

In addition, it is clear that across all these themes, one focus of the book is the implementation of the KuLaDig cultural landscape platform. This is not only visible in the contributions related to the KuLaKOMM project and KuLaDig itself but also in contributions by H.-J. Becker, B. Stemmer, D. Bruns, and others. The examples clearly demonstrate that the web platform is well suited for planning and interpretation.

Beyond the technical focus on spatial planning and landscape management, some texts give interesting and even entertaining accounts of specific historic landscapes, such as Th. Büttner's presentation of the monastic landscape at Eberbach, W. Buschmann's more detailed description of the history of industrial landscape and *Verbundwirtschaft*, and Ch. Stolz' heritage relics in forests.

The book was published in 2017 – six years after the project was finished – and thus seems already a bit out-dated. Approaches like landscape biographies, applied in Germany in the *Altes Land* region during the LANCEWADPLAN project of 2004–2007 or in the recent *Regiobranding* project, are not considered.

The texts have certain redundancies when it comes to descriptions of project aims or the KuLaDig platform. This, however, also provides easy access to each of the distinct articles of the book as a standalone piece. The texts regularly also repeat topics like landscape as a succession of land uses that destroyed traces of older uses, problems heritage management faces with intensifying land use practices, and the loss of heritage elements. These discussions, however, come from the different perspectives of the authors and their personal and scientific background, and thus provide a nuanced picture of these issues.

It is obvious that the large collection of different articles that make up this book need not be read from back to back. The volume rather invites the readers to browse the table of contents and pick individual accounts they are interested in. It is a book well-suited for readers interested in diving into the ocean of good practices and ideas around cultural landscape management and exploring the variety of approaches in Germany.

D-24837 Schleswig

Brockdorff-Rantzau-Str. 70

E-mail: Matthias.Maluck@alsh.landsh.de

Matthias Maluck

Archäologisches Landesamt Schleswig-Holstein

UNDINE STABREY, Archäologische Untersuchungen. Über Temporalität und Dinge. Histoire volume 98. Transcript Verlag, Bielefeld 2017. € 34.99. ISBN 978-3-8376-3586-7 (printed version). ISBN 978-3-8394-3586-1 (PDF open access). 246 pages with 27 illustrations.

This work of Undine Stabrey examines one of the fundamental research problems of archaeology – time. Though this is a broad aspect of study in archaeology in general, the question U. Stabrey is asking is: “how does time come into the soil?” (p. 10). To answer this, she delves into archaeology at the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th century, the time when archaeology was first becoming an academic discipline. She distinguishes between the “interpretation of things” and “interpretation through things” (p. 11). By differentiating these two positions, she points to an epistemological difference between interpreting things from the past and interpreting the past with their help. Archaeological time is inscribed to things in both cases, and that is why it is crucial for Stabrey to properly understand how it came to be. She insists that terms such as ‘ancient world’, ‘prehistory’, and ‘early history’ are all disciplinary inventions and not past realities.

The book, based on a doctoral dissertation of the author written at *Université Paris 1* and *Universität Bern*, comes in softcover and is well illustrated with line-drawings, photos, and sketches made by the author herself. It is divided into three main chapters which are followed by a summary in German and French, acknowledgments, a bibliography, and a word index.

The first chapter “Von Zeit und Archäologie – Temporale Relationen” (“On Time and Archaeology – Temporal Relations”, pp. 15–66) explores how interactions between time and archaeology produced a specific archaeological methodology around 1800. U. Stabrey uses this chapter to set the frame of her work, introduce the reader to her aims and methods, and to define some of the neologisms she is coining in order to better explain her results. U. Stabrey uses the term “Archäologem” to describe the observation of archaeological knowledge structure (pp. 30; 195). According to the author, archaeological time is a reaction to a changed system of timekeeping. Christian Jürgensen Thomsen (1788–1865), Danish antiquarian, developed the three-age system between 1810 and 1820, at the same time when Georg Friedrich Grotefend (1775–1853) deciphered cuneiform script and Jean-François Champollion (1790–1832) deciphered Egyptian hieroglyphs. While the latter two scholars made scripts readable, Christian Jürgensen Thomsen made objects readable. The question remains, how did he do this? Crucial for the development of the three-age system was the modernist idea of progress, the idea that some contemporary cultures are less developed than others and that these less developed groups represent living images of the former state of more developed cultures (p. 21). Before 1800, the idea of time was influenced by the Bible; any new results were correlated with the old biblical chronology. As an example, U. Stabrey gives the biblical explanation of Egyptian dynastic chronology as a consequence of many pharaohs living and ruling at the same time from different places; this was used instead of the acknowledgement that the biblical idea of only 4000 years of history before Christ could not stand (pp. 34–35). Ch. Jürgensen Thomsen, on the other hand, wrote in a time when priorities were shifting from believing to knowing (p. 179). In U. Stabrey’s work, the term “Objektzeit” (“object-time”) signifies those archaeological times based on temporal argumentation using things (p. 38), thus attaining interpretation through things. However, her statement that archaeological thinking is vivid thinking cannot be fully supported (p. 40). It is true that archaeological information becomes materialised in images (e. g. drawings, photos, plans, sections, etc.), as U. Stabrey nicely demonstrates in the third chapter of her book “Die Unsichtbarmachung des Sehbaren” (“Making visible invisible”, pp. 133–204), but this is only one aspect of archaeological work. Experience of things through senses was a part of archaeology long before the recent sensory turn.

