INTRODUCTION

The visitor leaving the industrial centre of Eindhoven in a South-Westerly direction will soon find himself in a region commonly referred to by the punning Brabantine as de Acht Zaligheden, literally the Eight Beatitudes (fig. 1). Sturdy, solitary brick towers symbolize the past, but likewise the present. When in the present century the building of a new church was undertaken, the old one would always be worth a few hundred guilders in old materials, and this is the reason why so many of the once picturesque Gothic churches were eventually demolished. The towers, however, had been municipal property since Napoleonic times, which without doubt prevented them from contributing in their own way to this novel method of glorifying the Creator. Nowhere in the Netherlands is there a sharper contrast between old and new, the modern miniature cathedrals and the solitary medieval towers, than in the ‘Eight Beatitudes’!

In this region, too, half a century ago, fertilizers brought about an agricultural revolution, and the era of the vast moorland reclamations began. The consequent increase of prosperity resulted in a correspondingly large increase in population which is still in progress. This, in its turn, calls for new large-scale reclamations which have already transformed a large area of the waste diluvial soils throughout the country into extensive complexes of arable land, while the areas unsuitable for agricultural purposes are being planted by the State Afforestation Service. In the course of a few decades the landscape and the socio-logical environment which had gradually taken shape in the course of millennia have been totally altered. Rarely do we find scenery now, where the hand of man cannot yet be discovered, where the moorland still stretches away as far as the eye can rove. At best a far-off bark will show the direction of the nearest homestead — more generally the honking of a nearby motor-horn breaks the illusion.

The reclamation of the waste ground means bread for many, and this forms the inexorable motive for the destruction of so much that is amongst the most beautiful that we possess. The cyclist following a narrow track along a fen, on a clear September evening, will not find a trace of either, the next spring. The fen has been drained, and in a few years’ time the cows will lie chewing the cud in the new pasture.

With the old landscape countless remains of the ancient past have fallen victim to the plough. Of these, groups of barrows, generally placed on the higher ridges, are the most conspicuous.
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For centuries these small regular mounds have drawn the attention: they play a part in many ghost stories and were the favourite haunts of the white women and other charming denizens of the world of magic and sorcery. Urnfields, settlements and flint workings hardly attract the attention on the earth's surface and many have been wiped out, unnoticed by archaeology. Everywhere the stories can be heard of large series of urns turned up by the plough in reclamations. Sherds, charcoal and cremations are left on the surface to attract attention at some later time, when all that could have been learnt from the soil itself has been destroyed by the plough, and all that is left to be done is to record yet another destroyed urnfield on the distribution map . . . .

* * *

A century ago, when the 'Eight Beatitudes' were still largely covered by moorland, it was the Westerhoven schoolmaster P. N. P a n k e n, who applied himself with much enthusiasm to the study of the antiquities to be found on the surrounding moors. His archaeological investigations derive much importance, nowadays, from the fact that the barrows recorded by him have often disappeared meanwhile, or are now hidden away in dense pine-woods. As he has told us himself, he was greatly interested from his youth in the antiquities of his native soil. Reading an essay on the Campine in September, 1839, and Dr C. R. Hermans' communications in the 'Provinciaal Dagblad van Noord-Brabant' greatly increased this interest, and gave him the idea that the numerous regular hillocks on the Berger Heath, near Bergeik, might well contain 'funeral urns, etc.', so that he 'was overcome by the desire to have the same dug through'. His temporary — later permanent — appointment as schoolmaster at Westerhoven, in September, 1840, gave Panken the opportunity to fulfil this desire, as this village is at only half an hour's distance from Bergeik, where his parents lived. Out of school hours — his 'uneartings' were always done in his 'holidays or Saturday afternoons'! — Panken would tramp the countryside for hours, in order to locate the 'pre-Christian burial places', as he calls them. It is worth while to follow his descriptions, and to accompany him on his walks through the Brabant fields of former times. Our schoolmaster's curiosity, however, went farther than the simple reconnaissance of barrow sites. Often he tried to reveal the secret of such a mound by means of the spade, and now and then his labour was rewarded by a broken or sometimes an intact urn (probably a secondary interment!). In most cases, however, the spoils consisted of fragments of charcoal, ashes, and cremations, and it can be ascertained from his descriptions that he was then almost invariably concerned with a Bronze Age barrow. Only once, for the 'Zwartenberg' at Hoogeloon, this dating can be corroborated by means
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of tangible proof, in the shape of a bronze palstave chisel (Part II, fig. 72). 5
A couple of copper rings, iron nails and hooks associated with a number of pottery vessels, much charcoal and cremated bone in a tumulus at Bergeik, 6 and a small iron pin 7 found with an urn from the cemetery between Veldhoven and Steensel — very probably a ringditch urnfield — comprise all the metal found besides. Pankén’s excavations, covering the years 1840–6, extended over some ten villages in the neighbourhood. They were mainly concerned with barrows; sometimes it is clear that he was dealing with an urnfield. 8

