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Looking Sharp

Dutch Bronze Age razors and tweezers in context

Stijn Arnoldussen & Hannie Steegstra
Groningen Institute of Archaeology, University of Groningen

Abstract: Discussions on the presence, nature and apparel of (presumed) European Bronze Age warriors has traditionally focused on weapon graves, armour and rock art – the latter two regretfully absent in the Low Countries. This means that for this area, warrior identities need to be reconstructed on the basis of funerary assemblages that may even lack actual weapons.

Since Paul Treherne’s seminal (1995) paper, particularly razors and tweezers have been recognized as reflecting the personal care typical of the warrior life-style.

In this paper, Bronze Age and Early Iron Age razors and tweezers from the Netherlands are discussed as part of their wider West-European distribution. Razors of different shapes (pegged, tanged, symmetrical and asymmetrical) can be shown to date to different phases in the period of c. 1600 – 600 BC. Moreover, in variations in handle and blade shape, regional groups and supra-regional contact networks can be identified. Tweezers too show ample diachronic and regional variations: in addition to presumably local types, Nordic and Hallstatt imports are discernible.

Razors and tweezers were part of toilet sets that differed in meaning and composition within the time-frame of 1600-600 BC. We argue that the short-hafted awls frequently found in association may represent tattooing needles. In the Hallstatt period, nail-cutters and ear-scoops complement the set (now often suspended from a ring and worn in leather pouches closed with rings or beads).

Contextual analysis of the objects shows that razors could be placed in hoards, yet most originate from graves. Several urnfield razors (and some tweezers) originate from funerary monuments that must have stood out for their age, shape or dimensions (e.g. older tombs, long-bed barrows), hinting at a special status for those interred with the toilet sets.

Remarkably, the association of razors and tweezers with weapons is infrequent for the Low Countries during most phases of the Bronze Age. Associations with swords are limited to the Ploughrescant-Ommerschans dagger from the famous Ommerschans hoard and the Gündlingen sword from the Oss chieftain’s grave. This means that in the Low Countries, a pars-pro-toto approach to the expression of warrior identity prevailed – one in which the interment of toilet sets instrumental to the expression of warrior identity took precedence over the interment of weaponry.

Keywords: Razors, tweezers, tattooing needles, toilet sets, warriors, Bronze Age, Early Iron Age, Western Europe.

1. Problem definition: Lost Bronze Age warriors?

Despite evidence of endemic violent conflict in the Bronze Age, within (e.g. Louwe Kooijmans 1993) and outside the Netherlands, and despite the numbers of Bronze Age weapons recovered (e.g. Essink & Hielkema 2000; Fontijn 2003), the actual existence and identifiability of local Bronze Age warriors has only rarely been discussed for the Netherlands (but see Fontijn 2003: 226-236; Arnoldussen 2008: 432-435). In no small part this must be due to the modest number of known Bronze Age weapon graves in the Netherlands: Bourgeois and Fontijn (2012: 540-541) could list only 12 daggers and swords from Early and Middle Bronze Age funerary contexts. As over 500 barrow phases are known for these periods (Lohof 1994: 99-100; Theunissen 1999: 72) and research intensity (i.e. the ratio of barrows excavated to known barrows) is estimated at around 20% (Bourgeois 2013: 8), this scarcity most probably reflects a prehistoric reality – albeit that weapons figure more prominently in riverine deposition (> 60 swords; Fontijn 2003: 228, fig. 11.3; Brück & Fontijn 2013: 199).

2 For chronology and absolute dates see Fig. 27.
Evidently, the Netherlands lack the substantial numbers of graves with weapons that elsewhere in Europe have sparked theories of a Bronze Age warrior class. Such a warrior identity may be identified through material representations of its core values: personal weaponry, a warrior identity may be identified through material representations of its core values: personal weaponry, drinking equipment, body ornamentation and grooming, horse-riding and wheeled vehicles. Any discussion of the validity of such models for the Netherlands must therefore be based not solely on the iconic “weapon graves”, but also take into account a wider range of contexts (most notably wetland deposition zones) and artefact associations, in order to support the plausibility and reconstruct the particularities of the Bronze Age warrior. In this paper, we consider the role that ‘toiletries’ or ‘grooming implements’ such as razors and tweezers may play in identifying warriors in the Low Countries.

The role of tweezers and razors as instruments for signifying a warrior status has been advocated best in Paul Treherne’s seminal study (1995), which since has proved influential in studies of martial identities (Frieman et al. 2017). Central to Treherne’s narrative is the finality of the burial ritual (Rebay-Salisbury 2017: 41), which provides a salient if brief arena for conveying the warrior values and identity (Treherne 1995: 108) embodied by the deceased – including an ethos of bodily perfection (Brück 2017: 38-39; also suggested by the muscular definition visible on cuirasses (Rebay-Salisbury 2017: 42; Egg & Kramer 2013). According to Treherne (1995: 105; 107; 110; 125), combs, (tattooing?) awls, razors and tweezers were instrumental in the fabrication of a look fit – or reserved – for warriors. Combing, shaving and plucking of hair, manicuring nails, scarification or tattooing could be part of the warrior’s bodily regime (Rebay-Salisbury 2017: 41; Harding 2008: 192) and use traces on toiletries reflect actual (regular) use. Martial identities – like other types of identity – obviously may have been expressed through the body by shaving, trimming and removal of (facial) hair (Rebay-Salisbury 2017: 42), but textiles, body painting or tattooing (cf. Van Giffen 1947: 118; Bergerbrandt 2007: 46) and perishable ornaments (equally archaeologically invisible) are similarly employable media.

The razors with their variations in form and quality of decoration (whose motifs are frequently thought to pertain to cosmological travel of the sun or actual travels by ship (Kaul 1998; Harding 2008: 193) and their infrequent interment may have expressed an elite status (Harding 2008: 192). Moreover, as stylistic variations can be detected in razor forms and decorations across Europe, a premise of personal ownership could provide handles for interpersonal contacts or mobility (Harding 2008: 193, cf. Sandars 1957: 320-321).

Others, such as Woodward (2000: 115), have stressed that the razors and tweezers recovered from graves may have been used to mark the bodies of the mourners instead, complicating their implicit interpretation as personal masculine objects. The recovery of facial hairs from more than one person on the Winterslow razor may be a case in point. Also, our limited understanding of the cosmological significance of the iconography on razors (which may reference animals as diverse as horses, fish, waterfowl and whales (Kaul 1998; Jockenhövel 2003: 139; Warmenbol 2015) warrants cautious and regionally specific interpretations. Moreover, the scope and pervasiveness of the warrior ideology, its selectiveness (who were entitled and when?) and its bodily repercussions have recently been called into question. A critical appraisal of proxies for warrior identity in the Low Countries beyond weapon-graves in the strictest sense, is therefore much needed.

2. Dutch Bronze Age toiletries

In the sections below, the information available on Bronze Age artefacts that may have been part of toilet sets (e.g. razors, tweezers, combs) will be discussed. This section will however start with an introduction to the terminology and typological labels frequently applied to these sets of artefacts, in order to facilitate clear and accurate descriptions, but also to allow comparison with similar artefacts found elsewhere in Europe.

2.1 Introduction, terminology and typology

The corpus of Dutch Bronze Age implements attributed to toilet sets comprises mostly razors (n=3) and tweezers
Batzhausen refers to short tattooing needles that end
in a flattened (cutting?) edge opposite their tapering
point (e.g. Torbrügge 1959, Taf. 29.10). Form Eilsbrunn
describes tattooing needles that have a square cross-section
becoming rounded towards the point, and that may
have organic or bronze handles (e.g. Torbrügge 1959, 56
No. 20; Taf. 56 No. 5).

Combs too may have been part of Bronze Age toilet sets
(Treherne 1995: 110), but as most were made of perishable
materials such as horn or wood (Kersten 1936: 57,
but see Sprockhoff 1932, Taf. 8n or Bergerbrandt 2007:
63 for bronze examples), they survive only in anaerobic
conditions such as coffins below iron-pan formations
(e.g. Egtved, Borum Eshej, Trindhej; Bergerbrandt 2007:
63) or in wetland votive deposits (e.g. Butler 1990: 63-64;
63 fig. 9 No. 2). Because of such funerary associations,
a dating to Per. II (1475-1325 BC) and III (1325-1125 BC)
was suggested by Kersten (1936: 58; Taf. XXXVI). Combs
are infrequently associated with razors, e.g. the Nybel
grave with razor and comb interred with an adult male
(Randsborg et al. 2006: 120; Kincade 2014: 39); Hafdrup-
Trindhej grave A (Aner & Kersten 1986: 25; Taf. 12) or
the King’s grave at Seddin (Kiekebusch 1928, 30-32; Taf.
XIX-XX). Bergerbrant (2007: 63) argues that combs
are interred both with males and – decidedly more
frequently – with females, but that their placement
(attached to the clothing of females, not attached with
males) differs.

For the razors, several typological schemes have
been forwarded. Baudou (1960: 29-39) classified the
Nordic razors into four main groups: a series with
forward-curved handles (plain, or horse- or bird-shaped),
a series with thin backwards-curved handles (Rasiermesser mit zurückgebogenem, drahtrörmigem
Griffsatz; Jockenhövel 1980: 164), a series of razors
with broad grips and a series of trapezoidal and semicircular razors. Tackenberg (1971: 126-149) stressed
the importance of looking at both blades and handle
shapes for the north-German razors, and devised a
typological scheme for symmetrical razors with different
types of openwork handles (open, cross-hatched,
ladder motifs; Tackenberg 1971, Karte 24) and tang-
and-loop handles (with or without ribs; op. cit.,31). For
the asymmetrical razors, a group of ‘palafitte’ razors
( Pfahlbau rasiermesser; with or without loops or handles)
and a group of more trapezoidal shape were proposed
(Tackenberg 1971, Karte 25-26). The Nordic razors
were classified by Tackenberg according to grip type
(s-shaped, spiral-shaped, cast-on handles) and blade

---

13 Torbrügge 1959, Taf. 8n; Butler & Steegstra 2007/2008, 376 fig. 1.
14 Müller 1897, 261; Holste 1939, 52; Broholm 1946, 99; Hundt 1958, 11; Torbrügge 1959, 67; tattooed human remains from c. 3300-2400
cal BC are known; Samadelli et al. 2015; Shishlina, Belkevich & Usachuk 2013, 68.

Tattooing needles may also have been part of Bronze Age toilet sets, but they are difficult to distinguish from generic awls (Torbrügge 1959: 66 note 227; 67). Baudou (1960: 40-44) classified the Nordic tweezers by form (triangular shapes of variable width and narrow, parallel-sided tweezers) and decoration (lines, bosses), following the earlier typological attempt by Kersten (1936: 58-61). Tackenberg (1971: 150-174; 283-292; Karte 33-37) classified the north-German tweezers by shape of the handle (narrow, widening), shape of the blade (triangular, paddle-shaped) and decoration (bosses, dot-circle motifs, linear motifs). From the Middle Bronze Age (e.g. Laux 2017: 130; Taf. 34.6) to the Early Iron Age (e.g. Jansen et al. 2011: 110), tweezers could be carried on suspension rings – to which further items could be added.

Tattooing needles may also have been part of Bronze Age toilet sets, but they are difficult to distinguish from generic awls (Torbrügge 1959: 66 note 227; 67). Baudou (1960: 40-44) classified the Nordic tweezers by form (triangular shapes of variable width and narrow, parallel-sided tweezers) and decoration (lines, bosses), following the earlier typological attempt by Kersten (1936: 58-61). Tackenberg (1971: 150-174; 283-292; Karte 33-37) classified the north-German tweezers by shape of the handle (narrow, widening), shape of the blade (triangular, paddle-shaped) and decoration (bosses, dot-circle motifs, linear motifs). From the Middle Bronze Age (e.g. Laux 2017: 130; Taf. 34.6) to the Early Iron Age (e.g. Jansen et al. 2011: 110), tweezers could be carried on suspension rings – to which further items could be added.
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back (straight, arched, curved upwards; Tackenberg 1971: 279-280; Karte 27-30). Jockenhövel too classified the razors of central (1971) and western Europe (1980), on the basis of a set of basic (symmetrical / zweischneidige versus asymmetrical / einschneidige; Jockenhövel 1971: 1; 2003: 137) and detailed morphological traits such as shape of the grip (tanged, or open-worked handle), blade notches or perforations (e.g. bifid razors) and overall shape of the blade and handle (Jockenhövel 1971: 1-3; 7-8; 1980: 3). Therefore we do not propose a new
classification, but rather present a reduced and somewhat simplified typological scheme based on the razor types predominant in the Low Countries (Fig. 1), which is nonetheless aligned with the widely-used typological labels defined by Albrecht Jockenhövel.

2.2 The Dutch corpus
The corpus of Dutch Bronze Age razors also reflects the main classification into symmetrical (Fig. 1, top: zweisechneidige Rasiermesser) and asymmetrical (einschneidige; Fig. 1, middle register) razors. The former group can be further subdivided into types that had an organic handle arrangement and blade form. The group of ship-shaped / einschneidige nordische Rasiermesser comprises examples with handles of varied shape. The group here labelled ‘ship-derivatives’ display handles curved forwards to meet the blade’s back (zurückgebogenem, drach-förmigem Griff-Vorsatz) or pierced handles (Ösengriff; cf. Jockenhövel 1980, Taf. 32). The third main type amongst the asymmetrical razors are the semicircular to trapezoidal razors (Halbrunde / Trapezoide), often with a distinct notch or curvature in the blade’s back (Rückendellung oder Rückeneinsattelung; Jockenhövel 1971, 1). In general, the thin cutting edge is affected by taphonomic degradation, meaning that exact blade outlines – whilst a valid criterium – are difficult to operationalize with archaeological specimens (Jockenhövel 1971: 7-8).

![Diagram of razor types](image)

**Fig. 2. Distribution of later prehistoric razor blades in the Netherlands.** The greyscale map shows their distribution against the palaeogeographic situation around 3800 BP (from De Mulder et al. 2003: 228; fig. 143: dark grey areas are coastal barriers, grey areas are peatbogs, halftone grey areas are uplands and light grey areas represent stream and river valleys), the inset shows the cluster of examples in Drenthe (with a reconstruction of the extent of the peatbog (brown) and upland zones (green to yellow to reddish tints) by 1500 cal BC (after Vos et al. 2011: 55). Drawing S. Arnoldussen (Groningen Institute of Archaeology, University of Groningen).
For the tweezers (Fig. 1, lower register), absence of prior typological work for the region under study meant that a pragmatic morphometric approach was taken that works for the corpus of tweezers from the Low Countries (but is not necessarily applicable elsewhere). The main typological distinction concerns the shape of the arms in the upper 70% of the tweezers body: tweezers both with parallel and widening (flaring) arms are found. On the latter category, the arm width (gradually) increases even over the upper 70% of the tweezers' length, whereas on the former, the width stays constant. The group of tweezers with parallel-sided arms can be subdivided by the shape of their blades: these may be semicircular or triangular and sometimes show a narrow 'shoulder' section perpendicular to the arms. For the widening-armed tweezers, variations in blade width versus arm width can be used to define 'narrow' (ratio of blade width to arm width < 2:1) and 'wide' tweezers (ratio of blade width to arm width > 2:1, cf. Steuer 2003: 178). Additionally, minor variations in the curvature of the blades occur (from convex to flat to concave blade tips) and occasionally sliding rings to hold the arms together are found (e.g. Figs 15 & 17, DB2737; DB2730). Also, tweezer arms may be twisted longitudinally to provide a decorative torsion effect (e.g. DB2732, cf. Torbrügge 1959, Taf. 24.27).

