however, that sherds of Horizon 4 pottery, which is so well represented in most *hunebedden*, are lacking. The tomb type remains puzzling.

D27b and D27c-Borger. At Borger, two dilapidated *steenkelders* are recorded in 1819-1820 (Questionnaires 1818/1819; 1820): "Orientation unclear because only depressions are visible. There are only vague indications. One in the garden of the widow of J. Brongers. The other in the *weidekamp* at the house of the widow of H. Oostingh. Hardly visible". At the time, small *hunebedden* were indicated by the term *steenkelder* (section 7). Van Giffen (1925: pp. 175-176) named them D27b-Borger and D27c-Borger (the numbers are misprinted in the 1925 table, but cf. van Giffen, 1927: p. 235). The fields in which they lay were named in 1819, but they have not been identified on the 1830 cadastral maps, because the subsequent owners in the twelve intermediate years could not yet be traced. *Weidekamp* (meaning meadow-plot) is the name of a cadastral block (section) at Borger, near D27-Borger. Perhaps the second *steenkelder* may be sought here.

Smids (1694: p. 61; 1711: p. 325) stated that there were nine *hunebedden* at Borger. Today only eight are known: five (D21-D25) at Bronneger, a nearby hamlet, and three at Borger (D27, D27b and D27c). Instead of D27b and D27c, Smids (who did not give a complete list) may have counted D28-Buinen and D29-Buinen. Buinen is also a village close to Borger and presently within the same *gemeente*. Comparison of Smids' data with those of 1819 and later is difficult. Some of the smaller graves, such as D27b-Borger, D27c-Borger, or some of D21-25 at Borger, may have been discovered under covering barrows after Smids' times. That one tomb is not known from later sources is not surprising by itself, because it may have been demolished meanwhile. Moreover, Smids probably based his information

on that given by sheriff Lenting and his son to Titia Brongersma, a Groningen visitor to Borger, and a mistake may have been made (Bakker, 1985).

Drouwen. Smids (1711: p. 235) noted that there were *wel seshien, binnen een bolwerkje geslooten* (at least sixteen, enclosed in a rampart) at Drouwen. That sixteen were here is entirely unacceptable, because only D19-Drouwen, D20-Drouwen and D26-Drouwenerveld are presently known, as was the case in 1819-1820 (Questionnaires). Lanting (pers. comm.) suggests that here, again, tumuli were concerned.

Ees, gemeente Borger. Janssen (1848: pp. 9, 191), in his note on four *hunebedden* destroyed in his age (cf. the quotation under Ide, above), meant Ees, when he wrote Eeze (cf. Pleyte, 1882: p. 34). No other source mentions this tomb. Janssen's manuscript notes do not refer to Ees, *gemeente Borger* (Kramer-Clobus, 1978) and neither do those of Reuvs of 1818 (R.M.O.L.) and 1833 (Brongers, 1973a), nor the answers given by the mayor of Borger to Hofstede's Questionnaires of 1818 and 1820. Possibly at Ees a *hunebed* was discovered and demolished shortly before Janssen's visit to Drenthe in 1847.

D32b-Odoorn was destroyed in the 19th century (van Giffen, 1925; Taayke, 1985). Until it is excavated this demolished *hunebed* is included in this section, rather than in section 3.

D42a-Westenes would have been located halfway between D42 and D44. It is known by the cadastral lot number from a report of 1855 by the mayor of Emmen (van Giffen, 1925: p. 182). Lanting (pers. comm.) has repeatedly searched this field, which formerly was a *haarpodzol* soil, for traces of a *hunebed*, but in vain, although the ploughed layer is thin and the circumstances seem suitable for finding a patch of granite grit and stones. These unfruitful searches have led Lanting to conclude that the mayor's report of 1855 (cited by van Giffen, 1925), which is the only available reference, is unreliable.

D48a-Noordbarge. Janssen (1848: table) recorded a 3-trilithon *hunebed*, 8 m long and 2.5 m wide (exterior measure), of which 'only five stones lie there'. His schematic plan (in his table) does, however, not stipple the missing stones, as it should according to its code. Janssen did not make a drawing of this *hunebed* in 1847, when he sketched most *hunebedden* on his study tour through Drenthe (there are two identical sets of drawings in D.M.A. and a third in the Leiden University Library). It is possible that Janssen relied on inaccurate hearsay evidence for the summary plan in his table, because no 19th-century map or other reports refer to this tomb.

