

# 1 The environmental and societal context of the ~~cemetery of~~ Posterholt-Achterste Voorst ~~cemetery~~

Posterholt is one of those small attractive villages in the Dutch province of Limburg situated along the Dutch-German border (fig. 1.1). At present it is part of the ~~municipality of~~ Roerdalen ~~municipality, which came into being created after with~~ the merging of the ~~villages of~~ Herkenbosch, Melick, Montfort, Sint Odiliënberg, Vlodrop and Posterholt ~~villages~~. The name of 'Posterholt' contains the element 'holt' (wood), ~~which refers a reference~~ to the importance of ~~the~~ forest, that once must have dominated the landscape in which the first medieval colonists settled.<sup>1</sup> The element 'poster' may refer to 'postel', a kind of berry, but this is not certain.

## Posterholt in ~~at~~ the regional context

Posterholt is part of an ancient territory situated ~~to the~~ east and west of the Meuse River and along the banks of its tributary, the Roer (fig. 1.2 and 1.3). This region must have been the original core of an early medieval pagus, ~~that is alternately~~ named Masao, Mosariorum, Masuarinse, Mashau, Mosavo, Masagao, Masagouwi, Maso, Maselant, ~~and~~ Maisou in texts dating ~~from~~ before AD 1000.<sup>2</sup> The names refer both to groups of people (Masuarinse) as ~~to well as~~ geographical units (Masagouwi). The oldest texts refer to places in ~~the Posterholt's~~ environs ~~of Posterholt~~; the younger texts also include places further ~~south-north~~ and ~~north-south~~, such as Maastricht and Blerick. ~~It is possible that in the course of Over~~ time, the ~~name of the pagus~~ Masau ~~pagus may~~ ~~have~~ expanded over a larger area along the Meuse River.

Important early medieval sites are found ~~not far from~~ ~~close to~~ Posterholt. One ~~of them~~ is the ~~Susteren~~ oratory and ~~mansionile of Susteren~~, donated by Pippin and his wife Plectrud to Willibrord, ~~the~~ bishop of the Frisians and abbot of the ~~Echternach~~ monastery ~~at Echternach~~ (in present day Luxemburg) in 714 (fig. 1.4).<sup>3</sup> The ~~Aldeneik~~ monastery ~~of Aldeneik~~ is also ~~located~~ ~~eloseby~~ ~~nearby~~, on the opposite bank of the Meuse River, ~~which, a~~ according to Dierkens, ~~is the~~ ~~Aldeneik monastery was~~ created in the second quarter of the eighth century.<sup>4</sup> ~~The A~~ third ~~close~~ important early medieval site is the ~~Sint Odiliënberg~~ monastery ~~situated in Sint Odiliënberg~~. ~~Its~~ ~~We are unsure as to its~~ origins and date of creation ~~have not been established~~; ~~but it could have~~ ~~come into being~~ ~~may have existed~~ ~~already since in~~ the eighth century. ~~The~~ ~~It is~~ first referenced ~~to~~ ~~it is found~~ in a charter of ~~k~~ King Lotharius II ~~and dates only~~ dating from 858,<sup>5</sup> ~~and it was~~ ~~is~~ indicated ~~as to be~~ a *monasterium* located in a place called 'Berg' (mountain) and dedicated to Saint Peter. ~~Two other important nearby sites, M~~ much younger ~~than the Sint Odiliënberg~~ ~~monastery~~, are the monastery of Thorn, created in the late tenth century,<sup>7</sup> and the tenth century *portus* of Wessem, ~~which~~ possibly ~~was~~ a predecessor of the later town of ~~Roermond~~.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Gysseling 1960, 806.

<sup>2</sup> See Theuws in press. [Limburg boek]

<sup>3</sup> Wampach 1930, nr 24.

<sup>4</sup> Dierkens 1979.

<sup>5</sup> Theuws 2007; Linssen 2008.

<sup>6</sup> Linssen 2008, 8.

<sup>7</sup> There is a debate on the exact dating of the ~~abbey's~~ foundation ~~of the abbey~~. Monna dates it between 972 and 995 (Monna 1988, 177-191).

<sup>8</sup> Linsen 1962-1963.

Comment [YS1]: The next title is "Posterholt cemetery in THE local context"- I think "the" is better anyhow.

Comment [YS2]: Yoel does the same thing: instead of "dramatic"- "dramatical". "satiric"- "satirical." ©

Comment [YS3]: This oratory and mansionile is one place/building or two?

Comment [YS4]: Is this man Pippin famous enough to be mentioned with no introduction (like Napoleon)? Otherwise, I'd preface it with something like "the nobleman".

Comment [YS5]: He was bishop and abbot for only 1 year? And was he bishop to all the Frisians or only to local group?

Comment [YS6]: Otherwise it is unclear whether the monastery or opposite bank was created in the second quarter of... etc

Comment [YS7]: Do you think it's necessary to provide brief background information on King Lotharius (whom I've also seen as 'Lothair'), or will your readers be familiar with him?

Comment [YS8]: I assume these two sites are the fourth and fifth important nearby sites. I would recommend placing these sites in some kind of order, or making the order more clear. Is your order location or time? Your mention of the age of the last two sites in relation to Sint Odiliënberg make the reader look for some kind of chronological order, and is confusing since chronological relationship is not first mentioned to be important.

Archaeological finds support the supposition that this area was important in the Early Middle Ages. Exceptional finds from the Carolingian period have been dredged up from the river Meuse, such as the huge silver hoard near Roermond, dating from about 853/854, and the exquisite Anglo-Saxon sword at Wessem (fig. 1.5).<sup>9</sup> Several important Merovingian cemeteries have been discovered in the pagus, and were completely or partially excavated. The two cemeteries closest to Posterholt are located in the Belgian village of Ophoven, and in the Dutch villages of Vlodrop.<sup>10</sup> Further north, finds confirm the presence of a cemetery at Swalmen;<sup>11</sup> and the presence of a complete biconical pot in the Herten village of Herten indicates the presence of a Merovingian cemetery as well.<sup>12</sup> The cemeteries of Ophoven, Herten and Swalmen, and Herten belong to a group of burial grounds closely related to habitation along the river Meuse river. In contrast, the cemeteries of Posterholt and Vlodrop should rather be associated with a group of cemeteries found in Germany, further to the east along the river Roer river and its tributaries rather than to those along the river Meuse. Immediately to the east of Posterholt finds indicate the presence of a Merovingian cemetery at Karcken, to Posterholt's immediate east, and further to the east, a cemetery has been discovered at Orsbeck.<sup>13</sup>

The Posterholt cemetery is 14.2 kilometres as the crow flies from the river Meuse river. It is, and 1.2 kilometres from the river Roer river. The Vlodrop cemetery is only 760 metres from the river Roer river. They are 4.4 kilometres apart and located in different settlement areas. To the north of Vlodrop/Posterholt is the region between the rivers Meuse and Rhine rivers. The landscape in that area is dominated by a north-south oriented forested ridge that, which runs parallel to the valley of the Meuse valley. This feature can still be seen is still apparent as such on modern maps. East of this elevated area are the lowlands of the Rhine valley in which where the river Niers river flows in a northerly direction, parallel to the Meuse and Rhine rivers (fig. 1.2). In the Up north, this river the Niers flows into the river Meuse. The landscape between the Meuse and Rhine rivers seems to have been sparsely inhabited; Only a few cemetery locations are have been discovered along the river Niers.<sup>14</sup> A comparable situation seems to exist to the The situation seems the same south-west of Posterholt. The area between Posterholt and the cemeteries discovered in Sittard is probably devoid of early medieval habitation (fig. 1.3). The cemeteries of Posterholt and Vlodrop cemeteries thus are thus located in a kind of corridor through high-lying land in through which the rivers Roer and Vlootbeek rivers flow in a north-westerly direction.

