Erfolg der Analyse verbrannter Überreste dar, wie von Douglas H. Ubelaker im Kapitel 9 („Case applications of recent research on thermal effects on the skeleton", S. 213–226) betont wird; ein wirklich wichtiger und häufig vernachlässigter Aspekt, der nicht oft genug wiederholt werden kann.

Die Schwerpunkte der unterschiedlichen Beiträge verdeutlichen, wie die Heterogenität der Einflussfaktoren innerhalb der oben aufgeführten, völlig verschiedenen Ebenen (materialbedingt oder kulturell und somit handlungsbedingt) allgemein gültige Interpretationen erschweren oder gar verhindern können. Lokal sind hingegen Übergänge des Bestattungsritus, z. B. von der Praxis der Verbrennung zur Körperbestattung, nachweisbar. Für Bestattungen aus dieser Übergangsphase wiesen G. Piga u. a. mit Hilfe der Röntgendiffraktometrie und Infrarot-Spektroskopie niedrige Verbrennungstemperaturen (zwischen 400 und 850° C) nach, die nur zu einer Teilverbrennung geführt haben.

Der Band „The Archaeology of Cremation" ist für Archäologen, aber auch Anthropologen zu empfehlen, die sich vor allem mit innovativen Aspekten und Interpretationen dieser Form der Bestattungskultur auseinandersetzen wollen. Die Leser sollten jedoch mit den spezifischen Charakteristika von Leichenbrand grundsätzlich vertraut sein, denn es war nicht Ziel von T. Thompson, eine weitere Einführung in die Bearbeitung und Auswertung von Leichenbrand herauszugeben, sondern den kulturellen Kontext von Brandbestattungen in den Fokus zu stellen. Dies ist Tim Thompson durch die facettenreiche Auswahl der Beiträge zweifelsohne gelungen.

D–37073 Göttingen
Bürgerstr. 50
E-Mail: birgit.grosskopf@biologie.uni-goettingen.de

Birgit Grosskopf
Historische Anthropologie
und Humanökologie
Johann-Friedrich-Blumenbach-Institut
der Georg-August-Universität Göttingen

Howard Williams / Melanie Giles (eds), Archaeologists and the Dead. Oxford University Press, Oxford 2016. £ 85,–. ISBN 978-0-19-875353-7. 465 pages, 78 figures and five tables.

The book starts with a foreword by Mike Parker Pearson and a preface by the editors. It contains 20 chapters: an introductory part, 18 different case studies and one concluding chapter. The focus of the book is on the complex dynamics between mortuary archaeologists and contemporary society. Specifically, it looks at the intersection of contemporary society, public archaeology and mortuary archaeology. The editors have chosen to concentrate on areas outside a post-colonial context and instead focus on the Western world. Most of the articles deal with cases in the UK, but other areas of Europe, such as Scandinavia and Austria, as well as post-colonial contexts from North America are also presented. The book is divided into three sections: "Investigating the Dead", "Displaying the Dead" and "Public Mortuary Archaeology". Each section contains between five to seven chapters respectively, excluding the concluding chapter in the third section.

The first section "Investigating the Dead" starts with an article by Sian Anthony. "Questions Raised in Excavating the Recent Dead" (pp. 22–38) is based on the excavation of a churchyard in Copenhagen, the Assistens cemetery, which was undertaken between 2009 and 2011. The excavation was necessary due to the construction of a metro station in one corner of the cemetery. What made this excavation special is that burials from 1805/06 up to the 1980s were excavated. The article begins by presenting the principles set up for excavating this sensitive site and continues with a discussion on how the excavation was processed and how communications with the public

occurred. It argues for the importance of research into death in modernity and that archaeology has an important contribution to this topic. The article would be useful to read before planning any excavations of recent burials, though in a Scandinavian setting; other cultural contexts might react very differently to this type of excavation. As repeatedly pointed out in the book, the relationship between the public and mortuary archaeology of any time period is necessarily very culture-bound, and views on what is culturally acceptable will vary in different groups and different cultures.

