

Mit den vorliegenden drei Bänden legt Dagmar Unverhau eine biografische Aufarbeitung der handelnden Personen des Kieler Museums vor, was eher ungewöhnlich in der Museumskunde ist und eindrücklich belegt, dass museale Arbeit „keinesfalls in einem Vakuum stattfindet und von den Akteuren gesellschaftliche und politische Positionierung verlangt“ (S. XXIV). Johanna Mestorf ist eine der bekanntesten Archäologinnen in der deutschen Geschichte und ihr Andenken wird vor allem durch Unverhaus Engagement weiterhin Ansporn und Vorbild für Wissenschaftlerinnen sein. Dagmar Unverhau wie auch damals Fräulein Mestorf zeigen, dass es für das Erreichen wissenschaftlicher Ziele nicht ausschließlich eines eingehenden Studiums bedarf, sondern auch Ehrgeiz, Willenskraft, Hingabe und Leidenschaft Voraussetzungen sind.

D – 55116 Mainz  
Ernst-Ludwig-Platz 2  
E-Mail: kieburg@rgzm.de

Anna Kieburg  
Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum

**STEPHEN LEACH, A Russian Perspective on Theoretical Archaeology: The Life and Work of Leo S. Klejn.** Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek 2015. \$ 79.00. ISBN 978-1-62958-138-5. 221 pages.

Despite globalisation, and the increasing internationalisation of archaeology, the discipline is still marked by major cultural and linguistic divides. Among these barriers is the relative lack of interaction between Russian and Western archaeologies, though there have been scholars acting as go-betweens. One of them is Leo S. Klejn. Not only his oeuvre, but also his life has become a medium which provides English-speaking scholars with a viewpoint on the history, development and political implications of Soviet and Russian archaeology. Stephan Leach's biography of Klejn is a welcome account of his life and intellectual pursuits, which also form a window on the workings of Russian society. Yet the book's objectives are ultimately somewhat hampered by the same cultural chasm it tries to cross.

The biography consists of eleven chapters and 142 pages divided into two parts, the first presenting Klein's life story, and the second his intellectual profile through publications. This narrative account is followed by two appendices. The first is a two-page translation of Klejn's 25 'commandments' to archaeologists, which hung on the walls during the seminars he supervised at Leningrad or St. Petersburg. The second appendix is a nearly 60-page thematic bibliography of Klejn's work. The list is very useful, because the task of compiling full and accurate information on his publications is otherwise quite daunting.

Leach begins with a brief account on Klejn's family and childhood. He was born into a secularised Jewish family in Belarus in 1927. Despite Klejn's background and later international pursuits, he considers Russia to be his homeland, and Russian discussions the primary context of his work. Klejn attracted the attention of the Committee for State Security (KGB) already in high school, and for much of his life, Klejn's career was conditioned by the fluctuations of Russian politics and official policies. In addition, as a young man, he acquainted himself thoroughly with the key Marxist texts. This gave Klejn the means to justify his own way of thinking with the phrases of the official ideology.

Klejn studied philology and linguistics at the Grodno Pedagogical Institute. He was then accepted as an external student at Leningrad University. There Klejn encountered Vladimir Y. Propp, whose approach to scholarly problems had a lasting effect on him. After struggling with university policies, Klejn was finally made a regular student. This allowed him to study philology under Propp, and archaeology under Mikhail Artamonov. Subsequently, Klejn focused on the ori-

gins of peoples, and he had his part in giving an impetus for Josef Stalin to refute Nicholas Marr's dogma on ethnicity in 1950.

Klejn typically collects as many scholarly views as possible on the issue at hand, and uses some major figures, like that of Gustaf Kossinna, as an adversary in relation to whom he forges his own view on the subject. With Kossinna, Klejn's questions focus on the association between archaeological sources and ethnicities. Klejn has also discussed the Kossinna Syndrome, or the phenomenon in which for decades after the Second World War archaeological interpretation was limited only to typological and chronological questions. In addition to theoretical and historical themes, the origins of the Indo-Europeans have preoccupied Klejn. He prefers to locate the Proto-Indo-European people not on the Steppes in the Bronze Age but rather in Northern Central Europe during the Neolithic. He is thus critical of the dominant Kurgan Hypothesis, and the Western scholars' ignorance of Russian scholarship.