The location of sites dating to the Early Middle Ages is not only determined only by the conditions of the physical landscape. The presence of Roman infrastructure remnants of the Roman infrastructure seems to be important as well. Nieveler, studying the Merovingian

Comment [YS9]: I imagine this is your intention.

Comment [YS10]: Villages, plural?

Comment [YS11]: Did you write "Swalmen" without the prefix "village" since it is more known than Herten/Ophoven/Vlodrop/any of the other villages you mention? Are they qualitatively different in any way? It would be best to have a uniform method of labeling locations, either always with the prefix village/town/city, or without.. Exceptions should have good reasons to be exceptions.

Comment [YS12]: You don't normally skip lines unless you have a new title. Is this skipped line intentional?

<sup>9</sup> Zuyderwyk/Besteman 2010; Coupland in press; Willems 1983, 276-279; Willems/Ypey 1985. More early medieval finds have been dredged up from the Meuse River; but a comprehensive inventory of these finds has not yet been made yet.

<sup>10</sup> Ophoven: #####. The Vlodrop cemetery of Vlodrop will be also published in the context of this project too.

<sup>11</sup> Milikovski ####.

<sup>12</sup> Bloemers/Willems 1980/1981, 56-57.

<sup>13</sup> Piepers 1989, ###; Siegmund 1998, 322-323 (Karcken) and 347-348 (Orsbeck).

<sup>14</sup> Siegmund 1998, Beilage 1; Nieveler 2006, 28, Karte 10.

habitation in the Rhineland, observed that the earliest Merovingian habitation in this area clings to the Late Roman infrastructure.<sup>15</sup> ~~whose~~ The main elements ~~of this infrastructure~~ are roads, castella and bridges. Bridges and castella do not seem ~~to be relevant~~ ~~to in explaining the location of the Posterholt's cemetery location~~, but ~~roads are~~. Several roads seem to have been important, ~~including~~ major ~~ones~~ roads and secondary ~~ones~~ roads (fig. 1.3). ~~The m~~Most important significant road was the road following the Meuse's right bank ~~of the Meuse~~ to the north. The town of Melick (*Mederiacum*) seems to have been located along this road.<sup>16</sup> ~~It~~ The road can ~~thus~~ be expected ~~that the road crosses to cross~~ the Roer river ~~nearby this place~~. It is ~~very more than~~ likely that the ~~monastery of Sint Odiliënberg~~ ~~monastery~~ was located ~~next to near~~ this river crossing (fig. 1.6).<sup>17</sup> At Melick, the road probably splits, ~~whereby with~~ one road ~~continuing to the~~ north along the Meuse's right bank, ~~of the Meuse~~ and another ~~continuing~~ to Xanten on the Rhine. A second road will have run ~~northwest along the left bank of the Roer river~~ from the Late Roman *castellum* of Jülich (*Juliacum*), ~~itself~~ located on the road from Maastricht to Cologne, ~~to the northwest, along the left bank of the Roer River~~.<sup>18</sup> This road may have run to the ~~probable~~ river-crossing near the ~~monastery of Sint Odiliënberg~~ ~~monastery~~ and ~~continued even further to the~~ northwest in the direction of the Meuse River. ~~There is a~~ third road ~~is~~ present in the area. Huub Schmitz, ~~the a~~ local amateur archaeologist, observed a band of ~~north-south running~~ gravel in arable fields ~~about~~ 2,500 metres west of the Posterholt cemetery.<sup>19</sup> ~~This band runs in a north south direction. If it is extended to the north and to the south one gets~~ Extending the band in both directions produces a straight line from the ~~bridge at~~ Sint Odiliënberg ~~bridge~~ to Heerlen (*Coriovallum*). ~~If this reconstruction of Roman roads is correct, T~~ the Posterholt cemetery of Posterholt is ~~thus~~ located in an area ~~that is~~ well connected to other regions ~~if this reconstruction of Roman roads is correct~~.

Comment [YS13]: Hm... Why? I do see the reason for "thus"- meaning how the town of Melick being on the road makes the road cross the Roer river.

Comment [YS14]: Local to where? The area you are talking about? Your university? ☺

Comment [YS15]: What is standard in your field? With a comma, without a comma?

#### The Posterholt cemetery in the local context

The Posterholt cemetery is located southwest of the ~~hamlet of~~ Achterste Voorst ~~hamlet~~ in an arable field complex ~~with the name called~~ Voorsterveld (fig. 1.4). The Voorsterveld is the northern part of a high-lying terrace, ~~which slopes~~ down in a ~~northern~~ and north-eastern direction. The ~~hamlet of~~ Achterste Voorst ~~hamlet~~ is located along a small tributary of the Vlootbeek, on the transition of the terrace and the ~~Vlootbeek valley of the Vlootbeek~~. ~~The tributary which~~ runs from southeast to northwest through the area. The relatively wide ~~Vlootbeek valley of the Vlootbeek~~ was probably a former stream valley of the Roer river.<sup>20</sup> The ~~present current~~ Vlootbeek stream of

<sup>15</sup> Nieveler 2006, 30.

<sup>16</sup> On Melick, see: Chevallier 1975, 122-123.

<sup>17</sup> ~~On the oldest topographical maps there is still a~~ An important river crossing ~~is~~ indicated ~~on the oldest topographical maps~~. This crossing, ~~at a place~~ where high lying grounds are close to the stream, is probably very old and may date from prehistoric times. On the ~~monastery of Sint Odiliënberg~~, see: Theuws 2007 and Linssen 2008.

<sup>18</sup> On Jülich, see: Tholen 1975 and Aouni-Pöppelmann 2010. The local archaeologist Huub Schmitz is trying to reconstruct the ~~road's exact trace of this road~~ with the help of Roman cemeteries, which he believes are located along this road. He ~~might may~~ be ~~quite~~ correct in this. See the website mentioned in the following footnote.

<sup>19</sup> [http://www.archeologie-posterholt.nl/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=28&Itemid=41](http://www.archeologie-posterholt.nl/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=28&Itemid=41). 14 April 2012.

<sup>20</sup> Loch 2006, 35-36.

~~the Vlootbeek is not supposed to would not~~ have been able to create such a wide valley. ~~The~~ Present day Posterholt village of Posterholt is located ~~to the~~ north of the Vlootbeek on a plateau between the ~~rivers~~ Vlootbeek and Roer rivers. Large arable field complexes dominate the present landscape ~~there~~. Vlodrop and ~~the Vlodropits~~ cemetery are located on this plateau between the rivers. It is thus not very likely that the Posterholt cemetery is related as ~~well~~. Rather, it must ~~rather~~ have been related to habitation on the Voorsterveld and the plateau to ~~the its~~ southwest of it. Due to its complex geological formation, the region's landscape ~~of the region~~ shows a great variability at short distances ~~due to its complex geological formation~~. River and eolian sand and gravel deposits, as well as tectonics, determine the relief and ~~the~~ quality of the soils.<sup>21</sup> ~~In most of the area~~ Eolian cover sands ~~lie at cover most of~~ the area's surface. ~~In these sands~~ Various soil formation processes took place in these sands, which largely determining ~~to a high degree the~~ agricultural possibilities for early medieval colonists. In figure 1.4, the surface areas of a number of several combined types of soil types are indicated.<sup>22</sup> Together they mark the extent of ~~the~~ soils best suited for ~~the creating on of~~ arable fields. ~~Originally~~ ~~these areas will would originally~~ have been covered by an oak beech or oak birch forest. Most of these areas ~~have been were~~ brought ~~under~~ cultivation ~~in the course of~~ throughout the Middle Ages. ~~The~~ ~~The~~ exception is the large area ~~to the~~ southwest of the Posterholt cemetery, ~~however, which~~ has not been reclaimed; ~~only~~ the terrace's northern flank ~~of the terrace~~, the Voorsterveld, was ~~turned into~~ made arable fields. As ~~said state~~ earlier, ~~it is to be expected that the~~ habitation related to the cemetery ~~has should to be searched sought for~~ in the fields of the Voorsterveld.

