
EDITORIAL

John Chapman

Since this is the first full-length editorial written for the *Journal of European Archaeology*, it seems appropriate to ground its presence in the past: not a deep past, for the journal can hardly claim that; nor an 'imagined past' à la Hobsbawm and Ringer, which would link the journal to desirable ancestry and make up for the lack of historical depth; but a brief but authentic past owing to a fledgling creation of the 1990s. This is a story worth telling, because... As is usual with all good stories, there is a wider context and an immediate context.

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

A central feature of the European academic economy in the years since the Berlin Wall has been the proliferation of both new and new-look journals in all disciplines. In central and eastern Europe, this process is defined by the creation of new academic identities through differentiation from what went before, whether in the titles and organizations of public institutions or the format and content of house and other journals. This trend has been paralleled in the West by the publication of hundreds of new journal titles, changing the (sur)face of all academic discourses while attempting to do much more. Alongside the obvious question of economic viability, the new journals in both East and West need early on in life to solve an identity problem – a justification for their presence in an increasingly competitive field. In central and eastern Europe, the forging of identities in contradistinction to those of the previous regimes has led to a flurry of new concepts and achievements. New journals proliferate from the institutes of the former Soviet Union; thematic editions of *Archeologia Polona* are increasingly the hallmark of the Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology in Poland, while differing formats and new goals are typical of *Pamatky Archeologicke* and *Archeologicke Rozhledy*. In the West, the crucial point of entry for identity is also necessarily naming, which follows three common strategies: first, the identification of specialist areas previously untouched (e.g. *Journal of Theoretical Roman Archaeology*); secondly, the integration of sub-fields of other disciplines into a new field (*Journal of Material Culture* or *Archaeomaterials*), and, thirdly, the publication of house journals, whether of museums or university departments (e.g. the *Durham Archaeological Journal*).

It is an axiomatic rule of the global economy that capital is divided unequally between fields of interest and fields which lose status lose funding. There has therefore been an unfortunate correspondence between the decline in status of the intellectual field in both eastern and western Europe and the mushrooming of new journal titles, ensuring that fewer and fewer academic libraries (not to mention individual scholars) can purchase the titles of their specialist interest, let alone others. Although continuing to fill its niche in academic publishing, journal proliferation has not, in general, impressed the funding powers, whose interests are regrettably remote from 'The Holocene' or 'Jornadas internacionales de arqueologia de intervencion'. Paradoxically, the very proliferation which is intended to make disciplines, groupings, and scholars look impressive is curtailing access and increasing inequalities.

Three answers present themselves – the personal network, the Internet, and the publishing network. The personal network concerns the distribution of archaeological works

amongst the author's close friends and acquaintances. In eastern Europe, I am told that frequently the only way to acquire the requisite specialist literature is to be on the net – the personal network. Short print runs and constrained official distribution systems are the problems to which the personal net is the solution. But it is a partial solution, excluding many more than it includes and excluding in a structured way.

A second answer is the 'other' net. The WorldWideWeb is, by apparent contrast, all-inclusive, provided initial access can be acquired. (Aside: this year, for the first time, you could foil Wiltshire police authorities and visit Stonehenge to see the summer solstice from any access point to the Net.) Different disciplines have reacted with varying speeds to the publishing potential of the Web. Colleagues in mathematics and physics tell me that they regularly access up to thirty new papers per day in their specialist sub-fields, leaving them no time for paper publishing. How far down this road is archaeology to go? Is the journal to turn to the WWW? In this issue, the article by Allason-Jones et al. discusses how a museum display was Netted for the first time in the world and raises related issues of ownership, control, and access. Perhaps the only effective way to conduct a survey of EAA members' access to the Web would be an electronic survey?! But an option for the future that the EAA needs to consider is publishing the journal on the Web instead of, or as well as, on paper.

The third solution is to stay with paper publishing and continue or initiate a journal which competes for the hearts, minds, and visacards of archaeologists with all the other journals in the discipline. The potential exclusion from acquiring access to a new journal is economic but this can be offset by corporate discounting to 'reduce the slope of the playing field'. This was the choice made by the group of archaeologists who began the publication of the journal even before the foundation of the association.

