

# Editorial

**Robin Skeates**

As the new General Editor of the *European Journal of Archaeology* (*EJA*), my priority is to produce an international, peer-reviewed, academic journal of the highest quality: for the benefit of members of the European Association of Archaeologists (EAA) and of the wider archaeological community. Fortunately, thanks to the hard work of my predecessors, the *EJA* has a strong reputation: rated A in the European Reference Index for the Humanities (ERIH) as a 'high-ranking international publication with a very strong reputation among researchers of the field in different countries, regularly cited all over the world', and listed in the Thomson Reuters Arts and Humanities Citation Index. But, at 19 years old, the *Journal* is still growing, both in independence and in aspect. The EAA has recently regained full ownership of the *EJA*. As a consequence, we have enhanced its form, with a more modern cover design, a larger format, higher quality paper, better illustrations – including colour images where appropriate, and a larger number of articles and reviews. Our motto is to publish the best of European archaeology.

In this double-issue of the *EJA*, some key themes run in and out of the articles and reviews, which – like the EAA's Annual Meetings and Newsletter (TEA) – reflect well the scholarly and professional state-of-play in European archaeology. Above all, healthy critical debate continues over the validity of old and new archaeological data, methods, theories and disciplinary parameters. This includes discussions of: cultural landscapes and the human uses and perceptions of their valued resources; the materiality and biographies of artefacts, monuments, and of human and animal bodies; the nature of ritual practices and religious beliefs; the formation of social identities, orders and inequalities, including constructions and tensions of gender; the growth and transformation of regional traditions and their connections to European-scale phenomena; the significance of major practical, social, economic and environmental changes over space and time; cultural responses to colonisation; the history of archaeological scholarship and practice; the place of archaeology in the modern world, including the management of archaeological remains; and the place of foreign archaeologists in European archaeology. Below, these themes reappear as I comment further on the articles in this issue, and briefly on the reviews.

Martijn van Leusen's generous contribution is a condensed and thematically ordered transcript of his interview with Marianne Kleibrink, emeritus Professor of Classical and Mediterranean Archaeology at the Groningen Institute of Archaeology, and director of excavation projects at Satricum in Lazio and Timpone della Motta in Calabria. It is not just an inspiring account of the life and work of a distinguished archaeologist, but also a fascinating commentary on the modern European history of women in archaeology, of foreign archaeologists, and of the public in archaeology.

Jonathan Thomas presents the results of a systematic study of over 3,000 Late Neolithic and Copper Age beads and pendants from six collective burial sites and one settlement site in the Estremadura province of Portugal. Statistics on the raw materials and

forms of these objects are interpreted with reference to their production, distribution and social values. The majority of beads were produced locally, probably in standardized batches. Nevertheless, stylistic variability was ensured by the use of a wide range of raw materials and the import of distinctive beads, which augmented the potential of these personal ornaments to fashion social identities and inequalities, particularly at a time of socio-economic transformation. Looking beyond the Estremadura, this study might be used as a stepping-stone to a much wider study of the production and consumption of personal ornaments across the diverse cultures of the Mediterranean during the fourth and third millennia BC.

Gordon Noble and Kenny Brophy place the interim results of their excavations at the later Neolithic palisaded enclosure of Forteviot in Scotland in the context of comparable sites in northern Europe, and consider the implications of these monuments for the wooded landscapes, capabilities, ceremonies and social ordering of the Neolithic communities that built and used them. Particularly interesting is the emphasis on the dynamic biography of the palisaded enclosures, including their component wooden posts, only some of which appear to have decayed *in situ* – others being burnt down or even removed. It would be interesting to see these ideas tried out elsewhere, particularly on the palisaded enclosures of central and southern Europe.

Kevin Walsh and Florence Mocci draw upon a case study of the Ecrins massif to discuss changes in the human uses of high-altitude zones in the southern French Alps during the late third and second millennia BC. They highlight the construction of novel, stone-built, pastoral enclosures from around 2500 BC – following a period of increasing pressure on lowland pasture, and at around the same time as the development of copper mining and rock art in the Alps; and they relate these structures to the development of specialized, high-altitude, transhumant pastoralism, which would have involved new ways of exploiting, experiencing and conceptualizing the mountains. With this theoretical basis now expressed, there is a case to be made for continued fieldwork to clarify further the uses of these high-altitude structures, by both humans and their herded animals.

Javier López Cachero describes the evolution and variety of ‘Urnfield’ cremation rites and related structures between the thirteenth and sixth centuries BC in the north-eastern part of the Iberian Peninsula. He also considers their implications for social transformation in the region: from a Late Bronze Age society in which social differences were not overtly reflected in the mortuary domain, to an Early Iron Age society characterised by a range of richer, more visible burials of an élite warrior class. Similarities to neighbouring parts of Spain and southern France, and connections to the Mediterranean trade in luxury goods, are noted. From here, it is surely also worth reconsidering the wider, European-scale, diversity and connectivity of the Urnfield culture.