Archaeological finds from the Voorsterveld

The Voorsterveld and its immediate surroundings are rich in archaeological finds. ~~The intimate knowledge of the archaeology of the region is gained through the activities of~~ Huub Schmitz who intensively surveyed the ~~territory of the Posterholt village's territory and gathered intimate knowledge of the region's archaeology of Posterholt~~.<sup>23</sup> A number of his finds ~~are of interest relate in relation~~ to the study of the Merovingian cemetery; ~~Some finds from the historical period will be discussed here; but~~ (for prehistoric finds ~~one has to consult~~ his website can be consulted.) ~~On~~ Several fields ~~surfaced~~, finds from the Roman, Merovingian and Carolingian periods ~~have been made~~ (fig. 1.7 [hoogtekaart]). ~~The~~ ~~finds are were~~ all located on the plateau's slope ~~of the plateau, towards the Vlootbeek, and to the east of the Akerstraat~~. On three sites, Schmitz found graves and grave finds dating to the Middle Roman period. They are indicated on the maps in figures 1.7 and 1.13 with the numbers 1 to 3. One of the Roman cemeteries (nr. 3) was situated at ~~the location of~~

<sup>21</sup> [bodemkaart]

<sup>22</sup> They are the Moderpodzolgronden (Y21, Y23, Y23b), the Vorstvaaggronden (Zb21, Zb23), Brikgronden (Bkd25, Bkd26), and the Hoge Enkeerdgronden (bEZ21, bEZ23, zEZ21, zEZ23). One should probably add the Ooivaaggronden (Krd1), which have not been mapped in fig. 1.4. There are, however, not many present in the mapped area. The soils are mapped on the basis of the *Bodemkaart van Nederland*, sheets 58 West (1972); 58 Oost (19##), and 60 (####). These soils are not indicated for the Belgium territory.

<sup>23</sup> See: <http://www.archeologie-posterholt.nl/>. We visited Huub Schmitz (now Montfort) on several occasions and discussed the finds ~~made by him~~ discovered on the Voorsterveld.

Comment [YS16]: I thought you just said that both Posterholt and Vlodrop and its cemetery are on the plateau between the rivers. Why wouldn't the Posterholt cemetery be related there? Is the Posterholt cemetery very far from present day Posterholt?

Comment [YS17]: Does "combined" refer to soil types that are mixed up? If it refers to "numerous" or "various" soil types, I would delete it ("number of/several" already states there are a few soil types.)

Comment [YS18]: Re footnote: I understand that you refer to Ooivaaggronden soil in the plural- "have". But it sounds strange "there are not many present..." Is it really plural? (I know, it is- it still sounds strange to refer to sand as bring in plural, though I see the form of the word indicates plural.) At least in America English, we refer to soil in the singular- not sure about specific sand types.

Comment [YS19]: It still is unclaimed? (you use present tense)

Comment [YS20]: This is presuming that "towards the Vlootbeek" modifies (refers to) term "slope".

the Merovingian cemetery. The cemetery's graves and finds ~~of this cemetery~~ are described in chapter 3 of this book.

Of great interest are a number of finds dating to the Late Roman period.

On location nr 4, a small axe was recovered (fig. 1.8). This axe is of a Late Roman type which Böhme defined ~~this type~~ as *Axt mit Schaftlochklappen*.<sup>24</sup> Subtypes are defined ~~on the basis~~ based on ~~of~~ the form of the axe's upper edge or back ~~of the axe~~. ~~Our~~ This specimen's back is ~~has a~~ slightly curved ~~back~~ and thus belongs to type B. Böhme dates these axes to the Late Roman Period and ~~the~~ early *Völkerwanderungszeit*, ~~which is~~ a vague indication ~~but which that~~ can be 'translated' as: "late fourth and first half of the fifth century". Such axes are usually found in graves ~~that~~ traditionally ~~are~~ considered warriors' graves or 'weapon' graves. As such, they are considered to ~~be an indication of~~ indicate the settlement of Germanic warrior settlements.<sup>25</sup> ~~However, o~~ Other interpretations are also possible ~~too~~. Burials with axes ~~form the majority of the~~ comprise most of ~~the fourth and fifth centuries'~~ 'weapon' graves ~~of the fourth and early fifth century~~. Axes need not ~~necessarily~~ be considered ~~as~~ weapons ~~but as they~~ may refer ~~have been used~~ to clearing land, and thus ~~may refer~~ to laying new land claims ~~on the land~~ by ~~new-incoming~~ settlers.<sup>26</sup> In the case of Posterholt, this might relate to a Late Roman reoccupation ~~in Late Roman times~~ of lands deserted in the third century (*agri deserti*). The Voorsterveld could thus be one of those *agri deserti*.

On location nr 5, a simple *Armbrust* fibula was found (fig. 1. #). Böhme dates this type of brooch to his *Stufe* 1, which he dates to c. 330 to 400 AD.<sup>27</sup> Schulze studied the *Armbrust* brooches in detail, ~~and~~ ~~the~~ Posterholt specimen fits her type Iz Aa 2c best.<sup>28</sup> She dates these brooches to the second half of the fourth and first half of the fifth century. They are found ~~to the~~ west and east of the Rhine River.<sup>29</sup> ~~The Posterholt specimen probably dates, i~~ In accordance with area's ~~the~~ other Late Roman finds in the area, the Posterholt specimen probably dates to the later fourth century and first half of the fifth century.

On location no. 6, two lancet-shaped strap ends with chip-carved decoration were found (fig. 1.9). Such strap ends are part of elaborate Late Roman belt sets. Strap end nr 1 is decorated with a so-called 'Flammenmuster' ~~that is~~ bordered by a ridge imitating a pearl rim. Along the edges of ~~the~~ its point are highly stylized animals. The strap end was fixed to the belt with one rivet. ~~An almost~~ nearly identical specimen was found in the Liebenau cemetery ~~of Liebenau~~ on the Elbe River.<sup>30</sup> The Posterholt specimen belongs to type 1 of the lancet-shaped strap ends, as defined by Böhme.<sup>31</sup> ~~He~~ assigns these to his *Stufe* III, which he dates from c. 400 to 450, or possibly to the end of the fifth century.<sup>32</sup> The second chip-carved strap end (fig. 1.9, nr 2) belongs to the same type. The point of the strap end is broken off. The chip-carving shows a geometric pattern. This

<sup>24</sup> Böhme 1974, 104-105. *Schaftlochklappen* are small protruding parts at the hole's location ~~of the hole~~ for the handle.

<sup>25</sup> Böhme 1974; Böhme 1997.

<sup>26</sup> Theuvs 2009.

<sup>27</sup> Böhme 1974, 8, 155.

<sup>28</sup> Schulze 1977, 33-35.

<sup>29</sup> Schulze 1977, Karte 18.

<sup>30</sup> Böhme 1974, Tafel 28, nr 10.