2.3 Razors

In the below section, the corpus of Bronze Age (and Early Iron Age) Dutch razors is discussed (Fig. 2 for locations). The razors are grouped by handle type (pegged, tanged, tang-and-ring, multi-ring tang and openwork handles) and shape of the blades. First, the symmetrical (German: zwischneidige) razors are discussed, followed by the asymmetrical (German: einschneidige) razors.

2.3.1 Symmetrical (bifid) razors: pegged (Fig. 3)

(DB 1759) Ommerschans, Gemeente Ommen, Overijssel. From the 1896 hoard.
L. 13.6 cm; w. 3.7 cm; th. 0.4 cm. Double-edged symmetrical razor, with parallel sides, tapering slightly toward the straight butt end. Two small rivet-holes at the base of the blade. At the opposite end a small notch (German: Blattauschnitt; Jockenhövel 1971,1) is discernible. Cross-section: shallow pointed-oval. Faint traces of what appears to be an organic handle are preserved in the patina on one side. Patina: grey-green. Found around 1896, by Geert Remmelts, near to the Ommerschans at Witharen (exact location unclear). According to the description, the hoard contained a ceremonial (68.3 cm) aggrandized dirk blade of the Ommerschans-Flougrescent type, laying on a platform of birchwood stakes, in peat on sand, onto which a series of smaller items were placed: the razor, two chisels, fragments of rods or pins, fragments of rough (sheet) bronze and several flint and stone artefacts (Butler 1990: 87 for full inventory). Museum: RMO, Inv. No. d 2017/7.2. Map reference: c. 223.2/511.6. References: Butler & Bakker 1961: 199; 206-207; fig. 3.2; Butler 1990: 87-91, 89 fig. 21 No. 2; Jockenhövel 1980: 81 No. 232; Taf. 13 No. 232; Amkreutz & Brattinga 2017: 20; Amkreutz & Fontijn 2017. Parallels: Lakenheath (Jockenhövel 1980: 81 No. 231, Taf. 13 No. 231). Otherwise found in Sicily (Type Pantalica; Jockenhövel 1980: 81; Müller-Karpe 1959: 23).
Dating: The group of ceremonial dirks of the Ommeriansh-Flougrescent type are currently dated to c. 1500-1350 BC (Fontijn 2001: 263; Amkreutz & Brattinga 2017: 20; Amkreutz & Fontijn 2017: 52). For the razor, a slightly younger (13th century BC) age had previously been suggested by Jockenhövel (1980: 81).

L. 12 cm; w. 4.2 cm; th. 1.5 mm. Symmetrical (bifid) pegged razor; handle of entwined bronze wire (diam. 0.4 cm) with flattened-out ends attached with two rivets to blade. Patina: mottled green, heavily corroded. Found during the excavation of an urnfield by Grontmij (now Sweco) in 2013.

Map reference: c. 189.1/347.4
References: -
Parallels: Type Irlich (Jockenhövel 1980: 85-86) describes two razors from Heimbach and Irlich (Kreis Neuwied) with identical handle types and handle-blade connections.

Dating: Type Irlich is dated by Jockenhövel (1980: 86) to the ältere Urnenfelderzeit (c. 1200-1125 BC), a date based primarily on the typochronology of the urn and pin found with the Irlich razor (op. cit., 86; Taf. 72C).

2.3.2 Symmetrical (bifid) razors: ranged (Fig. 4)

(1230) Drouwen, Gemeente Borger en Odoorn, Drenthe. Grave under a mortuary structure in tumulus.
L. +11.2 cm. Symmetrical tanged bifid razor. Thin, flat blade, poorly preserved (only a small part still exists; the tang and base of blade were well preserved, but not present on 19 Oct. 2017). Thicker narrow tang; thinning towards slightly widened end. The shape of upper half of blade as shown is based on an excavation drawing and photograph in situ; the exact original outline was indeterminate. Patina: mottled green, very corroded. From the central interment, a pit of 1.85 by 1.4 m placed amidst four posts (a possible mortuary house; cf. Lohof 2000), underneath a disturbed barrow 30 m across with a 9 m sandy core and a possible stone kerb. From this grave, a series of artefacts were recovered (Inv.Nos 1927/VIII.40a-g): a Sögel dirk, a nick-flanged axe, a pair of gold coils, nine flint arrowheads (elongated with concave base), a flint strike-a-light and a whetstone (inventory description: Butler 1990: 71-73 find No. 11). Museum: Assen, Inv.No. 1927/VIII.40f.

Map reference: 249.25/551.95.
References: -
O’Connor 1980: 91 list 48 No. 3; Butler 1990: 71-73, esp. 72 fig. 14 No. 3; Jockenhövel 1980: 39 No. 68; Taf. 3: no 68.
Parallels: Zweischneidige Rasiermesser mit langovalem Blatt und Griffangel, Variante I (Jockenhövel 1980: 37-40; Taf. 2-4). These razors have a mainly Atlantic distribution focused on United Kingdom and Ireland, with continental outliers in the Low Countries (DB1230) and Rheinland-Pfalz (Jockenhövel 1980: 49-50).

Dating: Based on the associated Sögel blade Montelius 1b, c. 1575-1475 BC (Vandkilde 1996, 156; Fontijn 2003: 10, Butler & Steegstra 2007/2008: 376, fig. 1).

(1263) Gasteren, Gemeente Aa en Hunze, Drenthe. Tumulus 42.
L. 10 cm. Symmetrical tanged bifid razor. Flat blade (w. 4 cm) with v-shaped notch and angular shoulders. Thin tang of rectangular cross-section, with angular lateral projections at its centre and two lug-like diagonal projections (remains of a ring-handle)? Cast in two-piece mould; edges ground slightly concave. Patina: dark green to black, with lighter corrosion patches; surface mostly well preserved. Found in urnfield, tumulus 42, which is a long-bed barrow of Vledder type, with a decentrally placed NW-SE inhumation. Near the presumed location of the skull (Van Giffen 1945: 83), tweezers (DB1269), the razor, a flint flake and two irregular discoid whetstones were found. Museum: Assen, Inv.No.1939/VII.45d.

References: -
Parallels: DB1197; DB1745.


(1197) Zeijen, Gemeente Tynaarlo, Drenthe. Noordse veld.
L. 10.5 cm (blade 7.3 cm; tang 3.2 cm); w. 3.5 cm; th. blade 2.2 cm. Symmetrical tanged bifid razor. Oblong blade, shallow blade notch at upper end; angular shoulder; tang of rectangular cross-section. Patina: mottled green; severely corroded (now embedded in plaster). Excavated in 1917 by A.E. van Giffen. Found in the southeastern corner of a NNE-SSW oriented, rectangular ditch-enclosed long-bed barrow (Type Noordbarge; Kooi 1979: 130-131), next to several other long-bed burrows in a multi-period cemetery. Museum Assen, Inv. No. 1917/VIII.76.

References: -
Van Giffen 1949: 93-148, fig. 22a No. 76; Jacob-Friesen 1963: 261 Abb. 235; Butler 1963: 117, Fig. 33 No. 6 (erroneously captioned “Gasteren”); Jockenhövel 1980: 58 No. 136; Taf. 8 No. 136; O’Connor 1980: 91, list 48 No. 5.
Parallels: The razor from Ehestorf grave, Kr. Bremervörde (Nowothning 1958: 129 Taf. 1 No. 3); DB1263; DB1745.

Dating: End Middle Bronze Age-B to Late Bronze Age, based on dating of the Gasteren (DB1263) razor. For long-bed burrows of the Noordbarge type, direct dates (Lanting & Van der Plicht 2003: 215) and typochronological associations suggest a date range from c. 1200 BC to into the Early Iron Age (c. 800/600 BC; Arnoldussen & Albers 2015: 155-157, tab. 2).

(1745) Emmen, Gemeente Emmen, Drenthe. Westenese D42.
L. +8.2 cm; w. 3.3; th. 0.2cm. Symmetrical tanged bifid razor. Edge abraded, break patinated. Thicker ellipsoid central body, thinning towards the cutting edges. Patina: dark, glossy green; many corrosion pits. Found during clandestine digging into
Map reference: c. 255.04/535.32.
Parallels: DB1230; DB1263. Similar to tanged razors of Type Hénon (Jockenhövel 1980: 58-61, Taf. 9, esp. nos. 146, 149, 151), which are found in Brittany, Normandy and southwest England (op. cit., 61).
Dating: A razor of Type Hénon was part of the Rosnoën hoard, datable to (the early part of) c. 1300-1100 BC (Butler 1989: 13; Fontijn 2003: 117).

L. +7.2 cm. Blade fragment of a symmetrical (bifid) tanged razor, with deep blade notch and blade perforation. Tang missing. Found in the 19th century near a group of urned cremations.
Map reference: c. 172.69/362.08.
References: Ubaghs 1890: 43, pl. VI No. 34; Jockenhövel 1980: 133, Taf. 24 No. 436 (Weert erroneously spelled Weerdt); Warmenbol 1988: 253, 254 pl. 4 No. 7; Hissel 2012 (no mention of razor).
Parallels: Jockenhövel’s (1980: 64-72, Taf. 10, nos. 164-175, esp. No. 174) Type Feltwell, with concentrations in southeast Britain and wider Atlantic distribution (Jockenhövel 1980, Taf. 50 A). DB1197, DB1230; DB1263 and DB1745 for tanged types.
Dating: Jockenhövel (1980: 67) places Type Feltwell razors in the Dowris or carp’s-tongue sword period (c. 950-800 BC).

2.3.3 Symmetrical (bifid) razors: tang-and-ring (Fig. 5)

(DB 895) Achterberg, Gemeente Rhenen, Utrecht.
L. +7.4 cm. Handle fragment of symmetrical (bifid) tang-and-ring razor. Diam. ring 2.8 cm (outside) to 2.1 cm (inside). Width of handle near (missing) blade 1.1 cm. Handle shows three ribs (or two grooves). Found in 1990 by Verhagen and Mom during construction works for development plan ‘Horst/Molenweg’. Collection Museum Rhenen, not present any more; present location unknown.
Map reference: c. 168.72/442.63.
Parallels: Similar elongated grooved/ribbed handles terminating in a ring have been found at Court-Saint-Etienne – La
Ferme Rouge (Jockenhövel 1980: 140; Taf. 26 No. 480; Van der Vaart-Verschoof 2017: 70 fig. C16 No. 16-2). A shorter and more stout parallel is known from Bohemia and Bavaria (Jockenhövel 1971: 43-44, Taf. 1 nos. 11: 12 and 12a). Several examples are listed under Jockenhövel’s (1980: 139-140) Typ Havré.

Dating: The Havré type is placed in the Early Iron Age by Jockenhövel (1980: 142). For the handle fragments from Court-Saint-Etienne – La Ferme Rouge, which were found without precise contextual information, it has been suggested (Van der Vaart-Verschoof 2017: 71) that they could fit the razor-blade fragment from Tombelle 5 of that site (op. cit., 69 fig. C6.15 No. 7). This tomb was dated by the razor-blade fragment to early HaC1 (c. 800-700 BC, Van der Vaart-Verschoof 2017: 70). The examples described by Jockenhövel (1971: 43-44, Taf. 1 nos. 11: 12 and 12a) are described as the ‘drei-fach gerippte Variante’ of his Typ Kostelec, dated to the BrZ.D (c. 1325-1200 BC; Jockenhövel 1971: 46). Given the slender morphology, a younger (i.e. Ha C) dating for the Rhenen fragment is favoured here.

(DB 526 & DB 2733) Halsteren, Gemeente Bergen Op Zoom, Noord-Brabant (dealer’s provenance)

L. 8 cm; w. 5.8 cm. Symmetrical (bifid) tang-and-ring objects, possibly razors. Nearly circular razor-like objects with tang-and-ring handle. Unfinished razors or pendants? Where the handle meets the blade, three ridges are placed on the blade. Not sharp(ened). Antiques dealer A. Groneman of Breda sold these in 1949 to the National Museum of Antiquities, allegedly part of a larger hoard also containing some bracelets (not acquired by the museum).

Map reference: c. 78/393.
Parallels: The morphology of the Halsteren objects is evidently related to razors (even if the Halsteren specimens are unsharpened): near-circular blades on short tangs are found with Jockenhövel’s (1980, Taf. 14) Zweischneidige Rasiermesser mit Vollgriff und tiefausgeschnittenem Blatt, ribbed ornaments on the blade/handle intersection are similarly common (e.g. Jockenhövel 1980: Taf. 14 No. 249, Taf. 20 No. 353, Taf. 21 No. 378, Taf. 22 nos. 395-397, 403, Taf. 23 No. 415, Taf. 24 No. 422).

Dating: The Halsteren objects appear unsharpened and more stylized versions of razors of Jockenhövel’s (1971: Taf. 26) Typ Nynice and Třebešov, which he dates to Nynice III, or the end phase of the urnfield culture (c. 1025-800 BC; op. cit., 171) and which are found in the central European upper reaches of the rivers Danube and Weser (op. cit., Taf. 47B).

2.3.4 Symmetrical (bifid) razors: multi-ring tangs (Fig. 6)

(DB 1620) Deurne, Gemeente Deurne, Noord-Brabant (dealer’s provenance).

L. 9.5 cm; w. 3.5 cm, th. blade 1.5 mm. Symmetrical (bifid) razor with multi-ring tang. Recent file-marks on back. No information on primary context available. Patina: dark bronze/dark green. Museum: RMO Leiden, Inv.No. Gt.D.11.

Map reference: c. 183/386.

Fig. 5. Symmetrical (bifid) razors: tang and terminal ring. Drawings: Groningen Institute of Archaeology / H. Steegstra.

Fig. 6. Symmetrical (bifid) razors: multi-ring tang. Drawing: Groningen Institute of Archaeology.
2.3.5 Symmetrical (bifid) razors with openwork handles (Rahmengriff) (Fig. 7)

(DB 2748) Dwingelo. Gemeente Westerveld, Drenthe.

L. 13.7 cm. Symmetrical (bifid) razor with openwork (Rahmengriff) handle. Openwork handle (three breaks) in the form of a lozenge with a terminal ring. Diam. terminal ring 3 cm, width at lozenge 2.4 cm. Blade worn away to tapering thicker middle section. Thickness of blade 1 mm. Patina: mottled green, heavily corroded, sandy encrustation on ring. Found in 2015 in an excavation trench across an elongated c. 16 x 6 m, post-encircled urnfield barrow/long-bed. The razor was found together with a pair of tweezers (DB 2749) and a pot (Kegelhalsterrine) in an urn placed underneath the barrow body. The top of the urn was destroyed, but the urn still contained the cremated remains of two adult males. This is part of a larger urnfield, of which over 35 graves were uncovered c. 40 m to the northwest (Kooi 1973: 10(138).

Map reference: c. 221.43/538.77.


Parallels: DB1181; DB1234 and DB2744. The Dutch examples appear to be worn-down representatives of Jockenhövel’s (1980: 92, Taf. 16 nos. 283-285) Typ Schledebrück razors, which occur in the northern and central Netherlands, and around the upper Ems (op. cit., Taf. 48B) and upper Weser (Tackenberg 1971: 276 Liste 61 nos. 8-13; Karte 24; Taf. 32:6, with one outlier at Miesenheim, Kr. Mayen, in the upper Rhine area (Tackenberg 1971: 276 Liste 61 No. 1; Karte 24, No. 1).

Dating: Typ Schledebrück is dated by Jockenhövel (1980: 92) to the start of Ha B1 (c. 1025-925 BC), on the basis of the tanged knife in the Bargeroosterveld hoard (found with razor DB1181).


