



Silbury Hill, Wiltshire, by Keith Britton. Keith says: "this shot was taken in August 2012, as I was driving away from the carpark at Avebury where I had taken my two children for a visit. I saw the partly cut cornfield, which seemed an excellent foreground to the hill, which has always impressed me. Silbury and West Kennet longbarrow both seem to have a very spiritual feel, which is lost to the tourists at Stonehenge and sometimes at Avebury. I was particularly happy with the curving edge of the corn flowing onto the edge of the hill, it reminds me somewhat of the avenue leading away from Avebury and seems wholly appropriate as a setting. The picture is a tone-mapped composite of three exposures, and some motion ghosting can be seen in the corn, which gives a feeling of life. The skies were wonderful that day; a polariser brings out the complex textures in the clouds." Photograph taken using a Canon EOS 1000D with Canon efs 18–55mm lens at 27mm, 1/15sec, F22, ©Keith Britton.

© Antiquity Publications Ltd.



Aerial view of collapsed walls of part of an undated field system near Senj on the slopes of the Velebit Mountains, Croatia. Photographed by Rog Palmer on 22 March 2012 as part of a research project undertaken by Vedrana Glavaš of Zadar University. Photograph taken using a Nikon 700D, 28–70mm lens at 28mm, from a Cessna 172 about 500m above ground level, © Rog Palmer.

© Antiquity Publications Ltd.

EDITORIAL

Our new cover design announces that *Antiquity* has moved to a new home with a new editorial team. It is both a great pleasure and an enormous challenge to follow in the footsteps of the distinguished series of editors who have guided and nurtured the journal since it first appeared back in 1927. Its mission remains unchanged: to bring the most significant recent research, be it fieldwork, analysis or debate, to the broadest possible archaeological audience.

Covering every aspect of archaeology and every part of the world, *Antiquity* is unique in its breadth and scope. Our mission remains as important today as when O.G.S Crawford, the founder of *Antiquity*, wrote in his first editorial in 1927 about important archaeological discoveries that “seldom reach the general public, and remain buried in obscure publications”. With the growth of archaeology as a profession over the past 50 years, the readership of *Antiquity* has changed, but we still aim to attract the interest of the general non-professional, alongside the archaeological and heritage students and professionals who today form our main constituency.

It is also more widely read than ever before: one advantage of the digital age is greater accessibility with all the benefits which that brings. Being able to access an article from a home or office computer saves time and makes it easier to find what we are looking for. It also makes it possible to share research and information internationally on a scale never seen before. All those developments are good things. The larger the community of knowledge, and the more diverse in terms of region and tradition, the richer the archaeology that should result.


One of the key challenges facing journals in the twenty-first century, however, is the economic model that supports them, and the growing demands for Open Access. Under the current arrangement, most journal articles are hidden behind pay walls to which only subscribers, those linked to subscribing institutions, or those who are prepared to pay for an individual article have access. That is increasingly being challenged. The alternative model, where the author pays for the cost of publication, is being championed by governments in the UK and elsewhere. The benefits are many. Articles funded this way will be free to access by everyone, whether in Newcastle or Novosibirsk. Subscription charges that developing countries find difficult to afford will no longer be a barrier to knowledge. A new age of wider sharing of knowledge seems hence to beckon. But there are downsides too that have yet to be resolved. Who will provide the funding for authors to pay for publication of their articles? And how will that affect archaeologists from developing countries who cannot possibly be expected to find the money required? *Antiquity* has been increasingly successful in attracting articles from non-western scholars in recent years, and it would be a tragedy if that were to be compromised or reversed through the pressure for Open Access. This is a complicated issue to which we shall return in future editorials.

My first encounter with *Antiquity* was as a university student in the 1970s, when Glyn Daniel was editor. He had taken over following the sudden death of O.G.S. Crawford in 1957, not without some misgivings, as he later confessed. But with the able support

of his wife Ruth, Glyn did a sterling job for 30 years, firmly establishing *Antiquity* as the leading journal of world archaeology. And so it has remained to the present day, its scope and content gradually expanding as there was more and more archaeology to report, not only from Europe, south-west Asia and North America but also from areas that hitherto had featured less regularly in these pages such as sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America and East Asia. The pattern had been set by Crawford: the very first issue of *Antiquity* in 1927 contained an article on Maori hillforts and a note on Mongolian flint scatters (the latter accompanied by acerbic comments on the chronology!). But it is the past decade or so that has seen the most striking progress in this regard. Our aim is to offer something of interest to everyone in each issue. Yet we also hope to bring key developments and discoveries in all areas and all periods to readers' attention, and to encourage awareness of archaeology throughout the world. That, surely, is both appropriate and desirable in an increasingly globalised age.