The next paper "Personhood and Re-Embodiment in Osteological Practice" (pp. 39–67) by John McClelland and Jessica I. Cerezo-Román takes an osteological view on human bones and addresses how the repatriation movement has changed at least North American physical anthropologists' views on human remains. The study draws upon material from Alameda-Stone cemetery in Tuscany, Arizona. In other words, we are within a North American context and the rules and regulations are different from the earlier case, though both projects can be seen as sensitive sites. The focus is on the role osteologists play as mediators between a dead community and descendant communities, which in this case comprises three different groups: the military, specific Native American tribes and the Hispanic community. The work on the skeletal material and the designations of the deceased individuals are presented and discussed. It is shown how the osteologist's role has changed to help facilitate and interpret the process of forming new identities.

The next article "Separating the Emotions: Archaeological Mentalities in Central Italian Funerary Archaeology" (pp. 68–96) by Ulla Rajala moves us back to Europe with an analysis of Italian mortuary archaeologists' attitudes to human remains. The study is based on interviews and surveys with professionals working in pre-Roman archaeology. U. Rajala finds that, despite some differences, there are also commonalities, such as shared aims for the field and a common view of the dead and the ancestors. It is also shown that the view held differs from results from an earlier similar study by M. Leighton (Personifying objects / objectifying people: handling questions of mortality and materiality through the archaeological body. Ethnos 75,1, 2003, 78–101) on attitudes among archaeologists living in the UK. U. Rajala makes clear that different archaeologists' attitudes and views on mortuary archaeology and human remains are dependent on how contemporary society approaches these questions as well as the specific historical settings in different countries.

In the next paper, "Slave-Trade Archaeology and the Public: The Excavation of the 'Liberated African' Graveyard on St Helena" (pp. 97–112) by Andrew Pearson and Ben Jeffs, we again find ourselves looking at a sensitive excavation of relatively modern burials and a painful heritage. It is an excavation of a cemetery with no living descendant group and centres on what can be seen as a painful heritage, the slave trade, performed by non-local archaeologists. This archaeological project was also the first ever excavation on the island. The article presents and examines how the team worked on the excavation, how they interacted with the public and how they dealt with the political situation. It also addresses thorny questions such as: should the human remains be repatriated? If so, to which country in Africa? It is an interesting presentation of the work, although the absence of a general discussion that could help future archaeologists faced with comparable situations is disappointing.

Staying within the category of 'painful heritage', the paper "Habeas Corpus: Contested Ownership of Casualties of the Great War" (pp. 113–138) by Martin Brown presents and discusses work with remains from the First World War. Though being aware that 'the Great War' is an established term for the First World War, I think that the more neutral term First World War would have been preferable, as the term 'Great' – as in enormous – might not be obvious for non-native speakers. Over 72,000 fallen soldiers at the battle of Somme have no known grave. This contribution dis-

cusses ownership of the fallen soldiers based on Brown's excavations in Belgium and France. To whom do the recovered fallen soldiers belong? Fatalities from World War One are recovered by both rescue excavations and research excavations. The article presents various opinions and views about excavations, from many different involved groups, including the army, the families, the archaeologist and the wider public. It presents the different treatment of reburial by the various armies of the recovered soldiers, the British, Australians and German. These differences are discussed in terms of the later history of the armies. It would have been interesting to include here a discussion on general trends in outlook and in the treatment of human remains.

