

parts of Syria, southeastern Anatolia and northern Iraq. Parallel to these articles which offer background information on various themes and debates, one can also read brief excavation reports on each site represented in the exhibition, written by the excavators themselves and thus providing up-to-date information.

Subsequent chapters focus on the Neolithic of central and west Anatolia, from Asıklıhöyük to Asağıpınar. Here one is overwhelmed by the amount of data from the new projects, which are successfully integrated by various authors, thereby providing the reader with a clear picture of important aspects and discussions on central and western Anatolian Neolithic cultures as well as on the neolithization process in Anatolia. The section written by Mihriban Özbağaran and Marion Cutting, which encompasses the emergence and development of a Neolithic way of life in central Anatolia, successfully combines old and new excavation results with the most significant issues that are discussed currently by archaeologists, such as the initial stages of the domestication process, the earliest year-round settlements in the region, changes in the diet, the impact of obsidian exchange, and the belief systems of various human groups. Jens Lüning and Jean Guilaine discuss the process of neolithization in Europe and the Mediterranean, providing ample information and insights about what happened during the Neolithic beyond Anatolia and how these regions relate to each other.

One of the most interesting parts of the whole book is where crafts, art, basketry, burial customs, obsidian exchange, early metallurgy and pottery production during the Neolithic period in Anatolia are presented by various field specialists. In this section, one finds substantial information on the daily life of Neolithic communities, how they made use of natural resources such as metals, obsidian or clay, how they treated their dead, or what kind of health problems they might have experienced.

The rest of the book is devoted to the exhibition catalogue, which presents in total 415 items, all provided with the information on findplace, date, material, size, bibliographic references and museum inventory numbers. A brief text describes each object and gives any relevant information, in each case accompanied by photos. Amongst the catalogue items are many previously unpublished objects.

To summarize, this book will benefit anyone – from the general public to field specialists – who wants to find out more about the new archaeological discoveries, themes, and current debates concerning the Anatolian Neolithic. The information is rich, up-to-date, accurate and frequently supported by illustrations and maps. The texts are written in clear language free of jargon. Turkish names are written correctly. A small glossary at the end of the catalogue is useful for the readers not familiar with the technical terminology of archaeology. Field specialists will turn the pages of this book for a long time and will definitely find something new each time they do so. Enjoy!

REFERENCES

- ÖZDOĞÇAN, M., 2001. Redefining the Neolithic of Anatolia, a critical overview. In R.T.J. Cappers and S. Bottema (eds), *The Dawn of Farming in the Near East. Studies in Early Near Eastern Production, Subsistence, and Environment* 6: 155–161. Berlin: ex oriente.
- ÖZDOĞÇAN, M. and N. BASGELEN, eds, 1999. *Neolithic in Turkey: the Cradle of Civilization*. İstanbul: Arkeoloji ve Sanat Yayınları.
- SCHMIDT, K., 2006. *Sie bauten die ersten Tempel. Das rätselhafte Heiligtum der Steinzeitjäger*. München: C.H. Beck.

Çiler Çilingiroğlu
*Institute for Pre- and Protohistory and
 Archaeology of the Middle Ages
 University of Tübingen, Germany*

JOURNAL REVIEW

Abenteuer Archäologie (Heidelberg: Spektrum der Wissenschaft Verlagsgesellschaft mbH, ISSN 1612–9954). Issues examined: 1/2004, 1/2005–1/2007.

The popular print magazine *Abenteuer Archäologie* (Adventure Archaeology) has been on the German market since the beginning of 2004. It competes with other special-interest magazines, most notably with *Archäologie in Deutschland* (Archaeology in Germany) and *Antike Welt* (Ancient World). Nevertheless, *Abenteuer Archäologie* is so successful that, since autumn 2006, it has been appearing six

instead of four times a year, with a circulation of 17,600 copies.

A journalistic product like this magazine needs to be reviewed by applying primarily journalistic criteria, just as a scientific paper has to be judged by scientific criteria. Writing for non-archaeologists has to be done in a different way from communicating within the discipline. In journalism a good story has to be factually correct, of course. But more important than conveying many facts is to make the reader understand the story. This requires more than just using a simpler language. The writing style has to be more vivid, more emotional, more captivating than in the impersonal, accurate and prosaic world of peer-reviewed journals. Different aspects of an issue may become relevant in journalism. Possibly something that may be important to the archaeologist cannot be communicated in an adequate way and therefore has to be simplified or even omitted. Again, in journalism only a story that really reaches the recipient is a good story. Therefore it might happen that a story that is brilliant from a scientific point of view is nevertheless unsuitable for the mass media.