It must be reckoned Pankén’s great merit that he kept careful notes of all his ‘unearthings’, and recorded his discoveries in successive reports. Dr Hermans accepted these latter for his ‘Bijdragen voor Noord-Brabant’, thus making them known generally. 9 The North Brabant Society for Arts and Sciences praised Pankén as its most industrious member and honoured him with a gold medal. A large part of the objects excavated were made over by him to the Society, conscious as he was, apparently, that a private collection is sooner or later doomed to dispersal. The Westerhoven schoolmaster has a right to the deep gratitude of all present-day workers in the field of Brabant’s prehistory. It is only from his descriptions that an idea can still be gained of the extraordinarily wide distribution and unusual density of the burial mounds in this part of the Campine. Pankén’s work constitutes one of the earliest attempts at an investigation and description, of the fullest possible nature, of the prehistoric phenomena of a circumscribed region. Hermans speaks highly of the fullness of Pankén’s descriptions: 10 ‘Many a reader will think this fullness superfluous, but to me it seems of the highest necessity, as this will occasion the elucidation of matters, customs and practices of our pagan forbears that have not yet been noticed elsewhere, or, if they have been recorded before, are here confirmed’.

As has been said, the North Brabant scenery has been drastically altered, nearly everywhere, in the course of the past hundred years. Fields and fir plantations have replaced the vast moors. Although the barrows and urnfields, lying as they did on the higher ridges, less suitable for cultivation, were often the last to be touched, yet much of what Pankén knew has since disappeared. For all this, the richness in prehistoric remains shown by the ‘Eight Beatitudes’ is still extraordinary. It is only here in North Brabant that a rounded and proportioned picture can still be obtained of the development of the successive cultures, starting with the Late Palaeolithic. Pankén recorded the density and distribution of the barrows and already undertook many excavations; in the present century it was Dr J. H. Holwerda, Dr M. A. Evelein, Dr A. E. van Giffen, Dr W. J. A. and J. Willems and Dr W. C. Braat who carried out a series of systematic excavations on modern lines, backed by modern ideas, enabling them to collect many data on the structure and stratigraphy of the barrows and, es-
specially, of the urnfields. Concerning the structure of the mounds not much
can be found in Panken, though he remarked upon the fact when occasionally
a tumulus did not consist of dark tilled soil, but of yellow or red sand. 11 He
also occasionally noticed, but did not interpret as such, the characteristic structure
of the majority of barrows, consisting of piled-up inverted heather sods. Of
postholes, occurring in many, if not in most of these barrows, we never hear a
word. He never acquired a more or less systematic method of excavation; his
expressions ‘dig through’, ‘spade through’ and ‘have turned over’ leave no doubt
as to the method followed in these ‘unearthings’. In his term ‘spade through
crosswise’, derived from Heylen, 4 we need not see a precursor of the quadrant
method! On the other hand his attention was twice attracted by a ditch round
a barrow, observable on the surface: possibly the first recorded instance in this
country of a ditched barrow. More importance still is to be attached to his
minute description of the ‘Galgenbergje’ (Gallows mound) near Bergeik:12
doubtless a good instance of a barrow surrounded by a ditch with internal bank,
and the sixth of this rare barrow type in North Brabant. The other specimens
are a barrow on the Rechte Heide near Goirle, 13 three at Toterfout-Halve
Mijl, 14 and the ‘Zwartenberg’ at Hoogeloon. 15 For the study of the relations
between England and the Continent during the Bronze Age these monuments
are of the greatest importance.