Faye and Duncan Sayer discuss the research excavation of an Anglo-Saxon site in Oakington in the article "Bones Without Barriers: The Social Impact of Digging the Dead" (pp. 139–165). It starts off by explaining the legal situation in the United Kingdom, where human remains have to be excavated behind a screen. This is something that, according to the authors, creates mistrust on the part of the general public, who are left to speculate about what archaeologists do behind the screen. They got permission to excavate the cemetery without any screens, and evaluate how they interacted with the general public. They argue that by imposing the morals of our own society onto that of the deceased we are guilty of imposing our own social understanding and values onto past people. Their work with the Oakington project is presented along with the strategies they chose and the results from the feedback form submitted by visitors to the site. They argue that most archaeological sites do not need to be excavated behind screens but instead might have clear warning signs stating the presence of human remains for those who are sensitive to this. They conclude that in most cases the screening off is bad as it stops the general public from engaging with the archaeologists, thus damaging relations between the profession and the public.

The second part of the book, "Displaying the Dead", focuses on how human remains are handled in museums. Headley Swain presents a general overview of how human remains are shown in museums around the world in the paper "Museum Practice and the Display of Human remains" (pp. 169–183). She concludes that traditions for displaying human remains vary in different parts of the world. In South America and Europe, human remains are common in many museums, whereas in China extraordinarily well-preserved remains are on display as scientific wonders. In North America, Australia, New Zealand, Africa, India, South East Asia and Japan, none or very few human remains are displayed in the museums. The reasons for this, according to H. Swain, are cultural, with the indigenous empowerment of historical abuse being the force behind the situations in North America, Australia and New Zealand. Attitudes in Europe seem to have changed slightly, and, according to the author, human remains are now seldom treated as just another artefact.

Three English Heritage cases are discussed in Sarah Tatham's article "Displaying the Dead: The English Heritage Experience" (pp. 184–203). In each case study, the reasons for displaying the remains are examined. The three case studies were all conducted without involving the public and were planned following the then current English Heritage guidelines. None of the cases have been criticised by the public for displaying human remains, and all three have been popular exhibitions. S. Tatham shows that most of the so-called 'general public' do not object to human remains being on display in museums, though she points out that we need to have an aim and a story to tell when we decide to put remains on display. She argues that publicly financed museums need to be open to criticism and that in some cases public involvement before an exhibition is launched may be valuable.

The woman from Bäckaskog, the Tollund man and the two deceased individuals found in the Oseberg ship are the main focus in "The Immortals: Prehistoric Individuals as Ideological and Therapeutic Tools in our Time" (pp. 204–232) by Nina Nordström. The article, as the title indi-

cates, discusses why some ancient deceased become 'immortal' and the impact this fame has on us. All three case studies are within a Scandinavian setting. N. Nordström argues that it is the modern history of a prehistoric individual that decides whether or not it becomes famous. The more attention they get the more famous they become. N. Nordström claims that the reason for this is a need in each of us to find out the truth about ourselves through an engagement with the ancient deceased. The author continues that we need these bodies as tools for ideological reasoning for questions we will never answer. These prehistoric individuals are constantly returned to, but the questions put to them change from generation to generation. N. Nordström argues that they help us define ourselves.

The next two papers relate to the same institution, the Manchester Museum, and comprise Karen Exell's article "Covering the Mummies at the Manchester Museum: A Discussion of Authority, Authorship, and Agendas in the Human Remains Debate" (pp. 233–250) and Tiffany Jenkins' contribution "Making an Exhibition of Ourselves: Using the Dead to Fight the Battle of the Living" (pp. 251–267). Manchester Museum was an active partner in the great British debate about the ethics of displaying human remains in museums in the period 2006–2009. This debate is mentioned in other articles in the book as well (e. g. H. Swain). K. Exell was at the time employed as curator of Egyptology at the museum, and T. Jenkins was part of a team employed to create a temporary exhibition at the Manchester Museum on Lindow man. T. Jenkins' article focuses on the creation of the exhibition of Lindow man and the invited participants, the different groups involved in the exhibition and their responses. K. Exell's paper deals with other aspects as well, such as the covering of mummies at Manchester Museum. The two papers together provide a broad view on the different claims and opinions in the ethics debate as put forward at the Manchester Museum. T. Jenkins argues that some museums experienced a 'crisis of cultural authority'. K. Excell claims that the individual agendas of a few people came into play at the Manchester Museum. Both demonstrate the great influence that even just a few individuals could have in shaping the debate.