The second chapter “Ding und Zeit als System – Dreiperiodenargumentation oder auf der Suche nach der gefundenen Zeit” (“Thing and Time as a System – Three-period Argumentation or on the Search for Found Times”, pp. 67–132) is a deep analysis of Ch. Jürgensen Thomsen’s work and the constitution of logic of archaeological time. After introducing the reader to Ch. Jürgensen Thomsen’s work and its publication, U. Stabrey embarks on an analysis of the structure of archaeological time as developed in his work and inherited in archaeology ever since. For Ch. Jürgensen Thomsen, objects were living images of the past (p. 89), just as some peoples, supposedly less progressive than others, were living images of past peoples (p. 90). Ch. Jürgensen Thomsen distinguished find-combinations as things which often were found together in a tomb and as one of the main criteria of temporal ordering in archaeology. They led to the definition of different time periods based on different typologies of outer structures of stone formations, inner structures, and burials themselves (p. 95). Ch. Jürgensen Thomsen also used ethnographic formal analogies in his argumentation which U. Stabrey somewhat erroneously terms ethno-archaeological (p. 97). The difference is that ethno-archaeology compares the remains of activities in the present (dynamic and static) with the archaeological record (static) in order to assume the dynamic processes from the past which produced it.

The time periods referred to by Ch. Jürgensen Thomsen are “remote”, “most remote”, “older”, “disappeared”, “later”, etc. (p. 97). U. Stabrey thus nicely illustrates that Ch. Jürgensen Thomsen did not argue “when something was” but how the sequence and length of time periods can be argued based on the materiality of things (p. 99). The beginning of a time period is shown in the quantity of a specific material used in this period. For example, the fact that iron is the newer and more costly material compared to copper indicates that it is later. So, the iron axes for Ch. Jürgensen Thomsen have to be younger, and therefore from the Iron Age. They simply could not be single finds from the Bronze Age. Generally, metal and its quantity were the two primary ordering criteria (p. 102). Gradually, time was translated into technique (p. 104). Thus, the Stone Age was a period when weapons and tools were made of stone, wood, and bone and metals were used little or not used at all. The Bronze Age was a period when weapons and tools were made of copper or bronze and either little or no iron or silver was known. The Iron Age was the third and last period; iron was used instead of bronze.

The three-age system was not only a novel way of distinguishing the age of things, but it also influenced practices on archaeological excavations. The goal was to find the way inside the mound, to identify the chamber, to open the chamber, and to make precise observations on the contents (p. 115). The soil itself – its colours, its qualities, its stratigraphy – did not play any role. Therefore, the established idea in historiography of archaeology that Ch. Jürgensen Thomsen worked with closed archaeological contexts is only partly correct. His closed contexts were not stratified (p. 116). Therefore, as they existed outside of a stratigraphic matrix, whether or not they were closed, does not make any difference. Ch. Jürgensen Thomsen assigned the age of the mound based on the burial inside it. The outside did not matter. The work of Olaus Rudbeck (1630–1702), Swedish scientist and writer, who – 200 years prior to Ch. Jürgensen Thomsen – held soils to be crucial for his time estimations, is much different (p. 149). The object-time of Ch. Jürgensen Thomsen is, however, time without stratigraphic time (p. 181), though this does not make it less linear.

U. Stabrey then goes to argue that the crucial aspects of archaeology are the difference between things *in situ* and *in motu*. The invention of the three-age system had major consequences for dating things *in situ* and *in motu*. She argues that moving things from their archaeological contexts to new contexts, such as storerooms or museum collections, established new temporal structures. This led to perceiving archaeological time as always linear and produced in the present (pp. 122–124). Furthermore, objects can be *in motu* through the media of their representation – a drawing or a photo *in visu* (pp. 130–131).