Where Panken could only speak of ‘pre-Christian burial places’ it is now
possible at least to assign rough dates to these monuments and to make compari-
sions with analogous phenomena elsewhere. Here the study of the structure of
the monuments and that of the pottery form the principal aids to knowledge.
The modern prehistorian seeks contact with other branches of science. Cremations
are carefully examined and can provide data on the age of the cremated. Remains
of more than one person in a single cremated burial throw light on contemporary
customs and put him on the look-out for ethnological parallels. The examination
of pollen grains from the old surface under the barrows — one of the few places
where it is at the present time possible to identify with certainty the natural
ground level belonging to a prehistoric culture — conjure up before our eyes
flora and climate, and enable us to see prehistoric man in his natural environ-
ment. Where technique is concerned prehistory has very recently made quite
considerable advances. Yet it is legitimate to ask whether, in principle, the
problems we set ourselves differ so greatly from those of Panken and Hermans.
At the investigation of a tumulus near Riethoven on August 18, 1844, a medical
student examined a cremated burial. 16 And from the fact that Hermans admitted
into the Noordbrabants Genootschap’s collection specimens of charcoal from
Panken’s excavations ‘from which a dendrologist may find occasion to arrive at
some conclusion concerning the kinds of wood growing in North Brabant in
the pre-Christian era' 17 we may conclude that these antiquaries were well aware of the problems. A number of charcoal samples from urns were later submitted to Professor Suringar, of Leiden. With the exception of only a few fragments they were found to be oak. 18 Though the examination of these specimens did therefore little to substantiate it, the speculation that it would thus be possible to gain an insight into the natural environment of prehistoric man remains remarkable.

It is to be regretted that we are no longer in possession of the map on which the position of the groups of tumuli near Bergeik, Riethoven, Veldhoven, Steensel, Knegsel, Oerle, Wintelre, Eersel, Hapert and Luiksgestel had been recorded. Originally it had been intended to have this map published, but on the appearance of the ‘Map of the Roman, Germanic and Gaulish antiquities found in the Netherlands, Belgium and adjacent territories’ by Reuvenis, Leemans and Janssen, this was judged unnecessary by Hermans. 19

Panken first investigated the cemeteries in the immediate vicinity of Bergeik and Riethoven, where we respectively find his groups I–III and IV–V. 20 After these had been dealt with between 1840 and 1844, Panken immediately proceeded to explore his wider surroundings, beginning with groups VI–VII, between Veldhoven and Steensel (fig. 2). This he completed even before the year 1844 was out. Then he turned his attention on Oerle, where ‘also a multitude of grave mounds was to be found’ (fig. 2). On behalf of the ‘Provinciaal Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen’ Hermans requested Panken to continue his ‘uneartnings’ and to forward the objects uncovered to Bois-le-Duc, the expenses to be borne by the Society. 21 The Society can therefore look back on a tradition of a century in support of archaeological investigation, to which the last few decades have again borne ample testimony! In 1845 there followed the investigation of group VIII, near Oerle, between Zandoerle and Halve Mijl (figs 2 and 3) — the group with which this publication is concerned —, and groups IX–X, between Oerle and Wintelre (fig. 2). Group XI, near Oerle, was not investigated, as was the case with group XII, near Wintelre. Of groups XIII–XV, near Knegsel, Panken excavated a number of barrows; group XVI and group XVII, near the Oerle mill, were left alone. With groups XVIII, between Eersel and Hapert, and XIX–XXI, near Luiksgestel, we approach the end of Panken’s activities. In the autumn of 1846 some work was still done on the mounds of groups I and III–IV near Bergeik and Riethoven, and finally, on September 16, 1846, he dug a big hole in the ‘Zwartenberg’ near Hoogeloon (fig. 2 and Part II, fig. 72).

