

pathological conditions. For example, dental pathologies are shown disconnected from each other on several figure plates. Furthermore, some plates may or may not contain figures of such different pathological conditions as bone necrosis on a tibia or a healed epidural haemorrhage (Pl. 124). Therefore, the book is clearly not written with the intention to become a general reference work. However, the number of microscopic images is extraordinary, in plain as well as polarised light. The latter ones, as well as the endoscopic pictures, are printed in colour. This supports the understanding of important aspects of the diagnostic methods. Also, the overall quality of the print as well as the paper and manufacture of the book are excellent. It is a pleasure to work with this book, and the reader does not experience the disappointment of not being able to recognise the object on the photograph due to a pixelated print. This is, unfortunately, not always the case.

The investigation and publication of the human skeletal remains from Starigard / Oldenburg is, as mentioned before, not flawless. Still, it probably ranks among the most important and useful comprehensive publications on palaeopathology of the last decades, especially, but not only, in the German-speaking anthropological sciences. It should not be missing in the library of any palaeopathologist. The presentation of the results of this investigation, at last, closes the gap in the exploration of Starigard / Oldenburg, which probably generations of students of pre- and protohistory encountered. The detailed results and the holistic presentation, including an extended catalogue, can be understood as an example for the basic analysis, which could then be perfectly extended and completed by continuing research in, for example, genetic or stable isotopic investigations. From a modern perspective, these would form an exciting and extremely valuable extension to the basic, osteoanthropological investigation. However, they should not be misunderstood as its replacement. This volume reminds the reader of the necessity and value of such profound, holistic osteoanthropological work.

D-99423 Weimar
Humboldtstrasse 11

E-mail: Jan.Novacek@tlda.thueringen.de

Jan Nováček

Landesamt für Denkmalpflege und Archäologie

REINHARD BERNBECK, *Materielle Spuren des nationalsozialistischen Terrors. Zu einer Archäologie der Zeitgeschichte*. Transcript Verlag, Bielefeld 2017. € 39.99. ISBN 978-3-8376-3967-4 (print edition). € 39.99. ISBN 978-3-8394-3967-8 (PDF). 515 pages with numerous illustrations, some in colour, and tables.

“The history of the modern era [... is] one of violence and catastrophe”, as the author explained in a recent interview (https://lisa.gerda-henkel-stiftung.de/die_geschichte_der_moderne_ist_eine_der_gewalt_und_katastrophen?nav_id=7498 [last accessed: 12 December 2019]). The task of dealing with National Socialism, which drove humankind to wage one of the biggest wars ever seen, perpetrated a genocide of unimagined magnitude and changed the political landscape for decades to come, is more pressing than ever, particularly given current racist tendencies. Readers of this book by Reinhard Bernbeck, a prehistorian and Near Eastern archaeologist by trade, are asked to disengage from the notion of a “traditional” publication of finds and features from archaeological excavations. They are asked to pluck up the courage to become involved in the author’s sometimes rather provocative and even uncomfortable deliberations and ideas; not only does he call on his readers to go in search of archaeological traces, he also gives them a political statement to ponder along the way, since, he argues, an archaeology of “interpretative restraint” ultimately amounts to “historical misinterpretation” (p. 230). As is clearly announced in the subtitle, which refers to an “archaeology of contemporary history”, Bernbeck’s work presents far more than just the results

gleaned from the excavations carried out at Tempelhofer Feld in Berlin, though the former airport and its surroundings are at the centre of the work. Whilst it has served as an inner-city oasis for many since the people of Berlin voted to keep the area free from development in 2014, it originally accommodated a military detention facility, built in 1896, and then became the location of the Columbia concentration camp (1926–1934). Test trenches and larger-scale excavations were planned and carried out in areas known as “the old airport”, “Columbia concentration camp”, “Lufthansa’s so-called Lilienthal forced labour camp”, “Weserflug’s Richthofen communal camp” (owned by Weser-Flugzeugbau GmbH, an aircraft manufacturing firm), and the “Weserflug ‘shanty town’” on the south-western edge of the site. Unfortunately, it is difficult to judge from the book where the trenches were located and how big they were. The features and functional units are highly complex. The forced labour camps, for instance, included not only barracks and infrastructural components (fences, paths) but also trenches for protection against shrapnel and fire water ponds. Another typical aspect of contemporary archaeology is the large quantity of finds (more than 90,000 artefacts). It is not just their sheer number but also the subject-object relationships that can be deduced from the seemingly anonymous finds that make the assemblage significant. Taking the example of tags made from duralumin, an aluminium alloy used in aircraft manufacture, the author discusses questions of representativity and the concept of “perceivability of the not-known” (p. 138), which is very important to his thought. The numbers on the tags could have been personnel numbers and therefore attest to “forced labourers present at Tempelhof; but they could be moved on or allocated to worse work areas for some misdemeanour, or even transferred to the Gestapo” (p. 138). As a badge of ownership, on the other hand, the tags attest to a “specific relationship, namely that between a forced labourer and his or her belongings which have been temporarily confiscated; an [...] individual experience of extortion” (p. 138).