Janssen situated the tomb '30 minutes SW of Emmen'. 'One hour walking distance' usually was 4.5 km in the 19th century, which would situate

D48a 2.2 km SW of the church of Emmen. This is just enough to reach 'D48-Noordbarg', which is a large erratic block and not a *hunebed*, SW of the village of Noordbarg. However, because Janssen usually recorded the size of the largest boulder of each tomb, and remains silent about this enormous boulder, it is not probable that he considered D48 as a genuine *hunebed*, and referred to it when he described D48a.

Considering the distances from Emmen to D46-Angelsloo and D47-Angelsloo, which Janssen recorded in his table, the '30 minutes SW of Emmen' for D48a could range from 0.9 to 1.8 km, and would not have been sufficient to reach D48 or a now forgotten tomb in its neighbourhood. The village of Noordbarg was just '1.8 km SW of Emmen' so that there is a small possibility that Janssen was referring to the tomb in the village green, which was later described as a 'cist' by van Giffen on the basis of hearsay evidence (see section 5).

More probably, a different but otherwise unknown tomb was concerned. This tomb was not D44a-Zaalhof (see section 3.2), because only two (end)stones were left of it (Janssen, 1848: p. 117), which does not tally with the five stones recorded for the Noordbarg *hunebed*. Moreover, the site locations do not agree. Musch could not locate the site in 1968 (Wieringa, 1968: p. 153), but guessed later that D48a was located north of the Noordbarg centre (documents in B.A.I.). Klok (1979: p. 13) even assigned the map references 17H: c. 255.90/533.10 to it.

4.3. Province of Overijssel

Friezenberg, gemeente Markelo. According to Benthem (1920), 'a *hunebed* on the southern slope of the Vriesenberg near Rijssen was, although damaged, still clearly recognizable in 1856'. The reference does not yet occur in the first edition of Benthem's book (1895), and the source of the information is unknown. This site does not occur in van Giffen's list (1925). Whereas Lanting assumes that an earthen barrow is concerned, B. Groenewoudt (pers. comm.) found that *zwerfstenen* (erratic blocks) were indicated on a geological map (Dijkink, 1921). About 1979, these stones, now a heap shifted to the side of a campground, comprised a one metre large block with a flat side. An imaginative interpretation of a view of the Friezenberg drawn in pencil by J. Hoyneck van Papendrecht in 1887 (Hagens & Olde Meierink, 1986: ill. on p. 148) may suggest that a *hunebed* is shown at the crest of the hill, but rather it is a clump of pine trees (photograph on p. 121 in Lammertink & Roeterdink, 1987).

4.4. Province of Utrecht

Ul-Lage Vuursche, gemeente Baarn. The original

location of this site, which is on the northern edge of the carriage way to the Drakenstein castle, is known only from a pen-wash made by J. Bulthuis in 1781 (de Boone, 1971: cf. Bakker, 1957). The pen-wash shows what could be primeval dolmen (*Urdolmen*), with its single capstone in a correct position (flat side turned down). Nevertheless, it cannot be excluded that it was a 'folly' or that an ordinary heavy stone was laid there on four smaller ones during road construction. Before 1800 it was relocated some 30 m to the west, to its present site in front of the local inn. No scientific excavation has taken place at the original site.

Thus, we have here one unexcavated *hunebed* that is probably genuine (G4-Onnen). Ten are problematic (D5b-Ide, D13a-Eext, D27b-Borger, D27c-Borger, Ees, D32b-Odoorn, D42a-Westenes, D48a-Noordbarg, Friezenberg, and Ul-Lage Vuursche). Nineteen *hunebedden* recorded by Smids (1711) appear to be unreliable (D6a, b, c, d-Tinaarlo, D9a-Annen, one at Borger, and thirteen at Drouwen).

5. GRAVES REJECTED AS *HUNEBEDDEN*

5.1. Province of Drenthe

D5a-Zeijen. According to van Giffen (1925: pp. 170-172), this grave was not a *hunebed* but an earthen barrow. Nevertheless, he named it D5a in his table. All reports concerning a genuine *hunebed* at Zeijen concern the extant D5-Zeijen, which is first mentioned by Reuvs (1833, ed. Brongers, 1973a: p. 4 and map 7), who did not record a second tomb at Zeijen (cf. also van Giffen, 1927: pp. 44-52). D5a-Zeijen is definitively not a *hunebed*.