Panken was certain, moreover, that ‘if the fir-woods etc. of the country surrounding Oerle and of other places were carefully observed’ more tumuli could be found. 22
The numbers of barrows in the cemeteries surveyed and investigated by Panken may therefore be summed up as follows. For convenience we have numbered his groups from I to XXI, a practice for which Panken had not yet felt the need.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of tumuli</th>
<th>Investigated by Panken</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bergeik</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>c. 20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>barrows and urnfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>barrows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>upwards of 50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>barrows and urnfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riethoven</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>barrows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>barrows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steensel-Veldhoven</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>barrows and urnfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>barrows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>barrows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>barrows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>barrows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>barrows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>barrows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wintelre</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>barrows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>barrows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XV</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>barrows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XVI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>barrows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XVII</td>
<td>a few barrows</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>barrows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eersel-Hapert</td>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>barrows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luiksgestel</td>
<td>XIX</td>
<td>many, mostly very irregular mounds</td>
<td>a few small mounds</td>
<td>urnfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>barrows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXI</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>barrows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoogeloon</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The ‘Zwartenberg’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total number of tumuli recorded will therefore doubtless have been around 250, though it must at once be added that many are no more than the small mounds of an urnfield. No less than 159 of the barrows were dug by Panken.

The following remarks on the several groups may serve to illustrate the tabular survey. 23
Group I, about ten minutes’ walk NW of Bergeik, near the hamlet ‘de Hooge Berkt’. As early as 1835 or 1836 Captain Baron F. van Voorst tot Voorst had one of the tumuli ‘thrown over’ by some troopers belonging to the 6th Hussars, which resulted in the discovery of an urn. Panken’s investigations (26. VIII. 1840, 3. VII. 1841, 25. VIII. 1843, 31. VIII. 1843, 16. IX. 1843, 13. IX. 1844 and 8. XI. 1845) yielded six urns and a sherd, private excavations by the farmers bringing two further urns to light. One of the tumuli consisted of yellow sand. — In a barrow lying 160 ells distant from this group, Panken, on 13. IX. 1844, found quite a collection of pottery fragments, viz. a brown jar-shaped urn with an intact saucer near its mouth, and another such urn, also with saucer. Both urns showed a decoration of regularly placed notches on the wall. Sherds of an undecorated urn and fragments of a third saucer were found with them, also pieces of a further, very delicate, small plain urn. At the bottom of the deposit lay seven rusty nails, five iron hooks, two very brittle copper rings, and finally cremated bones. The whole was surrounded by a large amount of charcoal. — A barrow situated between groups I and II consisted of yellow and reddish sand; the isolated ‘Kattenberg’, some distance away, also consisted of reddish soil, in which were found many fragments of a coarse urn of very gritty texture — the coarsest Panken had even seen. Some — apparently secondary — cremations are further to be mentioned. — In 1845, during road-building operations, four urns were found below the level heath near this group. Apparently a urnfield was here contiguous with the group of barrows, a situation repeatedly met with in later excavations in North Brabant.

Group II, about ten minutes’ walk from Group I, to the left of the road from Bergeik to Eersel. This cemetery had already been noticed by a clergyman from Gelderland on 2. VIII. 1837. Two of these barrows he caused to be dug, resulting in the discovery of some bone and charcoal fragments. Panken dug here on 29. VIII. 1840 and 13. IX. 1844. — In the vicinity of this group lay the ‘Galgenbergje’ (‘Gallows mound’). ‘It is not quite an ell in height and has 30 ells in circumference. Around the same, at a few paces distance, is a small dyke or ditch, containing some 80 ells in circumference, and the earth from which has been thrown towards the mound’. On 29. VIII. 1840 Panken dug through this striking monument ‘crosswise’ and nothing remarkable was found, which he ‘as being no barrow, had suspected beforehand’ (sic). Panken’s description does not seem to leave any room for doubt that he had before him a barrow surrounded by a ditch with internal bank. In spite of several reconnaissances in this neighbourhood, it has so far been impossible to locate the ‘Galgenbergje’.

Group III, to the right of the road from Bergeik to Eersel, near the farmstead ‘De Paal’. The cemetery was composed of several smaller groups. Panken’s successive excavations (8. X. 1842, 21. X. 1843, 3. XII. 1843, 17. XII. 1843, 23. III. 1844, 25. V. 1844, 16. X. 1844 and 18. X. 1845) yielded 17 urns, farmers contributing three more. A shepherd found a pot here in level ground, and several more seem to have thus been found hereabouts at earlier dates. Doubtless they indicate an urnfield, arranged round a nucleus of older barrows. After Panken had finished his excavations here on 17. II. 1850, thirteen more pottery vessels came successively to light at a spot only a few minutes’ walk away.