Klejn graduated in 1951, and began a postgraduate career with six hard years, earning his livelihood as a schoolteacher. He published his first academic paper on the origin of the Slavs in 1955. In 1957, Klejn finally got a university position, and was made an assistant professor in 1962. At that time, he became involved with the US-based journal *Current Anthropology*, which gave Klejn a channel to Anglo-American archaeology. In the 1970s, he started to write on theoretical issues. In 1977 appeared his famous article 'Panorama of Theoretical Archaeology', and in 1978, at the age of 51, L. KLEJN published his first monograph *Arkheologicheskie istochniki* (Archaeological Sources [Leningrad 1978]).

Understanding the character of archaeological sources or the archaeological record is central for Klejn's conception of archaeology as a discipline. Again, Klejn approaches the topic by collecting insights from various scholars and criticising a variety of theoretical movements. He observes parallels between the Western New Archaeology of the 1960s–1980s and Soviet Archaeology in their liking for universal laws of development, and the tendency towards schematisation. However, Klejn is not convinced that archaeology should lean on the sciences as a model. On the other hand, he argues that post-processualism made an error in blurring the distinction between archaeology and history. Instead, along with Mats P. Malmer, Klejn argues that archaeology belongs neither to the sciences nor to the humanities, but to some third group of disciplines. For him, the typological method has an essential role in determining the disciplinary position of archaeology.

Leach discusses Klejn's views on the differences between archaeology and history at length, largely because Leach himself is a specialist in R. G. Collingwood's philosophy of history. Klejn argues that while archaeology is a source-focused discipline, historians, in contrast, are not as a rule required to have a first-hand acquaintance with material sources. Accordingly, archaeologists are faced with a two-fold break. First, they have to translate material things and their relations into a natural language and, secondly, to compare the acquired evidence with other materials to establish what events are reflected in archaeological sources. After this, the material is processed into a form suitable for historical disciplines, i. e. it is ready for the language of historical phenomena and processes. Historians, in turn, have to deal with only one break, because they have written sources at their disposal from the start. In sum, archaeology gives answers to the question 'What happened?' whereas the historian's question is 'Why did it happen?'

In the early 1980s, Russian society took a conservative turn. In Klejn's life, this led to his politically motivated arrest and a charge of homosexuality. During and after his trial, Klejn spent 13 months in prison and five months in a labour camp. If nothing else, this horrid period gave him an insight on the functioning of the prison community. According to Klejn, the violent and highly ritualised life in confinement brings forth the natural state of humanity, whereas the society out-

side is artificial and structured by culture. L. KLEJN collected his experiences into the book *Perevernutyi mir* (The World Turned Upside Down [St. Petersburg 1993]).

According to Klejn, he became intrigued by homosexuality due to his conviction and subsequent time in prison. This led to L. KLEJN's book *Drugaya lyubov': Priroda cheloveka i gomoseksual'nost'* (The Other Love [St. Petersburg 2000]). It presents theories and views on homosexuality and its evolution in various societies and historical periods. Klejn believes that in a purely biological sense homosexuality is a pathology but there are also cultural conventions which play a part in its history and continuing existence. In *Drugaya storona svetila* (Another Side of a Luminary [St. Petersburg 2002]), Klejn explores the homosexual love of exceptional individuals, especially the life stories of well-known Russians. The issue of homosexuality has particular currency in present-day Russia with its discriminatory anti-Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer (LGBTQ) rights.

After his release, Klejn's career remained a struggle. He lost access to the university library, and although he received a pension in 1987, Klejn was deprived of his membership of Leningrad University until 1989. During the arduous years of the 1980s, Klejn focused on classical philology, especially Homeric studies. He published the fruits of this work from the 1990s onwards. Klejn's approach to the *Iliad* is archaeological, emphasising statistical analysis. On the basis of the names of gods and heroes, and the epithets associated with them as well as toponyms and ethnonyms, Klejn distinguishes chronological layers in the epic poem. He concludes that the *Iliad* comprises several interwoven but distinguishable components.

The collapse of the Soviet Union had a positive effect on Klejn's prospects. In 1991, he was again granted a university position, and during the 1990s, he taught as a visiting professor at many universities abroad. In 1993, Klejn defended his second doctoral dissertation, and in 1997, at the age of 71, he retired from St. Petersburg University. Although conditions in post-Soviet Russia are better for Klejn, he is worried about the present rise of xenophobic nationalism, and the revival of religious conservatism. Nonetheless, during the last twenty years Klejn has tirelessly produced one book after another on his wide-ranging interests.