In his first chapter (Introduction, pp. 7–41), the author lays the groundwork for his analyses and further thoughts and does so on a very high theoretical level, referring in particular to the work of Walter Benjamin and the critical theory of the Frankfurt School. This “introductory” section not only paves the way for the analyses which follow but ultimately requires the reader to adopt a firm position. The second chapter (The Materiality of Texts, Images and Objects, pp. 43–107) makes short shrift of some (pre)conceptions regarding the materiality of historical sources and objects. As will be shown later, many of Bernbeck’s conclusions initially serve as corrections of and additions to what is already known from other historical materials. After all, even the small, forgotten things, finds, and features can refute theories or even bring to light the unknown. So far, so good, since almost all historical archaeologists point to the complex interrelationships which exist in periods with dense and parallel records. The author therefore attaches particular importance not only to the relationship between material-based archaeology and the written sources but also to the power of the image to create a supposed objectivity. Moreover, the statement that personalised finds are often accorded too much relevance by both the public and research circles is not only convincing but constitutes a protest against the potency of individualised object biographies in the field of historical archaeology and beyond. Here, the author speaks as someone with sufficient experience to see beyond the dense mass of surviving historical materials, and he is right. Incidentally, the ‘founding fathers’ of ‘contemporary archaeology’ in the US were all, themselves, prehistorians, and as such acutely aware of the significance of “small things forgotten”. Therefore, when Bernbeck insists that “instead of desperately searching for names and individuals, the materiality of the archaeological finds and features should be used to bring to the fore the potential for remembering all those who will remain forever anonymous” (p. 154), we may wholeheartedly agree. I believe that it would be wrong to interpret his call to mean that all objects should always be excavated, recorded, conserved and archived. After all, an excavated assemblage of more than 90,000 finds does pose a challenge for heritage management, and makes it necessary to devise

strategies for the selection of finds or at least for their presentation. Randomness (*Beiläufigkeit*), as Bernbeck calls it, whilst challenging in all epochs, is particularly so in the case of the modern era in general and sensitive objects such as camps or trenches in particular. However, and this calls for fundamental debate, the question of “who decides?” must be raised, given both the call for a “public archaeology” and the ratification of the Faro Convention. Another, perhaps more provocative formulation of the question is: should finds from camps be handled with greater sensitivity than those from working-class estates or factories? Bernbeck’s answer to this question is very clear and can be traced back to philosophers such as Giorgio Agamben. Camps, in general, de-humanise – through physical and / or psychological violence and through deprivation of freedom, individuality and, as part of that, personal belongings. Added to this, particularly, though not exclusively, in the Nazi period, was reclassification according to racial, political and gender-based criteria. It would also be fascinating, however – in terms, apart from anything else, of the Critical Theory of the Frankfurt School represented by Bernbeck – to apply the concept of de-humanisation to capitalist systems of production.

In his next chapter entitled “Contemporary Witnesses and Testimonies” (pp. 109–174), the author endeavours to gauge the value of contemporary testimonies as source material, thus broaching a topic that is challenging for any researcher in the field of cultural sciences. He pursues two interlocking objectives. On the one hand, he takes a highly critical approach, and rightly so, to “oral history” as one of the most important source categories in archaeological research. On the other hand, however, he wishes to entice supposedly mute objects to speak and introduce them into the political and archaeological discourse as material contemporary witnesses. As a concrete example, he cites a number of skull fragments that were discovered near the former “Kaiser-Wilhelm-Institute of Anthropology, Human Heredity and Eugenics” at Berlin-Dahlem and later cremated. It was only thanks to further research that they were recognised as originating from the institute’s collections. At the time, they had served as material evidence for teaching “racial science”, and some had come from camps or medical experiments. The author sees this case as a key example of a “New Forensis” (pp. 160–174). “Forensis” here does not simply mean forensic science; it means making objects speak and unlocking their potential for political practice. Intrinsic to the author’s discussion, however, are fundamental questions about forensics itself; for instance, the researcher’s ostensible right to carry out scientific analyses (in this case aDNA analyses) for the purpose of provenancing.