The idea for a *Journal of European Archaeology* was mooted in 1991/2, largely as a response by archaeologists committed to the shaping of the new Europe which was emerging from the latest period of nation-state formation, the third in the last century. It was widely perceived that the collapse of the former Soviet hegemony in eastern Europe would lead to improved opportunities for communication between East and West, and greater possibilities for furthering the creative and scholarly interpretation of archaeological data. The movement was led by Kristian Kristiansen, who assembled an international editorial board who served for the first four issues of the journal. Our thanks are due to Kristian Kristiansen, Ian Hodder, Evzen Neustupný, Mike Rowlands, Alain Schnapp, Anna Maria Bietti Sestieri, and Tim Taylor for ensuring the launch of the new journal in spring 1993 and to all the early contributors to the journal.

In an editorial introduction to the first issue, Kristiansen commented that he found it 'remarkable that the *Journal of European Archaeology* does not exist'. There are doubtless good historical and personal reasons for its non-existence but the major challenge of forging a new European archaeological community arose out of the fall of the Berlin Wall and was met by a group of archaeologists sufficiently motivated to make an intervention. The creation of the Association of European Archaeologists, formally constituted at the Inaugural Conference in Ljubljana, Slovenia in September 1994, was a logical outgrowth of the need for communication and contact between East and West, a need specifically addressed in the policy of holding annual meetings.

THE EDITORIAL BOARD

In 1995, the EAA invited me to act as General Editor for three years, working with an Editorial Board whose continuity would be maintained by the re-appointment of Anna Maria Bietti Sestieri and Alain Schnapp, together with Ross Samson as publisher, but whose interests would be furthered by the inclusion of a majority of new members. The new members are: Natalie Venclová, Felipe Criado Boado, Paul Wagner, and Mike Shanks. Board

members decided that it would be helpful to readers to introduce ourselves: after much editing, this is the result:

JOHN CHAPMAN studied at the London Institute of Archaeology, where he wrote a Ph.D. on the Neolithic of south-eastern Europe. He recently took up a readership at the University of Durham. His research interests include social archaeology and landscape archaeology, which he has pursued in long-term projects in Dalmatia and north-eastern Hungary.

ANNA MARIA BIETTI SESTIERI is the Soprintendente Archeologo for the Abruzzo and member of the Italian National Committee for the Archaeological Heritage, as well as being the Vice-President of the Istituto Italiano di Preistoria e Protostoria. This year, Anna Maria won the prestigious Europa Prize (of the Prehistoric Society) for her sustained research on the Italian and European Bronze and Iron Ages, best exemplified in her excavations of the Osteria dell'Osa cemetery and Frattesina and Fidene settlements.

ALAIN SCHNAPP is Professor of Archaeology in the Sorbonne and Head of the Institute of Archaeology (Paris 1). His research interests lie in the philosophical origins of archaeology in classical thought and the history of archaeology, on which he has recently published a synthesis. His membership of La Maison des Sciences de l'Homme reflects his continuing interest in anthropology, history, and archaeology. He has a long-running field project in southern Italy, the excavation of a well-preserved Roman town.

NATALIE VENČLOVÁ is a senior member of the Institute of Archaeology of the Czech Academy of Science. Her research interests include settlement archaeology and the La-Tène Iron Age of central Europe. She has directed excavations at the famous site of Měšec-Zehrovice and run field surveys in central Bohemia. She recently co-edited (with Martin Kuna) the Evzen Neustupný Festschrift – *Whither Archaeology?*

FELIPE CRIADO BOADO, who organised the First Annual Meeting of the European Association of Archaeologists at Santiago de Compostela, lectures at the University of Santiago after completing his Ph.D. there on landscape archaeology and megalithic remains. His research interests combine post-processual landscape archaeological theory (monumentality and the social construction of space) and rescue archaeological practice. Felipe runs the university's archaeological unit, which offers at once a social service, a commercial enterprise, and a cognitive discipline.

PAUL WAGNER studied the archaeology of the Roman provinces at the Universities of Frankfurt and Freiburg, gaining an M.A. from Frankfurt in 1979 with a dissertation on Roman wooden bridges. Since then, he has worked in public archaeology, initially at the Hessen Landesamt für Denkmalpflege, later as an archaeologist for the Rheinland construction company and latterly as head of the 'Nideggen' Field Unit for the Rheinisches Amt für Bodendenkmalpflege. His research interests are landscape archaeology and heritage management.

