
EDITORIAL

Alan Saville

National Museums Scotland, UK

All of the articles in this issue, diverse though they are, are concerned with probing at the boundaries of our archaeological knowledge and undertaking new research or asking new questions of old data.

Pétrequin et al. have gone high up into the Italian Piedmont in search of Alpine jadeite sources for Neolithic axeheads and have used new ways of characterizing the raw material to investigate the long-distance movement of these products. This is part of the important wider work on stone axehead studies which Pétrequin and his extensive group of collaborators have been undertaking, setting new standards and revealing new insights in what is a promising new phase for this long-established branch of artefact-based archaeology.

Hamilton and Whitehouse and their colleagues provide a very readable entrée into the controversial area of phenomenological approaches to archaeology with their description of fieldwork on a prehistoric landscape project in southern Italy. In this project they are, intriguingly, picking up from and reconfiguring the site-catchment studies undertaken in the same area several decades previously. The fieldwork they describe is a kind of archaeology which will be unfamiliar to, or even summarily dismissed by, many readers of the *EJA* and the present article can be recommended as a sensitive and well-grounded introduction to the subject.

Largely on the basis of reinterpreting evidence from British Bronze Age burials, both the burials themselves and their accompanying grave-goods, Brück in her article gives a new, anthropologically-informed overview. Focusing particularly on artefact exchange and deposition, she explores possible social practice scenarios for individuals and their groups, thereby challenging previous more prosaic explanations and questioning assumptions which have tended to be uncritically based on modern-day economic principles.

Lastly, Rowley-Conwy gets to grips with what might at first seem a rather *recherché* subject, the early nineteenth-century developments in the terminology for prehistory. In fact the origins of the words prehistory and prehistoric (and of

European Journal of Archaeology Vol. 9(1): 5–6
Copyright © 2006 SAGE Publications (www.sagepublications.com) and
the European Association of Archaeologists (www.e-a-a.org) ISSN 1461–9571 DOI:10.1177/1461957107078974

course the concepts they betoken) have been of considerable interest to many historians of archaeology and there has remained a bit of a fog of confusion about who said what and who used what when. Rowley-Conwy has investigated the Scandinavian literature and demonstrates significant use of the words for 'prehistoric' before 1850; he also offers an elegant explanation for how a Scandinavian connection resulted in the first use of the term in English. In so doing he makes a cogent point for all of us involved in the EAA project about how scholarship can be inhibited by over-reliance on English-language sources.

Coincidentally, the latter topic formed one of the themes of a recent wide-ranging lecture presentation to the student archaeological society at Edinburgh University by Kristian Kristiansen, in which he observed how the early internationalism of European archaeology in the later nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries had subsequently declined and arguably has not yet fully recovered, a situation still manifest in the insularity of those 'European' archaeologists who remain steadfastly monolingual in English (or in another European language) when undertaking their research.

Self-obviously the EAA has a specifically internationalist agenda and its conferences and publications seek to foster and reflect this. Whilst English is the principal language of its conferences and the vast majority of papers published in the *EJA* are now written in English, this is purely intended to maximize access and understanding throughout Europe and beyond, given the practical realities of the present-day situation. (And I can note that since I have taken over as editor no submitting authors have wanted to publish in French or German, the other two languages to which the *EJA* is committed.)

However, through the bibliographies accompanying the articles it publishes and through its book reviews the *EJA* draws attention to a very broad range of European archaeological literature in languages other than English. All articles published are of course assessed entirely on their own intrinsic merits, but articles which, through the references cited, demonstrate a comprehensive appreciation of the appropriate European literature – in whatever language – are especially welcome and valued.