L. 14.5 cm. Symmetrical (bifid) razor with openwork (Rahmengriff) handle (L. 7.2 cm) in the form of a chamfered lozenge with a terminal ring. Blade 7.3 cm long (max. width 4.7 cm) with a very faint midridge and wide, shallow, angular blade notch and originally straight sides (since worn down to hourglass shape). Junction of handle and blade emphasized by cast-in triangular ridges. Patina: dark green to blackish, in part glossy; well-preserved. Sandy encrustation on ring. Found in or before June 1930 between Emmen and Weerdinge by a forester digging a posthole in a low heather-covered sand dune, c. 1.25 m beneath the surface, in anciently disturbed sand (Butler 1961: 109). The findspot was later found to be situated within the Weerdingerwaard, excavated in 1956 (also known as Wolfsbergen; Pleyte 1880: 17; Kooi 1979: 101 fig. 96). Museum: Assen, Inv.No. 1930/VI.2 (donated by F.W. Malsch, forester for Staatsbosbeheer, Houtwesterij Emmen).

Map reference: c. 257.4/536.2.

References: Butler 1960: 213 (39) fig. 11; Butler 1961: 108-109; 103 fig. 47 (small circle), 108 fig. 51; Tackenberg 1971: 276 Liste 61 No. 9; Jockenhövel 1980: 92 No. 283; Taf. 16 No. 283; Kooi 1979: 96-104; 102 fig. 97; O’Connor 1980: 154, list 119 No. 4; Drenth & Groenendijk 2009: 199.

Parallels: DB1181; DB2744 and DB 2748. The Weerdingerweg razor may represent a less worn version of Jockenhövel’s (1980: 92; Taf. 16 nos. 283-285) Typ Schledebrück razors, which occur in the northern and central Netherlands and around the upper Ems (op. cit., Taf. 48B) and upper Weser (Tackenberg 1971: 276 Liste 61 nos. 8-13; Karte 24, Taf. 32:6...
with one outlier; Miesenheim, Kr. Mayen, known from the upper Rhine area; op. cit., 276 Liste 61 No. 1; Karte 24, No. 1).

**Dating:** The Weerdingerweg razor is dated to LBA2 (c. 1125-975 BC) by O’Connor (1980: 154) and the start of the Jungurnenfelderzeit (Ha B1, c. 1025-925) by Jockenhövel (1980: 92).

(DB 2063) *Albergen, Gemeente Tubbergen, Overijssel.*

Monnikenbraak.

L. -7.2 cm. Handle of a symmetrical (bifid) razor with openwork (Rahmengriff) handle. Openwork handle in the form of a chamfered lozenge with a terminal ring. Blade missing; cross-section of lozenge pointed-oval, terminal ring round in cross-section. Patina: bluish light green, partly glossy, not burnt. The razor (handle) was found in 1964 by H. Vos in the spoilheap of the excavation of a cremation grave placed centrally or decentrally on the old podzolic surface beneath a sod-built barrow. Presumably it originated from or near the cremation grave (descriptive filing card by A. Verlinde). Museum Enschede, Inv.No. 714.

Map reference: 249.64/498.46.

Reference: Verlinde 1980: 132 (126); 138(132) Abb. 75 No. 530; 139(133) No. 530.

Parallels: DB1181; DB1234 and DB2748. The handle may have been part of a Typ Schledebrück razor (Jockenhövel 1980: 92; Taf. 16 nos. 283-285), commonly found in the northern and central Netherlands, and around the upper Ems (op. cit., Taf. 48B) and upper Weser (Tackenberg 1971: 276 Liste 61 nos. 8-13, Karte 24, Taf. 32:6).
Deposition date for the associated razor. The deposition date for the Amby razor. The Amby razor is dated to the Late Bronze Age, according to Ypey (1962/1963: 191).


Parallel: DB1292. Drouwen, Gemeente Borger en Odoorn, Drenthe. Stone packing in urnfield, 1939. L. 10.7 cm. Single-edged (asymmetrical) ship-shaped razor, with curved blade (w. 2.1 cm; th. 1 mm) and backward-curving S-shaped handle of round cross-section. Patina: dark green. The razor originated from one of a pair of terrine-shaped urns with strap handles (zweihenklige Terrinen) placed together under a stone packing amidst circular urnfield monuments, found during the urnfield excavations by A.E. van Giffen in 1939 (Kooi 1979: 92 fig. 87 No. 8 for location). The smaller of the two urns contained the razor (DB1292) and a pair of tweezers (DB1293).

Map reference: c. 249.18,552.82.

References: Van Giffen 1943: 482-483, afb. 45a-b; Butler 1969: 80, fig. 35, Pl. 30; Kooi 1979: 90-96, 94 fig. 89; O’Connor 1980: 220; list 225 No. 2; Jockenhövel 1980: 157 No. 572; Taf. 30 No. 572.

Parallel: DB1373 and DB1380. The Drouwen razor is classified by Jockenhövel (1980: 157; Taf. 30 nos. 565-576) as his Variante II of the single-edged razors with s-shaped handles (einschneidige Rasiermesser mit S-förmigem Griff), which are current in Schleswich-Holstein, Niedersachsen (Tackenberg 1996: 77 Karte 27) and Denmark (Baudou 1960, Karte 21). Dating: Per. IV (c. 1125-925 BC; O’Connor 1980: 222) on the basis of the associations. Given the associated zweihenklige Terrine, probably Late Bronze Age (c. 1100-900 BC, cf. Van den

DB 2744) Opheusden, Gemeente Neder-Betuwe, Gelderland. Merovingian hoard. L. (restored) 14.5 cm. Two fragments of a symmetrical (bifid) razor with openwork (Rahmengriff) handle. Openwork handle (l. c. 7 cm) in the form of an ovoid loop and terminal ring. Maximum remaining width of very worn blade 1.7 cm. Patina: mottled green. Found inside a Merovingian pot (Kugelkopfnadel) that contained silver Roman coins, as well as Late Bronze Age finds: the razor, an undecorated bronze arm-
Broeke 2005: 610 fig. 27.8; Scheele 2016: 85 tab. 2) in date. The grave of Wittenhusen (Kr. Minden-Lübecke, Nordrhein Westfalen) contained in an urn a razor almost identical to that of Drouwen (Jockenhövel 1980: Taf. 30 No. 574) and a socketed knife dated to Ha B3 (c. 925-800 BC; Jockenhövel 1980: 157).

**DB 1380** Harenermolen, Gemeente Haren, Groningen. Tum. II / De Tip – 4a. L. 10.3 cm. Single-edged (asymmetrical) ship-shaped razor, with S-shaped handle of square cross-section. Blade back straight (1.5 mm), remaining width 2.4 cm. Cutting edge in parts damaged, in other parts showing traces of being sharpened (from one face only). Patina: mottled dark green and black; well preserved. Excavated in 1922 by A.E. van Giffen as a secondary interment into the third mound period of the Harenermolen barrow (starting in the Late Neolithic; Van Giffen 1930: pl. 28; Lanting 1979: 184, 193-194, 200 fig. 5.3). The razor was found with cremated remains inside an urn with two handles (Zweihenklige terrine; Inv.No. 1922/V.4) datable to the Late Bronze Age (cf. Van den Broeke 2005: 610 fig. 27.8; Scheele 2016: 85 tab. 2), which was closed with an inverted accessory cup (Henkelgefass; Inv.No. 1922/V.4b). Museum: Groningen, Inv.No. 1922/V.4a (stolen in 1970). Map reference: c. 237.96/574.97.

References: Van Giffen 1930: Taf. 34/Abb. 29 No. 1b; Glasbergen 1957: pl. X No. 1; Tackenberg 1963: 12 Liste 6a No. 1; 1971: 143; Jockenhövel 1980: 162 No. 596, Taf. 31 No. 596; O’Connor 1980: 220, list 225 No. 5. Parallels: DB1380 and DB1292 for generic type. The particular handle type is classified by Jockenhövel (1980: 162-164) as Variante IV (mit eingegossener Spirale) of his Rasiermesser mit Spiralgriﬀ, for which five parallels from Nordrhein-Westfalen are known (op. cit., 162-163; Taf. 31, cf. Aschemeyer 1961: 81 Taf. 6a No. 5). Jockenhövel (1980: 164) characterized their distribution as not extending west of the rivers Hunte and Rhine (cf. Sprockhoff 1956: Karte 18D; Baudou 1960: Karte 22).

**DB 1373** Harenermolen, Gemeente Haren, Groningen. Tum. II / De Tip – 1a. L. +5.5 cm. Part of a single-edged (asymmetrical) ship-shaped razor, with a spiral-shaped handle of elongated hexagonal cross-section. Handle’s spiral fused/cast onto blade. Blade width 2.4 cm; thickness 1.5 mm. Excavated in 1922 by A.E. van Giffen as a secondary interment into the period-3 mound of the Harenermolen barrow (started in the Late Neolithic; Van Giffen 1930: pl. 28; Lanting 1979: 184; 193-194; 200 fig. 5.3). The razor was found with cremated remains inside a straight-necked urn (Cylinderhaltergefass; Inv.No. 1922/V.1). Museum: Groningen, Inv.No. 1922/V.1a. Map reference: c. 237.96/574.97.

References: Van Giffen 1930: Taf. 34/Abb. 29 No. 1b; Glasbergen 1957: pl. X No. 1; Tackenberg 1963: 12 Liste 6a No. 1; 1971: 143; Jockenhövel 1980: 162 No. 596, Taf. 31 No. 596; O’Connor 1980: 220, list 225 No. 5. Parallels: DB1380 and DB1292 for generic type. The particular handle type is classified by Jockenhövel (1980: 162-164) as Variante IV (mit eingegossener Spirale) of his Rasiermesser mit Spiralgriﬀ, for which five parallels from Nordrhein-Westfalen are known (op. cit., 162-163; Taf. 31, cf. Aschemeyer 1961: 81 Taf. 6a No. 5). Jockenhövel (1980: 164) characterized their distribution as not extending west of the rivers Hunte and Rhine (cf. Sprockhoff 1956: Karte 18D; Baudou 1960: Karte 22).

References: Glazema 1951: 2; afb. 5; Roes 1952: 50 fig. 1; Tackenberg 1971: 279 Liste 69 No. 15; O’Connor 1980: 221, list 225 No. 7; Jockenhövel 1980: 164 No. 604, Taf. 32 No. 604. Parallels: DB1292, DB1373 and DB1380. It is placed amongst Jockenhövel’s (1980: 164) Ansiermesser mit zurückgebogenem, drahftförmigem Griff-fortsatz, Variante I, which lists several examples from Nordrhein-Westfalen (op. cit., Taf. 32 nos. 603; 605-606). Baudou (1960, Karte 20) shows that similar razors cluster in northern Jutland. With respect to the iconography, similar – but much more elaborate and detailed – scenes with the ‘sail/tree’ mushroom-shaped motif (Kaul 1998a: 188-195) and radiant sun motifs (op. cit., 195-209) on ships are found on the Honum (Kaul 1998b: 111 No. 275), Abkær (op. cit., 136 No. 335) and Vandling/Nustrup razors (op. cit., 137 No. 339). Remarkably, not a single other iron Nordic razor is known, which – in combination with the crude design and “wrong” positioning of the ship’s keel (viz. towards the blade’s edge) and peculiar find history, leads Kaul (1998a: 227) to suggest it is a local imitation or a 1950s forgery. Dating: Stylistically datable to the end of Per. IV (Kaul 1998a: 227) or Per. V (O’Connor 1980: 221; Jockenhövel 1980: 165).
[DB 1384] Wedderveer, Gemeente Westerwolde, Groningen. L. 8 cm. Asymmetrical ship-shaped derivative (Nordic) razor, with an as-cast looped handle (Ösengriff). Width of blade 1.8 cm. Found in 1943 during a rescue excavation by A.E. van Giffen of an urnfield cemetery with keyhole-shaped graves, a long-bed barrow and graves with circular ditches (Van Giffen & Waterbolk 1949, pl. 15). Found in the southern part of the urnfield, in a large biconical urn (with impressions of emmer wheat; op. cit., 95), that – in addition to the cremated remains – also contained the razor (DB1384) as well as a pin (DB1385; Inv.No. 1943/III.32b). No ring-ditch was present around grave 32 (flat grave). Museum Groningen, Inv.No. 1943/III.32A.

Map reference: c. 267.82/567.54.


2.3.8 Asymmetrical trapezoid razors (Fig. 10)

[DB 2740] Noordbarge, Gemeente Emmen, Drenthe. Urnfield Hoge Loo, urn 484. L. 9.8 cm. Iron, asymmetrical hump-backed trapezoid razor. Blade width 4 cm. Patina: iron corrosion. Found amidst cremation remains placed inside an urn with roughcast belly, smoothed shoulder and fingertip-decorated rim (Harpstedter Rautopf; v484), outside of which a cup with strap handle was found (Henkelgefass, v484a; Kooi 1979: 29 fig. 19). This cremation grave is situated near the centre of a funerary structure 10 m in diameter, surrounded by an in parts 2 m wide ditch (Arnoldussen & Albers 2015: 159 fig. 6; Kooi 1979: 15.

Fig. 10. Asymmetrical trapezoid razors. Drawings: Groningen Institute of Archaeology / H. Steegstra. (DB 2742 from Verlinde 1987.)

[DB 1194] Wolfsbergen, Gemeente Emmen, Drenthe. “t Slag van Kooiker”. L. +8.5 cm. Fragment of asymmetrical razor. Tapering at one end, the other end is missing. Remaining blade width 2.5 cm. Found inside a biconical urn that – in addition to the razor fragment (DB1194) and cremated remains – contained two whetstones made from sandstone and a decorated accessory cup (Assen Inv.Nos 1911/VIII-1: 1a, c-d). The location is identified as “t Slag van Kooiker’, which means “Kooiker’s field”. Museum: Assen, Inv.No. 1911/VIII-1b.
fig. 8), interpreted by Kooi (1979: 17) as a ‘conspicuous’ monument, possibly for a tribal chief. Museum Assen, Inv.No. 1972/XI. 179.

Map reference: c. 256.8/532.7.

References: Kooi 1979: 18; 20; 29 fig. 19; 42 fig. 32 No. 484b; Arnoldussen & Albers 2015: 159.


Dating: Vessels in Harpstedt style are generally dated to the Early Iron Age (c. 800-600 BC: Brunsting & Verwers 1975: 67; Van den Broeke 2005: 610 fig. 27.8; Lanting & Van der Plicht 2003: 257-258). Einschneidige Halbmondrasiermesser ohne Griff are dated by Jockenhövel (1971: 236) to Per. V (c. 925-750 BC).

(\text{DB 2731}) Oss, Gemeente Oss, Noord-Brabant. Chieftain’s grave.

L. 6.4 cm. Iron asymmetrical razor. Discovered in 1963 during restoration of a corroded cluster of iron artefacts from inside the bronze situla that was interred in the famous Chieftain’s Grave of Oss, and that – in addition to the cremated remains – held various (textile-wrapped) artefacts. The incomplete state and severe corrosion rendered its identification as a razor difficult (originally two iron objects were interpreted as razor fragments; Van der Vaart-Verschoof 2017: 188). Amongst the many other artefacts in this grave (see Van der Vaart-Verschoof 2017: 188),  amongst the many other artefacts in this grave (see Van der Vaart-Verschoof 2017: 180-194) a Mindelheim sword (forged into a circle), bronze and iron horsegear, two bronze pins (Hohlkügelkopfnadeln), yoke and wagon components of bronze and iron, textiles, an iron tanged knife, an iron socketed axe and a flat stone were found. Museum: National Museum of Antiquities (RMO) Inv.No. k 1933/7.10d.