<sup>31</sup> Böhme 1974, 74.

<sup>32</sup> Böhme 1974, 155-157.

Comment [YS21]: Footnote: what hole? You mean the cavity where the metal piece goes in?

Comment [YS22]: Do you place the word 'weapon' in quotation marks here and in the next mention because you are unsure if they are really weapons?

Comment [YS23]: This makes your profession difficult.

Comment [YS24]: Is it common to list AD before a date once (page 1) and after a date (here)? Or is that done only when "circa" is before the date? Do you think it best to move Page 1's AD to after the date (1000) in light of this usage, or is this standard archaeological-writing practice?

strap end was fixed to the belt with two rivets. Such chip-carved belt fittings are considered ~~to be~~ parts of Roman military belts.<sup>33</sup> However, we should not be very ~~strict-rigid~~ in attributing such belts to military personnel. Swift already suggested that in the Roman West, chip-carved belt sets were worn by both military and non-military personnel. ~~This is~~ because specimens of such belts occur not only along the Rhine frontier but also deep ~~into~~ Gaul.<sup>34</sup> ~~What we have to~~ ~~We must~~ consider ~~is~~ that such belts, ~~both the general type as well as individual specimens~~, may ~~go through different stages, or in other words, that they have~~ possess a life cycle. ~~That goes for the type in general as well as for individual specimens.~~ The type may change function over time, ~~from signalling something~~ strictly military to ~~signalling~~ a wider range of power positions. Moreover, individual belts worn by military personnel may have ~~got-acquired another-alternative~~ meaning after ~~the-their wearers~~ retirement from service ~~of the person involved in the case he kept the belt.~~ The finds of such belts (or belt fittings) across the Rhine does suggest that belts were ~~transported~~ ~~taken there~~ or imported there.<sup>35</sup>

We ~~have to consider how the distribution of those belts came about~~ should also analyse the ~~meaning behind belt distribution.~~ ~~In general it is suggested that the~~ Distribution patterns are ~~generally seen as~~ reflecting the movement of men wearing those belts, more specifically, the movement of Germanic men into the empire to serve in the army, and out again, with ~~military equipment.~~ However, it is possible that a number of belts were gifts and do not relate to men ~~who served~~ in the Roman army. Moreover, we ~~have to consider~~ should contemplate the fact that most of these belts were found in graves. ~~We therefore have to answer the question w~~ Why it was thought important ~~that for~~ such belts ~~to were-be~~ placed in ~~the~~ graves? The traditional answer ~~is~~ related to the supposition that ~~such-the~~ belts were deposited in ~~the~~ graves because they were ~~the-a soldier or warrior's~~ personal possession ~~of a soldier or warrior.~~ But, if this is a rule we have to accept that in all such cases the belts were placed in the grave. This is clearly not the case, for the simple reason ~~that there are in~~ This should lead us to wonder why, in fact, ~~few-fact not a lot of~~ such belts were placed in graves.<sup>36</sup> This suggests that ~~the-choice to plac~~ inge a belt in ~~the-a~~ grave ~~is~~ related to other variables ~~other~~ than ~~just~~ the military or warrior status of the deceased. -If we consider ~~the-fact~~ that such belts may have a life cycle and change meaning over time, and may ~~also~~ have been ~~elements in-the~~ exchanged as -gifts, ~~exchange other-alternate reasons-causes~~ for ~~depositing them in their~~ grave-depositions may be suggested. ~~There may also be different reasons~~ Reasons may vary within ~~inside~~ the empire and outside ~~the-empire~~ of it. ~~Just-a~~ As has been suggested for ~~the~~ graves with axes and lances, ~~the~~ graves with such belts may refer to positions in the local group related to new ~~land claims-on the land.~~ ~~These positions may have been~~ formulated ~~in-a-way-that~~ differently ~~from-than~~ those current in the Roman state of the first to third centuries.<sup>37</sup> In that case, the distribution

Comment [YS25]: What does military equipment have to do with this idea?

Comment [YS26]: Are you trying to say that the local group made claim on the land differently than those in the Roman state of the first to third century? How do you infer this from belt distribution?

<sup>33</sup> Böhme 1974; Swift 2000, 201-202.

<sup>34</sup> Swift 2000, 202.

<sup>35</sup> Böhme 1999, Abb. 10-11.

<sup>36</sup> The catalogue of military belts may be quite substantial (Swift 2000), but if this number is divided over the period of time in which these belts were deposited and the geographical area over which they are distributed, then the number of belts per generation is quite low in most regions of northern Gaul.

<sup>37</sup> Theuvs 2009.

pattern of such belts ~~would~~ signals an entirely different aspect of the Late Roman world than the settlement of Germanic people or Germanic warriors. ~~It is possible that~~ Veterans may have been among those ~~who claiming~~ land in the late fourth and fifth century ~~were veterans~~, but even in ~~that those cases, the deposition of such a belt in the grave~~ deposition then does not ~~could~~ relate ~~not only~~ to his former military position, but ~~to also to~~ his new position on the land ~~he occupied~~. We do not know to what context the Posterholt chip-carved strap ends originally belonged. They ~~might could~~ be grave finds, settlement finds, ~~or~~ stray finds. Whatever ~~is the case,~~ these strap ends ~~do not need not to be an~~ indication of Late Roman military presence ~~in the area~~.

Near ~~at~~ these finds ~~on the Voorsterveld~~, a number of ~~L~~late Roman coins was found ~~on the Voorsterveld as well~~. At ~~H~~location no. 7 ~~held~~ a small AE 4 coin ~~was found~~ which is difficult to attribute.<sup>38</sup> It is either a coin of Theodosius or of emperor Johannes (423-425). At ~~H~~location no. 8 ~~held~~ an AE2 of Gratianus (367-383), struck in Trier, ~~was found~~ along with a ~~small diminutive~~ pile of small ~~L~~late Roman coins.<sup>39</sup>

All these ~~L~~late Roman finds indicate that the Voorsterveld was the scene of Late Roman activities of some kind. Most likely the Voorsterveld was reoccupied ~~again~~ in Late Roman times, probably at the end of the fourth century until at least the middle of the fifth century or possibly somewhat later. Finds ~~that~~ unmistakably dating ~~to~~ the second half of the fifth century, however, have not been found. The finds are scattered over an area of more than 900 metres both ~~to the~~ north and south of the Merovingian cemetery. The ~~cemetery's~~ oldest finds ~~from the cemetery~~ date to the first half of the sixth century. The oldest core of the cemetery has not been excavated. It may reach back into the second half of the fifth century, but ~~we do not know this for a fact~~ this is unverified.

It is ~~thus~~ possible that the cemetery ~~is was~~ laid out ~~when the~~ towards the end of ~~habitation since the~~ Late Roman ~~habitation, period still lingered on, and with~~ some form of ~~habitation~~ continuity of ~~habitation was~~ present. This, however, is conjecture, ~~and we will have to~~ awaiting new finds or excavations ~~to be certain about it for confirmation~~. It is possible that ~~t~~ the Late Roman habitation ~~may have ended~~ stops somewhere in the second half of the fifth century, as is the case ~~on with~~ a number of other ~~L~~late Roman sites in the southern Netherlands. In that case, the area ~~was would~~ have been re-colonised ~~again~~ in the first half of the sixth century by those who created the cemetery.