The third chapter “Die Unsichtbarmachung des Sehbaren” (“Making visible invisible”, pp. 133–204) investigates facts produced through vision. The main problem recognised by U. Stabrey is that the visual realities of archaeological documentations and publications are often mistaken for past realities (p. 137). Starting from an excavation, archaeology oscillates between seeing and not seeing (p. 155). Things become history from the moment we make visible that what should be visible (p. 158). We decide what should be visible based on our own ideas of the past and the present world in order to form knowledge of both the past and the present. The process of archaeological documentation and publication has always been selective, serving the needs of a particular interpretation or a narrative. The process of making things visible is, according to U. Stabrey, crucial for understanding archaeological research in its goals, methods, and logic. For her, the new rationalisation of heaven in early 19th century astronomy is what made things visible (pp. 190–192). Instead of seeing stars as gods or God, some people started seeing heaven as the home of celestial bodies with age. The age of heavens called for investigation of the age of earth beyond Biblical catastrophism as explanation.

These discussions lead U. Stabrey to differentiate between archaeological argumentation and thinking about archaeological argumentation. "Archäologikum" is for U. Stabrey the presence of things, as an object becomes archaeological only after it is recognised as such (p. 199). We know of so many examples of collecting some and discarding other remains of the past coming from the same archaeological context. Following U. Stabrey, we can say that we see some of them, and part of what we see, we then make visible; the rest is made invisible in this process. She then argues that the three-period system is, according to her classification, an archaeologicum whereas its internal structures and logic are archaeologems (p. 201). U. Stabrey uses Ch. Jürgensen Thomsen's three-age system to develop a new way of analysing archaeological thinking. Thus, her work on the three-age system presents a case study in archaeological reasoning and an exercise on how it could be further analysed.

The bibliography is listed on 18 pages (pp. 221–238) followed by a six-page index (pp. 239–244). Considering the topic of the book, the lack of references to other major archaeological discussions on time in archaeology is surprising. Among these one should mention "Time and Archaeology" edited by Tim MURRAY (London, New York 1999) and "Time in Archaeology: Time Perspectivism Revisited" edited by Simon HOLDAWAY and LuAnn WANDSNIDER (Salt Lake City 2008). The dependence of the three-age system on modernism and the idea of progress was argued by many authors before. What U. Stabrey did not address in her work is the ideological connection of the three-period system to the modernist aims of totality and closure related to colonial aspirations.

D-48143 Münster
Schlaunstraße 2
E-mail: urosmatic@uni-muenster.de

Uroš Matić
Institut für Ägyptologie und Koptologie
Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster

OLIVER J. T. HARRIS / CRAIG N. CIPOLLA, *Archaeological Theory in the New Millenium. Introducing Current Perspectives*. Routledge, London, New York 2017. £ 115,-. ISBN 978-1-13888-870-8 (Hardback). £ 31,99. ISBN 978-1-13888-871-5 (Paperback). £ 28,79. ISBN 978-1-31571-325-0 (E-Book). 238 Seiten.

„Archaeological Theory in the New Millenium“ ist das jüngste Einführungswerk in archäologische Theoriedebatten, das sich primär an eine Leserschaft ohne theoretische Vorkenntnisse richtet. Inhaltlich deckt das Buch vor allem den englischsprachigen Diskurs ab den 2000er Jahren ab. Durch die gute Lesbarkeit, auch mit durchschnittlichen Englischkenntnissen, und die große Verständlichkeit, mit der die Autoren auch komplexere Ansätze behandeln, hat die Publikation das Potential, in den Kanon der zentralen archäologischen Grundlagenliteratur aufgenommen zu werden.

Verfasst wurde das mit 238 Seiten kompakte Werk von Oliver J. T. Harris und Craig N. Cipolla. Beide haben sich in der Vergangenheit sowohl durch theoretische Publikationen als auch umfangreiche Erfahrung in der Feld-, Forschungs- und Vermittlungspraxis ausgezeichnet. Die Autoren beginnen das Buch mit einer Selbstpositionierung bezüglich ihres biographischen Hintergrundes und Theorieverständnisses (S. 1–3; 8–11). In das Zentrum ihres Theorieverständnisses stellen O. J. T. Harris und C. N. Cipolla dabei die kritische Reflexion der Fragestellungen der archäologischen Forschungspraxis (S. 2). Dadurch bringen sie den Stellenwert theoretischen Arbeitens allgemeinverständlich auf den Punkt. Als weiteres Element nennen sie die Ordnung und Gliederung archäologischer Informationen und Interpretationen (S. 2). Beide Teile stellen zusammengenommen eine eingängige Formel dar, die gleichzeitig die missverständliche Trennung archäologischer Forschung in Theorie und Empirie unterläuft. Die gegenseitige Durchdringung,