Parallels: -

Dating: Early to Middle Iron Age, according to the radiocarbon dating of the cremated remains (c. 790-540 BC, GrA-55551: 2500 ± 30BP), while the artefact typology favours a dating in the early 8th century BC (Van der Vaart-Verschoof 2017: 195).

(\text{DB 2742}) Losser, Gemeente Losser, Overijssel. De Oelemars.

L. +3.3 cm. Fragment of an iron razor amidst the cremation remains placed into a Harpstedt urn (Verlinde 1987: 216 urn 202). Found in 1974 during sand extraction. Provinciaal depot Overijssel RMT 1975-10.


Parallels: Verlinde (1987: 184) states that similar razors are found in Niedersachsen in graves dating from Ha D (Tackenberg 1934: 5), and they are also found in Ha D and LT A graves in the Hunsrück-Eiffel Kultur (Haffner 1976: 29).

Dating: Early Iron Age (c. 800-600 BC), based on the Harpstedt pot (Brunsting & Verwers 1975: 67; Van den Broeke 2005: 610 fig. 27.8; Lanting & Van der Plicht 2003: 257-258). A younger Hallstatt D (c. 625-480 BC) dating for such iron razors is possible (Verlinde 1987: 184, 216).

2.3.9 Possible razor fragments of indeterminate type (Fig. 11)

(\text{DB 1377}) Harenmolen, Gemeente Haren, Groningen. Tum. II / De Tip – 3b.

L. 2.7 cm. Possible blade fragment of a (Nordic?) razor. Remaining width 1.2 cm, thickness 0.8 mm. Patina: green. Excavated in 1922 by A.E. van Giffen as a secondary interment into the period-3 mound of the Harenmolen barrow (started in the Late Neolithic; Van Giffen 1930: pl. 28; Lanting 1979: 184, 193-194, 199, 200 fig. 5 No. 2). It was found with a possible tattooing awl (DB1376, Lanting 1979: 198) in an urn with two handles (Zweihenklige terrine) datable to the Late Bronze Age (cf. Van den Broeke 2005: 610 fig. 27.8; Scheele 2016: 85).

(\text{DB 2731}) Oss, Gemeente Oss, Noord-Brabant. Chieftain’s grave.

L. 6.4 cm. Iron asymmetrical razor. Discovered in 1963 during restoration of a corroded cluster of iron artefacts from inside the bronze situla that was interred in the famous Chieftain’s Grave of Oss, and that – in addition to the cremated remains – held various (textile-wrapped) artefacts. The incomplete state and severe corrosion rendered its identification as a razor difficult (originally two iron objects were interpreted as razor fragments; Van der Vaart-Verschoof 2017: 188). Amongst the many other artefacts in this grave (see Van der Vaart-Verschoof 2017: 180-194) a Mindelheim sword (foraged into a circle), bronze and iron horsegear, two bronze pins (Hohlkügelkopfnadeln), yoke and wagon components of bronze and iron, textiles, an iron tanged knife, an iron socketed axe and a flat stone were found. Museum: National Museum of Antiquities (RMO) Inv.No. k 1933/7.10d.


Parallels: -

Dating: Early to Middle Iron Age, according to the radiocarbon dating of the cremated remains (c. 790-540 BC, GrA-55551: 2500 ± 30BP), while the artefact typology favours a dating in the early 8th century BC (Van der Vaart-Verschoof 2017: 195).
Looking Sharp

Tab. 2), which was closed with a large part of a bowl (Lanting 1979: 202 pl. 5). Museum Groningen, Inv.No. 1922/V.3b.

Map reference: c. 237.96/574.97.

References: Van Giffen 1923: 54; 1930, Taf. 34/Abb. 29; Lanting 1979: 193-194; 198-199; 200 fig. 5 No. 3.

Parallels:
- Dating: Late Bronze Age, c. 1150-850 BC, based on dates for zweihenklige Terrinen.

**DB 1985** Dwingeloo, Gemeente Westerveld, Drenthe.

L. +9.1 cm. Fragment of sheet bronze. Remaining width 3.1 cm, thickness < 1 mm. The concave section is original and squared-off, so was never part of any cutting edge. A circa 8 mm wide strip is folded over and a perforation is visible. Lipping on the inside of the perforation suggests that this occurred after casting. It may have been a razor made from reused sheet bronze (cf. Drescher 1963: 128-129; Eibich 1970: 250 Abb. 1). The folding may have provided a straight and stiffened back. Of the handle little remains, and the placement of the perforation (mid-blade) is illogical. On the surface of the blade an irregular tangle of hairs was preserved in the corrosion of the bronze. Presumably the razor was placed in a leather pouch, or some other material lined with animal skin, with the hairy side inward. Patina: dark mottled green. Found at c. 1 m depth during the construction of a slurry pit by the farmer on the Lheeweg. A possible ringditch was observed. The bronze item was found inside a large (h. 34 cm) Schräghals urn. Museum Assen, Inv.No 1969 /X.28.

Map reference: c. 221.5/538.7.


Parallels: For the overall shape no parallel exists. For the creation of razors from sheet bronze, the razors from Rooksberg (Kr. Verden; Eibich 1970) and Winsen (Kr. Harburg; Drescher 1963, Taf. 3) deserve mention. In the Cromaghs (Co. Antrim) hoard, a folded leather pouch (hairs inside) was found which may have held the tanged bifid razor that was also part of the hoard (Jockenhövel 1980: 30; Eogan 1983: 53 No. 4, fig. 19).

Dating: According to Jockenhövel (1980: 170) no more precise dating than Per. IV-V (c. 1125-750 BC is possible).

**DB 2407** Mariënberg, Gemeente Hardenberg, Overijssel.

Lange Akker.

L. 4.45 cm; w. 1.35 cm. Thin sheet bronze fragment, found in the spring of 1975 inside an urn from the Lange Akker urn-field. Too poorly preserved to be positively identified as a razor. Private collection.
2.4 Tweezers

In the section below, the corpus of Bronze Age (and Early Iron Age) Dutch tweezers is discussed (see Fig. 12 for locations). These are discussed as groups based on the form of their arms (parallel or flaring) and shape of the blades (triangular, semicircular, shouldered, etc.).

2.4.1 Tweezers with parallel-sided arms and triangular blades (Fig. 13)

(DB 1029) Haarle, Gemeente Hellendoorn, Overijssel. Urnfield.
L. 4.6 cm; w. 0.9 cm. Narrow arms 0.2-0.2 cm; triangular blade, slight damage at edges. Found before 1930, reportedly with spearhead (Verlinde 1987: 173). Patina: glossy green. Museum Enschede, Inv.No. 1106 (old No. 0.588).

Parallels: see Fig. 13 (except DB2732), Tackenberg (1971: 152, 283-284, Liste 78, Karte 33) classifies these as ‘Haarzangen mit schnälem Schaft und dreiteckigem Wangen’.

Dating: Per. IV to V (c. 1125–800 BC; Tackenberg 1971: 153).

(DB 1262) Gasteren, Gemeente Aa en Hunze, Drenthe. From tumulus 42.
L. 5.7 cm; w. of blade 1.5 cm. Tweezers with almost parallel-sided arms (thickness 0.35-0.45 cm), triangular blade. Found in urnfield, tumulus 42, which is a long-bed barrow of Vledder type, with a decentrally placed NW-SE inhumation. Near the presumed location of the skull (Van Giffen 1945: 83) the tweezers, a razor (DB1263), a flint flake and two irregular-discoid whetstones were found. Museum Assen, Inv.No. 1939/VII.45c.

Parallels: see fig. 13 (except DB2732).
**DB 2120** Odoorn, Gemeente Borger en Odoorn, Drenthe. De Poort.
L. 5.6 cm. Narrow parallel-sided arms of rectangular cross-section, flaring toward triangular-shaped blades (w. 1.05 cm at blade tips). Teardrop-shaped loop. Patina: glossy green. Found with cremated remains. Private collection.

**Map reference:** c. 252.9/542.4.

**References:** -
**Parallels:** In view of the 'high' triangular blade, mainly DB1257, DB2075, DB2080.

**Dating:** Late Bronze Age, based on the typochronology of the urn (cf. Van den Broeke 2005: 610).

---

**DB 2732** Enumerhoogte, Gemeente Loppersum, Groningen.
L. 8.2 cm. Narrow parallel-sided arm (w. 0.3) of square cross-section, torsioned from beneath loop to above blade (w. 1.1 cm at blade tip). Blade tip now shows serrated edges; it is unclear whether this reflects natural deterioration (taphonomy) or deliberate decommissioning / transformation by filing. Found with suspension loop. Originating from dwelling mound Enumerhoogte (stray find?).

**Map reference:** c. 248.1/595.9.

**References:** -
**Parallels:** see Fig. 13 (except DB2732).

**Dating:** c. 1285-1135 BC, based on AMS dating of the associated human remains.

---

**DB 2749** Dwingeloo, Gemeente Westerveld, Drenthe. Lheeweg urnfield.
L. 6.2 cm. Narrow (w. 0.3 cm) parallel-sided arms ending in triangular blades (w. 1.9 cm at blade tips), round loop. Patina: mottled green, corroded, sandy encrustation. Found in 2017 in an excavation by Transect of an elongated, c. 16 x 6 m, post-encircled urnfield barrow/long-bed barrow. The tweezers were found together with a razor (DB2748) and pot (Kegelhalsterren) inside an urn placed underneath the barrow. The top of the urn was destroyed, but the urn still contained the cremated remains of two adult males.

**Map reference:** c. 222.3/538.8.

**References:** -
**Parallels:** Brinkum, Kreis Grafschaft Hoya (Tackenberg 1971: 283; Taf. 35 No. 4).

**Dating:** c. 1285-1135 BC, based on AMS dating of the associated human remains.

---

**DB 1257** Odoorn, Gemeente Borger en Odoorn, Drenthe. Cremation grave.
L. 5.75 cm. Nearly parallel-sided arms (w. 0.25-0.4 cm) ending in triangular blades (width at blade tips 1.15 cm). Patina: mottled green-brown. Blade tips abraded. Recovered June 1939 from an elevation (barrow?) known locally as "de Berg..."
van Nijhof” (Nijhof’s hill). The find is described as originating from ‘the edge of the barrow, among cremated remains’. Acquired by Museum Assen from H. Arends of Odoornzeand. Museum Assen, Inv.No. 1939/VII.8.


Reference: Jaarverslag Museum Assen 1939: 22 No. 45.

Parallels: see Fig. 13 (except DB2732).


2.4.2 Tweezers with parallel-sided arms and semicircular blades (Fig. 14)

(DB 2062) Oldenzaal, Gemeente Oldenzaal, Overijssel. Urnfield De Tij. L. 7.1 cm. Narrow (w. 0.4-0.5 cm) arms and semicircular blades (w. 1.8 cm at blade tips). Excavated by C. Hijszeler in 1947. The tweezers were found – broken into three pieces – on top of a cremation (in an urn) in the centre of an elongated tomb with internal post-setting (No. 37) of the Vledder type (Verlinde 1980: (81)75 Abb. 38; (84)78 Abb. 41; 1987: 173). Patina: dark green. Museum Enschede, Inv.No. 657.

Map reference: c. 258.8/482.2.


(DB 1269) Gasteren, Gemeente Aa en Hunze, Drenthe. Tumulus 45. L. 7.2 cm. Thin (0.3-0.4 cm) parallel-sided arms, round loop, semicircular blades (w. 1.8 cm at blade tips). Patina: mottled green. Found with a cremation at the centre of a tumulus (No. 45) that also witnessed later funerary activities. Excavated by A.E. van Giffen in 1939.

Museum Assen, Inv.No. 1939/VII.44.


References: Van Giffen 1945: 118 No. 96, 121 No. 121, afb. 20 No. 74; Glasbergen 1954: 144 fig. 67 No. 3; Tackenberg 1971: 283 Liste 78 No. 2; O’Connor 1980: 221 list 226.


Dating: c. 1200-1000 BC (LBA2; O’Connor 1980: 221).

2.4.3 Tweezers with parallel-sided arms and shouldered semicircular or triangular blades (Fig. 15)

(DB 1214) Weerdinge, Gemeente Emmen, Drenthe. Cremation grave. L. 7.7 cm. Tweezers with narrow arms (0.2-0.4 cm) of rectangular- (arms) to lozenge-shaped (loop) cross-section. Small horizontal platforms (shoulders) where the blade departs from the arms. Width of semi-circular blade at blade tips 1.8 cm. Patina: fine glossy dark green, excellently preserved. Found in 1925 by A.E. van Giffen, in a cineration grave (cremation) east of the passage tomb D37a at Weerdinge (cf. Bakker 1979: 29).

Map reference: c. 255.9/537.9.


Dating: Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age? Based on formal similarities to Tackenberg’s (1971: 155, 288 Liste 79, Karte 33) ‘Haarzangen mit schmalem Schaft und paddelförmigen Wangen’ dated to Per. IV to VI (c. 1125-575 BC; op. cit., 155).

(DB 2737) Niersen, Gemeente Epe, Gelderland. Tumulus G6. L. 8.2 cm. Narrow parallel sided arms of square (2x2 mm) cross-section. Narrow shoulders where the triangular blades join the arms. Width of blade at blade tips 1.9 cm. Originally
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held a sliding ring (now lost). Patina mottled green. Found in tumulus G6 during excavation by Holwerda in 1908, from a bowl with everted rim (G220; RMO Inv.No. e1908/1.3). Museum RMO, Inv.No. e1908/1.4.


Parallels: DB1214 for the shouldered blade, DB2737 and Tackenberg (1971: 171-173, 291-292 Liste 88a-b, Karte 37) for the sliding ring.

Dating: Late Bronze Age, based on the associated bowl (Hulst 2010: 58). Tackenberg (1971: 171) argues that sliding-ring tweezers (Schieberpinzetten) in northwest Germany date to Ha C and Ha D (c. 800-480 BC), whereas Steuer (2003: 179) places them in Per. IV up to Ha D (c. 1125-480 BC).

2.4.4 Tweezers with parallel-sided arms and equal blade and arm width (Fig. 16)

(DB 2756) Uden, Gemeente Uden, Noord-Brabant. Maashorst, Slabroek
L. 9.2 cm. Bronze tweezers of straight parallel form (width at loop and tips c. 0.5 cm). Found together with an iron nail-cutter with torsioned body and an iron ring with leather attached (possibly a pouch for the toilet set, closed with an amber bead). Inhumation grave beneath charcoal deposits, of an unsexed individual wearing bronze anklets, bronze bracelets and hair rings (Van der Vaart-Verschoof 2017: 222-226). A broken-up bronze pin and remains of wood, textile and bone could also be recognised (ibid.).

Map reference: c. 169.75/412.55.


Dating: Based on six radiocarbon dates from charcoal in the pit, c. 780-430 cal BC (Van der Vaart-Verschoof 2017: 224); based on the typochronology of the entire assemblage presumably Ha C (c. 800-625 BC; op. cit., 227).

Parallels: For tweezers with parallel-sided arms and equal blade and arm width, see Nidderau (Ney 2017: 321-322) or Havré (Van der Vaart-Verschoof 2017: 125 fig. C13.4).

L. ± 6.5; w. 0.9 cm. Folded bronze tweezers, pointy tips with slight transverse ridges (for grip?). From a bronze vessel that originally contained cremated human bones and pars pro toto parts of a wagon (linchpins, hub fitting), horse-gear (bridles), the top half of a bronze socketed axe, an iron knife, the bronze tweezers and several unidentifiable bronze objects (Van der Vaart-Verschoof 2017: 214 tab. 28.1). Museum Rhenen, Inv. No. R12.