Group IV. Here Panken (22. VI. 1844, 26. VIII. 1844 and 18. X. 1845) found two urns and several sherds. One of the mounds consisted of red sand. The description of an isolated barrow lying near the ‘Broodven’, at some distance from the group, is of special interest. On its top lay a separate small elevation. The tumulus proper consisted of ‘red’, the tump on its top of black soil. In the top an almost wholly disintegrated coarse urn was found, filled as usual with cremated bone.

Group V. Only a few sherds came to light (26, VIII. 1844). It was here that a medical student examined a cremated burial.

Group VI(fig. 2). The finds consisted of eleven urns, one of which contained a smaller accessory vessel (28. IX. 1844). On one of the cremation-filled urns was found a thin,
oblong iron pin. The majority of the mounds consisted in whole or in part of yellow soil. The urns found in the large tumuli invariably derived, it would appear, from secondary interments; those from the smaller mounds doubtless formed the central interments of ringditch tumps. More than 15 pieces of pottery, amongst them a small dish, were subsequently excavated by inquisitive people from the neighbourhood. We are here on the site opposite the brickworks ‘De Heibloem’, where Drs J. H. Holwerda and M. A. Evelein carried out a cursory and fruitless excavation in 1909. What remained of the cemetery was investigated by the writer in two campaigns in 1948, under the direction of Professor Van Giffen. Besides some ‘ridges’ (raised beds enclosed by sub-rectangular ditches, probably prehistoric arable fields) a number of circular ditches were uncovered. As a result of intensive ‘urn delving’, which continued into very recent times, nearly all interments had been robbed.

Group VIII (figs 2 and 3), where Panken carried out an investigation on 19. X. 1845, was excavated by the writer in the years 1948–51. It is to these excavations that the present study is dedicated, and Panken’s observations will therefore be dealt with at length on pp. 14–16.

Group IX, investigated on 23. XI. 1845, yielded three urns, doubtless from secondary interments. One of these was of gritty texture (‘Deverel’ urn?). Some sherds were also recovered.

Group XII yielded two urns.

Group XIII. From each of the four barrows an urn had been dug up by country lads. Panken was still able to record (30. XI. 1845) that one of the barrows consisted of yellow soil.

Group XIV. Here Panken found a very coarse urn (30. XI. 1845). Panken was still able to record (30. XI. 1845) that one of the barrows consisted of yellow soil.

Group XVIII, between Eersel and Hapert. It was found here (26. IV. 1846) that for the lower part the mounds consisted of ‘reddish’ soil. Only a single shard came to light. In 1950 the group was systematically excavated by Dr H. Brunsting, Conservator of the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden at Leiden. Tumulus I, showing a faint sod structure, was surrounded by an irregular double circle of small closely spaced posts (diameter: 12.50 metres). Of the central interment all but a small portion had been destroyed. Tumulus II was surrounded by a penannular ditch (diameter: 8.00 metres), showing a gap on the NE side. Tumulus III, which had been completely ploughed over, was probably a two-period barrow, the primary mound being surrounded by a ringditch (diameter: 7.50 metres). The second phase was enclosed by a postcircle (diameter: c. 10 metres). Tumulus IV turned out to have been built from grey sods. NNW of the centre lay the remains of a secondary funeral pile from below which an urn (Early Iron Age) came to light containing the cremated bones of an adult man or woman. In a hollow beneath the urn lay the cremated bones of a child. Fragments of calcined bone were also recovered from among the remains of the pyre.

Group XIX. An urn and several sherds were excavated by Panken (29. III. 1845). Very shortly afterwards four or five more urns were dug up by farmers.

Group XX. These three tumuli turned out to have been thrown up from ‘reddish’ sand (17. V. 1845). One urn found probably represented a secondary interment.

Group XXI. All tumuli here were composed of ‘reddish’ soil. Panken found four urns (17. V. 1845). They were probably secondary interments; one of them was perhaps a ‘Deverel’ urn.