MIKE SHANKS, our reviews editor, studied at Cambridge before teaching on Tyneside for a decade. He then returned to archaeology with a bang and his publications, with Chris Tilley, of *Reconstructing Archaeology* and *Social Theory and Archaeology*. While completing his Cambridge Ph.D. on Archaic Greek pottery and society, he took up a post at the University of Wales/Lampeter, where he was recently promoted to Reader. His research interests in post-processual archaeological theory and practice are broad and include the archaeology of experience and the formation of cultural identity.

ROSS SAMSON, the publisher of the journal through his Cruithne Press, was a first-generation immigrant from Scotland to America, but returned to Scotland to study, first at St. Andrews where he read medieval history and archaeology, and later at Glasgow, where he completed a Ph.D. in archaeology. His research interests are the Dark Ages, on which he has published some 30 papers. Since 1990, he has been translating, typesetting, commissioning, and publishing some 25 books.

I need hardly add that board members are at your disposal for advice and comments concerning articles which you may wish to submit to the journal and any issues or problems which you feel should be raised and discussed either in the journal or in the association's newsletter.

STATEMENT OF EDITORIAL PRINCIPLES

One of the first tasks of a newly appointed Editorial Board is the production of a structuring statement about the identity and aim of the journal. After much debate, the following statement has been agreed by the board:

1. *Aim.* The primary aim of the Editorial Board is the creation of a journal which attracts some of the best archaeological writing currently produced about European matters. Interpretation, analysis and/or synthesis of data are a pre-requisite over empirical data presentation in all contributions.
2. *Overall balance.* Since the journal is one of the principal benefits enjoyed by members of the EAA, the journal will reflect as far as possible the tastes and interests of the membership. This will be achieved by selection of papers whose composition provides a balance across a number of different dimensions, within each issue and between issues.
3. *Gender balance.* The journal aims to publish a 50–50 ratio of papers written by women and men.
4. *Nation state balance.* The journal will aim to provide a balanced geographical coverage of all main regions of Europe and, over a number of issues, a balance between different nation states within Europe. Articles may be written in the French, German, or English language, with abstracts in all three languages.
5. *Thematic papers.* After taking principles 3 and 4 into account, the journal will favour articles with a strong thematic content and a European 'dimension' (i.e., of implicitly or explicitly Europe-wide relevance). Thematic treatments of archaeological science, environmental archaeology and heritage are encouraged.
6. *Geographical scope.* After taking principles 3 and 4 into account, the journal will favour articles with a wider geographical coverage (inter-regional issues, regional problems) over those dealing with local or site-based questions, unless the site or local area has a clear European dimension.
7. *Chronological scope.* The journal will accept papers on any chronological period from the Palaeolithic to the present.
8. *Postgraduate section.* The journal will reserve one article per annum for the best article submitted by a postgraduate student on a topic with a European dimension. Each year, post-graduate students from a different country will be invited to apply.
9. *Editorial.* The journal aims to improve balance and to highlight issues of urgency and wide significance through the use of an editorial section. The contents of the editorial will be complementary to, but distinctive from, those of the association's newsletter.
10. *Book reviews.* The journal aims to represent the balance of issues defined in principles 3–7 above through the careful selection for review of a wide range of books and other media on the archaeology of European matters.
11. *Publication of editorial principles.* The journal undertakes to publish an agreed statement of editorial principles in the journal. The Editorial Board will review the statement of principles, and the success of their application, every two years.

The following is an editorial commentary on these principles and their rationale.

1. *Aims.* The keywords here are 'European matters' and 'interpretation'. In his article in issue 2.2, Mike Rowlands raised the question of whether the journal should seek to define a

distinctly European style or tradition of archaeology or whether indeed the best global tradition was preferable. I concur with Rowlands in seeking to apply the best global traditions and style of archaeological writing in its application to distinctively European matters.