D6f-Tinaarlo (van Giffen, 1944b). It has not convincingly been demonstrated that this concentration of stones, pottery and other TRB finds next to D6e-Tinaarlo (section 3) actually represented the site of a demolished tomb, as van Giffen assumed it was; it may have been (Lanting, pers. comm.) a recent deposit of soil and debris of D6e at a lower spot, such as Lanting found at D32a-Odoorn (Taayke, 1985: p. 127).

Balloo-Kommerkamp. Van Giffen (1925: pp. 175-176) mentioned a cist found in the Kommerkamp at Balloo, but did not include it in the table. Since then there are new data concerning a cist found 1819 in the Kommerkamp, a sandy ridge extending into the valley of the Looner Diepje north of *hunebed* D16-Balloo (Brongers, 1973b; Reuvs, 1833, ed. Brongers, 1973a: p. 2). Below a pavement of stones, the remains of two skeletons, with their heads directed east, and apparently without grave goods, were found in white sand. The presence of recognizable skeletons and the absence of pottery argue against a

TRB date. It appears that Westendorp (1822: p. 184) assumed that these were early Christian burials (cf. van Giffen, 1925: p. 140, note 1, about not-covered Carolingian cists).

D18a-Amen, 'possibly a *hunebed*, WSW of Amen', *gemeente* Rolde, was given a questionmark in van Giffen's 1925 table. It is indicated on the map (atlas: pl. 120). The text (van Giffen, 1925: p. 175, note 1) describes it as a much damaged barrow containing large pieces of granite and situated on the boundary between Rolde and Beilen. A trial excavation was apparently not undertaken in 1925-1926. In 1947, *hunebedden* D54b-Hooghalen and D54c-Hooghalen were excavated in the immediate vicinity (cf. section 3), and what was probably a demolished stone-lined cist, with much pottery, was discovered nearby in 1963 (Bakker, 1970; 1979a: p. 190). One of these may have been referred to in 1925.

D20a-Drouwen. Van Giffen (1925: pp. 175-177) suggested that the *hunebed* 'half an hour east of Drouwen' mentioned in the answers to the Questionnaire of 1818/1819 was, in fact, D26-Drouwenveld, located to the west of Drouwen. He included D20a, 'vanished, E. of Drouwen?' in his table. That *oost en west* were mixed up in 1818/1819 is confirmed by the Questionnaire of 1820, which van Giffen did not consult. In it the grave is located to the west of Drouwen, and is D26. 'D20a-Drouwen?' must therefore be erased from van Giffen's table (1925).

D27a-Borger (van Giffen, 1925: p. 177), a single barrow crowned by bushes amidst the fields, was explored by van Giffen in 1964. According to Lanting, who studied the summary documentation, the core of the barrow consisted of a massive pack of cobbles into which a recent pit had been dug. The emptying of this pit gave the wrong impression that it was a 'cist' or a stone-lined earthgrave. Barbed wire-decorated Early Bronze Age sherds occurred as stray finds. It is certainly no *hunebed*. The 1925 table misprints the name of this grave as D27c, but see van Giffen, 1927 (p. 235), where both Borger *steenkeldertjes* are named D27b-c.

Exloo. The '*hunebed*' indicated on the Ordnance Survey maps north of D30-Exloo was constructed by the State Forestry when the forest was planted in the 1930s (Klok, 1979: ill. on p. 75, calling it a *nep-hunebed*, a bogus *hunebed*).

D32e-Odoorn. Musch proved that the remains of the tomb recorded by van Giffen (1944a: p. 421, No. 2) were identical to D32d-Odoorn (van Giffen, 1925: p. 181), by fitting together fragments of a chisel from both sites (Wieringa, 1968; Taayke, 1985: p. 126).

Westenes. At Westenes, more to the west than the tombs D42-Westenes and D44-Westenes (map references 17E: 254.3/534.99), an area of 61.5 m full of stones and stone grit, oriented from east to west,

was excavated by C. van Duijn (R.O.B.) in November 1958, because this could represent a demolished *hunebed*. A few undecorated Neolithic sherds, flint blades and a flint arrow-head were found in the pavement, and outside it sherds datable from 400 BC to 400 AD in a pitfill and four postholes. This was no *hunebed* (report by P.J.R. Modderman in archive Klok, R.O.B.).