The ‘Zwartenberg’ at Hoogeloon (fig. 2). This isolated tumulus is certainly the most imposing grave mound in the whole province of North Brabant. On 15. IX. 1846 Panken dug a large hole in it. ‘The soil consisted mostly of black and whitish layers, which still enabled one to observe that after the erection of the mound the soil had not been moved much, but naturally built. The top of the mound lay at a depth of 1.75 metres, not below. Below that there was a heavy turf bed, then a layer of black soil, then a kind of turf bed, then a layer of black soil, then a kind of turf bed, and so on. It thus appears that the mound was raised over a long period of time’.
at the depth of the level heath" — apparently, therefore, the old surface — an oxidized bronze palstave chisel 47 (Part II, fig. 72) came to light (Early Bronze Age). Between the Eastern edge and the centre of the barrow a scrap of bone was found. — The pit dug by Panken had disfigured the ‘Zwartenberg’ for more than a century, and was, moreover, used as a point of attack for much irresponsible digging. In 1949 the writer caused it to be filled in. — In the summer of 1950, under the direction of Dr H. Brunsting, a systematic excavation was undertaken. 48 This showed that the barrow (height: 1.40, diameter: c. 18) had indeed been built from finely preserved inverted sods on a clearly podsolized old surface (in places stripped), on which a thin layer of wind-blown sand could be seen at some places in the sections. Besides sods agreeing in composition with the old surface and which must therefore have been cut in the immediate neighbourhood, other sods had been used, with a black, peaty humus layer and clear white layer of leached sand, which must have been cut elsewhere, on a lower-lying site. The pit dug by Panken showed as an enormous recent disturbance in the centre. At the edge of the barrow three secondary cremation burials were discovered. The barrow was surrounded by a bank (width: c. 4 m) thrown up from a wide external ringditch (width: c. 3; overall diameter: c. 40 m). In the ringditch — which must soon have been filled with material from the bank — a secondary single widely spaced postcircle 49 had been placed, showing a large gap on the NE side. At the Eastern periphery of the barrow a further small two-period timber monument came to light, consisting of a small single closely spaced postcircle and a segment of another similar circle. 50 Encircling the top of the barrow a secondary ringditch was observed.

The ‘Zwartenberg’ is the most monumental example of a barrow with enclosing bank and ditch in the Netherlands, where some seven such barrows have so far been recorded. The postcircle in the ringditch is also the most monumental example of its kind. The ‘Zwartenberg’ further derives its great importance from the datable bronze find which, in all probability, came from the primary grave.

Judging from Panken’s remarks the majority of the tumuli investigated by him must have been built from inverted heather sods; when he speaks of yellow or reddish sand this has invariably been mentioned by us in the above survey. Probably in the latter cases we are concerned either with tumuli dating from the time before the heather podsol formation, Neolithic or Aeneolithic monuments therefore, or with (Bronze Age) barrows raised from and on prehistoric arable soil.

In many instances Panken observed charcoal and cremations, and occasionally a broken or even a whole urn could be taken home in his bag. There can hardly be doubt that the urns are generally secondary interments, unless it is the central urn from a small mound of a ringditch urnfield. Apart from one or two ‘Deverel’ urns the majority of the pottery found must have belonged to Urnfield times (mainly Iron Age).

We may finally mention that Panken drew attention several times to barrows lying in a row (groups VI, XI and XXI). Presumably we are here concerned with tumuli built along a prehistoric road, a phenomenon already frequently observed elsewhere.
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1 Actually the ‘Acht Seligheden’, from the termination ‘sel’ (= sala) common to the names of eight villages here, viz. Duizel, Eersel, Hulsel, Knegsel, Netersel, Reusel, Steensel and Wintersel (= Wintelre). The area between and around these villages is thus called the ‘Eight Beatitudes’.

2 Petrus Norbertus Panken, b. Duizel, 6 Sept. 1819, d. Bergeik, 20 July 1904, son of Joannes Baptista, head teacher and later burgomaster of Duizel (d. there 7 July 1823, 39) and Antonia Willems of Bergeik. Studied to be a teacher. Head teacher at Westerhoven; retired on pension 1861 to become postmaster there. Continued as such for many years. After superannuation removed to Bergeik to stay with brother’s children. H. N. Ouwerling in Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek, vol. 4, 1918, columns 1065–66.