A study comparing attitudes towards death in two different settings, one post-colonial (USA) and the other post-national (Sweden), is offered by Liv Nilsson Stutz in "To Gaze Upon the Dead: The Exhibition of Human Remains as Cultural Practice and Political Process in Scandinavia and the USA" (pp. 268–292). Fundamental differences in the history of archaeology and the effect this has on modern society's opinion of the discipline are presented. North American archaeology stems from an oppressing colonial past, whereas in Europe archaeology is part of a nationalist project; and it is argued that the past belongs to mankind and cannot be claimed for any specific group. This article shows the important roles of different modern societies in how ancient remains are viewed and treated in different cultures and cautions that before drawing conclusions we need to look at the culture context in each specific case. Decisions made in one context may not be relevant or transferable to another context.

Howard Williams discusses the lack of cremated bones and the presentation of cremations as part of the treatment of the dead in museums in "Firing the Imagination: Cremation in the Museum" (pp. 293–329). I found this claim of a lack of bones in museum displays surprising, as to my mind most Scandinavian museums display cremated bones, and my thought went straight to the Historical Museum in Stockholm (SHM) and the cremated bones that were displayed there. It was therefore particularly interesting for me to read the analysis of SHM. As an archaeologist who originates from Stockholm, I have often visited the museum, but as I am more familiar with the material than most, I clearly have not thought about how it is presented; I have just used my knowledge to interpret the exhibition. Therefore, I have missed the fact that the cremated bones are presented without contexts. I now realise that the lack of contextual information is a general

problem within the exhibition as a whole, though, and is not confined to the cremations. Returning to H. Williams' article, he also points out a lack of discussion on how we display and discuss cremated human remains, and he continues to argue that researchers studying cremations need to engage in the debate about how this practice is portrayed within museums and presented to the public.

The final part of the book deals with "Public Mortuary Archaeology". "Contemporary Pagans and the Study of the Ancestors" (pp. 333–344) by William Rathouse discusses the relations within and between different pagan communities and archaeology in Britain. It starts with pointing out that there is not one pagan community but many, and they can have conflicting opinions. The paper is based on interviews with a number of people involved in different pagan groups. The various groups are shown to have very different interests and attitudes to mortuary archaeology, although it seems universal that pagan groups regard archaeology as part of the establishment, and many have a fundamental need to challenge the establishment. It would have been interesting to include some kind of overview of how pagan groups in other parts of the world interact with archaeology and museums in order to understand whether or not the situation in the UK is unique.

The article by Estella Weiss-Krejci "'Tomb to Give Away': The Significance of Graves and Dead Bodies in Present-Day Austria" (pp. 345–366) takes us to another part of Europe, the German speaking world. It examines contemporary attitudes to human remains in Austria by examining the modern history of burials. It is pointed out that charnel houses and ossuaries have been used up to 1995 in Austria, that many churches display human remains that date as late as the fifteenth century, and that the grave plots have an expiration date. Thus, in contrast to some other areas such as the UK, Austrian people are not expected to rest in the same place for ever. E. Weiss-Krejci argues that this is one of the reasons for a late participation in the repatriation discussion and ethics of exhibiting human remains in museums.

The next paper, "Digging the Dead in a Digital Media Age" (pp. 367–395) by Duncan Sayer and Tony Walter, discusses how we can measure the public's opinion about mortuary archaeology. The authors point out that very few people actually comment on articles in the media and that those who write do not always reflect the general opinion. Some digital media has the option to like or dislike comments made to an article. The authors suggest that measuring the likes or dislikes in the comments will give us a better understanding of public opinion rather than just the comments themselves. They present three case studies: the campaign for raising the profile of the reburial problem in England; a discovery of a specific grave in Oakington (the same site as discussed in the paper by Faye and Duncan Sayer); and the investigation of Richard III. For the second case study, the media stage of the project is explained before the examination of the public reaction to articles published in the media. It is argued that it would be helpful to have a developed media strategy before conducting excavation projects. This demonstrates that it is important for an archaeologist to be pro-active in informing the public of the contexts relevant to the archaeology.