The journal takes the 'best' writing to mean that archaeological writing which seeks to improve our understanding of empirical data by analysis, interpretation, and synthesis. In arguing against a naive or a sophisticated positivism in archaeology as in other human sciences, I submit that no data is purely 'empirical' – its selection is itself a theoretical task and so are the categories used in taxonomy and seriation and any other mode of analysis. In correspondence, readers have warned the editor against developing a 'Journal of Theoretical Archaeology' (because there exists one already!). But since all archaeological writing is inherently, if not explicitly, theoretical, we have to avoid other dangers – first and foremost the belief that archaeological writing can be purely empirical. To put the matter more positively, since archaeological writing is unavoidably theoretical in any case, there remains no serious intellectual barrier to making a theoretically explicit interpretation of already theoretical data. An example is Persson and Sjögren's article, in this issue, about new accelerator radiocarbon dates for burials in Scandinavian megaliths, in which much new and invaluable data is interwoven with the interpretation of the overall megalithic sequence. This now turns out to be grounded in building styles overlapping in both time and region and having different combinatorial associations with an earlier (articulated bodies) and a later (mixed bones) style of mortuary inclusion, rather than the mainstream 'evolutionary sequence'.

2. Balance. The general point about balance is refined in comments upon later forms of balance. None the less, articles about all periods, peoples and places are welcome in principle.

3. Gender balance. Discussion of this point on the Editorial Board raised two splits: whether or not this was an 'issue' at all, and whether or not there was anything an editorial board could do to ameliorate the situation. In their excellent review of the journals *American Antiquity* and *Historical Archaeology*, Victor and Beaudry (Women's participation in American prehistoric and historic archaeology: a comparative look at the journals *American Antiquity* and *Historical Archaeology*, pp. 11–22, in C. Claassen (ed.), 1992, *Exploring Gender through Archaeology*. Madison: Prehistory Press) conclude that 'women in the fields are not represented at levels even remotely equal to men or to their membership in those organizations.' They ask: 'why do women remain so under-represented as authors and as authorities relative to their numbers in the field?'; 'why is women's research so apparently devalued in the field of archaeology?' and 'how can we make the climate for women in archaeology less "chilly"?. Nothing which I have read concerning European data makes me believe that women's positions here are different from those in America. Therefore encouragement of women authors and authorities to publish in the journal is the main aspect of our agreed policy. It is believed by some on the Editorial Board that the policy of positive discrimination in favour of women is insulting, condescending, and no more than political correctness of the worst sort. The view is that either a woman's work is good enough to publish or it is not. However, there are many stages before an article is submitted to an international journal and many possible gender-related hurdles to be overcome before this stage – the stage at which the Board can have an impact. Thus, to anyone wishing to contribute to the journal, female or male, you are encouraged equally to do so, irrespective of gender. While the journal clearly has no future as a beacon of feminist writing in archaeology, it is hoped and expected that articles discussing engendered archaeology and the problems of gender bias in archaeological practice will become a regular part of future issues (in this issue, see in particular Arnold's article on La-Tène rich female graves).

4. Regional and nation state balance. This aim is a long way off but it is an aim that we shall do our best to follow. Our thinking is derived from the obvious point about 'Europe'

as a place of diversity-within-unity. Not only do the main regions in Europe have differing archaeological traditions (for an account of the central European tradition in settlement archaeology, see Ostoja-Zagórski's article attacking naive empiricism, this issue), but many nation-states have their own particular traditions of what archaeology means to them and their neighbours. It may be argued that, at present, eastern European archaeology has a balance of interests more typical of empirical positivism than is current in western Europe (but see Neustupný's article in issue 3.1). The journal accepts these historically generated differences, while welcoming contributions which deconstruct them and while maintaining a stance on the essential nature of data interpretation. The period since 1989 has already been identified as a period of renewed state-building; it would be extraordinary if the archaeological agenda in the newest nation-states would not differ markedly from those in more well-established political landscapes. The role of archaeology in such contested political landscapes as the Caucasus and Moldova is discussed openly by Schnirelman in this issue; above all others in this issue, his article reinforces Kristiansen's point (issue 1.1) that 'archaeologists cannot place themselves outside society: the past has lost its political innocence'. We have to face the issues underlying the appearance of the 'invented tradition' with all the data (and interpretations) at our disposal.

Discussing terms such as 'region' and 'nation-state' reminds us that each term is in itself problematic. As a nineteenth-century political organising principle, the nation-state has given rise to the basic operational units of anthropology (the 'tribe') and archaeology ('the culture'). The theoretical basis of both entities have been under strong and repeated challenge. In political terms, an undeniable component of the nation-state is diversity – whether ethnic, religious, or linguistic. The incorporation of this diversity is essential to any nation-state and, in this sense, ethnic or cultural 'cleansing' is an attack on the nation-state itself, not a defence of it. Archaeology (and anthropology) has a role here, through the political use of academically defensible accounts of the past; the journal is committed to presenting the arguments. The key term of ethnicity requires careful handling – then as now – as in Wells' article, in this issue, about 'Celts' and 'Germans' – an example of how to deconstruct Julius Caesar's views of these entities and how we understand these entities differently today.

