

der Wissenschaftler*innen etwas unterreflektiert bleibt. Zwar sind auch hier einige „founding gestures“ (S. AHMED, *Open forum imaginary prohibitions. Some preliminary remarks on the founding gestures of the ‚New Materialism‘*. *European Journal Women’s Stud.* 15, 2008, 23–39) zu beobachten, generell ist aber der Beobachtung zuzustimmen, dass (nicht nur) dieser Sammelband Teil einer Entwicklung ist, in der die Zukunft archäologischer Theorie debattiert wird (vgl. J. THOMAS, *The future of archaeological theory*. *Antiquity* 89, 2015, 1287–1296). Ob sich daraus aber eine durchgängige Forschungsrichtung einer „Archaeology after Interpretation“ etablieren wird, bleibt jedoch abzuwarten; bislang fehlt es noch weitgehend an einer kritischen Auseinandersetzung damit (siehe aber R. BERNBECK, *Archäologie als Zukunft vergangener Subjekte*. *Ethno-gr.-Arch. Zeitschr.* 56,1/2, 2015, 16–21).

Allen Artikeln ist gemein, dass aufgrund der durchweg kurzen, wohl auch von den Herausgebern gewollten Artikellänge von je ca. 15 Seiten sowohl die ontologische bzw. theoretische als auch die Diskussion der Fallbeispiele gezwungenermaßen zu kurz kommen. Hier wäre mehr auch mehr gewesen. Der Rezensent möchte allerdings auch keinen Beitrag missen, da sie erst in der Gesamtschau einen Eindruck über die Vielseitigkeit des angestrebten Perspektivwechsels geben. Wer sich jedoch eine umfassende Theorieentwicklung verspricht, ist hier genauso falsch, wie jemand, der eine konsequente Anwendung neuer Ansätze erwartet. Vielmehr inspiriert der Band dazu, selbst nachzudenken und nach Anwendungen zu suchen bzw. eigene Forschungsprojekte aus einer anderen Perspektive zu betrachten. Daher ist er trotz der Kürze der einzelnen Beiträge als großer Gewinn auch für die deutschsprachige Archäologie zu betrachten. Es bleibt jedoch, ähnlich wie auch bei der postprozessualen Archäologie, abzuwarten, ob den theoretischen Impulsen auch tiefergehende archäologische Studien folgen.

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

Stefan Schreiber
Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum
Leibnizforschungsinstitut für Archäologie

ANDRZEJ KOKOWSKI / WIEŃCYSŁAW NIEMIROWSKI, Na tropie zaginionych odkryć. Archeologia w świetle doniesień prasowych z dawnej prowincji Grenzmark – Posen-Westpreußen. Auf den Spuren von verlorenen Entdeckungen. Die Archäologie im Spiegel der Presse der ehemaligen Provinz Grenzmark – Posen-Westpreußen. Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, Lublin 2016. Zł 51.50. ISBN 978-83-7784-762-6. 567 pages, 3 tables.

The offer to review the book of Andrzej Kokowski and Wieńcysław Niemirowski gave me the opportunity to learn more about newspapers as sources for both archaeological research and heritage management in the early 20th century and for the history of archaeology. The volume reveals the parallel development of archaeology and newspapers. Archaeology turned into an institutionalised science and newspapers into the most influential medium of information, to the “university of the men on the street” (K. D’ESTER, *Zeitungswesen. Jedermanns Bücherei* 8 [Breslau 1928] 84). During these times, journalists sometimes were quicker than archaeologists to inform a wider audience of finds and spectacular archaeological sites. And print media were influential not only by spreading information on archaeological discoveries and research projects but also by developing a narrative of a site or a find. On the other hand, newspapers often were the best way for early professional archaeologists to inform and to teach about archaeological issues and goals. Parallel to the public archaeological discourse the scientific discourse developed, mostly well preserved in libraries. Regionally often very influential press articles, however, are quite often not archived and therefore lost, especially in the eastern parts of Germany during the last World War. They became a

widely unknown source for the history of regional archaeology – a rich source, as it seems, which should be used more often.