~~Finds from the Merovingian period are known from~~ ~~T~~three or four sites ~~unearthed finds from the Merovingian period~~.<sup>40</sup> The ~~Posterholt cemetery site is~~ located at ~~site~~ no. 3, ~~is the cemetery published in this book. It where was also the same location of~~ one of the Roman cemeteries ~~was situated as well~~. Another highly interesting find comes from site 5. It is an ~~equal armed~~ brooch of a rare and exquisite type (fig. 1.10).<sup>41</sup> ~~Each~~ The brooch's ends of the brooch has each bear an animal head ~~of which the whose~~ mouths and the eyes are clearly indicated. The eyes are inlaid

<sup>38</sup> Found by Huub Schmitz in 2007, in his collection.

<sup>39</sup> Found by Huub Schmitz in 2008, in his collection.

<sup>40</sup> The number depends on the date of one of the brooches.

<sup>41</sup> The brooch is 5.9 cm long.

Comment [YS27]: "Reoccupied" "again"=redundant. ☺

Comment [YS28]: Would "established" work just as well?

Comment [YS29]: Which specific Roman cemetery are you referring to? I couldn't find mention of it in text. (If it isn't specific, replace "on of the" with "a".)

Comment [YS30]: I would insert a comma to make it "equal-armed" unless it is customary not to.

with either red garnets or red glass. One of the eyes is of opaque red paste, probably glass. The areas around the eyes are thickened, in order to accentuate the heads. Below the eye is a small groove, probably indicating an anatomical element, rests beneath each head's eyes. Behind the heads proper are horizontal grooves. They might may indicate hair, which makes one suspicious of the undermining the interpretation of a comparable example that saw the heads as snake's heads which has been suggested for a comparable example.<sup>42</sup> Moreover, the eyes are placed way very much behind the mouths, which does not match with unlike the a snake's anatomy of a snake. If the horizontal grooves are an indication of hair, other, more ferocious beasts, could have been in the mind of the maker could have envisioned other more ferocious beasts. The top of the brooch also consists of two opposing animal heads, which are placed mouth to mouth. The eyes of these animals' eyes, too, are inlaid with garnets or red glass. There is no indication of hair, though, and the mouths are shaped in another way differently than those of the ending animal heads at the ends, suggesting that different animals are meant. Between the animal heads of the top and the ends A short, plain, D-shaped copper alloy stave is present between the two sets of animals heads.

Two comparable brooches have been were found further south in the Meuse valley region. One specimen was found in the fill of a partly disturbed grave at Wellin (Belgium, province of Luxembourg).<sup>43</sup> It is 7.7 cm long (fig. 1.11). In contrast to the brooch from site 5, its section body however is more flatter and the eyes of the animals' eyes are rather lying lie on top of the brooch. The brooch belongs to a rich grave ensemble that is dated to the second quarter of the sixth century.<sup>44</sup> Next to this brooch the grave contained were three pairs of beads, a chain of silver and crystal bead chain, an iron knife, a chopping knife, a bone comb, and a Roman glass bottle. The grave was disturbed by a later grave, the whose fill of the grave also contained: a pair of gold ear rings with polyhedron ends inlaid with garnets; the head of an exquisite gold needle; a gold Ss-shaped brooch; a fragment of a silver-gilded bow brooch of the 'Cividale' type; a beaded necklace of beads; and gold wire, probably of brocade. Roosens dated the grave to the second half of the sixth century.<sup>45</sup> However Koch, however, raised serious objections against this early date.<sup>46</sup> He dates the grave to the second half of the sixth century, although he suggests that the grave may date to the third quarter of the sixth century.<sup>47</sup> In the end Ultimately,

<sup>42</sup> Evrard 1997, 26.

<sup>43</sup> Evrard 1984, 207 and Tafel 22,4a/b; Roosens 1984.

<sup>44</sup> Evrard 1984, 208; Roosens 1984, 211.

<sup>45</sup> Roosens 1984.

<sup>46</sup> Koch 1998, 337-339.

<sup>47</sup> Problematic in his argumentation is the use of the date of the Lombard invasion in Italy in (568) and the relation he supposes to exist between this invasion and the dating of supposed Lombard material culture, such as the Ss-brooches of the type found in Wellin. There are two almost exact identical specimens of the Wellin S-shaped brooch in Rácalmás (Hungary) and Cividale (Italy). Such brooches cannot, in his ethnic identity inspired research, have been deposited in Italy before the Lombard invasion. He supposes that they could have been made in the decennia before 568 and have been brought to Italy by the Lombards. Thus the S-brooch from Wellin cannot be older than c. 550 AD. Ergo the grave of Wellin must date from the second half of the sixth century. Such reasoning is loaded with pre-suppositions about the production, circulation and deposition of such brooches as an element of ethnic identity and thus the movement of individual people, which do not need to not be relevant. There are is not a single clue as to where these S-brooches are were made produced and how they got to Belgium, Italy and Hungary. We should not use such historical dates events to date the archaeological material, simply because the relation between the objects and their ethnic 'identity' is a modern

Comment [YS31]: Do all these details apply to both pairs of animal heads? I have made revisions to make that more clear.

Comment [YS32]: Is the chain silver with crystal beads, or composed of silver beads and crystal beads?

Comment [YS33]: I'm assuming you are talking about the fill of the later grave.

Comment [YS34]: I tried looking online to see if "ear rings" was common usage; at least here in the US, it is always one word: "earring".

Comment [M35]: Is dit een andere Koch? Een mannelijke?

Comment [YS36]: So they both date the grave to the second half of the sixth century??? Koch's objections don't sound that serious in that case. If he did indeed date it to the same date, you should insert, "Nonetheless, he, too, dates the grave to the second half..."

Comment [YS37]: Referring to the second to last line in the footnote: aren't most of our ideas of the Middle Ages "constructs" rather than "givens"? What distinguishes Koch's understanding of history from others?



we cannot be certain ~~about of~~ the ~~date of the~~ Wellin ~~burial's~~ date. It is safest to say -it may date to the second and third quarter of the sixth century.<sup>48</sup>

Evrard mentions ~~that there is~~ another, similar but ~~less well~~ poorer-executed specimen found at the Place Saint-Lambert in Liège in 1907, ~~which is~~ kept at ~~the~~ Liège's Curtius Museum ~~in Liège~~.<sup>49</sup> We do not know of other specimens of this brooch ~~type of brooch, which is~~ one of the earliest forms of equal -armed brooches, is an element of ~~the~~ Merovingian material culture of the Meuse valley.

~~In the end it can be concluded~~ We can conclude that ~~the~~ brooch from site 5, c. 230 meters north west of the cemetery's excavated ~~part area, of the cemetery a brooch has been found that dates~~ from the time the cemetery was already in use. ~~Is it~~ Whether it is a stray find from a settlement or ~~is it~~ a grave find is unclear.<sup>2</sup> The object is in good condition, which may indicate ~~that~~ it did not linger in ~~the~~ plough soil ~~for a long time~~.

At location no. 10 contained an equal armed copper alloy brooch was found with round end plates. It can be identified as type II A1a or ~~as~~ type II A2a according to ~~the~~ Thörle's classification ~~of Thörle~~.<sup>50</sup> Type II A1a dates to the *Jüngere Merowingerzeit* II (630/40-670/80).<sup>51</sup> Type II A2a dates to the *Jüngere Merowingerzeit* II or III (670/80-720). Thörle dates ~~This~~ this type of brooch is thus dated by Thörle to the seventh century; and it may thus may be contemporary with the Merovingian cemetery.<sup>52</sup> The brooches of type II A1a are found predominantly in the middle Rhine/Moselle area.<sup>53</sup> Other specimens are found in northern France and southern Belgium. Type II A2a is almost exclusively found in the middle Rhine/Moselle region. The Posterholt specimen is one of the northernmost examples of either type.