D45a-Emmerdennen and *D45b-Emmerdennen* are 'two small cists made of stones east of Emmerdennen' (van Giffen, 1925: p. 182). It is quite possible that these were not TRB graves. They were not *hunebedden*. Klok's reference (1979: p. 13) to D45b-Weerdinge, map refs. 17H: c. 257/537, is erroneous, because van Giffen (1927: pp. 52-54) named that D37a (see section 3).

'*Hunebed*' between *Emmerschans* and *Bargeroosterveld* (map refs. 17E: 260.90/560.53), property of the State Forestry. Each so many years the B.A.I. or D.M.A. is informed of the existence of this '*hunebed*', which is, however, only a natural heap of stones at the 'escarpment' of the Pleistocene Hondsrug at the Hunze valley.

'*Hunebed*' of *Klazienaveen* (map refs. 17E: 263.18/529.18). A natural heap of stones at the escarpment of the Hondsrug at the Hunze valley, at Vastenow, on the Rundeweg north of Klazienaveen, which is now and then reported as a *hunebed* to D.M.A. and the B.A.I. (pers.comm. Lanting).

'*Cist* between *Emmen* and *Noordbarge*' (van Giffen, 1925: pp. 140-141, 182, but not listed in the table). This probably is the *grafkeldertje* (small burial vault made of stones) found in 1899 behind the Dutch Reformed vicarage of Emmen, which in the D.M.A. inventory book was erroneously located 'on the road from Emmen to Noordbarge, instead of on the *esweg* (road) from Emmen to Westenesch', at the western fringe of Emmen. Late Bell Beaker finds from it were bought by the D.M.A. (Lanting, 1973: pp. 238-241, fig. 11). This grave belongs to a class of late Bell Beaker graves, often lined with stones, so-called cists, recognized in Drenthe by Lanting (1973: pp. 232 ff.).

'*Cist* in the village green of *Noordbarge*'. The passage on pp. 140-141 (van Giffen, 1925) corrects the passage on p. 182, that mentions 'the village green of Emmerdennen', a village that has never existed. "In the barrow on the village green [of Noordbarge] a cist was demolished some years ago" (*Nederlandsch Bureau voor Anthropologie, Verslag Tweedaagse Excursie op Zaterdag 23 en Zondag 24 Mei 1925*, p. 4; probably written by van Giffen). This cist is not recorded in van Giffen's table (1925). It was not a *hunebed*.

'*Hunebed*' of *Coevorden*. A postcard, stamped 1932, illustrates this '*hunebed*', which is nothing more than a large boulder resting on three others.

5.2. Province of Friesland

'*Hunebed*' of *Appelscha* (map refs. 17W: c. 220.80/549.05). It seems to have been found by workmen about 1912. In 1931 it drew the attention of the amateur archaeologist H.J. Popping who notified the press. Van Giffen investigated it on 5.3.1932. He drew a plan and a section. Five stones, 1-1.5 m long, formed a cell-like construction below the surface (c. 4.52.5 m exterior measures, interior width of what seemed vertical stones 1.8 m). Popping's assumption that the stones formed a small *hunebed* or stone cist is understandable. Van Giffen was, however, immediately 'disappointed' after some digging and coring. The stones lay in and on the natural soil. Foundation pits, other indications that it was a piece of human architecture and artefacts lacked completely. A few weeks later, Popping invited F.C. Bursch of the R.M.O.L., who also concluded that it was a natural heap of stones. All the same, Popping reconstructed it as a cist or small *hunebed* in 1934. He concluded that it had been for example a Bronze Age cist without finds, but claimed that charcoal had been found. Although he has dropped the idea of a *hunebed* himself, it lives on in the local tradition. There is a detailed report by van Giffen to the board of the Friesch Genootschap (8.3.1932), accompanied by a plan, a section of the excavated stones and surrounding natural soil, and three photographs (files B.A.I.). See further: yearly report R.M.O.L. 1932: p. 5, an article by Popping in *De Ooststelling-werver* 5.8.1932 and newspaper clippings 7.12.1931 (*NRC*), 21.3.1932 (*Algemeen Handelsblad*), 22.3.1932 (*Nieuwsblad van het Noorden*), 3.5.1932(?) (*Provinciale Drentsche en Asser Courant*), 7.7.1934 (*NRC*) (in files of R.M.O.L. and B.A.I.).