Map reference: c. 167.14/441.79.


Parallels: -

Dating: Hallstatt C (c. 800-625 BC; Van der Vaart-Verschoof 2017: 215), based on the associated bucket, linchpins, hub fittings and horse-gear.

L. 6.8 cm. Width of blade at tips 1.7 cm, th. 1 mm. Metal wire wrapped around upper section of arms. No information on find context available. Collection: Gemeentehuis Baarlo or Maasbree. Possibly also listed as DB 1822, but object unavailable for verification.


Parallels: -

Dating: Tweezers with broad parallel blades occur (albeit rare) in urnfield graves (e.g. at Telgte-Raestrup (Wilhelmi 1983: 45 Abb. 39 F8) but continue into the Roman and early medieval
periods (e.g. Krefeld – Gellep Grab 45 (Steuer 2003: 180 Abb. 36 No. 4). Given the scarcity of Late Bronze Age parallels in our area, the curvature of the blade tips, and the similarities to the tweezer from the Elst-‘t Woud grave 163 (dated to c. AD 460-550; Verwers & van Tent 2015: 227, a qb. 7.117b No. 10), a younger (Roman/early medieval) date is favoured here.

4.4.5 Tweezers with narrow flaring blades (Fig. 17)

(DB 2730) Busjop, Gemeente Leudal, Limburg. Tumulus XIII. L. 5.9 cm. Flaring arms that widen from 0.2 cm (near loop) to 0.4 cm (near blade) in width. Blades of triangular shape (w. 1.45 cm at tips). One of the arms has retained the sliding ring. Blade edge worn. Excavated by Hijszeler of the State Service for Archaeological Research (then ROB, now RCE) in 1951, following reports of ‘urn shards’ being found during forestry works. Patina: green. Museum: RMO Inv.No. l 1951/0.XIII. Map reference: c. 191.720/361.627.

References: Hijszeler 1951: 2; Theunissen et al. 2013: 42-45 (no mention of tweezers in either publication).


Dating: Tackenberg (1971: 171) argues that sliding-ring tweezers (Schieberpinzetten) in northwest Germany date to Ha C and Ha D (c. 800-480 BC), whereas Steuer (2003: 179) places them in Per. IV up to Ha D (c. 1125-480 cal BC). Tweezers with flaring blades from northwest Germany are dated by Tackenberg (1971: 166-168) to Per. IV into VI (c. 1125-625 BC).

(DB 2066) Hilbertshaar, Gemeente Tubbergen, Overijssel. Urnfeld. L. +3.2 cm. Fragment of bronze tweezers (unburnt). Arms widening from 0.7 cm (near loop) to 0.9 cm (end of preserved fragment). Found August 1938 in urn (Inv.No. 844) with cremation and burnt bronze rod/bar/pin fragment (l. 4.2 cm). Urn 33 cm high with three vertical strap handles. Former collection of G.J. ter Kuile. Museum: Museum Enschede, Inv.No. 844a. Map reference: c. 248.20/491.90.


Parallels: see Fig. 17 for overall shape (cf. Tackenberg 1971: 287-290 Liste 85-86, Karte 37).

Dating: Late Bronze Age to Per. V (c. 1100-750), based on the associated urn (Verlinde 1987: 215).

(DB 724) Hilbertshaar, Gemeente Tubbergen, Overijssel. Urnfeld. L. 5.7 cm. Arms of rectangular cross-section, widening from 0.3 cm (near loop) to 1.2 cm (width at tips). Found in 1949 in an urn of 29 cm height (Inv.No. 1978:3) with cremated remains and containing two ancillary cups (one Henkelgefass; Inv.Nos. 1978:3ab) and a fragment of a (burnt) ring of square cross-section. Tweezers burnt and deformed. Former collection of G.J. Eshuis. Museum: Museum Enschede, Inv.Nos 1978: 3c. Map reference: c. 248.20/491.90.


Parallels: see Fig. 17 for overall shape.

Dating: On the basis of the angular cross-section of the associated ring fragment, Verlinde (1987: 215) suggests a dating in the Late Bronze Age or earliest part of the Early Iron Age (Per. IV-V; c.1125-750 cal BC).

(DB 2272) Garderense Heide, Gemeente Barneveld, Gelderland. Hooiweg. L. 7.4 cm. Arms gradually widening from 0.25 cm (near loop) to 1.4 cm (width at tips), diameter of loop 0.9 cm. The arms have a rectangular cross-section and are 2 mm thick. In the bend of the loop is an irregular lump of bronze, apparently a cast-on repair. Patina: glossy dark green, covered by a varnish. Found around 1930-1940 as a secondary interment into an older tumulus. The urn is a tripartite bowl (h. 10.5 cm; Schräghalsurn). Formerly in the Westendorp collection. Collection GAS, Inv. No. 1976-4-83a.

Map reference: c. 177.5/470.5.


Parallels: see Fig. 17 for narrow, flaring tweezers (cf. Tackenberg 1971: 287-290 Liste 85-86, Karte 37). A similar
repair of the tweezer loop was found in the Riesenbeck grave (an urn with accessory cup, razor and tweezers; Aschemeyer 1966: 83 Taf. 8B No. 3).

Dating: Based on typochronology of associated pottery, possibly early phase of the Early Iron Age (Verlinde & Hulst 2010: 156, cf. Van den Broeke 2005: 610 fig. 27.8), but most plausibly Late Bronze Age (Hulst 2010: 58).

(DB 1253) Sleenerzand, Gemeente Coevorden, Drenthe. Tumulus Galgenberg. L. 5.2 cm. Fragment (one arm) of tweezers, with three vertical ribs. Reportedly found in the primary grave of period 2 of Middle Bronze Age tumulus ‘De Galgenberg’, excavated in 1934 and 1938 by A.E. van Giffen. Grave goods included a palstave, a pair of gold spirals, a twisted bracelet and a series of sheet-bronze, triangular tanged arrowheads. There are doubts as to the association of the tweezer fragment with the funerary assemblage: Butler (1990: 86) states that according to W.A.B. van der Sanden, then curator of the Drents Museum, the context of the tweezer fragment is not explicitly identified in the documentation. Moreover, its functional interpretation as a tweezer fragment is not robust. Museum Assen, Inv.No. 1934/V.30.4. F.


Parallels: For tweezer arms with longitudinal ribbing, see Ney (2017: 321 fig. 2, HaC) or Pirling et al. 1980, Taf. 23.

Dating: The primary grave can be dated to the first half of the Middle Bronze Age-B (c. 1500-1100 BC) on the basis of the palstave (Butler 1990 ((1992)): 86). Tweezers with ribbed arms most probably date to the Late Bronze Age or Early Iron Age (supra), which argues against their association in this grave.

2.4.6 Tweezers with wide flaring blades (Fig. 18)

(DB 1399) Goirle, Gemeente Goirle, Noord-Brabant. Regte Heide-Vijfberg Tumulus VI. L. +3.8 cm. Flaring arms; 0.4 cm (near loop) to 1.4 cm width at tips. Flattened ovoid cross-section. Loop missing. Decoration near the blade margins. Found during excavation by A.E. van Giffen in 1935 in the central interment of tumulus VI of the barrow cluster known locally as ‘De Vijfberg’. This central interment was a coffin grave placed on the old surface and covered by a sod-built mound (Butler 1995/1996: 200).

From the coffin, a high-flanged axe with low-placed, short flanges (AXRSL; Butler 1995/1996: 199 fig. 22 Cat.No. 72) was recovered, as well as the pair of tweezers, two tiny trapeze-shaped indeterminate bronze items, an incomplete cylindrical bronze ring and bundles of bone strips (op. cit., 201; Van Giffen 1937: afb. 24 No. 60; Verwers 1980: 19). Present location of artefacts unknown.

Map reference: c. 129.8/390.77.


Parallels: DB569; DB1293; DB2573 for overall shape. For incised decoration along the blade margin see DB1293, Aschemeyer (1961: 78 Taf. 3B No. 4), Baudou (1960, Taf. 8 no XIIb-2) or Kubach (1977: Taf. 117 D2).

Dating: The associated axe is of non-local (Hungarian plain? Butler 1995/1996: 200) origin and is attributed to the Hadjusamson-Apa phase (c. 1574-1475 BC; Lanting & Van der Plicht 2003: 126, 134).

(DB 1293) Drouwen, Gemeente Borger en Odoorn, Drenthe. 1939 Urnfield, stone packing. L. 7 cm. Arms widening from 0.5 (near loop) to 2.3 cm (at tips). Broad triangular blade. The sides of the arms are lined with punched-in triangles. Tweezers originated from one of two terrine-shaped urns with strap handles (zweitenkliige Terrinen) placed together in one stonepacking amidst graves with circular ditches, uncovered during the urnfield excavations by A.E. van Giffen in 1939 (Kooi 1979: 92, fig. 87 No. 8 for location). The smaller of the two urns contained the tweezers and a razor of Scandinavian ship-derivative type (DB 1292). Museum Assen, Inv.No. 1939/XII.8-4.

Map reference: c. 249.11/552.76.
References: Van Giffen 1943: 482-483, afb. 45a-b; Butler 1969: 80, fig. 35, Pl. 30; Kooi 1979: 90-96, 94 fig. 89; O’Connor 1980: 221, list 226 No. 23.

Parallels: Fig. 18: DB569, DB1399, DB2573 for overall shape. For incised decoration along the blade margin, see DB1399, Montelius (1917: 48 No. 1121, 72 Pl. II:4 No. 1121 (gold)); Baudou (1960: 40, Taf. 8 no XII B2) or Wilhelmi (1983: 21 Abb. 15 No. B7).


Parallels: see Fig. 18 for overall shape and Tackenberg (1971: 287-288 Liste 85; 288-290 Liste 86; Karte 36) for wider distribution.


References: -
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the same site, *Kerbsnitt-* and *Cylinderhals* urns are reported). Possibly also listed as DB 1908, but object unavailable for verification.

*Map reference:* c. 201.85/371.8.
*Parallels:* -
*Dating:* -

(DB 2755) *Kneqsel, Gemeente Eersel, Noord-Brabant.*
Tweezers from burial 34 in an urnfield excavated by W.C. Braat of the National Museum of Antiquities in Leiden. Associated with a penannular gilded ring. Tweezers now lost.
*Map reference:* c. 152.60/379.68.
*Reference:* DB 2755; Van der Plicht & Schachbink 2001: 2 fig. 4.31. Possibly also listed as DB 1908, but object unavailable for verification.

*Map reference:* c. 201.85/371.8.
*Parallels:* -
*Dating:* -

(DB 2738) *Emmen, Gemeente Emmen, Drenthe.* Noordbarger es.
Fragments of very corroded sheet bronze from an urned cremation close to a Middle Bronze Age barrow. The urn also contained sherds from a second pot. Given the observation that two sheet-bronze fragments were found on top of each other, an interpretation as remains of a pair of tweezers was suggested (De Wit 2002: 12).

*Map reference:* c. 256.05/533.32.
*Parallels:* -
*Dating:* The associated urn is dated to the Early or Middle Iron Age (800-250 BC; De Wit 2002: 10).

2.5 Possible tattooing needles (Fig. 19)

For two Dutch Bronze Age awl-like objects (DB1376; DB1964), their incorporation into a funerary context suggests that they maybe were used as tattooing implements (cf. Tackenberg 1971: 153; Aschemeyer 1966: 77; Taf. 2B No. 3). A speculative addition could be the – as yet unstudied – fragment of a needle from the Weert-Boshoverheide urnfield (Hissel 2012: 218 tab. 7.20). Possibly, the narrow-ended bronze-wire fragments from four graves in the Early Iron Age urnfields of Roermond-Mussenberg (Schabbingk & Tol 2000: 41) and Sittard-Hoogveld (Tol 2000: 114 fig. 4.14) served a similar purpose (albeit that these may equally be pin or needle fragments).

(DB 1376) *Harenermolen, Gemeente Haren, Groningen.*
Tum. II / De Tip – 3a.
L. +4.6 cm. Bronze awl or tattooing needle. Diameter of middle part 2 mm; rectangular cross section (w. 2.5 mm, th. 1 mm) opposite to point. Small shallow groove on both sides from middle part to point. Patina: dark green, corroded. From secondary interment into the period-3 mound of the Harenermolen barrow (started in the Late Neolithic; Lanting 1979: 184; 193-194; 200 fig. 5.3). It was found with a thin sheet of bronze (a possible razor fragment: DB1377; Lanting 1979: 193-194) in an urn with two handles (*zweihenklige Terrine*) datable to the Late Bronze Age (cf. Van den Broeke 2005: 610 fig. 27.8; Scheele 2016: 85 tab. 2) covered by a large part of a bowl serving as a lid (Lanting 1979: 202 pl. 5). Museum Groningen, Inv. No. 1922/V.3a.

*Map reference:* c. 237.96/574.97.
*Parallels:* DB 1376; Torbrügge 1959: Taf. 29.10. Similar to Form Batzhausen (Torbrügge 1959: Taf. 29.10).
*Dating:* Late Bronze Age, c. 1150-850 BC, based on dates for *zweihenklige Terrinen*.

(DB 1964) *Drouwen, Gemeente Borgor en Odoorn, Drenthe.*
1941 Urnfield.
L. +5.1 cm. Bronze awl or tattooing needle, rectangular cross-section in upper part (2.5 x 2 mm) and round (diameter 2 mm, decreasing towards tip) in the lower part. Patina: dark green. Found during excavation of the Drouwen urnfield by A.E. van Giffen in 1941. From a tall urn with round shoulders and straight neck (*Cylinderhals* urn; 1941/V56) that contained cremated remains and the awl (DB1964). The urn was capped with a stone. Museum Assen, Inv.No. 1941/V56a.

*Map reference:* c. 249.11/552.76.
*Parallels:* DB1376.
*References:* Van Giffen 1943: 97-98; afb. 4 No. 56a; Kooi 1979: 90-96 (no mention of awl).
*Dating:* For the associated *Cylinderhals* urn, a Ha A2 to Ha B age is plausible (c. 1125-800 BC; Van den Broeke 2005: 610 fig. 27.8; Lanting & Van der Plicht 2003: 248-249 fig. 8).

3. Contextualizing Dutch razors and tweezers

3.1 Dutch razors in their depositional context

The majority of Dutch later prehistoric razors have been recovered from funerary contexts (see below),...
but of some the provenance is less clear. For the razor-shaped objects from Halsteren (DB526 & DB2733) and the razor reportedly from Deurne (DB1620), their context was specified by selling antiques dealers and need not be reliable. For the Achterberg (DB895) find, no contextual information is available. The authenticity – and hence also context – of the Sittrard iron ship-shaped razor (DB1131) has been called into question (Kaul 1998a: 227). Only three razors were part of hoard assemblages. The most peculiar of these is the razor from Opheusden (DB2744), which ended up with a Late Bronze Age pin and silver Roman-period coins in a Merovingian pot. This custom of prehistoric ‘relic’ deposition in Merovingian graves is widespread (e.g. Ungerman 2009; Kurasińska, Purowska & Skóra 2010: 145–146). The second hoard is a peat bog deposit of a tanged urnfield knife (DB1180; Arnoldussen, Butler & Steegstra 2012: 85) together with a Typ Schledebrück razor (DB1181) at Bargeroosterveld. The third hoard assemblage concerns the (Sicilian) Pantalica-type razor from the well-known Ommerschans hoard, which also contained an aggrandized ceremonial Ommerschans-Plougrescant dirk and a range of stone and bronze artefacts (Butler & Bakker 1961; Butler 1990: 87), which also was a peatland deposition.