Archaeologist A. Kokowski and Germanist W. Niemirowski, both full professors at the Maria-Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin, analysed newspaper articles with archaeological information which were published in the former German province Grenzmark Posen-Westpreußen. This project was realised with financial support from society “Freunde der Archäologie in Europa e. V.”, Frankfurt a. M., and the North Eastern European Commission for Research of Archaeological Finds and Data in Archival Materials (KAFU), Berlin. A. Kokowski already published a comparable, but smaller analysis of newspaper articles with archaeological topics for the county Flatow of this province (A. KOKOWSKI, *Przygoda z archaeologią, czyli najstarsze dzieje Krajny Złotowskiej [do czasów lokacji miasta Złotowa]* [Warszawa 2011]). The province Grenzmark Posen-Westpreußen was founded in 1922 and had two spatially separated parts – a northern one along the border to the province Brandenburg and a southern one along the border to the province Silesia. In their 567 page, bi-lingual (Polish and German) publication the authors present 183 German-language newspaper articles which were published between the foundation of the province and its termination in 1938. A. Kokowski and W. Niemirowski did not evaluate a concrete archive or a newspaper clipping collection of an archaeological institution or of an archaeologist. They collected the articles of newspapers, which were available in the province in the 1920s and 1930s, in the State Library of Prussia (Berlin), the archive of the Museum of Pre- and Protohistory (Berlin), and in archives and collections of different museums and historical societies of the region (p. 23–24). They thus reconstruct what an individual interested in archaeology could have read about the subject in regional and local newspapers of the province Grenzmark Posen-Westpreußen. We now can imagine how much public knowledge on regional archaeology was available via newspapers. As I learned from Anke te Heesen, this level of information was indeed expected by specialists and by interested readers at that time (A. TE HEESEN, *Der Zeitungsausschnitt. Ein Papierobjekt der Moderne* [Frankfurt am Main 2006]).

The entire book is comfortably typeset in two columns – including introduction (pp. 15–35), summary (pp. 511–519) and three tables (pp. 559–567) – with every newspaper article running parallel to a Polish translation. A bibliography (pp. 521–537) and a very useful index of persons (pp. 539–557) complete the volume. A. Kokowski and W. Niemirowski present this treasure in four different chapters.

Chapter I (pp. 37–318) collects 133 articles with information on discoveries of different sites and excavations, arranged alphabetically by toponyms. Farmers or local administration were clearly still the main informants on new sites and finds and the print media were an important link between the wider public and the developing archaeological science. In their comments, A. Kokowski and W. Niemirowski correlate published information on sites and finds with contemporary research and identify a lot of today unknown, forgotten sites. In some cases, they also mention all the references of some news in the research literature of the time or in official documentation and discuss dating or cultural classification of finds or sites. For example, they checked indices of sites in publications like the volume by Carl Engel and Walter La Baume on the early history of Prussia and discuss mistakes or gaps (C. ENGEL / W. LA BAUM, *Kulturen und Völker der Frühzeit im Preußenland* [Königsberg 1937]). In the most interesting cases, the reader can follow the research history of an archaeological site from the very first discovery over the excavations and interpretation to the planning of a local museum or a monument – completely through the journalistic reports. In the case of the Hallstatt period cemetery of Dolnik / Wittenburg (Gm. Krajenka / Kr. Flatow) (pp. 69–88) only more than two months went by between the localisation of the grave yard and the excavation of 45 stone box graves under the eyes of 2860 local visitors. I

guess that most of the articles were illustrated, but the original illustrations of the articles are unfortunately not reproduced. Pictures of site or finds are always much more suggestive than words and they must have been impressive for the journals' readers in the 1920s and 1930s. To know these illustrations would help to reconstruct the influence of archaeological articles on people at this time.