5.3. Province of Overijssel

Koe en Kalf, Steenwijk. The boulders names 'Cow and Calf' lying together in a park at Steenwijk are called 'the remains of a destroyed *hunebed*' in a tourist guide (Berk & Buter, c. 1982), but nothing proves this.

Between Wierden and Hoge Hexel. In his diaries of 1812-1813 de Clercq wrote:

Nadat men genooten heeft van schoone uitzichten op golvende korenvelden, komt men aan het Hexel. In het voorbijgaan ziet men een heuvel, waarvan den reiziger wordt meedegeedeeld, dat dit een Hunnebed is, gelijk men ze in Drenthe aantreft

Because a *heuvel* (hillock) is mentioned, but no boulders are, a non-megalithic earthen barrow must have been concerned. The Hofkes family, the informants of the young Amsterdam traveller Willem de Clercq, may never have seen genuine *hunebedden*!

6. TOPONYMY

On the basis of such placenames as Steenberg(en) by which *hunebed* sites were usually designated, Huiskes (1985) located 96 possible sites of destroyed *hunebedden* in the province of Drenthe alone. He has not been successful in finding traces of *hunebedden* at places where they were supposed to have been. Although several of these placenames must have applied to 'stone heaps' other than *hunebedden*, their large number suggests that Picardt's guess (1660: p. 131) that 'probably half of them (the *hunebedden*) is not preserved anymore' may not be incorrect.

7. THE TERM *GRAFKELDER*

The term *grafkelder* (burial vault) designated small *hunebedden* at first (van Lier, 1760). Subsequently Westendorp (1815; 1822) strictly distinguished *hunebedden* from *grafkelders*. *Hunebedden*, in his theory, were free-standing chambers made of trilithons, of which D6-Tinaarloos would have been an example, whereas *grafkelders*, like D13-Eext and D41-Emmen, were covered by a barrow. They had an entrance in one side 'which is never found in *hunebedden*'; the inner face of the orthostats was better dressed; the spaces between the orthostats were carefully filled with smaller stones; the orthostats stood closely together whereas those of *hunebedden* stood more apart. "Although they [the Drenthe *grafkelders*] may be considered as younger [than the *hunebedden*], they are undoubtedly built by the same people, but who had been subjugated by another [barrow building] tribe" (Westendorp, 1815: pp. 240-242; 1822: pp. 7-9).

Reuvens (1833), Janssen (1848) – and Lukis & Dryden (manuscript 1878, cf. Bakker, 1979c), Lukis (1879) and Oldenhuis Gratama (1886), all who followed Janssen – used the term *grafkelder* for such *hunebedden* as D13-Eext, D41-Emmen, and both passage graves in *Langbett* D43-Emmen. *Langbett* D43-Emmen was still called *de Grafkelders* locally in the 1910s and D13-Eext is even presently called *de Grafkelder*.

At the end of the 19th century, the term became more and more synonymous to *steenkeldertjes* or cists, which usually were stone-lined earth graves and were not necessarily TRB graves. Slabs of stone to tightly enclose a cremation urn were also called *steenkeldertjes*, however, which increases the confusion.

8. NOTES

- The following abbreviations are used in the text:
B.A.I. = Biologisch-Archaeologisch Instituut, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.
D.M.A. = Drents Museum, Assen (formerly Drentsch Museum van Oudheden).
I.P.P. = Albert Egges van Giffen Instituut voor Prae- en Protohistorie, Universiteit van Amsterdam.
R.O.B. = Rijksdienst voor het Oudheidkundig Bodemonderzoek, Amersfoort.
R.M.O.L. = Rijksmuseum van Oudheden, Leiden.
- I am very grateful to Drs. J.N. Lanting (B.A.I.) for providing all kinds of detailed information and for the discussions we had together. J.E. Musch (Annen) and many others generously contributed information, and I wish to thank them all. Susan Loving (I.P.P.) was kind enough to improve the English.