The last chapter of the biography is devoted to Klejn's views on the relations between archaeology and the forensic sciences. This is an issue that Leach is particularly interested in, as Collingwood also makes the same comparison. A nine-page chapter, however, cannot be comprehensive, and this is unfortunate, since Leach here reflects on Klejn's ideas and compares them with another author, and at the same time, provides his own reactions to Klejn's work. The analogy between the forensic sciences and archaeology appears highly productive and exciting. In fact, Leach could have expanded the chapter into an article or even a book of its own.

As Klejn points out, many of his arguments and interpretations are embedded in the Russian social and disciplinary context, and occasionally this makes his statements dated, or irrelevant for contemporary Western scholarship. For instance, Klejn's opinions on homosexuality are old-fashioned whether one considers the present state of gender and queer studies, or the recent conclusions of biological sciences that same-sex sexual behaviour has had evolutionary advantages for the human species. Similarly, Klejn's preoccupation with the relations of archaeology and history seem to miss the point, because historical disciplines have developed greatly during the last couple of decades, and extended their scope to cover the issues of materiality and things.

In places, there appear to be contradictions in the summaries of Klejn's thinking. For instance, Klejn states that although there are apparent similarities between modern and Palaeolithic art, the two forms of art were produced in totally different social contexts (p. 48). Later he claims that (p. 55) human nature was formed in the Cro-Magnon period and has not changed biologically

since, and thus there is an abundance of valid similarities between Upper Palaeolithic and modern prison societies. Many brief characterisations of archaeological movements seem inadequate as well. Klejn argues that when post-processual archaeology focused on the unique and the individual, it lost sight of the general and the law-like. However, it could be argued that the focus of post-processualism was not the particular *per se*, but the importance of signification, and how the relations between 'general' and 'particular' become defined and operationalised.

Due to language limitations, the biography is based mainly on interviews available in English, supplemented with new interviews that Leach has conducted. As a result, the biography does not offer much novelty if the non-Russian-speaking reader is already acquainted with the previously published interviews and Klejn's works in English. In fact, advanced readers might have profited more if KLEJN's autobiography of 2010 *Trudno byt' Klejnom* (It's hard to be Klejn: An Autobiography in Monologues and Dialogues [St. Petersburg 2010]) had been translated into English instead.

In order to make Klejn's texts relevant for the Western archaeological community and especially for theoretical debates, his work should be scrutinised in detail, perhaps in relation with other thinkers. Leach takes steps in this direction in the final chapter by comparing Collingwood's and Klejn's views. Another interesting point of comparison could be the recent neo-materialist and speculative materialist movements, since they emphasise that archaeology is a source-studying discipline. For instance, there are apparent parallels between Klejn's work and Laurent OLIVIER's *The Dark Abyss of Time: Archaeology and Memory* (Walnut Creek 2011), although their intellectual backgrounds are unlike. Such detailed contrastive and interpretive reading of Klejn would substantiate his importance for theoretical archaeology and contemporary debates in the West. Perhaps these concerns are too broad to be addressed in a concise biography and general introduction to Klejn's thought. Nonetheless, Leach is able to show to what lengths Klejn's life and career have been conditioned by the history and social forces of the Soviet Union and then Russia, and how he still has produced an important body of work that has great scholarly relevance.

FI – 20014 University of Turku  
Akatemiankatu 1  
E-Mail: vialim@utu.fi

Visa Immonen  
Archaeology

**KRISTIAN KRISTIANSEN / LADISLAV ŠMEJDA / JAN TUREK (eds), Paradigm Found. Archaeological Theory – Present, Past and Future. Essays in Honour of Evžen Neustupný.** Oxbow Books, Oxford, Philadelphia 2015. £ 45.00. ISBN 9781782977704. 288 pages.

This is the second *Festschrift* dedicated to Professor Evžen Neustupný (after M. KUNA / N. VENCLOVA [eds], *Whither Archaeology? Papers in Honour of Evžen Neustupný* [Praha 1995]). The book consists of three parts: Contemporary Discourses in Archaeological Theory, Past and Future Directions, and Thinking Prehistory. Most submissions relate to theory and methodology of archaeological research. Some are strictly theoretical, whereas others present region-specific case studies.

Geographic distribution of the contributors varies. Most are from the former Eastern European Bloc countries, some from Western Europe, and one from Japan. There is also a small North American contingent represented by the faculty of the Anthropology Department of the State University of New York at Buffalo, accompanied by Bettina Arnold of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, and Timothy Earle of Northwestern University.