At location no. 9, another equal armed copper alloy cast brooch with round end plates was found (fig. 1.12, nr 1). It is 4.7 cm long, bearing. ~~The~~ end plates have with profiled edges. ~~Along t~~ The brooch's edge is a dotted decoration with dots is present. The ~~centre of the plates's centres is are~~ decorated with ~~an~~ engraved or cast line ornaments, ~~while~~ the arms are decorated with dots and grooves. ~~On A top of the bow we find is~~ a small disk with a decoration of with grooves, forming an equal armed cross in circle. Thörle does not illustrate a comparable brooch.<sup>54</sup> To some extent, ~~the~~ Posterholt specimen resembles ~~to some extent~~ those of *Gruppe* II E2 (*Dreiplattenfibeln*). ~~These which~~ are not easy to date. Some *Gruppe* II E2 specimens are found in graves from ~~the Merovingian period or rather the~~ Late Merovingian period. The type, might

construct rather than a given from the Early Middle Ages. Dating objects on the basis of historical dates in combination with their supposed ethnic identity is loading construction upon construction, hypothesis upon hypothesis.

<sup>48</sup> Both gold earrings with polyhedron, quite similar to those found in the grave of the woman under the Cologne cathedral, can date from the second quarter of the sixth century. Von Freeden explains that such earrings do not occur in Southern Germany after c. 550 until c. 650, but that in the north they may occur in the second half of the sixth and beginning of the seventh century (Von Freeden 1980, 276). ~~In the end~~ Ultimately, the earrings are do not much of a help in accurately dating the Wellin grave ~~quite accurately~~.

<sup>49</sup> Evrard 1984, 207.

<sup>50</sup> Thörle 2001, 53-54, 58-59.

<sup>51</sup> Ament 1976.

<sup>52</sup> Dating these types of brooches is however problematic because of the lack of well datable contexts after the deposition of grave goods came to a halt in the late seventh century. These types of brooches thus may also date from the eighth century.

<sup>53</sup> Thörle 2001, Karte 8.

<sup>54</sup> Thörle 2001.

Comment [YS38]: I had forgotten which brooch we were talking about by the time we got here. Also, why this referred to as "site" 5 whereas the next are referred to as "locations"?

Comment [YS39]: Which brooch are you talking about? I thought all three/four brooches were from the time the cemetery was in use.

Comment [YS40]: Do you mention your finds in any order beyond chronological? Do location numbers play any role? (as of now they don't seem to)

Comment [YS41]: Tried to find it online, but didn't see any reference. Is this usually two words? Hyphenated?

Comment [YS42]: It seems that archaeology uses the present tense to describe where finds were/are found.

however, might also date to the Carolingian period; ~~but~~ this is difficult to prove because of ~~since~~ the lack of well-dated grave inventories from that period in northwest ~~ern~~ Europe.<sup>55</sup> Still, in view of the almost complete absence of such brooches in Merovingian graves, ~~it seems more likely that this brooch type is more likely to of brooch date s-~~ to the Carolingian period.

At location no. 9, another find from the Carolingian age came to light. It is a square brooch of 2 by 1.8 cm (fig. 1.12, nr 2). The ~~hollows of the brooch's hollows~~ were originally filled with enamel, probably of a red colour. Frick classified these brooches as *Rechteckfibeln* type 1, variant 1. They are mainly found mainly east-north and north-east of the Rhine river.<sup>56</sup> The Posterholt specimen is one of the few found west of the Rhine, although by now, in the metal detector age, more examples are probably found ~~metal detectors probably have unearthed~~ more. Frick cannot date these brooches accurately ~~for since~~ none of them have been ~~were~~ found in a dated context. He suggests a date in the first half of the ninth century.<sup>57</sup> Almost identical specimens were found in the lost settlement of Diderikeshusen in Germany, Kreis Paderborn in Dötlingen (Germany, Niedersachsen) and in Gamle Hviding in Denmark.<sup>58</sup> Brooches with identical decoration but with ~~a~~ broad, lower lying rims, such as the one found in the lost settlement of Aspen in the present village of Erwitte-Bad Westernkotten (Germany, Kreis Soest), are dated to the Ottonian period.<sup>59</sup> It is difficult to imagine that brooches with an almost nearly identical decoration ~~but with and without a broad rim, such as the ones mentioned above, should~~ have quite widely ~~differeingnt~~ dates unless such brooches were produced over a long period of time. This is not likely in view of the limited number of specimens discovered. ~~Maybe the~~ The thin broad rims ~~were may not have been~~ intended to ~~be left attached to the brooch and had to be~~ cut off after the casting process.

On the basis of the finds discussed above, it is possible to suggest a hypothesis as to the development of habitation and settlement ~~of in~~ the Voorsterveld from Roman to modern times.

#### A hypothetical settlement history of the Voorsterveld

Is it a coincidental ~~alee~~ that the Carolingian/Ottonian finds were made ~~to the~~ south-east of the Merovingian cemetery? Could this distribution of finds indicate that ~~the~~ habitation shifted away in a south-eastern direction, that is in the direction of the Sankt Johannes Klause church, just across the German border in the Waldfeucht municipality (fig. 1.13?)? ~~The~~ is church is already mentioned in 1328, but is most probably older.<sup>60</sup> ~~We were not able to go~~ Delving into details of the history of Haaren's history is n beyond the context of this study, ~~for it goes far beyond the intentions of this book. However but, in a somewhat unscholarly way we took did survey some evidence information~~ from the ~~website of the municipality of~~ Waldfeucht municipality's website.

<sup>55</sup> Thörle 2001, 90-93.

<sup>56</sup> Frick 1992/1993, 432, Karte 6.

<sup>57</sup> Frick 1992/1993, 279.

<sup>58</sup> Bergmann 1999, 443, Abb. 5 nr 9; Frick 1992/1993, 280, 378 (catalogue nrs 1 and 2), Taf. 7.1 (Dötlingen).

<sup>59</sup> Bergmann 1999, 443, Abb. 5 nr 15; Stiegemann/Wemhoff 1999, I, 415-416 (Catalogue number VI.164).

<sup>60</sup> Schmitz ~~###, ##~~.

Comment [YS43]: I like your use of alternate phrasing for grave finds.

Comment [YS44]: Is there a reason you put east before north? It seems to me that north and south are generally placed before east and west.

Comment [YS45]: Why do you say probably? You don't know for sure? Isn't this something you could look up?

Comment [YS46]: Unless it's so famous that everyone but me knows what it is (which I doubt because I couldn't find it on Google ©).

Comment [YS47]: Since I felt Waldfeucht came out of nowhere in the next few sentences, I took the liberty of (I hope properly) introducing it here.