9. REFERENCES

- ANSCHER, T.J. TEN, 1988. *Een inventarisatie van de documentatie betreffende de Nederlandse hunebedden* (= R.A.A.P.-rapport 16). Amsterdam.
- BAKKER, J.A., 1957. Hunebeddencultuur bij de Lage Vuursche? I. De Vuurscher kei. *Westerheem* 6, pp. 27-30.
- BAKKER, J.A., 1970. Diepsteekceramiek uit Hooghalen. *Nieuwe Drentse Volksalmanak* 88, pp. 185-211.
- BAKKER, J.A., 1979a. *The TRB West Group. Studies in chronology and geography of the makers of hunebeds and Tiefsch pottery* (= Cingula 5). Amsterdam.
- BAKKER, J.A., 1979b. Protection, acquisition, restoration, and maintenance of the Dutch hunebeds since 1734: an active and often exemplary policy in Drenthe (I). *Berichten van de Rijksdienst voor het Oudheidkundig Bodemonderzoek* 29, pp. 143-183.
- BAKKER, J.A., 1979c. July 1878: Lukis and Dryden in Drenthe. *The Antiquaries Journal* 59, pp. 9-18.
- BAKKER, J.A., 1983. Het hunebed G1 te Noordlaren. *Groninger Volksalmanak* 1982-1983, pp. 115-199.
- BAKKER, J.A., 1985. De opgraving in het Grote Hunebed te Borger door Titia Brongersma op 11 juni 1685. *Nieuwe Drentse Volksalmanak* 101, pp. 103-116.
- BAKKER, J.A., 1989. Petrus en Adriaan Camper en de hunebedden. In: J. Schuller tot Peursum-Meijer & W.R.H. Koops (eds), *Petrus Camper (1722-1789), onderzoeker van nature*. Groningen, pp. 89-98.
- BAKKER, J.A., in press. *The hunebedden, the Dutch megalithic TRB West Group graves compared with those of Germany* (= British Archaeological Reports, Intern. series). Oxford.
- BAKKER, J.A. & H.T. WATERBOLK, 1980. De Nederlandse hunebedden. Rapport uitgebracht op verzoek van de minister van Cultuur, Recreatie en Maatschappelijk Werk en het Provinciaal Bestuur van Drenthe. Typescript I.P.P./B.A.I./R.O.B.
- BENTHEM, A., 1920. *Geschiedenis van Enschede*. Enschede. (2nd edition edited by C.J. Snuif & J.J. van Deirse)
- BERK, G.L. & A. BUTER, c. 1982. *Landschappen in Zwolle*. Zwolle.
- BOONE, W.J. DE, 1971. De dolmen aan de Vuurse. *Westerheem* 20, p. 149.
- BRINDLEY, A.L., 1983. The finds from hunebed G3 on the Glimmer Es, mun. of Haren, prov. of Groningen, the Netherlands. *Helinium* 23, pp. 209-236.
- BRINDLEY, A.L., 1986a. Hunebed G2: excavations and finds. *Palaeohistoria* 28, pp. 27-92.
- BRINDLEY, A.L., 1986b. The typo-chronology of TRB West Group pottery. *Palaeohistoria* 28, pp. 93-132.
- BRONGERS, J.A., 1973a. *1833: Reuvens in Drenthe, een bijdrage tot de geschiedenis van de Nederlandse archeologie in de eerste helft van de negentiende eeuw* [= facsimile edition of manuscript Reuvens, 1833, with English translation]. Bussum.
- BRONGERS, J.A., 1973b. Het Genootschap ter Beoefening en Opheldering der Oudheden en Geschiednissen van Drenthe (1819-1822). In: W.A. van Es, A.V.M. Hubrecht, P. Stuart, W.C. Mank & S.L. Wynia (eds), *Archeologie en Historie, opgedragen aan H. Brunsting bij zijn zeventigste verjaardag*. Bussum, pp. 459-468.
- CAMPER, P. & A.G. CAMPER, 1768-1811. Hunne[n]bedde[n] van Drenthe getekend door P. Camper. [manuscript of P. Camper, with drawings of 1768, 1769 and 1781 and notes; additional notes by A.G. Camper, 1769-1811; University Library Amsterdam MS II G53; cf. Bakker, 1989].