"Writing About Death, Mourning, and Emotions: Archaeology, Imagination, and Creativity" (pp. 396–408) by Trevor Kirk discusses the lack of emotion in many mortuary archaeological interpretations to the public. It is suggested that archaeologists should work together with creative writers in order to interpret burial complexes. This co-operation is needed as the interpretation needs to be set within the archaeological data, but also needs multivocality, imagination and creativity.

In her paper "Reconstructing Death: The Chariot Burial of Iron Age East Yorkshire" (pp. 409–432), Melanie Giles starts by examining previous reconstructions, mainly visual reconstructions of chariot burials. She demonstrates that the reconstructions all show clear traces of the aesthetic of

the times in which they were made. After this examination and discussion about reconstructions and their role, M. Giles presents how she went about creating a reconstruction of a chariot burial from Yorkshire. The work involved close co-operation with the artist. There was an interpretive aspect to the reconstruction and its creation continued over a long period of time, including incorporating vital input from colleagues. M. Giles argues that modern computer technology has made it easier to make changes to a reconstruction; hence it can evolve in the process. She argues that this needs to be taken into account in the project budget and should be seen as part of the interpretive work as well, not just the final illustration.

Lynne Goldstein draws together the different threads in the book and adds her experience in the concluding chapter "Reflections on the Intersections of Mortuary Archaeology and Contemporary Society" (pp. 433–451). She identifies four overarching themes in the book which she has chosen to comment on. These are 1) excavations of mortuary sites and issues of accessibility and changing perspective; 2) exhibits of mortuary archaeology and their accessibility (or lack of accessibility) by the public; 3) opinions about archaeology in general and mortuary archaeology in particular, as well as how the opinion is measured; and 4) reinterpretation and / or reanalysis of sites and exhibits and how that reanalysis or reinterpretation is achieved. As shown in the concluding chapter, many articles deal with more than one of these questions.

A general problem is that some of the articles deal with the situation in the UK as if it is the norm. Some of the titles are very general (e. g. W. Rathouse) but only go on to discuss the situation in Britain, whereas the articles dealing with specific case studies outside the UK tend to identify the name or the site, area or country in the title. This could be due to the fact that English people write articles in their native language and therefore do not think about the potential obstacles when writing for a local audience versus an international one. This book appears to have been compiled for an international audience, and consequently it would have been appreciated if this had been acknowledged by the authors. This may also be due to the fact that the book originated as a result of two conferences that were held in the UK.

A number of these articles deal with a relatively new field of research, i. e. digging the recent dead in modern times, and therefore take the form of presenting personal experiences (e. g. S. Anthony, A. Pearson / B. Jeffs and F. Sayer / D. Sayer). Others examine general public opinions from different angles (e. g. D. Sayer / T. Walter, T. Jenkins / S. Tatham), while some of these include a methodological section for their work (e. g. U. Rajala), others lack this (e. g. W. Rathouse). Analysing media and conducting interviews has long been the standard within many social sciences (C. L. Briggs, Learning How to Ask. A Social Linguistic Appraisal of the Role of the Interview in Social Science Research [Cambridge 1984] p. 1) and there are established methodologies for doing this (e. g. C. L. Briggs 1984; N. K. Denzil / Y. S. Lincoln [eds], Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials [Los Angeles 2008]; D. Silverman [ed.], Qualitative Research [Los Angeles 2016]). As a number of articles do not mention methodology more than very generally, it is difficult to know if any established methodology was employed or how exactly the materials were analysed. This way of working might be new to many archaeologists, but as it is not new to science there is no need to re-invent the wheel. For future studies of these kinds, I would suggest that the authors relate their method in more detail, including its strengths and pitfalls, and that they do this based on the established methods from other fields. As methodology does not feature in some of these articles, it can be difficult to evaluate the veracity of the conclusions.