'First-hand knowledge' is both the slogan and the promise of *Abenteuer Archäologie*, a member of the *Spektrum der Wissenschaft* magazine group (*Spektrum der Wissenschaft* is the German edition of *Scientific American*). The authors are archaeologists who report on their own fields of expertise, science journalists with a degree in archaeology, and the editors of *Abenteuer Archäologie*, who are also specialized in archaeology. A scientific advisory board assists the editorial work. As to the target market of the magazine, editor Joachim Schüring, whom I interviewed in July 2006, says: 'we are addressing everyone who is interested in human history and in the exploration of cultures: professional scientists, hobby archaeologists, interested laymen. Our aim is to make such a broad target group feel comfortable with our magazine'.

Each issue of 98 pages has a special focus to which several different articles are devoted but there are also articles on topics beyond the chosen focus. Issue 1/2005, for example, has features about underwater archaeology, Tikal, prehistoric trepanation, a medieval recipe, a travelogue from Peru and Korean scripture. Such sequences are no coincidence. The journalists aim at an entertaining mix, says

Schüring: 'we try to produce issues as manifold as possible. We may actually consider: we already have three articles about the Romans in the upcoming issue, now we should put in something different, for example about Mesoamerica'. Besides the major articles, *Abenteuer Archäologie* has several sections that reappear in most issues. There are: short, current reports on recent research; explanations of archaeological techniques; ancient recipes and their respective background; re-narrated ancient stories in today's language; and picture-oriented pieces about current exhibitions. There is also a prominent section labelled 'DAI International', which is the result of cooperation between the magazine and the German Archaeological Institute (DAI), featuring articles about the DAI's current research projects.

Clearly designed maps accompany features dealing with specific regions and major topics are introduced with at least one full-page picture, if not a double-page spread. There are some visually powerful pictures, such as of beautiful landscapes or underwater archaeologists at work. Unfortunately, from a journalistic point of view, quite a few photos are rather impersonal. In issue 4/2005, for instance, 54 pictures merely present ruins or objects – a very academic use of imagery. There are only nine photos in this issue which also show people, thus endowing the image with a certain emotional touch and creating human interest – normally an important aspect in journalism.

While there are gripping reports and fascinating articles, several texts are written in a rather academic style demanding persistence from the reader. The research history and dates of birth and death of each mentioned person in several articles do not make for a lively style of writing either. Explanations of terms are offered rather randomly: whereas the term 'Neolithic' is explained in one article, other articles imply knowledge of terms like 'bituminous', 'Cretaceous', or 'Nestorianic'. Such texts resemble simplified versions of scientific presentations. The textual heterogeneity in each issue may, of course, be due to the different kinds of author – from scientists to journalists.

This leads us to one of the main challenges the editors have to face. Transferring the often factual language of scientists into an exciting text suitable for the different audiences the

magazine addresses. Schüring confirms: 'to take this step – from the results of intensive research towards a generally understandable story – seems enormously difficult for some archaeologists. For us, who are inviting such scientists as authors, this always means a balancing act; inducing the scientist to take this step, but not putting him or her off by the comprehensive editing sometimes needed'. However, the editors do not always succeed in adapting such articles to the needs of a general audience. Occasionally, texts and pictures still reveal that the respective author did not sufficiently have the readers in mind. For example, archaeologist Hans-Georg Hüttel writes in issue 2/2005 (pp. 32–37) about a Mongolian palace in Karakorum and considers whether or not this site was Ögödei Khan's residence. Hüttel describes the history of research at great length and mentions countless details that are only tangentially relevant. What is more, Hüttel writes in a prosaic language that is probably meant to demonstrate the 'scientific' character of the text. Yet from a rhetorical point of view, the text does not succeed in catching the attention of a non-expert.

Would it be better if archaeologists did not write journalistic pieces? Or are there reasons why the scientist who reports on her or his own research is in fact the best author for *Abenteuer Archäologie*? Nobody knows the facts as well as the scientific expert. No one could describe the circumstances of a discovery as authentically as the researcher. These are good points for preferring the scientist. The science journalist, on the other hand, knows the audience's interests better and is skilled in using different linguistic means and perspectives. A journalist narrates and integrates a story in a broader social context. He or she writes – ideally – with a critical distance towards the subject being described and thereby gives the reader all the information needed to arrive at his or her own opinion. An unambiguous answer on whether the scientist or the science journalist is the better author is, therefore, not possible. It has to be clear though that scientists writing for the mass media have to accept certain journalistic conventions of writing, and thus need to adapt to a completely different discourse from the academic conventions they may be used to. In the case *Abenteuer Archäologie*, not all of its authors have taken this to heart. The magazine's benefit of offering

'first-hand knowledge' is, therefore, in fact a mixed blessing.