In his fourth chapter on “Evocation and Narration” (pp. 175–250), the author pursues the notion of ‘remembrance’. To replace the concept of ‘authenticity’, which Bernbeck rightly rejects, he uses that of ‘evocation’ (p. 95 Fig. 2.11). By this, he means not merely a stylistic device for crystallising mental images but the conjuring up of a deity or higher power and, not least, the right to appropriate decision-making from the point of view of hindsight. In each of these interpretations, objects also serve as a means to illustrate and convey human suffering. This is a concept that is very much open to debate. Here, too, the basic question is and will remain: by what authority is the evocative character of certain objects determined and how can they be identified in the absence of any further contextualisation? Bernbeck answers this question in a rather unique way by introducing the idea of “spaces of possibility” in relation to archaeological finds. Using the fragment of a hand-held searchlight (pp. 177–186) as an example, he develops two fictional narratives, one representing surveillance (guard), the other representing flight (inmate). Another example are trenches for protection against shrapnel as an embodiment of “fearful waiting”. But here can we not also see a discovered condom and condom holder as evidence of rape, witnesses to fearful “sexual violence”, as Bernbeck assumes (pp. 157–160)? This call to imagine the scene, to relive events and the associated “scenarios of evocation” (pp. 173–186) is quite new, unusual, and perhaps upsetting for some. However, as a scientist, the author knows that this “interpretative excess” (p. 228) can only

be justified by a “disciplined imagination” (p. 200) and that the limits are always set by the facts. Otherwise the result would be precisely what Bernbeck denounces: conjecture which turns into fact and can be instrumentalised almost at will.

Both finds and features are generally related to a specific spatial setting. This allows the author to present multiple versions of the production of space. In this process, Bernbeck ultimately draws on the only recently rediscovered spatial concept of H. Lefebvre, who discerned the relationships between spatial practices (lived space), representations of space (perception) and spaces of representation. To illustrate these, the author cites a number of examples from the Tempelhof camp, which he uses not only to point to discontinuities between planned space and lived space, but also to explore different levels of scale, or multidimensionalities. Archaeology, he concludes, is uniquely able – and has the responsibility – to demonstrate local singularities (pp. 252–254), point out contradictions, and incorporate them, from a micro-historical perspective, into a global historical narrative.

The final chapter entitled “Current Pasts” (pp. 323–413) is an intensive study of the culture of (German) remembrance and the many forms of dealing with the past: places of remembrance, places of perpetrators and victims. Who lays claim to which points of view, and how must they be incorporated into both the scientific and the socio-political discourse? Here, too, Bernbeck opens up a wide area of discussion, not only intensively exploring various knowledge formats but also providing food for thought on matters beyond the archaeology of National Socialism. This comes with self-reflection at a metalevel, in which the author subjects the claims of his own excavations and their presentation to critical analysis. Thus, by inserting narratives of positionality at various points, the author emphasises a relativising historiography.

In the Epilogue (pp. 415–435), Bernbeck attempts to place his thoughts and conclusions in a bigger context. They include, on one hand, a call for the incorporation of contemporary archaeology into university teaching and critical remarks on the Bologna process and an increasingly neo-liberal slant to the academic enterprise and, on the other, a critical assessment of the mediation of archaeological projects. The author also takes a stand on questions of migration and how refugees are dealt with in German everyday life and politics. The epilogue concludes with a section on “Boundaries of moral communities”. However, precisely because Bernbeck attempts, in the epilogue, to incorporate the Tempelhof site and “Nazi archaeology” into an archaeology of the modern era, with all its scientific and societal challenges, some areas of this section seem painted with too broad a brush. A lot is merely touched on, without any consistent further elaboration, though this would probably have exceeded the remit of the book. For instance, important reflections on objectivity in the archaeology of the modern era, and perhaps even archaeological research in general, are widely scattered throughout the book and these could have been further elaborated at this point. I would also have liked to see a section on the challenges presented by an archaeology of the modern era for archaeological heritage management and for such concepts as “dark” or “difficult heritage”. In my opinion, the terms “contemporary archaeology” and “archaeology of the modern era” are not sufficiently well defined; with regard to the latter, in particular, it would have made sense to add a discussion of “modernity”, as a (western) epochal term and philosophical concept, from an archaeological point of view. Finally, I am rather sorry that there is not a broader perspective, seeing the continuities from the 19th to the 21st century. Above and beyond the statements relating to social and scientific politics, there would have been an opportunity here to ask questions about the archaeological links between the development of capitalism, crises, dictatorship and terror. If, as Bernbeck claims, the history of the modern era was “one of violence and catastrophe”, I would have appreciated a glance at these links and would have expected no less from a decidedly political work.