3 Panken I, p. 537.

4 A. Heylen, Historische Verhandeling over de Kempen, Turnhout, 1837.

5 Cf. p. 11.

6 Panken I, pp. 551–2.

7 Ibid., p. 562.

8 As in Groups I, III, VI and XIX, to be summarized below.

9 Cf. Part II, Bibliography (Abbreviated References), sub Panken. Later, in 1865, Hermans summarized Panken’s excavations in his Noordbrabants Oudheden, where a number of the urns found were first reproduced.

10 Panken II, p. 282 (‘Aanteekeningen’, by Dr C. R. Hermans).

11 Cf. infra Group I (two barrows), Group III (one barrow ?), Group VI (tumuli 4, 8 and 9), Group XIII (tumulus 4), the earth of which was yellow, and Group I (one barrow), Group IV (two barrows), Group XVIII (tumuli 1–3 ?), Group XX (tumuli 1–3), Group XXI (tumuli 1–6), the earth of which was ‘reddish’. Concerning the structure of a tumulus Hermans (NO, 1865, p. 81) says in summarizing Panken’s excavations at Luiksgestel: ‘Mr Panken observes that he saw the bottom of the urns stand at a level with the heath. From this it may be concluded that they were placed on the ground and then surrounded by a heap of earth’.


14 Cf. infra, tumuli 1, 1B and 9.

15 Cf. infra, pp. 10–11.


17 Panken II, p. 266 (footnote by Hermans).

18 Hermans, NO, 1865, p. 60, note 1.


20 Of these, Groups I–IV lie almost in a straight line from NE to SW.


22 Panken II, p. 267.

23 Apart from Hermans, NO, 1865, the urns etc. found have been described and partly reproduced in Holwerda & Smit, Cat. 1917.


26 Panken II, p. 279.


29 Description by Panken, in Hermans, NO, 1865, pp. 78–80, Pl. III: 6, 9, 11, 12 and 13. ‘In all these pots nothing but sand has been found, except in the largest, in which some
burnt human bones were present. Around this urn had been placed all the other pots, some of which had sagged towards the East'.

31 Panken II, p. 275.
33 Panken I, pp. 556–65; Hermans, NO, 1865, pp. 82–5. For the pottery cf. also Holwerda & Smit, Cat. 1917, p. 29, nos 77–87, Pl. 2: 77 & 78, Pl. 3 (read: Pl. 4): 79, Pl. 4: 81 & 87.
34 Found on the W side of tumulus VIII. Panken I, pp. 561–2. For the urn cf. Hermans, NO, 1865, p. 84, Pl. VI: 3; Holwerda & Smit, Cat. 1917, p. 29, nos 78 and 87a (= 78a?!), Pl. 2: 78.
35 ‘After some digs in the vicinity of the Heibloem brickworks had first made us find indeed the remains of a single tumulus and a few urn fragments of a Germanic population, but had also given us the conviction that there could be no question here of a true unified necropolis and that, in so far as any such small barrows might still have lain together here in a complex, these had yet been disturbed too much to raise any expectations of success for a more extensive investigation’, etc. J. H. Holwerda & M. A. Evelein, OM Leiden, OR IV, 1910, p. 43. For the finds made by the teacher C. Rijken in 1910 cf. Holwerda & Smit, Cat. 1917, pp. 29–32. Cf. also below, pp. 115, 119 (palynological examination by H. Tj. Waterbolk).
39 Panken II, pp. 266–7; Hermans, NO, 1865, p. 85.
40 Panken II, p. 267.
41 Panken II, pp. 268–9; Hermans, NO, 1865, p. 82.
43 Panken II, pp. 269–70; Hermans, NO, 1865, pp. 80–1.
44 Panken II, pp. 270–1; Hermans, NO, 1865, pp. 80–1, Pl. VI: 9.
45 Panken II, pp. 271–3; Hermans, NO, 1865, p. 81, Pl. VI: 8.
46 Panken II, pp. 280–1; Hermans, NO, 1865, pp. 86–7.
48 BH II, 1950, p. 93.
49 Cf. Part II, postcircle type 3, North Brabant, no 15.
50 Cf. Part II, postcircle type 5, North Brabant, nos 5–6.