For the razors from funerary contexts, urnfields dominate and most razors originate from urned cremation graves once placed under low, earthen, ditch-enclosed mounds (c. 10–12 instances). For other razors, it is clear that the funerary monuments from which they originated must have stood out in terms of their shape or size. At Sleen, a razor (DB2752) was added to a cremation placed beneath a keyhole-shaped barrow. The Zeijen (DB197) razor was recovered (decentrally) from within a ditch-enclosed long-bed barrow. The Gasteren (DB1236) razor was found within a long-bed barrow with an inner post-setting (Type Vledder) and the Dwingeloo razor (DB2748) was found within an elongated barrow with a double outer post-setting. For these elongated (long-bed) barrow types, it has been argued that these may represent founder burials for heads of households, around which younger-period interments clustered, and which may have symbolized the ties between the living and the ancestors of the local community (Roymans & Kortlang 1999: 42–51). While such razor graves may thus have formed founder burials dating to the transition of the Middle to the Late Bronze Age in their respective urnfields, the association of razors with distinct mound bodies lasted into the Iron Age. The Noordbarge iron razor (DB2740) originated from a central grave under a barrow 10 m in diameter, that was enclosed by a 2 m wide ditch (Kooi 1979: 15 fig. 8; Arnoldussen & Albers 2015: 159 fig. 6). The razor from the ‘princely’ Ha C grave of Oss underlay a barrow 52 m in diameter (Fokkens 1997: 1). The preference for a more monumental appearance for burials with razors, could also explain their placement into older Neolithic tombs.

To the Harenermolen Bell-Beaker barrow, three interments with asymmetrical ship-shaped razors (or fragments) were added as secondary interments to the third mound period (DB 1373; DB1380; DB1377; Lanting 1979). This could also explain the recovery of the Emmen (DB1745) razor from within the chamber area of Funnel Beaker period (TRB) passage tomb D42: the – then presumably still mound-capped – megalithic tomb provided – albeit anecdotal – evidence for the association of distinctive monuments with razor graves, funerary monuments were not a prerequisite: at Wedderveer a razor was put into a barrowless (flat) grave (DB1384), and the Drouwenn 1939 razor (DB1292) was recovered from a set of two urns placed inside a stone-packing (but with no evidence for a mound; Van Giffen 1943, afb. 45a–b).

The exact roles that the razors may have played in the funerary rites will have differed. In a series of graves from the northern Netherlands, the degree and location of fragmentation suggests that razor fragments – rather than complete razors – were interred (e.g. DB1194; DB1373; DB1377). For the fragmented razors that still retained part of a blade, curation and continued use may be assumed, but is also possible that breakage was part of the funerary rite (of decommissioning the razor), perhaps after a final instance of use on the deceased or the mourners (cf. Woodward 2006: 115; Brück & Fontijn 2013: 209). In the cases where complete razors were interred, these seem to reflect intensive wear from resharpening/whetting (loss of blade area; e.g. DB1194; DB1234; DB1263; DB1745; DB2748) or peening (blade deformation; e.g. DB1292). Particularly the changes in blade shape may reflect lifespan usage, which could – but need not – indicate personal ownership. Some razor blades were presumably well protected during life, as indications of a leather casing were found on the Lheeweg (DB989) razor. Possibly, some razors were repaired in antiquity (DB1181). Few razor blades show modest to little evidence of wear (taphonomy permitting), but maybe the tanged razors from Drouwenn (DB1230) and Gasteren (DB1236) or the Typ Irlich razor from Echt (DB2762) entered the grave in a better or new condition. Only the Amby (DB2750) razor showed clear signs of burning, suggesting that it had been part of the goods burned on the pyre.

The date range reflected by the Dutch later prehistoric razors spans the 16th century BC into the Ha D period, but most razors are dated by their associated objects or enclosing urn to the period of c. 1125–750 BC. The oldest dated examples are the tanged razor from Drouwenn that formed part of a Sögel-Wohlde funerary set (c. 1575–1475 BC; DB1230) and the pegged Pantalica-type razor from the Ommerschans hoard (c. 1500–1350 BC; DB1759). The only radiocarbon-dated razor is the one from
Dwingeloo, whose associated cremation could be dated to 1285-1135 BC (DB2748). The youngest dated razors (Ha C/D; 800-480 BC) are the iron examples from Losser (DB2742), Noordbarge (DB2740) and Oss (DB2731). Specific razor types may have known long periods of currency: whereas Dwingeloo (DB2748) may be the oldest date for a Typ Schledebrück razor, the association with a Ha Bi knife in the Bargeroosterveld hoard of 1899 (DB1181) suggests that this type spanned the 13th to 11th or 10th century BC. Similarly, tanged razors occur from the 16th century BC (Drouwen; DB1230) into the 12th century BC (Gasteren; DB1263). For most razor types, however, too few Dutch specimens are available for discussing type longevity.

As to objects commonly associated with razors in the funerary assemblages, three combinations with tweezers (see below) are known. In two cases (DB1292; DB2748), the tweezers were the only other item recovered, whereas at Gasteren (DB1263) a flint flake and two discoid whetstones were recovered as well. Presumed drinking cups (Henkeltusse) were added inside the urn alongside razors in two cases (DB1194; DB1648), or they were placed outside the urn (DB2740) or used as a lid to close the urn (DB1380). Whetstones also frequently accompany razors (DB1194; DB1230; DB1263), and in two cases a set of two whetstones appears to be present (DB1194; DB1263, cf. Aschemeyer 1961: 32; 76 Taf. 1A; Jockenhövel 1980: 157 No. 573; Taf. 80A). In two other cases, bronze razors were associated with incomplete ‘urnfield’ knives. In the case of the Bargeroosterveld hoard (DB1181) this was a tanged knife missing its tip, in the Amby case (DB2750) this was a fragment of a socketed knife (Butler, Arnoldussen & Steegstra 2012: 73). The Wedderveer grave (DB384) contained a pin as well as a razor. In terms of ‘toilet sets’, the association with tweezers is most notable (cf. Montelius 1917, No. 1105), yet the recurrent association with whetstones may warn against too strict a definition for such sets. The only two other evident “funerary assemblage” associations are that with the Sögel-Wöhlde grave goods in the grave at Drouwen (DB1230, cf. Fontijn 2003: 228; 345-347; Vandkilde 1996: 156-159) and the incorporation of an iron razor into the extensive elite Hallstatt-inspired Ha C burial set of the Chieftain of Oss (DB2731; Van der Vaart-Verschoof 2017: 176-198). As these two assemblages represent the oldest and youngest examples, the conclusion is permissible that in the intervening 14th-9th centuries, no more extensive or more standardised funerary sets comprising razors (other than the already noted prominence of tweezers and whetstones) can be identified for the Low Countries.

Both in the types of razors recovered and in their associated artefacts, different supra-regional connections can be identified (Fig. 20). The probably Sicilian ultimate origin of the Ommerschans razor (DB759) testifies to the scale of contact networks of that period – a fact...
also shown by the distribution of the Ommerschans-Plougrescant ceremonial dirks (Amkreutz & Fontijn 2017). The Drouwens (DB1230) razor fits within a Sögel-Wohldre interaction zone extending across Jutland, northwest Germany, Mecklenburg and southwards into Hessen (Butler 1986: 150). For the asymmetrical ship-shaped razors from Harenermolen (DB1373; DB1380) Drouwens (1939; DB1292) and Sleen (DB2752), the best parallels are to be found in southern Scandinavia and northern Germany. The Ösengriff razor from Wedderweer (DB384) is part of a group of similarly shaped razors that appear native to the northern German and adjacent Dutch area, and that may trace the gateway for the procurement of the previously mentioned ship-shaped razors (DB1292; DB1373; DB1380; DB2752). Yet, more networks than just the Nordic one were in play. The Brentford-type razor from Deurne (DB1620) could theoretically substantiate an Atlantic contact network (possible western French origin?), but as this find has only an antiques dealer’s provenance, this connection is suspect. Integration into the central European Urnfield Culture (Urnfelderkultur; UFK) networks can more credibly be argued for. The Typ Irlich razors (DB2762; Jockenhövel 1980: 85-86) may be a product of the German Neuwied and Dutch Limburg areas. Imports from UFK areas also can be identified. The Amby razor (DB2750) fits a group of razors with identical blade shape that cluster in the Upper Rhine areas of Neckar, Main and Moselle, and the accompanying fragment of a socketed knife has clear Palafitte affinities (Butler, Arnoldussen & Steegstra 2012: 78 fig. 8; 79; 83). Whether the affinities of the Halsteren objects should be sought in the southeast German/Austrian Nynice and Třebešov types (Jockenhövel 1980, Taf. 47B) or rather in more southern (French) urnfield groups is a moot point, as they only have an antiques dealer’s provenance.

3.2 Dutch tweezers in their depositional context

The contextual associations of the Dutch tweezers – like the razors – are decidedly funerary in nature. Ten tweezers originate certainly from urnfield cemeteries, and for four more examples this is plausible. Moreover, five tweezers originate from secondary interments into older funerary monuments (DB546; DB1204; DB275; DB2772 and DB 2737). Another three tweezers may originate from interments without covering moulds (DB2124; DB1293 and DB2738). For just three tweezers no funerary association can be argued for: a metal-detection find (DB2573), a pair of tweezers from a levelled dwelling mound (DB2732) and one from Epe (DB2739) for which there is no contextual information. It is important to stress that often the context from which tweezers were recovered, stands out in the urnfield owing to the prominence of the funerary monument, or the composition of the grave-goods assemblage. For example, the tweezers from Gasteren (DB1262), Dwingelo (DB2749) and Oldenzaal (DB2062) were all recovered from elongated barrow types known as long-bed barrows (Dutch: langbedden) with post-settings (DB2749) or post-settings within ditches (DB1262; DB2062). The pair of tweezers and razor from the elongated post-setting at Dwingelo are radiocarbon-dated to c. 1285-1135 BC, the long-bed barrows of Vledder type (DB1262; DB2062) presumably date to c. 1380-920 cal. BC (De Vries 2012: 15; Lanting & Van der Plicht 2003: 214), confirming a relatively early date in the urnfield period. This association of tweezers with a rarer (and relatively older) type of tomb could hint at a special significance or status of those interred, and perhaps the incorporation of tweezers was fitting to this social position. The fact that tweezers were part of the assemblages of the ‘princely’ graves of Slabroek (DB2756) and Rhenen (DB2754) shows that this connotation may have been long-lived, and was still observed in the Ha C period.

There is ample variation in the condition and treatment of the tweezers used in the burial rites. Some tweezers were worn (DB2730) or repaired in prehistory (DB2722), some where wrapped in cord (DB2080), and yet others may have been folded-over (DB2754) prior to interment. Also important is that both burned (DB2742) and unburnt (DB2066) tweezers occur in the same urnfield (Hilbertshaar). This signals that tweezers could either (as private possessions or otherwise) accompany the deceased onto the pyre or be added in working order to the cremated remains (by the mourners) – and that this could vary in individual cases.

The long-term use of tweezers as grave goods during later prehistory is well attested in the Dutch data. The association at Goirle of a pair of tweezers with a palstave attributed to the 16th-15th century BC (DB1399) represents the oldest available date so far. The absolute date of the Dwingelo tweezers (DB2749) in the final three centuries of the Middle Bronze Age-B (c. 1500-1000 BC) is matched by the pair of tweezers found in a Gasteren-type urn (DB1235) which dates to the same time-slot (Arnoldussen 2008: 409 note 147; Lanting & Van der Plicht 2003: 162; 213). Typochronological dates for the associated urns (zweitenklige Terrinen, Henkelgefäße) moreover place several tweezers in the Late Bronze Age (c. 1100-800 BC; DB549; DB724; DB1293).

The association of the Garderen tweezers (DB2272) with a Schräghals pot, and the ornaments (DB2756) and horse gear (DB2754) from the ‘princely graves’ of Slabroek

---

16 Certain: DB549; DB1262; DB1269; DB2062; DB2066; DB2080; DB2730; DB2749, DB2754 and DB2756. Plausible: DB569; DB1029; DB1030 and DB2120.
and Rhenen documents continuation of the tradition of using tweezers as grave goods into the Early Iron Age (c. 800-600 BC).  

In terms of funerary assemblages, the most common associations of tweezers are rings (DB1399; DB2066, DB2755 and DB2756) and razors (DB1262; DB1293; DB2749). Amber beads were found with tweezers twice (DB1235; DB2756). Rings, razors and beads may have formed a functional assemblage, in which a toilet set was held in an organic (leather? DB2756) pouch, fastened by the amber bead.  

According to Bergerbrandt (2007: 69-70) such pouches – sometimes closed by a pin (cf. DB1204) – were found placed near the waist or left arm of males in Scandinavian Bronze Age inhumation graves. The Ha C princely grave of Uden Slabroek (DB2756) with its nail-cutter, ring with leather attached, and amber bead may be the most complete Dutch representation of such a pouched ‘toilet set’ (Van der Vaart-Verschoof 2017: 227). Also notable is that no weapons are associated with tweezers beyond reasonable doubt: the tweezers fragments from Sleenerzand (DB1253; a barrow with bronze tanged arrowheads) may present an erroneously associated Late Bronze Age object, for which a function as tweezers is also not beyond doubt (Butler 1990: 86), and the association of DB1029 with a spearhead is also speculative (Verlinde 1987: 173). 

Whereas many of the types of Dutch tweezers recovered may reflect locally current (yet more widely distributed; cf. Tackenberg 1971, Karte 33-37) types, a few tweezers hint at supra-regional origins or affinities. The torsion decoration on the Enumerhoogte tweezers (DB2732) is common in Hallstatt assemblages (cf. Fig. 25; Van der Vaart-Verschoof 2017: 221-227; Ney 2017: 320-323) and the torsion-decorated nail-cutter and pin in the Slabroek assemblage situated 200 km further south are the closest parallel (DB2756). The decorated tweezers from Goirle tumulus VI (DB1399) are matched by examples in the Nordic realm (cf. Baudou 1960, Taf. 8 no XIIb-2 or Central Germany (e.g. Kubach 1977, Taf. 117 D2). Interesting is that the axe from the Goirle grave is also of clearly non-local (Hungarian Plain?) origin (Butler 1995/1996: 200). An obviously Nordic origin (Elber-Weser region: cf. Tackenberg 1971, Karte 34) may moreover be proposed for the tweezers with dot-circle motifs from the Groevenbeekse heide (DB569), for which unfortunately contextual information is absent. Similarly, the Nordic affiliation of the wide-bladed Drouwen (DB1293) tweezers with triangular decoration is supported by parallels (e.g. Tackenberg 1971, Karte 29) for the ship-derivative Nordic razor (DB1292) also found in that urn.

3.3 Dutch later prehistoric razors and tweezers in their European context

Following up on the above discussion of the state of the artefacts, their contexts of recovery, dating evidence and associated items for the Dutch later prehistoric tweezers and razors individually, they will now be

---

17 See Steuer 2003; Verwers & Van Tent 2015 for continued use of tweezers as grave goods in and after the Roman period.
discussed jointly in their broader northwest European context.

Using a quick scan of a series of publications19, an impression of the types of contexts of recovery for Bronze Age razors has been compiled (Fig. 21). Completeness was not the aim, but the number of cases inventoried (n=782) means that for most areas (i.e. those with n>10) their relative distribution across categories such as hoards, inhumation graves and cremations can be considered representative.