Reinhard Bernbeck's book is challenging in every way. Even at a readability level it is not easy and occasionally demands a substantial degree of familiarity with the cultural sciences on the part of the reader. Moreover, the reader must be willing to engage with the author's personal writing style, since Bernbeck acts according to Agamben's injunction to "seek a witness, be a witness". In terms of its contents, the book is an archaeological essay penned by a political archaeologist outside of the usual restraints of excavation analyses. When Bernbeck states that "an archaeology of the Nazi period [...] can never take a post-humanist and object-ontological standpoint without sliding into cynicism" (p. 131) and thus concealing "human suffering", he is hardly asking too much, given the epoch he is dealing with. Such an archaeology raises precisely the sort of questions that are constantly being prompted, for instance, by "post-colonial studies". One question which remains unanswered, however, is whether or how this demand can and should be transferred to other epochs, regimes, or social situations.

The book is not a traditional excavation analysis, nor does it offer an introduction to the archaeology of the modern era. It is an archaeological essay grounded in deep sociological and philosophical thought, a call for a self-reflective approach to archaeology, and an appeal for recognition of the powerful eloquence of supposedly voiceless materiality. The Adorno quote in the introduction (p. 7) is not only a guiding motif for Bernbeck's scientific analysis but appears to me to have a deeply personal, biographical resonance; it is obvious how closely the author identifies with the topic at a human level. The book not only inspires but actually forces its readers to contradict, agree, disagree, and reflect. And that is a good thing, because beyond the archaeological site at Tempelhofer Feld and the National Socialist era, fundamental questions are raised about the self-conception of archaeological work and historical interpretation. The author answers these consistently from his chosen perspective. Reinhard Bernbeck's statements are provocative, and rightly so. Archaeology as a field of scientific research must not be political, but the archaeologist should certainly be. For readers who agree with this view, this book is to be recommended.

Translated by Sandy Hämmerle and Isabel Aitken.

D-24118 Kiel
Johanna-Mestorf-Str. 2-6
E-mail: umueller@ufg.uni-kiel.de

Ulrich Müller
Institut für Ur- und Frühgeschichte
Christian-Albrechts Universität Kiel

HUGO ANDERSON-WHYMARK / DUNCAN GARROW / FRASER STURT (Hrsg.), Continental Connections. Exploring Cross-Channel Relationships from the Mesolithic to the Iron Age. Oxbow Books, Oxford 2015. £ 36,00. ISBN 978-1-78297-809-1. iv + 172 Seiten mit 49 Abbildungen und 2 Tabellen.

Im Zeichen des Brexit erscheint es bemerkenswert, dass 2015 im United Kingdom diese Sammelchrift erschien, die die Zusammenhänge zwischen der Vorgeschichte der Britischen Inseln mit der kontinental-europäischen Vorgeschichte thematisiert. Die Herausgeber, Dozenten an den englischen Universitäten von York, Reading und Southampton, haben ein Team von zehn Autoren zusammengeführt, die über Problemfelder vom Mesolithikum bis zur Eisenzeit referieren. Die Arbeiten werden in ihrer Reihenfolge in dem Werk besprochen.

Eingangs führen Duncan Garrow und Fraser Sturt in die Materie und die folgenden Beiträge ein („Continental connections: introduction“, S. 1-6). Beim Ende der letzten Eiszeit waren Irland und England mit Schottland und Wales noch Teile des Kontinents, die erst postglazial zu Inseln wurden, Irland um 18.000-14.000 v. Chr. und Britannien um 8000-6000 v. Chr., das einstige