

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.

I shall briefly comment on the contributions in order of appearance. In the introductory essay, the book editors summarise Evžen Neustupný's contribution to European archaeology and emphasise the fact that he developed his own paradigm under the condition of political control of archaeology during the communist era. Indeed, working behind the Iron Curtain in the Soviet realm for about 45 years, Neustupný independently developed ideas and methodologies that resemble what has been known as processual archaeology. As Neustupný revealed in his recent publication (E. NEUSTUPNÝ, *Czech archaeology under communism*. In: L. Lozny [ed.], *Archaeology of the Communist Era: A Political History of Archaeology of the 20th Century* [New York 2017] 151–166), the presumably oppressive times during the communist regime were not as cruel for archaeologists in former Czechoslovakia as one might think.

In his provocative article, Timothy Darvill deviates from the idea of national archaeologies and suggests the existence of archaeology's community of practice (a term coined by Etienne WENGER, *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity* [Cambridge 1998]), whose role is to enrich both the practitioners and consumers of archaeological knowledge. In his outlook, all knowledge is seen as contributing to such enrichment. Without going into details about this stimulating chapter, one can say that the way how we (the practitioners and consumers) understand the past tells more about us than the past itself.

John Bintliff presents his contribution as “manifesto” and asks: Can archaeology be a science? It depends on what we mean by science. I see it as a part of the social sciences characterised by experimentation and hypothesis testing, scepticism, and empirical approach, where rigorous application of methods provides new data further elaborated through the use of innovative methodologies and interpreted through novel theories. The key characteristic of such science is changeability of explanations. We will never know how it was in the past; we can only approximate the past, applying theories and methodologies borrowed from the other social and natural sciences. As Kent V. FLANNERY (*The Golden Marshalltown: A Parable for the Archaeology of the 1980s*. *Am. Anthr.* 84,2 [1982] 265–278) pointed out, there is no specific archaeological theory. Nevertheless, the public (consumers of archaeological knowledge) reveals a tendency to interpret the past in the way they want, without our (archaeological practitioners) help.

In his eloquent piece, John C. Barrett discusses the problem of deterministic vs spontaneous behaviour in the context of social evolution and points out how archaeologists might reveal the evidence of spontaneity that may have contributed to social change. This is a very promising approach as deterministic models do not explain convincingly certain evidence of social changes, for instance the emergence of political complexity in the absence of specific economic and other critical stimuli, the emergence of coalescent societies, or the critical role of agency, etc.

Ladislav Šmejda and Monika Baumanová's chapter is a successful attempt to mix sociological and anthropological ideas on social identity with the archaeological data. Indeed, there is a pressing need to theoretically discuss various forms of social identity that go beyond the traditionally understood ethnicities, etc. The recently studied phenomenon of coalescent societies relates to spontaneous emergence of communities. Some survived longer whereas others dissolved when the stress that contributed to their formation dissipated. The Seminole of Florida formed on the basis of several native groups that escaped the pressure of European settlers. A similar phenomenon may have happened in Europe at different times, especially during traumatic periods of major economic or political collapses such as the fall of the Roman Empire, etc.

Felipe Criado Boado discusses a vaguely defined archaeology of space labelled as “xspace”. His conceptualisation of space resembles what otherwise is known as landscape archaeology, or a part

of it. I am sure there is a simpler way to say that human culture, whether past or present, is polysemous and that tangible evidence of such context might be revealed archaeologically.

Marie Louise Stig Sørensen's plea to return to typological studies is a bit puzzling. We never left typologies. But what can we learn from typologies that we cannot from other approaches to materiality? Typologies do help with the organisation of data but have little explanatory value. They might suggest correlations but not causation; they indicate change but do not explain it. And change can also be recognised and should be studied through other means.

Timothy Taylor recalls his first encounter with Evžen Neustupný as a student guide who introduced the honouree to the landscape of Wessex. The author makes references to the theoretical works by David L. Clark which were very much valued in 1980s' Eastern Europe. One brief mention caught my attention, a reference to "event theory". Regrettably, Taylor does not discuss it in detail, and thus I am not sure what exactly he means here. Nevertheless, I see this phrase as related to a methodological approach designed to counter confirmation bias, which is better known to me through the works of Pete Vayda and Brad Walters (A. P. VAYDA / B. WALTERS [eds], *Causal explanations for social scientists. A Reader* [Lanham 2011]) as event ecology.