Comment [YS48]: You'll have to explain what relevance Haaren's history has. I see no reference to Haaren at all. Wikipedia tells me that Haaren is in Noord Brabant, but you'll have to explain the connection to us novices.

albeit in a somewhat unscholarly fashion.<sup>61</sup> ~~It is related to~~ We examined the *curia seu villa dicta Kirenz*, ~~which is~~ located 100 meters ~~to the~~ east of the Klaus. ~~The~~ ~~is~~ curia, an aristocratic site with moats that have now disappeared, is mentioned in 1276 and 1277 and seems ~~at that time to be to have then belonged to in the possession of~~ the ~~monastery of~~ Sint Odiliënberg ~~monastery~~. In the seventeenth century, it was in private hands and was transferred to the owner of the ~~eastle of~~ Annadael ~~castle~~ just north ~~to of~~ the Voorsterveld. The ~~owner of the curia's owner~~ ~~had retained~~ the right to propose the new rector of the ~~chapel~~. It thus seems fairly certain that the curia and ~~the chapel~~ are related and were originally in the hands of a single owner. The chapel, probably a proprietary chapel, ~~created inside within~~ an existing parish, was a daughter chapel of the parish church in Waldfeucht, five kilometres ~~to the~~ southwest. The village of Haaren was split ~~off~~ from the ~~parish of~~ Waldfeucht ~~parish~~ and became an independent parish in 1804. ~~From that time on~~ ~~Forthwith~~, the Sankt Johannes Klaus chapel ~~became was~~ the ~~new~~ parish's church, ~~of the new parish~~ and the ~~dependent~~ chapel was thus ~~upgraded promoted~~. However, ~~in 1824~~ the chapel was sold ~~in 1824 to~~ Baron Peter Willem de Lidelle de Well after a new church ~~had been was~~ built in nearby Haaren (otherwise named NeuHaaren) itself.<sup>62</sup> The chapel ~~will would~~ have been too small to function as a parish church. ~~Moreover and maybe~~ ~~Perhaps~~ even more important, the chapel ~~was standing stood~~ outside the ~~Haaren~~ village ~~of Haaren~~. The new church stands 750 meters ~~to the~~ southwest. In ~~the~~ local history, the ~~chapel's~~ relation with the ~~monastery of~~ Sint Odiliënberg ~~monastery~~ is used to date ~~the chapel it~~ back ~~into to~~ the eight century. This is probably overstretching the data. The most likely scenario is that the *curia* and chapel came into being in the eleventh or twelfth centuries, as ~~did~~ so many small strongholds, related to local aristocrats. ~~But there is o~~ One aspect, ~~that we have to consider which is~~ of some importance to the ~~area's~~ history, ~~must be considered of the area~~. ~~We have to wonder why~~ The location of the dependent chapel, serving a group of people in the northern part of the ~~parish of~~ Waldfeucht ~~parish~~, ~~was located where it is is~~ ~~curious~~. Why was ~~n't~~ ~~the chapel it not~~ located on the site of the *curia* itself? ~~The answer is probably: because originally t~~ The village ~~that~~ it served was ~~probably~~ located there but ~~was got lost in the course of over~~ time. ~~As a e~~ ~~Consequently, ee~~ the chapel became an isolated spot in the landscape. We can hypothesize ~~that~~ the surroundings of the Sankt Johannes Klaus ~~is to be~~ the site of a settlement from the Carolingian period ~~up till until~~ the High or Late Middle ~~a~~ Ages. We can also hypothesize that ~~the~~ habitation moved there in ~~the~~ Carolingian period from sites located further ~~to the~~ north, ~~located~~ not far from the Merovingian cemetery. This does not mean that the chapel itself is also of early medieval date. There are other examples of dependent chapels from the High Middle Ages ~~that were~~ built ~~next to~~ a settlement dating from the Early Middle Ages.<sup>63</sup> We also saw that the majority of the Late Roman finds was found ~~to the~~ north of the Merovingian cemetery. Could there ~~have been~~ a general movement of habitation from the north to the south in Late

Comment [YS49]: What chapel? Whose chapel? Parish/Sankt Johannes Klaus?

Comment [YS50]: Of which church the Sankt Johannes church? You might want to clarify that, since someone could think you are referring to the Sint Odilienburg monastery.

Comment [YS51]: How had it been dependant before? (Not mentioned text) Still unsure if "dependant chapel being promoted" refers to the Sankt Johannes chapel being promoted to church of the new parish, or if the other (yet unnamed) chapel was promoted because the Sankt Johannes church became the church of the new parish.

Comment [YS52]: "Upgraded" can connote renovated, which I doubt you mean.

Comment [YS53]: I am still uncertain which chapel this is referring to. That of the Sankt Johannes church or something else entirely?

<sup>61</sup> [http://www.waldfeucht.info/index.php?site=berichte\\_details&objekt\\_ID=8](http://www.waldfeucht.info/index.php?site=berichte_details&objekt_ID=8). Literature on the ~~village's~~ history ~~of the village~~ was not readily available to us. ~~On T~~ the website refer~~ences are made~~ to sources and secondary literature.

<sup>62</sup> The ~~name of the baron's name~~ is written according to the cadastral records from c. 1830.

<sup>63</sup> A good example is the settlement at Dommelen (Netherlands, province of Noord-Brabant) (Theuws 1988).

Roman to Modern times, in the direction of the Sankt Johannes Klause and ~~the~~ curia Kirenz? We ~~do not know are~~ yet uncertain. However, if we ever want an answer to this question ~~To unearth the answer,~~ we ~~have to~~must consider the archaeological complex of the Voorsterveld, ~~the and the~~ Klause and ~~the curia-complex across the Dutch-German border as an integrated whole. We thus need a~~ Creative heritage management strategy is needed ~~because as~~ this complex is outstanding in its preservation and might well be a type case of the region's habitation development of habitation in the region from Roman times to the present.

Comment [YS54]: Unnecessary (se understood) and just drags the sentence out.

~~In order to~~ To substantiate the idea that ~~both the~~ archaeological complexes ~~aeross on both sides of~~ the border form an integrated whole, it is worthwhile to ~~have a short look~~briefly detail at the Voorsterveld's land use and ~~the parcelling~~ structure ~~of the parcelling of the Voorsterveld at the time of the production of when~~ the first cadastral maps were produced, ~~in at e-around~~ 1830 (figures 1.13 and 14). ~~The cadastral maps show a~~ field track runnings from south to north through the Voorsterveld. ~~It~~ ~~The field track~~ connects the Klause with the arable fields to ~~its~~the north ~~of it~~. To the west is the Akerstraat. The fields ~~to the~~ west of the Akerstraat belong to the Echt municipality ~~of Echt~~. The ~~southern part of the~~ Voorsterveld's south is bordered by a broad strip of coppice in the west, along the Akerstraat, ~~by a broad strip of coppice~~. ~~It is possible that~~ ~~†~~ This strip ~~was may have been~~ a large bank on which the coppice stood. ~~In the very south this~~ ~~The~~ coppice ~~has probably disappeared~~ is not present in the Voosterveld's very south, probably when due to two new parcels were being created, ~~probably out presumably from of~~ the large field to the coppice's/Voosterveld's east ~~of it~~. ~~On †~~ The cadastral map (fig. 1.13) shows this strip of coppice endings in the north where the fields of the hamlet Voorste Voorst are present. ~~On †~~ The topographical map of c. 1840 (fig. 1.14), however, marks it continuings further ~~to the~~ north. The coppice is also present along ~~a~~ part of the Voosterveld's southern border ~~of the Voorsterveld~~.

Comment [YS55]: Since I'm not sure whether all the features you describe still exist, I'll insert that to allow you to comfortably use present tense.

Comment [YS56]: Of what? The field track?