From the overview of European contexts of Bronze Age razors (Fig. 21) it is clear that across northwestern Europe razors predominantly originate from funerary contexts. Only in the Atlantic sphere (France, United Kingdom) do they figure in hoards to any degree. In France and Denmark, razors are interred with inhumation graves and cremation graves in equal measure, but in the Netherlands, Germany and the British Isles cremation graves figure far more prominently. Across the categories of inhumations and cremation graves, the numbers listed here mask the occurrence of stone-pack-mation graves figure far more prominently. Across the Netherlands, Germany and the British Isles cremation graves figure far more prominently. Across the categories of inhumations and cremation graves, the numbers listed here mask the occurrence of stone-pack-mations with both inhumation graves (56 in Denmark, 14 in France) and cremation graves (67 in Denmark, 18 in Germany, 1 in the UK and 1 in the Netherlands).

The state of the items interred varies: in the Dutch corpus, pristine objects appear rarely, yet tweezers seem usually to have entered the grave intact (and functional). Only rarely do Dutch razors and tweezers seem to have been burnt on the pyre. On the whole, Dutch razors and tweezers both show signs of moderate to intensive use – with some razors being considerably worn down. Similar patterns can be observed in other regions too (Jockenhövel 1980: 30-31). For the razors from northwestern Germany, Drescher (1963: 138) states that the degree of wear suggests that razors were life-long personal possessions (‘...daß die Klinge, welche wir in den Gräbern zum Gebrauch auf der Reise ins Jenseits finden, ihre Besitzer ein Leben lang begleiteteten’). Jockenhövel (1980: 30-31; 2003: 138) also noted the ample wear on Bronze Age razors from western Europe and speculated whether razors might have been gifted upon initiation (puberty?) and were kept until death without replacement or exchange. Razor blades may show signs of repairs to ensure longevity (Jockenhövel 1971: 5; 1980: 30), as do some tweezers (DB2272; Aschemeyer 1966: 83 Taf. 88 No. 3).

In order to have them last a lifetime, razors and tweezers were well protected. For the Dutch tweezers, we have argued that they may have been housed in organic pouches closed and fastened with (amber) beads. Remains of a wooden tweezers case – preserved in blade corrosion – were observed in Schleswig-Holstein (Schwantes 1939: 329), but organic pouches are more common (Drescher 1963: 140). The cutting edges of razors also required protection. A leather case may have shielded the fragile sheet-bronze razor from Dwingelo-Lheeweg. From Schleschwig-Holstein and Denmark (Drescher 1963: 139-140; Nowothnig 1958: 166) and the British Isles and France (Jockenhövel 1980: 30) leather and wooden razor cases are also known. In the palafitte area, similar wooden razor cases have been recovered (e.g. Groß 1883: fig. 26; Taf. 14; Egloff 1972: 10).

For the Dutch razors, it was observed that in three cases fragments rather than intact razors were interred. This was also noted for 13 razors in Jockenhövel’s inventory, and he suggested – as has been proposed for the Dutch examples – that this represents deliberate acts of decomposition by the mourners: “Diese intentionelle Unbrauchbarmachung ist wahrscheinlich im Zusammenhang mit bestimmten Deponierungssitzen zu sehen: Die Rasiermesser sollten nicht mehr weiter benutzt werden (nach dem Tode des Besitzers)” (Jockenhövel 1980: 31).

Unfortunately, the prehistoric owners of razors and tweezers remain rather obscure in terms of age, gender and status. Whereas the interpretation of graves with razors (and tweezers) as those of adult males is common (Sørensen 1989: 459; Jockenhövel 2003: 138; Steuer 2003: 138) and has even been considered axiomatic, biological determination of sex is rare (cf. Jockenhövel 1975: 9), meaning that most sexing is archeological and based on artefact associations (Bergerbrandt 2007: 8). At Dwingelo, a set of a razor (DB2748) and a pair of tweezers (DB2749) was interred with a cremation that contained the burnt bones of two adult males (> 40 yr; pers. comm. F. Verhagen, Feb. 2018). Associations of possible razors with female-identified graves are rare (but see Jockenhövel 1980: 30 No. 72; 43 No. 109; 82 No. 238; 101 No. 310). For the toilet set containing tweezers from Uden (DB2756), it is unclear whether it was interred with a female or a male (Jansen et al. 2011: 111) and in the Iron Age an association with a female grave is not improbab (cf. Krüger 1961: 22; 29; Tackenberg 1975: 173). With regards to social standing, we have argued for the Netherlands that the types of graves from which relatively many razors originated, hint at a special prominence (of those graves, and of those interred there). Six razors and three Dutch tweezers originated from elongated or long-bed barrows, which are taken to represent founder’s monuments that guided later urnfield development (Roymans & Kortlang 1999: 42-51). Kooi (1979: 17) interpreted the barrow from which the Noordbarge razor (DB2740) originated as a ‘conspicuous’ monument fit for a tribal chief. The razor from Oss (DB2731) came

from what is still the largest Early Iron Age barrow in the Netherlands (52 m diam.; Fokkens 1997: 1), which suggests that a privileged (elite?) connotation for razors persisted well into the Iron Age. For the southeastern French necropolises of Mailhac-Moulin and Cazevielle, the low frequency of razors (c. 8-10% of the graves) has been interpreted as a funerary tradition in which only heads of households were supplied with razors in the grave (Jockenhövel 1980: 31). This linkage of razors (as proxies for styles of facial hair) to (elite) identity may owe much to Diodorus Siculus’ description of the shaven cheeks of Gaulish nobility. Such observations cannot be uncritically projected back into prehistory, but that razors (and tweezers) were used to distinguish certain persons in both life and death remains probable. The nature of such social distinction (by age, through achievement, religious, hereditary) and the scale of recognition (household, household group, tribe) thereof, must remain open questions for now (cf. Jockenhövel 2003: 31). Analysis of the associated objects may shed light on such possibilities.

On the basis of an inventory of 782 object associations of Bronze Age razors and/or tweezers in hoards and funerary contexts, supra-regional and regional comparisons in object associations can be made. For a total of 82 hoards with razors, associated objects have been inventoried (Fig. 22)

It is clear that weapons (swords, spearheads, daggers), tools (axes) and ornaments (rings, pins and bracelets) occur in frequent (n>20 cases) association with razors in hoards, and that the hoards from the Atlantic interaction zone dominate this distribution. The fuller ranges of associated objects seen in such Atlantic hoards is broadly similar for France and the British Isles, and from the other regions selected objects appear to be absent (e.g. swords in Scandinavia, daggers in the Netherlands). It seems unlikely that in such associations much information on past perception or usage of Bronze Age razors or tweezers is encoded. At best, attempts at decoding illustrate that razors and tweezers (in addition to a wide spectrum of other objects), were
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20 Biliothecae historicae V.28.

21 Milcent (2015: 30-31) classifies razors as elite gear, associated with appearance and beauty – especially during ceremonies in the LBA-EIA periods (op. cit: 32 tab. 3.1).

22 See note 19 for references.
deemed suitable for incorporation into Late Bronze Age hoards in the Atlantic sphere.\(^{23}\)

For the razors and tweezers from funerary contexts, more revealing results may be expected: there, associations may form standardised sets of either personal belongings, standardized funerary sets to represent a (standardized, e.g. warrior) persona of the deceased or (decommissioned) items reflecting the community of mourners and their activities, e.g. feasting, scarification, tattooing, shaving. Through recurring association, ties between functional object categories (e.g. toilet sets, weapons, tools etc) may come to the fore and help in reconstructing the identities expressed by the deceased. Artefacts associated with razors have been inventoried for a total of 569 funerary contexts (Fig. 23).

From the inventory of objects associated with razors in graves, clear regional differences can be identified. First of all, there is a clear reversal in prominence of the Atlantic regions (France, British Isles) versus Scandinavia and Germany when compared to hoards (Fig. 22). Clearly, the occurrence of razors in graves is something that is particular to the Nordic interaction zone (southern Scandinavia, northwestern Germany and adjacent northeastern Netherlands). Secondly, from their near-exclusive occurrence in those regions, strike-a-lights, studs, brooches, knives and daggers appear elements of the standardized funerary kits of razor graves in the Nordic realm. Thirdly, for the German region, tweezers, pins and awls (or tattooing needles?) appear to be frequently associated, whereas among the French data pins, bracelets, swords and rings take centre-stage. Another important observation is the strong correlation between razors and tweezers: no other artefact types occur more frequently in association, albeit that the geographic distribution of the cases at hand suggests that this too is mainly a southern Scandinavian

---

\(^{23}\) Bradley 1990: 112-128; O’Connor 2007: 71; Armada & Martinón-Torres 2016
Fig. 24. Funerary associations of the standardised Nordic Per. IV-V toilet set of razor, tweezers and tattooing awl. Germany: Altstadt (after Laux 2017, Taf. 103 nos. 3.13); Denmark: Tarp (after Aner & Kersten 1978, Taf. 32 No. 2323), Eltang (after Baudou 1960, Taf. XXIV No. 37) and Gudum (after Baudou 1960, Taf. XXV No. 388); Slovakia: Kapušany (from Kaul 1998: 276 fig. 174). Objects not to scale.
and northwest German phenomenon. Even so, the dominance of tweezers in graves — and their scarce occurrence in other contexts (settlements, hoards) — strengthens the ties between razors and tweezers as part of a ‘grooming set’, that probably comprised tattooing needles (misidentified as awls?) as well (cf. Kaul 1998a: 150). Whilst there may be typological (and taphonomical) blurring between descriptions of ‘pins’ and ‘awls’ from funerary contexts, the strongest case that such ‘awls’ served different purposes from pins is provided by contexts in which both are present (Fig. 24). A spectacular example may be the German deposit of Allstadt (Fig. 24, top right), which contains a double or triple toilet set (two razors and three awls/tattooing needles, three tweezers, two pins and three miniature swords (Laux 2017: 235; Taf. 103 nos. 3-13). From Tarp in Denmark a funerary assemblage comprising a carp’s-tongue sword, knife, brooch, two pins, razor blade and full-hilted awl/tattooing needle is known (Fig. 24, top left: Aner & Kersten 1978: 97; Taf. 32 No. 2323). At Eltang (Amt Vejle), the ‘standard’ toilet set of razor, tattooing awl and tweezers is supplemented with an arrowhead and sword (Fig. 24, middle left; Baudou 1960: 318; Taf. XXIV No. 371). At Gudum (Amt Vejle), an awl/tattooing needle and spiral-head pin were found with a razor and arrowhead (but here the tweezers are lacking from the ‘standard’ set; Fig. 24, lower right: Baudou 1960: 318; Taf. XXV No. 388). In Slovakia, the grave of Kapušany yielded a similar set of pin, tweezers, razors and awl/tattooing needle (Fig. 24, lower right; Kaul 1998: 276 fig. 174). In the Nordic sphere of influence, this triad of awl/tattooing needle, razor and tweezers appears commonplace in Per. IV to V (Fig. 24; cf. Torbrügge 1959: 66; Baudou 1960: 40). In all probability, it is not until the Ha C period that
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Fig. 26. Correspondence analyses (using PAST; Hammer, Harper & Ryan 2001) of objects associated with razors and/or tweezers in funerary contexts from Scandinavia (A), Germany (B), the Netherlands, Belgium & Luxemburg (C) and for France (D). See note 19 for primary data. Figure S. Arnoldussen (Groningen Institute of Archaeology, University of Groningen).
a novel primary association for tweezers becomes dominant: a different (but related) grooming set in which nail-cleaners and ear-scoops - accompanied by tweezers, and occasionally razors - are suspended from a ring (Fig. 25, cf. Baudou 1960: 44).

As revealing as such regional summaries may seem, they may equally mask more specific underlying object associations (e.g. hypothetically, two discrete sets of grave goods that share no other item than the razor). To investigate whether this is the case with our data, a correspondence analysis (using PAST; Hammer, Harper & Ryan 2001) of the artefact associations in funerary contexts was undertaken. For the Scandinavian cases (n= 197), only categories were included that occurred in five or more cases (hence excluding iron fragments, flint flakes, bronze needles or saws, combs, spirals and pendants).

For the Scandinavian data (Fig. 26, A), the central association of a toilet set comprising razors, tweezers, pins, beads and ‘awls’ is clear. Directly outside this grooming complex, a weapons complex consisting of swords, spearheads and daggers is found. As for the studs, the finds from grave 17 at Hvidegård (Aner & Kersten 1973: 143 No. 399; Taf. 83) suggest that these may have formed part of the leather fittings connecting scabbard to belt. Amongst the other frequently associated items, groups of ornaments (e.g. brooches, bracelets, buttons), tools (e.g. knives, axes, strike-a-lights) and belt/pouch fittings (e.g. buckles, belthooks, rings and wire fragments) can be identified. For the German graves (n=289), daggers, studs, buttons, bracelets, beads, neckrings, brooches, pendants, spirals, wire fragments, chisels and axes all occurred less than four times and were omitted from the correspondence analyses (Fig. 26, B). The resultant plot indicates a compact central cluster for the grooming set, and a weapons complex containing swords, arrowheads and spearheads. Associated with the Scandinavian data set, horse-gear and whetstones appear as regionally specific additions.

For the already modest (n=32) dataset for the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxemburg, only razors (n=20) and tweezers (n=14) meet the criterion of more than five instances listed. To allow proper execution of the correspondence analysis and to chart the range of associated items, all cases have been incorporated (Fig. 26, C). In the Low Countries, the basic grooming or toilet set is recognisable, but other associations, with weapons (e.g. two 24 swords, two arrowheads, one spearhead), tools (two axes, one knife, one whetstone, one strike-a-light, one flint flake) and ornaments (two bracelets) are infrequent. It is clear that in the types of associated artefacts other than razors and tweezers, in part a Nordic (i.e. Scandinavian and northwest German) affinity may be presumed. Whetstones and strike-a-lights in particular form part of such Nordic assemblages, but are absent in the French examples (Fig. 26, D).

Amongst the 115 inventoried French graves, certain weapon-associated objects (daggers, arrowheads, belt-hooks, shapes), tools (chisels, axes, whetstones, iron or flint fragments) and ornaments (pendants, neckrings and spirals) occur in frequencies (n<5) too modest to be incorporated into the correspondence analysis (Fig. 26, D). Here again, a central association of a toilet set comprising razor, tweezers, awls and pins can be identified, and the beads and rings may be related to pouches that once contained the aforementioned. Associations with swords (21 cases) and bracelets (26 cases) are fairly common.

It is clear that the concept of a grooming set essentially comprising razor, tweezers, awl and pin (and sometimes rings, pins or beads for the pouches that contained them) is shared across the four regions, but that ample regional variation existed nonetheless. Items such as studs seem to indicate a Nordic affiliation, whetstones a northwest German-northeastern Dutch affiliation and bracelets a central European Urnfield Culture affiliation. Such differences are evident from variations in the prevalence of certain artefact types. For example, the frequency of swords varies from c. 40% in the Scandinavian data (74 swords in 187 funerary contexts), to c. 3% (8 swords in 289 German funerary contexts), and c. 6% (2 swords out of 32 funerary contexts from Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxemburg) and is c. 18% for the French data (21 swords from 115 funerary contexts). The fact that regions in which swords figure more prominently (Scandinavia, France) are separated by regions in which they are scarce (Germany, Netherlands, Belgium and Luxemburg), should warrant against univ alid interpretations of the presence of such items. In the Low Countries, the core assemblage appears to be restricted to the tweezers and razors, but their concurrence is not unique to this region. Associations of razors with tweezers are in fact common in four regions: (1) a zone comprising Belgium, Westfalen and the northern Netherlands, (2) an Atlantic interaction zone comprising southern England, Wales and western France, (3) the southern French urnfields (Jockenhövel 1980: 31; 2003: 138; Sandars 1957: 173 note 2) and southern Scandinavia (Baudou 1960: 40; Tackenberg 1971: 134-149; Sørensen 1989: 459; Steuer 2003: 178). It is thus not the composition of the toilet set per se that sets the Low Countries apart, but rather the absence of object associations (weapons complex, tools, ornaments) that are found in the surrounding regions but are lacking here.