Stanisław Tabaczyński writes on the relationship between Polish archaeologists and the Annales School. This brief descriptive essay would have been more on target if the author had provided an example of how the Annales paradigm has been used to examine or explain a research problem addressed by Polish archaeologists. One of the tangible outcomes of this cooperation was the research conducted by Polish archaeologists and historians in France (abandoned villages), discussed, for instance, by A. ABRAMOWICZ (*Historia archeologii polskiej XIX i XX wiek* [Warszawa, Łódź 1991]) or J. GAŚSOWSKI (*Archaeology and Marxism in Poland: A personal account*. In: L. Lozny [ed.], *Archaeology of the Communist Era: A Political History of Archaeology of the 20th Century* [New York 2017]). Thus, the question of how Polish archaeology benefited from these contacts remains unanswered.

Predrag Novaković writes on a little-known episode related to L. Binford's visit in the Balkans during his stay in Europe in 1986. The visit of the then prominent American archaeologist is secondary, however, to Novaković's presentation of the activities of the journal *Arheo*. Inspired by the French *Nouvelle d'Archéologie*, the journal was devoted to theoretical debates and made some impact on the intellectual outlook of archaeology in Southern Europe in the 1980s and later times (P. NOVAKOVIĆ, *Archaeology in the new countries of Southeastern Europe: A historical perspective*. In: L. Lozny [ed.], *Comparative Archaeologies. A Sociological View of the Science of the Past* [New York 2011] 339–461).

Arkadiusz Marciniak discusses the beginnings of bioarchaeology in Poland. It is exciting to see evidence of interest in ecological aspects of past societies in Polish archaeology of the 1930s; however, the use of the term "bioarchaeology" is a bit confusing. What Marciniak means by bioarchaeology relates to J. D. G. Clark's reference to zooarchaeology. In the context of Clark's research at Star Carr, I prefer the term historical ecology that covers all aspects of human relationship with nature examined through zooarchaeological data and human remains. Nevertheless, as Marciniak points out, incidental interests and vernacular forms of research cannot be taken as a serious attempt to use a method or theory related to the ecological condition of past societies. The secondary point that such attempts were not known or appreciated by the European archaeological community of the time because Polish archaeologists did not publish in English is rather dubious. Other forms of scholarly exchange, such as meetings, conferences, and personal communications, existed and innovative approaches could have been noticed, as the case of the Polish research on the Palaeolithic clearly demonstrates.

Koji Mizoguchi presents a “meta-critique” of the current archaeological thought. Here we find brief discussion of the post-processual approach, mentions of semiotics, some discussion on the speculative nature of archaeological inferences, etc., all presented under the umbrella of the concept that Lynn MESKEL (*The somatization of archaeology: Institutions, discourses, corporeality*. *Norwegian Arch. Rev.* 29,1 [1996] 1–16) labelled “somatisation of archaeology”.

Zbigniew Kobyliński addresses the dilemma: how does archaeology change in the context of new economic and political settings? He points to Neustupný’s dichotomy between mainstream and minority archaeologies, which may have worked during the Cold War but has little relevance in the current political context. Presently, archaeologists have access to major publications, conferences, and instant communication via email or Skype, etc. Major publishers do not discriminate against less known archaeologists or even esoteric ideas if they survive the peer review process. The power of reviewers is significant as they may not always recognise the value of a book or paper, especially if it is outside of the commonly accepted views. This is the endemic problem discussed widely in the academia.

Two points emerge from Ezra Zubrow’s piece: first that democratisation of education allows for the quantitative and qualitative change through the introduction of new (presumably better) ideas, and second that more investment in science allows for a wider choice of subjects to research. The third point is: none of the above would have happened without quality education. His analysis of paradigmatic shifts is short and the concluding remarks regarding dissatisfaction with the present status of archaeology are widely shared (this reviewer included).

Bettina Arnold writes on the relationship between archaeology and politics. She clearly demonstrates that archaeology remains politicised. Nation-state nationalisms characteristic for the late nineteenth and the twentieth century have not been mitigated by the emergence of supra-national political organisations and the increasing significance of intra-national identities. Even if the significance of the nation-state at times of globalisation is weakening, nationalistic sentiments rise. Thus, archaeology and politics are inseparable. The examples are from Europe, where nationalisms recently (sadly) gained popularity.

Miroslav Barta discusses the possible origins of the Egyptian civilisation using the evidence from the Western Desert. His methodology dwells on the analysis of iconographic data, which is doubtful at best. The Western Desert should be seen as a place where the East African Cattle Complex originated as demonstrated by Wendorf and Schild (F. WENDORF / R. SCHILD / A. E. CLOSE, *Egypt During the Last Interglacial. The Middle Paleolithic of Bir Tarfawi and Bir Sahara East* [New York 1993]) and their collaborators. This cultural phenomenon contributed to the emergence of many East African indigenous cultures. For now, I remain sceptical about Barta’s argument.