Finally, where is the magazine located between the respective priorities of archaeology, journalism, and the audience? As Schüring subsumes: 'we see ourselves as mediators between 'real' science and the interested lay person. This means, we break each article a scientist wrote for us journalistically down to a commonly understandable level'. Describing the journalist as somebody who 'translates' the scientist's statements and transmits them to an illiterate but curious lay audience corresponds to the traditional concept of popularizing science, that since the seventies has also been known as the 'deficit model' (it describes missing scientific literacy as a deficit). According to this model, journalism is ultimately not respected as an autonomous discourse and journalists are merely seen as translators and PR agents for science (cf. Weingart 2001:233–236). However, this 'deficit model' has been falling short of expectations and has not been leading to the desired success in communicating science effectively to wide audiences (Nowotny 2004). As Matthias Kohring (2005:172), an expert in communication theory, states: 'the traditional "deficit model" of scientific literacy... is seen as completely unsuitable for grasping the social context in which the production and the usage of scientific knowledge are embedded'. Nevertheless, some archaeologists, possibly including the magazine's editors, still follow the traditional concept of popularization and thus regard *Abenteuer Archäologie* partly as a PR instrument for increasing the public approval of scientific archaeology. One manifestation of this attitude is the journal's regular section 'DAI International', which in effect constitutes an outsourcing of journalistic responsibility to an organization with its own aims and PR interests.

Within the niche of the special interest magazine market, the old tradition of popularization and of archaeologists educating the general audience with support of the journalist is thus still existent. *Abenteuer Archäologie* does not represent a science journalism that is observing and occasionally critiquing science. Instead it is a window that archaeologists and museum curators open up to interested audiences who are keen to look into the scientific discipline. Given that aim, it is surprising that the magazine does not use all the available journalistic techniques to address lay audiences

(as discussed earlier). However, the magazine has very strong points too. Its major strength is the enormous variety of topics covered. *Abenteuer Archäologie* provides a good source for every archaeologist who wants to get an overview of what is going on in the field. Non-experts (certainly the large majority of the readers) will realize the diversity and fascination of archaeological research.

REFERENCES

- KOHRING, M., 2005. *Wissenschafts-journalismus. Forschungsüberblick und The-orientwurf*. Konstanz: UVK.
- NOWOTNY, H., 2004. Wissenschaft auf der Suche nach ihrem Publikum. In Christian Müller (ed.), *SciencePop. Wissenschaftsjournalismus zwischen PR und Forschungs-kritik*: 221–228. Graz: Nausner & Nausner
- WEINGART, P., 2001. *Die Stunde der Wahrheit. Zum Verhältnis der Wissenschaft zu Politik, Wirtschaft und Medien in der Wissensgesellschaft*. Weilerswist: Velbrück.

Diane Scherzler
Südwestrundfunk
Reutlingen, Germany

BOOK REVIEWS

Graeme Barker, *The Agricultural Revolution: Why Did Foragers Become Farmers?* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006, xvi + 598 pp., numerous line drawings and photographs, hbk, ISBN 0 19 928109 2)

Graeme Barker follows Gordon Childe in calling the origins of food production the Agricultural Revolution, certainly one of the transforming events of human history. He speaks with some authority in his book with that title, which surveys the evidence for this development on a truly global canvas. His closely argued thesis draws on more than a century of basic research, which barely scratches the surface of a complex subject.

The coverage is regional, the scope of the book balanced across the Old and New Worlds. Chapter 1 describes changing approaches to the origins of agriculture since Victorian times and carries us effortlessly from Gordon Childe through hearths of domestication to the 'new'

archaeology, and debates about forager decision-making. Next, Barker discusses the complex realities of forager lifeways, which ranged over a broad spectrum. The process of committing to agriculture was much more variable than the archaeological record suggests. How, then, do we identify foragers and farmers? In Chapter 3, Barker discusses the dauntingly wide series of questions about everything from environmental context to population densities and settlement patterns that have to be addressed if we are to identify the options available to different societies and their choices.

The next six chapters summarize the evidence from different regions. Barker leads us succinctly through the familiar stamping grounds of southwest Asia, with its diverse environments and potential domesticates. He rightly cautions against concentrating on a few well-researched hot-spots when important new evidence is coming from the peripheries, witness recent DNA researches in southeastern Turkey. Here we learn of the importance of climate change, but also realize just how little we know about the decision-making processes and about contemporary perceptions of the environment and the world. Central and south Asia, the frontier between wheat and rice, are somewhat of an archaeological 'black hole'. Barker argues, and I agree with him, that the changeover here was not an 'aftershock' of what happened in southwest Asia or China. Foragers in India's Ganges Valley were harvesting wild rice early in the Holocene, perhaps in an independent hearth of plant domestication. Barker points out that plant-foods were being harvested systematically by late Pleistocene times throughout east and southeast Asia, before Holocene climatic changes transformed habitats for rice and other crops. Yangtze farmers were using rice as a staple by 7500 BC, and millet was the equivalent in the Huang He Valley of the north a millennium later. In southeast Asia and the offshore islands, the shift was gradual and local until the introduction of rice and water buffalo. The transitions throughout this vast area have to be researched in strictly local terms before we can understand the complexity of the process.

Chapter 7 summarizes the origins of food production in the Americas and discusses, for the most part, familiar data. Maize may have been a status crop before becoming a staple during the first millennium BC. In Chapter 8,