Chapter II (pp. 319–417) contains 24 articles on archaeological exhibitions and the work of archaeological collections and museums in the region. All of these collections were lost during the Second World War and so these articles can help to reconstruct the development and setting of the regional show rooms and collections. Examples for initiatives to found a collection or museum with spectacular finds close to the archaeological site (pp. 319–324) or for erecting a monument on the excavating site (pp. 411–417) prove to be highly interesting. Museums were already established forms of powerful national profiling since the 19th century (B. GRAF / H. MÖBIUS [eds], *Zur Geschichte der Museen im 19. Jahrhundert 1789–1918*. Institut für Museumsforschung [Berlin 2006]). From 1918 museums and collections became a modern way of regional communication and networking in the growing “Grenzlandkampf” (borderland fighting) (J. M. PISKORSKI / J. HACKMANN / R. JAWORSKI [eds], *Deutsche Ostforschung und polnische Westforschung im Spannungsfeld von Wissenschaft und Politik. Disziplinen im Vergleich. Deutsche Ostforschung und Polnische Westforschung 1* [Osnabrück, Poznań 2002]). It is no coincidence that we have only few studies on the cultural policy of the western and northern borderlands of Germany – most of the museums and institutions with their archives in the eastern borderlands are lost, making the traditional ways of writing their history impossible. However, studies on the developments in the western and northern borderlands can teach us about former strategies and arguments for constructing regional identities; some examples do exist, but the authors only paid little attention to archaeology (e. g. B. BOURESH / St. LENNARTZ [eds], *Auf der Suche nach regionaler Identität. Geschichtskultur im Rheinland zwischen Kaiserreich und Nationalsozialismus* [Bergisch-Gladbach 1997]; F. GRESSHAKE, *Deutschland als Problem Dänemarks. Das materielle Kulturerbe der Grenzregion Sønderjylland – Schleswig seit 1864* [Göttingen 2013]). Hubert Fehr published an excellent study on a main field of archaeological research in the western part of Germany making deep impact on the border discussions (H. FEHR, *Germanen und Romanen im Merowingerreich. Frühgeschichtliche Archäologie zwischen Wissenschaft und Zeitgeschehen. Ergbd. RGA² 68* [Berlin, New York 2010]).

It was only after the First World War that pre- and protohistoric times appeared as a preindustrial, pure and original paradise. Archaeology became an ideal source for constructing collective identities, especially in the eastern provinces of the former German Empire (exemplary for German-language research: W. ROHRER, *Wikinger oder Slawen? Die ethnische Interpretation frühpiastischer Bestattungen mit Waffenbeigabe in der deutschen und polnischen Archäologie. Stud. Ostmitteleuropaforsch.* 26 [Marburg 2012]; S. GRUNWALD, “Die Aufteilung der Burgen auf die Geschichte wird eine Änderung erfahren müssen”. *Zur Geschichte der Zantoch-Idee. Acta Prähist. Arch.* 41, 2009, 231–262; ID., *Der Schlossberg von Zantoch als Lern- und Geschichtsort. Acta Prähist. Arch.* 44, 2012, 161–202). The initiators of museum foundations – politicians, historians and archaeologists – felt as soldiers in the so called “Grenzlandkampf” against their Polish colleagues after 1918. The whole region from the Baltic Sea to Silesia became a propagandistic war zone and at both sides, in reborn Poland and in Germany, scientists mobilised historical and archaeological data to prove the Polish or German character of these borderlands. While the impact of historians on this debate, the so called “Deutsche Ostforschung” (research of the German East), is widely acknowledged, the impact of archaeologists on “Deutsche Ostforschung” and the so called “Grenzlandkampf” is little known. Until now we only know that after 1918 a hand full of well-educated young archaeologists like Friedrich Holster moved into provinces like Grenzmark

Posen-Westpreußen, worked enthusiastically in the politically charged periphery of Germany and established archaeological institutions (on Holster as the founder of the Provincial Museum of Archaeology in Schneidemühl: A. KOKOWSKI, *Przygoda z archeologią czyli najstarsze dzieje Krajny Złotowskiej [do czasów lokacji miasta Złotowa]. Abenteuer Archäologie oder: Die älteste Geschichte des Flatower Landes [bis zu den Zeiten der Stadtgründung von Flatow] [Warszawa 2011]).*

However, financial crises after the First World War and at the end of the 1920s and early 1930s negatively influenced all the plans of expansion of archaeological institutions in the peripheral provinces as chapters III and IV are showing. The 16 articles of chapter III (pp. 419–446) are about pre- and protohistory of the province in general and some public talks about archaeology. In the last chapter (pp. 485–509), ten articles on archaeological conferences and meetings are published. Only from the early 1930s, the output of archaeological work was large enough and the province gained attention of some archaeological organisations like the “Berufsgemeinschaft deutscher Vorgeschichtsforscher” (Professional community of German archaeologists) or the “Reichsbund für deutsche Vorgeschichte” (Reichsbund for German antiquity). However, like in other regions, we know very little about the real influence of archaeology on politics then, of the argumentations of regional politicians, of cultural political decisions and finally of that what we call a regional identity. Therefore, detailed analyses of internal strategic papers and discussions are necessary.