Johannes Müller addresses the always significant and at the same time highly speculative issue of past demographics. It is promising, however, that the author discusses new methodologies used to infer on the status of past populations. Müller’s thinking seems right on track to accommodate the methodological novelties in an otherwise highly speculative approach towards quantitative data regarding past demographics.

Marie-Lorraine Pipes, Janusz Kruk, and Sarunas Milisauskas provide a study on cloth production at the Neolithic site Bronocice, Poland. Pipes et al. clearly demonstrate how economic change and specialisation contributed to social change (increase of hierarchisation), which was not sufficient to produce a more complex political system. It is promising to see that the younger generation of American scholars follows the footsteps of Sarunas Milisauskas who, despite difficult political conditions that prevailed until the 1990s, engaged his scholarly interests in Eastern Europe and enriched the local archaeology.

Kristian Kristiansen and Timothy Earle refute the argument made by Tobias Kienlin regarding the qualitative difference between the Neolithic and the Bronze Age. This is a well-argued and eloquent reply to what seems to be a not very well-justified concept. It was a true pleasure to read such a well-focused and argued paper – not a common quality these days.

Sławomir Kadrow presents a factual paper on the idea of an Eneolithic, but his interpretations are problematic. He should try to think outside of the proverbial box rather than recycle old ideas by furnishing them with new data. What Evžen Neustupný intuitively identified as Eneolithic looks to me like a sphere of interaction, an exchange network to move things and ideas around.

The concept of a sphere of interaction is better verbalised, although not labelled as such, by Jan Turek, who examined the Bell Beaker cultural domain (he calls it the Beaker Package; I call it the Beaker Sphere of Interaction). This is one of the most theoretically interesting papers in the set, accompanied by another Czech author, Martin Kuna, who presents a well-thought-out methodological paper inspired by Brian Schiffer and Evžen Neustupný's ideas on how to understand post-depositional processes.

The nature of a *Festschrift* is to eulogise the person to whom the book is dedicated, thus making its critical review impossible or even pointless. However, I tried to discuss the contributions in some detail. It is not academic criticism but suggestions from a reader somewhat informed about archaeology, its goals, findings, and explanatory worth. Thus, as an informed reader, I conclude that it was certainly a pleasure to read such an assortment of papers clearly demonstrating how influential the honouree is.

Finally, allow a personal disclaimer. I learned about Professor Evžen Neustupný in the mid-1970s while attending a seminar on the Neolithic Period offered by Prof. Zdzisław Sochacki at Warsaw University. When discussing ideas regarding the Late Neolithic, Neustupný's theories came up. Prof. Sochacki in his usual jovial tone mentioned that Neustupný, as his name suggests, firmly stands behind his thoughts (the name can be translated as “stubborn” or “persistent” or “insistent”).

All the best Professor Neustupný!

New York, NY, USA
E-Mail: llozny@hunter.cuny.edu

Ludomir Lozny
City University of New York

THOMAS ETZEMÜLLER, Auf der Suche nach dem Nordischen Menschen. Die deutsche Rassenanthropologie in der modernen Welt. Transcript Verlag, Bielefeld 2015. € 29,99. ISBN 978-3-8376-3183-8 (Hardcover). € 26,99. ISBN 978-3-8394-3183-2 (E-Book). 291 Seiten mit 37 Abbildungen.

Thomas Etzemüller wählt die Rassenanthropologie als Beispiel für das Phänomen, wie Wissenschaft sich langfristig ständig aus sich selbst heraus bestätigt und politisch / weltanschaulich instrumentalisiert werden kann. Wer sich mit der Geschichte der Rassenkunde, v. a. der Rassenideologie des Dritten Reiches und deren Nachhall in der Zeit nach 1945 bereits beschäftigt hat, wird zunächst inhaltlich nichts Neues erfahren. Hierzu sei auf die einschlägige Literatur verwiesen (z. B. H. SEIDLER / A. RETT, *Das Reichssippenamt entscheidet – Rassenbiologie im Nationalsozialismus* [Wien 1982]; P. WEINGART / J. KROLL / K. BAYERTZ, *Rasse, Blut und Gene. Geschichte der Eugenik und Rassenhygiene in Deutschland* [Frankfurt a. M. 1992]), insbesondere auf die Monographie von N. C. LÖSCH (*Rasse als Konstrukt. Leben und Werk Eugen Fischers* [Frankfurt a. M.