- CLERCQ, W. DE, 1812-1813 (1919). Diaries 1812-1813 cited by H. Salomonsson. In: G.J. ter Kuile (ed.), *Ons Twenthe, Proza en poëzie uit en over Twenthe*. Almelo, p. 189.
- DIJKINK, H.J., 1921. *Proeve eener geologische beschrijving van Markelo en omgeving*. Wageningen.
- ES, W.A. VAN, H. SARFATIJ & P.J. WOLTERING (eds), 1988. *Archeologie in Nederland; de rijkdom van het bodemarchief*. Amsterdam/Amersfoort.
- FOCKEMA ANDREAE, S.J. & B. VAN 'T HOFF, 1961. *Christiaan Sgrooten's kaarten van de Nederlanden*. Leiden.
- GIFFEN, A.E. VAN, 1925-1927. *De hunebedden in Nederland* [I (1925), II (1927) and atlas (1927)]. Utrecht.
- GIFFEN, A.E. VAN, 1943. Opgravingen in Drenthe. In: J. Poortman (ed.), *Drenthe, een handboek voor het kennen van het Drentsche leven in voorbije eeuwen*. Meppel, pp. 391-546 [1944a, Meppel, 393-568; manuscript 3rd edition of c. 1947, kept in Groningen University Library].
- GIFFEN, A.E. VAN, 1944b. De twee vernielde hunebedden, DV1e en DV1f, bij Tinaarlo, gem. Vries. *Nieuwe Drentse Volksalmanak* 62, pp. 93-112.
- GIFFEN, A.E. VAN, 1944c. Een steenkeldertje, DXIIIa, te Eext, gem. Anloo. *Nieuwe Drentse Volksalmanak* 62, pp. 117-119.
- GIFFEN, A.E. VAN, 1944d. Twee vernielde hunebedden, DXIIIb en c, te Eext, gem. Anloo. *Nieuwe Drentse Volksalmanak* 62, pp. 119-125.
- GIFFEN, A.E. VAN, 1946. Een vernield hunebed, DXLIIa, het zoogenaamde Pottiesbargien, in het (vroegere) Wapserveld bij Diever, gem. Diever. *Nieuwe Drentse Volksalmanak* 64, pp. 61-71.
- GIFFEN, A.E. VAN, 1951. Het grote hunebed D53. *Nieuwe Drentse Volksalmanak* 69, pp. 102-104.
- GIFFEN, A.E. VAN, 1961. Een gereconstrueerd hunebed. *Nieuwe Drentse Volksalmanak* 79, pp. 189-198.
- GIFFEN, A.E. VAN & W. GLASBERGEN, 1948. Opgravingen in Nederland in 1947. *l'Antiquité Classique* 16, Archéologie, pp. 366-368.
- GIFFEN, A.E. VAN & W. GLASBERGEN, 1949. Opgravingen in Nederland in 1948. *l'Antiquité Classique* 18, Archéologie, pp. 418-423.
- GIFFEN, A.E. VAN & W. GLASBERGEN, 1950. Opgravingen in Nederland in 1949. *l'Antiquité Classique* 19, Archéologie, pp. 427-436.
- HAGENS, H. & B. OLDE MEIERINK (eds), 1986. *Twente te pronk, drie eeuwen verbeeld in prenten, tekeningen en aquarellen 1600-1900*. Utrecht.
- HIJSZELER, C.C.W.J., 1957. Mander. *Nieuws-Bulletin van de K.N.O.B. (Archeologisch Nieuws)* 10, col. 225-226.
- HIJSZELER, C.C.W.J., 1966. Mander en omgeving. *Verslagen en Mededeelingen Vereeniging tot Beoefening van Overijsselsch Regt en Geschiedenis* 81, pp. 1-50, spec. 24-27.
- HUISKES, B., 1985. Van veldnaam tot vindplaats? Een onderzoek naar het verband tussen hunebedden en 'steennamen' in Drenthe. *Driemaandelijks Bladen, orgaan van het Nedersaksisch Instituut der Rijksuniversiteit te Groningen* 37, pp. 81-94.
- JAGER, S.W., 1985. A prehistoric route and ancient cart-tracks in the gemeente Anloo (province of Drenthe). *Palaeohistoria* 27, pp. 185-245.