Summarising, all reprinted newspaper articles are rated on their value for contemporary archaeology (pp. 560–563). The scale goes from “1” for new information on a still unknown archaeological site or find to “5” for a small addition to established knowledge and “6” for a repetition of information from a scientific publication. 112 articles delivered helpful new information on the contemporary archaeology, which is why the authors are rightly claim that “explorations in the press [...] enrich our knowledge on the archaeology of the province” (p. 512). In this way, it renders possible to reconstruct the archaeological discourse of the region and the book by A. Kokowski and W. Niemirowski is an interesting and helpful extension of our knowledge on archaeology in the East German borderlands between the two World Wars.

And what about the mentioned maximum of information on a special field? Not only academic disciplines developed habitus, methods, structures and specific ways of communication, such as conferences, periodicals and libraries, in the 19th century. With the development of newspaper media, the general public acquired a modern medium for knowledge transfer. News became mass-produced goods with prize and market. To deal with the mass of news new strategies of making accessible information on single topics had to be developed. Since the end of the 1870s, special bureaus of newspaper clipping were founded in Paris, London, New York and Berlin (TE HEESEN 2006, 78–82). Already for 1906, a “developed newspaper-clipping-industry” is mentioned and lots of regional and national bureaus worked in Germany and later in Poland. The bureaus offered the service to collect published articles on special, individual topics for a customer. Artists, politicians and more and more academics became clients of these bureaus, later also companies and local authorities (A. TE HEESEN [ed.], *Cut and paste um 1900. Der Zeitungsausschnitt in den Wissenschaften. Kaleidoskopien 4* (Berlin 2002)). This ‘industry’ remained influential until modern methods of copying and storing were established at the end of the 1960s and postmodern internet search engines changed our way of asking, searching and knowing fundamentally (<https://www.xerox.de/de-de/innovation/history> [last access: 24 October 2018]; TE HEESEN 2006, 301–302). As the ideal of a maximum on information which seems so postmodern was developed more than a hundred years ago.

This ideal of maximum information meshed perfectly with the ideal of comprehensive archaeological land survey. Did single early archaeologists use these services, as proven for Rudolf Virchow, Gustaf Kossinna and Józef Kostrzewski (p. 17)? Were archaeological societies and later the State Offices for Heritage Management and Archaeology customers of this newspaper clipping bureaus? We know very little on the interaction between archaeology and press at the time of the emergence of archaeology as a scholarly discipline. As the book by A. Kokowski and W. Niemirowski reveals, G. Kossinna supported the reception of newspaper news as the editor of the “*Nachrichtenblatt für deutsche Vorzeit*” and organised the rubric “*Mitteilungen aus der Tagespresse*” (messages from daily press) (p. 17). And his follower on the Berlin chair of Pre- and Protohistory, Hans Reinerth, forced colleagues and institutions to report actively on archaeological topics in the NSDAP daily newspaper “*Völkischer Beobachter*” and instructed his students to observe this newspaper (G. SCHÖBEL, Hans Reinerth. *Forscher – NS-Funktionär – Museumsleiter*. In: A. Leube (ed.) in *Zusammenarbeit mit M. Hegewisch, Prähistorie und Nationalsozialismus. Die mittel- und osteuropäische Ur- und Frühgeschichtsforschung in den Jahren 1933–1945* [Heidelberg 2002] 321–396, p. 350. – Thanks to Gunter Schöbel for his help regarding this issue!). To me this speaks for modern strategies of discourse reception and discloses early 20th century archaeology as an academic community acting in a modern way. For the history of archaeology it is not only of interest to bring to light the maximum of available information enabling a reconstruction of former archaeological discourses. To know the individual reception of the scientific and public discourse through quoted literature and collected newspaper articles on archaeology would help to understand strategic and scientific decisions. Books like the one reviewed here are perfect initial points for research on this field.

Berlin

E-Mail: mrs.susanne.grunwald@googlemail.com

Susanne Grunwald