Camilla Norman was awarded the EAA Student Award in 2010, for the best paper presented at the EAA conference by a student or archaeologist working on a dissertation. A revised version of that paper is published here, in which Norman rejects the long-established interpretation of the decoration on the forearms of the Iron Age statue-stele of southeast Italy as representations of gloves. Instead, she reinterprets this marking as tattoos, with reference to appropriate ethnographic evidence of the tattooing of women in a range of traditional societies. In the process, previous gendered interpretations of Daunian stele and human bodies are extended – something that should also be of benefit to gender studies of Iron Age societies elsewhere in Europe.

Patty Baker provides a contextual study of some 200 collyrium stamps found in Roman Gaul. In contrast to previous interpretations of this artefact category – as objects used to mark eye medicines and as evidence of the introduction of Roman medical practices – Baker argues that these visually striking objects were also used as protective amulets and votive offerings: their functions and values being culturally adapted to fit traditional (Iron Age) healing practices and beliefs in the region. In this way, Baker contributes effectively to contemporary discourses in the social sciences that emphasize cultural diversity – in this case, in artefact biographies, body care, and responses to Roman occupation.

Pam Cross was also awarded the EAA Student Award (in 2009); again, for the conference version of the article published here. Integrating archaeological, archaeozoological, documentary and ethnographic evidence, she reconsiders the cultural significance of the horse in Britain during the first millennium AD. Special reference is made to the horse bones deposited at the Anglo-Saxon site of Sedgeford in Norfolk, where Cross identifies a variety of rituals involving horse sacrifices and feasting. These include: a high status, combined, human-horse burial; a sacrificial burial of a complete horse; and feast-related special deposits of horse body parts. Her approach should stimulate further analyses of the horse burials dating to the Iron Age and Early Medieval period in northwest Europe, notably in Germany and Iceland, where large numbers have been discovered.

Debi Harlan examines an unpublished series of lectures on British and European megalithic monuments delivered by Arthur Evans in 1885 to explore the growth of his early ideas regarding the development of religious architecture and thought, which he later applied to his influential interpretation of Minoan cult and civilization. In particular, Harlan argues that Evans' early ideas of religion were heavily influenced by contemporary scholarship – especially anthropological evolutionary theories. For historians of archaeology, Harlan's consideration of the unilinear cultural evolution model covers an important and rather understudied aspect of the discipline's history, while for Aegean specialists – who may only know Evans' Minoan texts – Harlan's research provides an extended background to their own studies.

Katharina Ulmschneider and Sally Crawford's study is likewise historiographical, but also biographical: telling the moving story of two men – both of whom lost their original academic status and became foreigners in their country of work. Ulmschneider and Crawford draw upon an archive of 81 personal letters exchanged between Paul Jacobsthal – Professor of Classical Archaeology at Marburg University, a specialist in Celtic art and a member of a secular Jewish family – who sought refuge in Oxford before World War II, and his colleague, Gero von Merhart – Professor of Prehistoric Archaeology at Marburg – who remained in Germany, to illustrate the multiple challenges experienced by these scholars before and after the war, and the impact of their responses on post-war archaeological scholarship in Britain and Germany. The transnational and trans-disciplinary dimensions of this study, and the related issue of scholarly identity, are pertinent not just to this key phase in the history of European archaeology, but also to its configuration today.

The reviews section is even wider-ranging. It begins with four reviews of theory-rich books, which focus on the themes of materiality, the senses, connectivity, and spatiality. There follows a review of a book on Bell Beaker burials in France. Next come evaluations of two books with an emphasis on methodology: one on the archaeozoological

study of bird remains, the other on the practice of archaeological ethnography. Then there is a review of an edited volume on the management of historic places in Europe, which, somewhat bizarrely, leads onto a review of a book on the archaeological heritage found in outer space, and an archaeological commentary on a science fiction American television series. Coming back to Earth, there is a comparative review of two atlases of prehistory – one global, the other European, in scale. The following 23 reviews are arranged chronologically, extending from the Palaeolithic through to the Middle Ages, with the European Bronze Age being particularly well served. Finally, two books covering aspects of politics, colonialism and collecting in the history of archaeology are assessed.

I want to end with some brief but sincere words of thanks to the dedicated team of people who helped produce this issue of the *EJA*. Fritz Lüth was unswerving in his support over the course of a challenging year, as was Mark Pearce and the Executive Board of the EAA. Alan Saville, my predecessor, handed over the *EJA* in good order. The Editorial Board of the *EJA* actively commented on a large number of submissions, as did a host of anonymous peer reviewers. Leo García Sanjuán and Estella Weiss-Krejci efficiently maintained a steady flow of book reviews, with the assistance of their predecessors Cornelius Holtorf and Troels Myrup Kristensen. Magda Turková and Sylvie Květinová were always there when I needed them. Heiner Schwarzberg, Isabelle Gerges, Nathan Schlanger and Tina Jacob kindly produced abstract translations on demand. Our numerous contributors combined patience with some frenetic last-minute activity. And, last but not least, Sonja Magnavita magically realised our dreams in print.

*The General Editor*  
*Durham University, UK, August 2011*