5. Thematic articles. The journal is interested in taking up major and/or topical themes, as illustrated by three of the articles in this issue (Schnirelman's article on 'alternative pre-history'; Ostoja-Zagórski's article on settlement archaeology; and Allason-Jones, O'Brien, and Goodrick's article on the WorldWideWeb). The contributions of archaeological science have been many and varied and the journal feels these too should form an important component of interpretative work. In resisting the straw-man approach of outright rejection of all archaeological science as 'scientism' and 'positivism', the journal feels that the integration of scientific data with strong and innovative interpretation is one of the best ways for archaeological science to make an impact (see the sampling and iron analyses in Groeneveldt and Van Nie, this issue). Issues such as the European heritage and environmental archaeology are curiously underrepresented in journal issues so far – why is this and what will readers be doing to remedy the situation?

6. Geographical coverage. We do not mean to exclude any particular scale of theme – from a Europe-wide assessment of a phenomenon to the detailed interpretation of a key single site. Since the 'site' is still one of the basic units of analysis (some may claim the basic unit), excavation reports on key sites are clearly important. But one of the key insights of survey archaeology over the past two decades is the importance of the regional context for a single excavated site. Two of the articles in this issue debate one of the larger units of analysis – the inaptly named 'world-system' (usually European or Eurasian-based in pre-history and therefore derogatory of other parts of the settled world outside the 'system').

Brun and Dietler come to opposite conclusions on the utility of the core-periphery approach to Mediterranean – Temperate European interactions in the Iron Age. While Brun defends Mediterranean city-states as making a decisive impact upon temperate chiefdoms so unstable as to be capable of rapid social transformation, Dietler renews the search for local meanings in colonial encounters and warns against taking imports as generic ‘prestige goods’ with the same meaning everywhere. This debate will run and run.

7. Chronological balance. The current core of the journal (issues 1–3) is undoubtedly later European prehistory – with a shortage of articles on the Palaeolithic, the Greek and Roman periods (but see Groenewoudt and Van Nie, this issue), and the medieval and post-medieval. This issue has a strong representation of the Iron Age among its papers. In addition to the Brun and Dietler debate, there are papers on *Viereckschanzen* (Murray), on Celts and Germans (Wells) and on late-Iron-Age elite female burials (Arnold). Arnold focusses on what women can do when men are away at war, unpacking the gender stereotyping widespread in Celtic studies which has stopped archaeologists from recognising a class of rich burials because the interred remains were female. The key issue of how females did participate in feasting echoes an issue discussed equally by Dietler and Murray. Murray recognises in late-Iron-Age enclosures a pattern of association with earlier burial monuments and suggests that the legitimisation of new social practices, focussed on the enclosures and connected to feasting, was effected through the association of old ritual places in the landscape (cf. heterotopias). In future issues, this cluster of papers on the Iron Age will be matched by groups of papers from the same period, as a means of concentrating the focus of interpretative debate.

8. Postgraduate competition. Gender bias is but one bias in the field of archaeological publications. Peer reviews can also act against younger colleagues, who nevertheless may well hit upon the most revolutionary ways of challenging orthodoxies. For this reason, the journal will soon begin its first postgraduate competition, in which the best 5,000-word essay on a theme of European significance will be published in the journal. The Editorial Board has selected Germany as the first country for this competition and the details will be advertised in all departments of archaeology, through all professors of archaeology. If you are a German postgraduate student and wish to have the details of the competition, please write to the General Editor.

10. Book reviews. In future issues, Mike Shanks will be writing his own review editorial, in which not only books, but also archaeological films, museum displays, events and new places to visit will be reviewed.

11. Evaluation of principles. The next formal discussion of the principles will be in Easter 1998; informal reactions are welcomed (to the General Editor or any of the board members).

In tandem with the statement of principles, the Editorial Board has formulated a set of editorial practice which, it is hoped, will enable the journal to become a fully professional operation with peer reviewing and feedback for contributors. It remains the responsibility of each individual member of the EAA to make the journal a better publication. We encourage you to do just this.

John Chapman
General Editor