---

24 This pertains to cases of association, not actual object counts.
4. Interpreting the Dutch later prehistoric toilet set

In terms of both composition and dating, it would be a fallacy to envision ‘one’ toilet set in Dutch later prehistory. Essentially, three chronologically distinct contexts of association can be identified. Whilst grouped in discussions earlier in our text, they represent distinct traditions of deposition and may have signalled different modes of usage and values attributed. Below, they are discussed in chronological order. The oldest of these three concerns the razors that are associated with sword blades in the period of 1600-1350 BC. In the Dutch corpus, these are represented by the tanged razor from the Drouwen Sögel-Wohlde grave (DB1230) and the pegged Sicilian razor from the Ommerschans hoard (DB1759).

4.1 The early sword phase

The Drouwen Sögel-Wohlde grave illustrates that in the 16th century, the northern Netherlands were firmly integrated into the Nordic (or north-German? Thrane 2001: 555) network in which such graves were current.25 Vandkilde (2014: 614; 621) argues that such graves reflect male warrior identities that reflect the upper hierarchy of pan-European networks of cultural exchange, driven in part by the novelty of the sword.26 In the Dutch dataset, tweezers cannot yet be reliably related to such Sögel-Wohlde graves, but they do occur on and off in the southern Scandinavian and north German regions as part of such grave furnishings (Vandkilde 1996: 156-159; Bergerbrandt 2007: 37; 39; 43; 87). Remarkably, whilst possible depositions of weapon sets indicative of warrior identities are known from the southern Low Countries in the 16th century (viz. at Overloon; Fontijn 2003: 103), they do not contain razors or tweezers (just pins, swords, spearheads and axes). This could suggest two things: either that in those regions weaponry rather than bodily appearance defined the warrior, or that the rule-sets that applied to the deposition of weaponry (Fontijn 2003: 229-232) did not require deposition of the grooming tools as well – notwithstanding the fact that bodily appearance will have been part and parcel of warrior identities at that time (‘...the conceptualisation of sword-bearing warriors implied bodily adornment as well’; Fontijn 2003: 232).

The special status of swords as emblems of interpersonal conflict may also have been what inspired the creation of aggrandized, non-functional and masterly crafted ‘icons’ of swords of the Ploughrescent-Ommerschans type around 1500-1300 BC (Fontijn 2001; Amkreutz & Fontijn 2001). Their stylistic uniformity is coupled with a wide west-European distribution, ranging from Brittany (Ploughrescent), central France (Beaune), southeast England (Rudham, Oxborough) to the Low Countries (Jutphaas, Ommerschans). For the Beaune, Oxborough and Jutphaas dirks, their similar alloy composition suggests production in the same workshop (Postma et al. 2017: 49-50), yet they were found 690 km apart. Evidently, the presence of a Sicilian (DB1759) razor in the Ommerschans hoard must be understood as reflecting similarly extensive networks of contacts, in which items from faraway parts of Europe were exchanged, and selected for deposition.

4.2 Razors and tweezers: an Urnfield toilet set

The second chronologically distinct phase of the use of tools for bodily adornment in the Netherlands is marked by the incorporation of tweezers, tattooing awls and razors into urnfield-period graves (c. 1300-800 BC). In these contexts, the lack of associated weaponry is clear: no razors or tweezers datable to this phase were found associated with a sword, spearhead or arrowheads. Rather, razors are most frequently associated with tweezers, whetstones and ‘regular’ urnfield items such as accessory cups, pins, and occasionally knife fragments.

This absence of weaponry complicates the extrapolation of ‘the association of grooming tools as part of the warrior identity’ from preceding phases into the Middle and Late Bronze Age. But this should not be used to dismiss warrior identities in those periods. Fontijn (2003: 230; 2005: 148-150) has cogently argued that in the southern Netherlands a Bronze Age taboo on the placement of weaponry in graves may have prevailed (cf. Roymans & Kortlang 1999: 56; Gerritsen 2003: 129 note 84). North of the river Meuse, Middle Bronze Age graves with weaponry are known in small numbers (Bourgeois 2013: 165 tab. 73; Bourgeois & Fontijn 2012: 540-541), but in the three graves with swords datable to c. 1300-1000 BC,27 razors and tweezers are again lacking. If a toilet set comprising a razor, tweezers and the occasional tattooing needle was required to constitute the image of a warrior during this period, it was subject to a different biography of deposition compared to the weapons that may equally have defined the martial persona.

The fact that different trajectories of deposition applied to grooming tools (which in this period are unknown from contexts other than cemeteries) and weapons means that we cannot be sure about any links between (the rights and responsibilities involved in) bearing arms and particular bodily appearance. But
that does not mean we can infer nothing about the social standing of those interred in urnfields with razors and tweezers. There is sufficient evidence to suggest that those receiving such items in their graves held a special position in society. First, there is the low prevalence in urnfield cemeteries of metalwork in general (usually <5%) and elements of a toilet set in particular (Table 1)\(^27\).

For urnfields with more than 50 graves uncovered, the proportion of graves with razors or tweezers is invariably smaller than 2.5%. With smaller areas of urnfields uncovered this percentage seemingly rises, but only Hilbertshaar appears to be a real outlier with three tweezers from such a small urnfield. This low frequency means that clearly not all (adult) males received razors (or tweezers) in their graves, and has led to the conjecture that such items were reserved for people of particular social prominence such as household or tribal heads (cf. Kooi 1979: 17; Jockenhövel 1980: 31).

Second, we have argued that interments with razors or tweezers are frequently recovered from (primary) funerary monuments that stood out in terms of morphology (long-bed barrows \(n=4\), keyhole-shaped barrows \(n=1\), or from secondary interments in older conspicuous tombs (e.g. the Harneremolene Late Neolithic barrow or Middle Neolithic passage tomb D42). The observed relation between prominence of the funerary monument, a generally early phasing in the urnfield development and the exclusiveness of receiving grooming tools into the grave, indicates that those receiving them held a distinct and possibly higher social standing – regardless of the relation to martial roles fulfilled by such individuals.

### 4.3 Toilet sets: a Hallstatt elite accessory?

The third cluster of later prehistoric razors and tweezers, concerns the Early (to Middle?) Iron Age (Hallstatt C-D/La Tene A) occurrence of toilet sets. In this period, the toilet set often is physically linked when several implements (awl, ear-scoop, nail-cleaner and tweezers) were strung together on a metal ring or combined in an organic pouch (Fig. 25; Van der Vaart-Verschoof 2017: 36; 124; 126). At Slabroek, Frankfurt, Otzing and Hochdorf, such sets were placed on the chest of the deceased (Van der Vaart-Verschoof & Schumann 2017: 20-21). Razors were not necessarily part of such toilet sets in a physical sense (i.e. not part of the tools strung together on a ring or cord) but were part of the toilet set in the broader sense (Fig. 25, lower left, cf. Van der Vaart-Verschoof 2017: 152 fig. C19.3; 154 fig. C20.1; 126). The cases of their incorporation into the ‘princely graves’ of Rhenen-Koerheuvel, Oss ofstengraf and Uden-Slabroek show that (now also iron) razors, tweezers and nail-cleaners were fitting grave goods for the upper social echelon. In such graves, the elite affiliations are evident, but it remains debatable whether the incorporation of single iron razor blades in Early Iron Age urns (e.g. DB2740; DB2742) signalled a comparably elevated social standing. Noteworthy is that the composition of

---


### Table 1. Prevalence of razors and tweezers from plausible urnfield contexts in the Netherlands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DB</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Place-Toponym</th>
<th>% razor/tweezer</th>
<th>Gravens</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2762</td>
<td>razor</td>
<td>Echt - Kelvingweg</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2753</td>
<td>razor</td>
<td>Weert - Boshoverheide</td>
<td>&lt;0.3</td>
<td>&gt;312</td>
<td>Hissel 2013, 101 tab. 7.3; 128 tab. 7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2748/2749</td>
<td>razor/pair of tweezers</td>
<td>Dwingleoo - Leheweg</td>
<td>&lt;1.8</td>
<td>&gt;55</td>
<td>Van Kerkhoven et al. 2017; Kool 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1292/1309/1293</td>
<td>razors/pair of tweezers</td>
<td>Drouw en - 1939/1941</td>
<td>&lt;2.1</td>
<td>&gt;141</td>
<td>Van Giffen 1943, 98; afb. 5 no. 57; Kool 1979 90-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1384</td>
<td>razor</td>
<td>Wederveer</td>
<td>&lt;0.7</td>
<td>&gt;143</td>
<td>Van Giffen &amp; Waterbolk 1949, 114 no. 141; abb. 15 no. 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2750</td>
<td>razor</td>
<td>Amberveld - Hagerhof</td>
<td>&lt;1.1</td>
<td>&gt;89</td>
<td>Dyselink &amp; Warmenbol 2012, 59; Dyselink 2013, 54; 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1262/1263</td>
<td>razor/pair of tweezers</td>
<td>Gasteren - Tum. 42</td>
<td>&lt;0.9</td>
<td>&gt;107</td>
<td>Van Giffen 1945, 80; 83; 105; abb. 15A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1269</td>
<td>pair of tweezers</td>
<td>Gasteren - Tum. 45</td>
<td>&lt;0.9</td>
<td>&gt;107</td>
<td>Van Giffen 1945, 80; 83; 105; abb. 15A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1197</td>
<td>razor</td>
<td>Zeijen - Noodse veld</td>
<td>&lt;0.6</td>
<td>&gt;177</td>
<td>Van Giffen 1949, afb. 22a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>724/2066/2080</td>
<td>pair of tweezers</td>
<td>Hilbertshaar</td>
<td>&lt;7.5%</td>
<td>&gt;40</td>
<td>Verlinde 1980, 125(119)-127(121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2062</td>
<td>pair of tweezers</td>
<td>Oldenzaal - De Tij</td>
<td>&lt;2.6</td>
<td>&gt;38</td>
<td>Verlinde 1980, 80(74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>569</td>
<td>pair of tweezers</td>
<td>Ermelo - Groevenbeekse heide</td>
<td>&lt;0.8</td>
<td>&gt;370</td>
<td>Verlinde &amp; Hulst 2010, 138-139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the Oss-Vorstengraf assemblage, with its Mindelheim sword (Van der Vaart-Verschoof 2017: 183-185), made the link between weaponry (albeit rendered defunct, cf. Van der Vaart-Verschoof 2017: 51) and toilet sets visible again. This grave may reflect southern affinities, as razors occur in 25% of HaC sword graves from Gaul, and constitute the fourth most common association after pottery, scabbards/charps and textiles; Milcent 2017: 94-95; fig. 6).28

5. Toilet sets and warrior identities: who once were warriors?

As stated above, no unequivocal identification of toilet sets and warrior identities is possible for the Dutch later prehistoric data. An interpretative leap of faith is required for much of the urnfield data, as during this period the scarcity of weaponry may reflect a veritable taboo on its incorporation. Yet this period of c. 1300-800 BC is flanked chronologically by two periods in which weaponry was unproblematically combined with razors. Preceding it we observe a phase of incorporation of razors (e.g. DB1230) and tweezers (e.g. DB1399) in barrows and hoards (DB181; DB1759). The tanged razor from the Drouwen grave (DB1230) may represent the most clear-cut case of a toilet set item interpretable as (part of the toolkit required for the display of) a warrior identity, given its affinity to Sögel-Wohlde graves elsewhere – in which such identities appear quite explicitly stressed.29 The Goirle barrow shows that at the same time, in the southern Netherlands, tweezers of non-local origin (DB399) may reflect the importance of bodily modification (‘looking sharp’) even if not accompanied by swords.

Regionally specific traditions regarding toilet-set elements are to be expected (cf. Brück & Fontijn 2013: 206), as we have shown that the Bronze Age taboo on weaponry in graves mattered less in the western and northern Netherlands around 1300-1000 BC (Bourgeois & Fontijn 2012: 540-541). Also, it should be noted that razors and tweezers were not part of the inventory of those inhumation graves furnished with swords or arrowheads. We remain in the dark as to whether this signals a relaxation of the connections between bodily appearance and warrior status compared to the preceding period, or whether this simply reflects regionally different traditions in deposition or funerary rites. For the cremation graves datable to the period 1300-800 BC, it appears that once again regional trends come to the fore: in the southern Netherlands, symmetrical bifid razors are found in urnfields – but not together with tweezers (and never with weapons). In the Veluwe and Overijssel regions in the central and eastern Netherlands, tweezers are often found, but not with razors (and again never with weapons). In the northern and northeastern Netherlands, the types of razor found (asymmetrical ship-shaped razors and derivative forms thereof) once again appear to reflect an integration into Nordic interaction networks. In this northern/northeastern region, razors and tweezers could be unproblematically combined – but again without weapons. In such graves, the importance of bodily appearance – and in particular the manipulation of facial hair – is stressed. But to associate such graves with warriorhood will once more require a leap of faith: indeed the northeastern Dutch graves show sufficient similarities to graves in northern Germany and Denmark in which the types of razor found here were associated with weaponry (cf. Fig. 24). Yet for these regions as well, a shift has been documented from graves with more focus on weaponry towards one (in Per. III, i.e. 1325-1125 BC) in which appearance-enhancing artefacts such as tweezers and razors dominate (Bergerbrandt 2007: 80).

Also, we have argued that the types of monument in which graves furnished with razors or tweezers were incorporated, hinted at a privileged social status of the deceased. Yet for most of the Bronze Age in the Low Countries, no fixed, elite social class of warriors (sensu Kristiansen 1984; Kristiansen & Larson 2005) can be substantiated (cf. Arnoldussen 2008: 433-437). Whereas we can identify an elite lifestyle in which grooming of (facial) hair played an important part (and that may have involved weaponry – which however was not eligible for deposition in graves, cf. Fontijn 2003: 236), we still remain quite a distance from warrior elites defined as “professional agents specifically trained in the techniques of warfare” and which are “…centered on both the living and the dead masculine body: common life-/death-style and norms, beliefs, appearance as well as inbred social superiority and habits of cultural consumption” (Vandkilde 2017: 58). Rather, in the Low Countries a warrior ethos (even if fluid and transient; cf. Fontijn 2003: 227-232; Rebay-Salisbury 2017: 42) was expressed more explicitly in life than in the funerary assemblage.
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td><strong>Ha C</strong></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>800-625 BC</td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ha B3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>925-800 BC</td>
<td>2800-2650 BP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td><strong>Ha B1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1025-925 BC</td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ha A2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td>1125-1025 BC</td>
<td>3000-2875 BP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ha A1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200-1125 BC</td>
<td>3000-2850 BP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MB D</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1325-1200 BC</td>
<td>3100-3000 BP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MB C2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>1400-1325 BC</td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<tr>
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<td></td>
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<tr>
<td><strong>EB A2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1775-1575 BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EB A1b</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-1775 BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EBA la/late</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025-1900 BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EBA la/early</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2150-2025 BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 27. Absolute chronology after Lanting & Van der Plicht 2001/2002. Drawing H. Steegstra, GIA (from Butler & Steegstra 2007/2008, p. 376, Fig. 1).