Many of the articles present both a case study the authors have been involved in themselves and discuss their experience in relation to another experience and / or scientific question, whereas some just present a case study without placing it within any kind of broader perspective. This leads to a

rather varied quality of the articles. Although some of the case studies are interesting in and of themselves, placing them in a broader context and discussing the example within an international framework would have boosted the importance of the article and enhanced its future use. Such examples can now be used as comparative material for further research, rather than research that can stand alone.

This book, or at least parts of it, is an important read for excavators setting out on excavating sensitive sites such as relatively modern cemeteries. It contains the experience and choices of archaeologists who have already engaged in this type of excavating, and drawing on their experience will be an advantage for archaeologists dealing with similar situations. However, as pointed out by Nilsson Stutz, not all solutions will work in all places: each has to be locally contextualised. The same is also true for creating new exhibitions. The book will provide valuable information of how others have thought about and constructed their exhibitions, but obviously the context has to be considered here, too. One thing that is made very clear within all the case studies in this book is that the response of the general public to mortuary archaeology is extremely contextual, based on contemporary society and its archaeological as well as modern burial rules and regulations.

As has been shown above, this book deals with the ethics of mortuary archaeology in a modern society. The book can, at times, as noted by the editors, feel a bit too Anglo-Saxon focused, though it provides important insights into other areas as well. Ethics of mortuary archaeology have mainly been discussed within the post-colonial world and within native English speaking communities, and countries such as Scandinavia, which tend to follow the Anglo-Saxon world closely. The contributions by e. g. U. Rajala and E. Weiss-Krejci are important for adding new perspectives to this debate, broadening its horizons considerably. This is an important book that collects different perspectives and personal experiences in the field, and it is hoped that it will be used by archaeologists in the future both for research as well as in preparation for excavations, museum exhibitions or interaction with the so-called general public. I hope that this book will inspire and lead to more studies and perspectives on these topics from other areas of the world, including parts of Europe.

S–40530 Göteborg
Box 200
E-Mail: sophie.bergerbrant@gu.se

Sophie Bergerbrant
Department of Historical Studies
University of Gothenburg

Sarah Milledge Nelson, Shamans, Queens and Figurines. The Development of Gender Archaeology. Left Coast, Walnut Creek 2015. £ 110,–. ISBN 978-1-61132-946-9. (Hardcover). £ 31,99. ISBN 978-1-61132-947-6. (Taschenbuch). £ 22,39. ISBN 978-1-31542-025-7. (E-Book). 287 Seiten mit 8 Abbildungen.

Sarah Milledge Nelson hat dieses Buch nach über 40 Jahren Tätigkeit in der Archäologie mit der Absicht geschrieben, den Weg ihrer Karriere zu zeigen (S. 7–12). Sie sieht es auch als eine umfangreiche Antwort auf das bekannte Buch von Sheryl Sandberg, „Lean In. Women, Work and the Will to Lead“ (New York 2013), das Geschäftsfrauen ermutigen soll, aggressiver in ihrer Karriere zu agieren (S. 9).

Nach dem Vorwort (S. 7–8) folgen acht Teile (S. 9–238) und ein Nachwort (S. 239–250); abgeschlossen wird das Buch mit Bibliographie, Sachregister, Autorenindex und kurzer biographischer Notiz. Die Teile I und II sind rein autobiographisch, in den Teilen III–VIII und im Nachwort gehen die autobiographischen Texte bereits publizierten, hier erneut abgedruckten Aufsätzen voran, die ihre Forschungen in der Genderarchäologie illustrieren. In Teil VIII legt die Verf. fiktio-