The ~~parcelling of the~~ Voorsterveld's parcelling is remarkable. Several zones can be identified. ~~There is a~~ northern zone with long narrow strips of arable fields connected ~~with to the northern~~ Voosterveld's habitation ~~in the northern part of the Voorsterveld. To the s~~ South of ~~it the northern~~ is a zone with are large undivided blocks of arable land. Further ~~to the~~ south is a large rectangular block of arable fields, ~~which is~~ clearly connected to the Voorst habitation ~~in Voorst~~. Two field tracks, ~~which are~~ both indicated as Heiweg on the oldest cadastral map, connect these fields to the houses in Voorst. The ~~eastern part of this~~ rectangular block's eastern section is characterised by short rectangular parcels, with the block's western part-section characterised by long narrow parcels. The fourth, southernmost zone is again a zone with large blocks of arable land. At the time the first cadastral records were made, the large blocks of arable land were all in one hand: that of all belonged to ~~B~~baron Peter Willem de Lidelle de Well, who also owned the eastle-Annadael castle just north of the Voorsterveld (fig. 1.13). ~~However,~~ In 1824, the baron ~~he~~ also became the owner of acquired the Sankt Johannes Klause ~~in 1824~~, which he turned into a farm.<sup>64</sup> We were unable to go into further detail ~~on~~ the historical-geographical structure of the Voorsterveld, but the following hypothesis seems plausible: ~~;- Possibly the~~ the Voosterveld's

Comment [YS57]: Is it definite that the parcels were created, but probable that they were created out of the large fields to the blank's east?

Comment [YS58]: Saying "Tom's thumb" instead of "the thumb of Tom" is more concise and generally facilitates comprehension. "Northern Voosterveld's habitation" instead of "the habitation in the northern part of the Voosterveld" = 3:9.

Comment [YS59]: Are these divided in contrast with the undivided arable land?

Comment [YS60]: In this case it is not part of the title, it is an adjective and need not be capitalized.

Comment [YS61]: Because of the lack of information, or because you only conducted an unscholarly search due to the topic being outside the confines of the book? If the latter, would replace with: "We elected not to further investigate the historical...."

<sup>64</sup> Schmitz ###.##.

southern two-thirds ~~of the Voorsterveld probably~~ originally formed a single block surrounded by a large bank with coppice ~~of which whose the western part and part of the southern parts~~ were still extant ~~in e. around~~ 1830. This block originally belonged ~~either~~ to the church of the Sankt Johannes Klause ~~church~~ or ~~to~~ the curia Kirenz. At some point in time, ~~perhaps the~~ (Late Middle Ages?), the Voorst hamlet ~~of Voorst~~ was created, and ~~the (dependend?)~~ farmers, possibly ~~dependant~~, were allowed to ~~take in possess~~ a block of arable fields and divide it ~~into smaller~~ ~~pareels~~. It is odd that in c. 1830, the Voorst hamlet ~~of Voorst~~ ~~had~~s no direct connections to Posterholt, while it ~~is did have direct~~ ~~connectioned~~ to the Sankt Johannes Klause. ~~Maybe~~ Those ~~who~~ ~~controllinged~~ the Sankt Johannes Klause ~~may have~~ created the hamlet.<sup>65</sup> The remainder of the arable fields, (the large blocks,) remained ~~in the hands of~~ the Klause's ~~property~~ until they were transferred to ~~the~~ Baron de Lidelle de Well. The map indicating the ~~baron's~~ property ~~of this~~ ~~baron~~ in Voorst (fig. 1.15) ~~strongly~~ suggests ~~strongly~~ that the ~~Voort's~~ arable fields ~~of Voorst~~ were cut ~~out~~ from a larger whole ~~of which the remnants were now in his possession~~.<sup>66</sup> Now the ~~Kluisweg~~ track ~~of the Kluisweg seems to~~ ~~makes~~ sense: it connects the Klause and the curia Kirenz with ~~its~~ arable fields to the north.<sup>67</sup> ~~As we will see, T~~ this track forms, ~~as we will see~~, the eastern limit of the Merovingian cemetery and may thus be a very old element ~~in of~~ the landscape. Some traces of the track were found in the easternmost part of the excavation, but these traces could not be dated. The Heiweg, now ~~Kruisweg~~, cuts right through the cemetery and must thus be much younger.

At the cross-roads of the Kluisweg and the Heiweg, ~~that is right next immediately near to~~ the Merovingian cemetery, a road cross is present, ~~seemingly~~ 'since times immemorial' (fig. 1.16). It is certainly older than 1830, ~~for since~~ it is indicated on the oldest cadastral maps. Is this ~~a~~ coincidental~~lee~~? We don't know, but as can be imagined, the cross and the old monumental trees around it still stir the imagination of those ~~who are~~ interested in the historicity of its surroundings. Moreover, it is a fine place to sit and ~~think~~.

## Conclusions

~~At the end of this chapter we can~~ Our analysis allows us to draw some conclusions as to the choice of location ~~of for~~ the cemetery.

Firstly, ~~of all~~ we can ~~again~~ observe that the cemetery ~~was is~~ located on a 'historical' spot in the landscape, a location with a past. This ~~might may~~ be due to ~~a~~ continuous use of the site as a burial ground since Roman, and possibly even late prehistoric times, but this seems unlikely. ~~As yet, There are no indications yet for nothing indicates~~ continuity of habitation and burial in the periods c. 200 – 350 and 450 - 525. As in other cases in the southern Netherlands and northern Belgium, ~~the~~ early colonists from the Merovingian period buried their dead on sites with a past.<sup>68</sup>

<sup>65</sup> Could it be that these were the inhabitants of a settlement near the Klause ~~that who~~ were moved to this place?

<sup>66</sup> This map also suggests that the two fields to the east of site 2 are new and that the bank with coppice disappeared there when they were created.

<sup>67</sup> Another idea could be that this track is younger and that it connects the Klause and curia with the castle Annadael which came in the same hands. The curia Kirenz was already attached to Annadael in the seventeenth century. However, the northernmost part of the track does not connect to Annadael on the cadastral map of c. 1830. It runs in the direction of Posterholt; this part of the track is named Kerkweg on the cadastral map.

<sup>68</sup> De Haas ####; Theuws/Van Haperen 2012, #####. See also Williams ####. -See chapter ## for further details.

Comment [YS62]: Would "large coppiced bank" be as accurate? It's shorter.

Comment [YS63]: Parallel structure

Comment [YS64]: That contradicts the previous statement - what were his lands, that which was cut from larger whole, or the remnants of what was cut?

Comment [YS65]: Er- what is this Klaisweg trace exactly? Does it have something to do with the KLAUSE church?

Comment [YS66]: The trace's? (arable fields)

Comment [YS67]: Do you mean Kluisweg?

Comment [YS68]: Is this what you meant? Not "crossroad" or "roadcross"? What is a road cross? cross on the road?

Comment [YS69]: It seems from the next few sentences that you are not being literal when you say "from time immemorial." It might be confusing to the reader, who is used to you trying to make accurate guesses as to age, and not sentimental statements. When I first read it I assumed the first.

Comment [YS70]: Lol, I love it. Someone snuck a poetic comment into an archaeology book.

One ~~of the~~ explanations for this practice is that the new colonists related their dead to ancient dwellers in order to ritually substantiate their new claims on the land.

Secondly, we can observe that the cemetery is located ~~way well~~ inside an inhabited and cultivated area-section that is inhabited and cultivated, which is that of the Voorsterveld. This contrasts with the location choices of location of the for cemeteries in the Kempen region, ~~that~~ which are located ~~at on~~ the limits of the habitation-cultivation area. This has been well illustrated in the case of the Bergeijk cemetery of Bergeijk.<sup>69</sup>

Thirdly and finally, the cemetery is ~~not~~-related neither to the Posterholt village ~~of Posterholt~~ itself, neither nor to ~~that of the Voorst~~ hamlet, ~~of Voorst~~ but rather to a lost settlement related to the Sankt Johannes Klause and the *curia* Kirenz.

Comment [YS71]: Oh, the Bergeijk cemetery, our dear friend!

Comment [YS72]: Unless you mean "the village of" the Voorst hamlet.

---

<sup>69</sup> Theuws/Van Happeren 2012, ###