- JANSSEN, L.J.F., 1848. *Drenthse oudheden*. Utrecht.
- KLOK, R.H.J., 1979. *Hunebedden in Nederland, zorgen voor morgen*. Haarlem.
- KOEMAN, C., 1983. *Geschiedenis van de kartografie in Nederland. Zes eeuwen land- en zeekaarten en stadsplattegronden*. Alphen aan den Rijn.
- KRAMER-CLOBUS, G.M.C., 1978. L.J.F. Janssen (1806-1869): an inventory of his notes on archaeological findspots in the Netherlands. *Berichten van de Rijksdienst voor het Oudheidkundig Bodemonderzoek* 28, pp. 441-541.
- LAMMERTINK, J. & D. ROETERDINK, 1987. Markelo, het dorp op de vijf heuvels. *Jaarboek Twente*, pp. 117-121.
- LANTING, J.N., 1973. Laat neolithicum en vroege bronstijd in Nederland en N.W.-Duitsland: continue ontwikkelingen. *Palaeohistoria* 15, pp. 215-317.
- LANTING, J.N., 1975. De hunebedden op de Glimmer Es (gem. Haren). *Groninger Volksalmanak*, pp. 167-180.
- LEEMANS, C. & L.J.F. JANSSEN, 1845. *Kaart van de in Nederland, België en een gedeelte der aangrenzenden landen gevonden Romeinsche, Germaansche of Gallische oudheden, benevens de Romeinsche en andere oude wegen ... begonnen door C.J.C. Reuvens*. Leijden.
- LIER, J. VAN, 1760. *Oudheidkundige brieven* The Hague.
- LUKIS, W.C., 1879. Report on the hunebedden of Drenthe, Netherlands. *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of London*, 2nd ser. 8, pp. 47-55.
- MEEÛSEN, W., 1983. Het verdwenen hunebed D54a bij Spier, gem. Beilen. (typescript B.A.I.)
- OLDENHUIS GRATAMA, L., 1886. Officiële verslagen omtrent oudheden in Drenthe van 1818 en 1819. *Nieuwe Drentsche Volksalmanak*, pp. 100 ff.
- ORTELIUS, A., 1570. *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum*. Antwerpen.
- PICARDT, J., 1660. *Korte beschrijvinghe van eenige vergetene en verborgene antiquiteiten ... tusschen de Noord-Zee, de Yssel, Emse en Lippe* Amsterdam.
- PLEYTE, W., 1882. *Nederlandsche Oudheden*. vol. Drente. Leiden.
- Questionnaire, 1818-1819. [Questionnaire about ancient monuments from the Governor of Drenthe, 6 November 1818, sent to the mayors and answered by them in 1818-1819]. The answers were published by L. Oldenhuis Gratama, *Nieuwe Drentsche O* Volksalmanak* 5, 1887, pp. 200-232. Cf. Bakker, 1979b: pp. 176-178.
- Questionnaire, 1820. [Questionnaire from the Governor about mobile antiquities, 20 September 1820, sent to the mayors and answered in 1820]. Unpublished, cf. Bakker, 1979b: pp. 177-178. Assen State Archives.
- REUVENS, C.J.C., 1838. Manuscript about antiquities in Drenthe. Published by Brongers, 1973a.
- SCHOLTEN, F.W.J., 1989. *Militaire topografische kaarten en stadsplattegronden van Nederland 1579-1795*. Alphen aan den Rijn.
- SCHONHOVIUS, A., 1547. De origine et sedibus Francorum, de Chamavis, Bructeris, Tencteris aliisque ... [letter of 20.12.1547 directed to C. Gualterus published by A. Matthaeus, 1738. *Veteris Aevi Analecta* 1, pp. 37-44].
- SMIDS, L., 1694. *Poësyne*. Amsterdam.
- SMIDS, L., 1711. *Schatkamer der Nederlandsse oudheden* Amsterdam.
- TAA YKE, E., 1985. Drie vernielde hunebedden in de gemeente Odoorn. *Nieuwe Drentse Volksalmanak* 102, pp. 125-144.
- WESTENDORP, N., 1815, 1822. Verhandeling ter beantwoording der vrage; Welke volkeren hebben de zoogenoemde hunebedden gesticht? In welke tijden kan men onderstellen, dat zij deze oorden hebben bewoond? In: *Letter- en Oudheidkundige Verhandelingen van de Hollandsche Maatschappij der Wetenschappen te Haarlem* 1, 1815. Revised edition Groningen, 1822.
- WIERINGA, J., 1968. Iets over de ligging van de hunebedden op het zuidelijk deel van de Hondsrug. *Nieuwe Drentse Volksalmanak* 86, pp. 149-157.