The current issue encapsulates the range and diversity of research around the world, from the Upper Palaeolithic caves of southern France to the origins of herding in southern Africa, the Viking period in Iceland, and brick stupas in Sri Lanka. Our 'Method' section covers residue analysis, luminescence dating and aerial survey. The latter is a double feature, one part quantifying and interpreting Iron Age barrows in Romania through archive and satellite imagery, the second showing how spectral imagery on grassland at different times of year gives different results. Finally, 'Debate' includes a thoughtful review of the 2011 Japanese earthquake and its impact on cultural heritage as well as the role of archaeology in the aftermath of a disaster of this kind. Archaeology, with its unique time depth, allows us to place the 2011 catastrophe within a long-term historical and prehistoric perspective. It shows, sadly, that this was not the first such event, but that powerful tsunamis have struck the Sendai plain several times in the past. The archaeology of risk and resilience is set to become an increasingly important field of research.

In the news

 *Antiquity* editorials have always covered recent and forthcoming issues and developments within and around archaeology, and we shall continue to make this a regular feature.

Heritage protection is, as so often, a key concern, not only in war torn regions such as Syria and Afghanistan, but also closer to home. The current economic downturn that affects much of Europe and the USA has already had negative impacts on archaeology. Many Western countries have reduced their funding for universities and research. The decline in economic activity and development has led to widespread redundancies in commercial field units. There has also been pressure on governments to lighten the 'burden' of cultural heritage regulation, which some claim places unnecessary, inappropriate or expensive requirements on house-building, roads or other civil engineering projects. The arguments for the protection of cultural heritage are clear. It is irreplaceable and an integral part of community identity. Human societies today are the product of their pasts and we cannot understand ourselves today without that. Furthermore the costs of archaeological intervention—excavation in advance of development or other mitigation works—are generally paltry in comparison to the costs (and profits) of the development as a whole. But politicians do not always see

© Antiquity Publications Ltd.



Left: now—the A344 running adjacent to Stonehenge, almost touching the Heel Stone and severing the Avenue, the monument's ancient processional way. Right: future—Stonehenge returned to a more tranquil grass setting with the existing facilities moved out of sight, the A344 closed and grassed over and the monument reunited with the Avenue (images and caption ©English Heritage).

it like that. In a recent statement to a UK parliamentary committee, Mr Nick Boles MP, Under-Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, argued that “a single archaeological report can cost £4000 to produce, and there are often requests for multiple reports to be prepared, the cost of which taken together can make it unviable to progress a development at all”. The perception that developer-funded archaeology is an obstacle to development is clearly a challenge that must be urgently contested. We are all in favour of greater efficiency in planning and other processes, but the potential loss of cultural heritage must be accorded its proper value, and must be mitigated accordingly. Similar debates are being played out across the world, as the pressure for rapid development and economic recovery continues.

On a more positive note, there is encouraging news about the role of Social Sciences and Humanities in the European Research Council's 'Horizon 2020' programme, which will open in 2014. The current FP7 programme that is due to close in 2013 supported a number of major archaeological projects, several of which have been the subject of articles in *Antiquity*. The campaign to ensure that Humanities and Social Sciences have their own separate section in Horizon 2020, and are not simply subsumed within other programmes, appears to have been successful. Likely to be entitled 'Europe in a changing world—culture, identity and social change', it is a response to concerns by both the European Parliament and the Council of the European Union that Humanities and Social Sciences might otherwise be under-represented. Much will depend on the precise specification of the new programme, and whether it will be as receptive to archaeological projects as the current FP7 remains of course to be seen.

Still more positive is the prospect of the new Stonehenge Visitor Centre, due to open a year or so from now. The latest update from English Heritage (<http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/daysout/properties/stonehenge/our-plans/project-update/>) shows work on

© Antiquity Publications Ltd.



The new Antiquity team (left to right): Jo Dean, Editorial Manager; Rob Witcher, Reviews Editor; Chris Scarre, Editor.

the car park and the substructures in progress. It has taken 20 years since the visitor arrangements were publicly described as “a national disgrace” by a committee of Members of Parliament. We will review the new facilities in *Antiquity* as soon as they are officially opened.

Finally, some news about the recent changeover at *Antiquity* itself. The new editorial team is a threesome, as before. In addition to myself, Rob Witcher takes over as Deputy Editor/Reviews Editor, responsible for the Project Gallery and—from the June issue—for book reviews and the New Book Chronicle. Jo Dean is the new Editorial Manager, running the *Antiquity* office and overseeing the day-to-day administration of the journal and the online submission system.

We are looking to publish the latest and most exciting archaeological research from around the globe, with a particular focus on new discoveries and analyses. *Antiquity* has been in eminently capable hands under its previous editors and we believe that the current structure of ‘Research’, ‘Method’ and ‘Debate’ has worked well. *Antiquity* offers a widely read, widely circulated and widely accessible forum in which to bring key findings to the attention of a readership that transcends period, regional and thematic specialisms. Research articles should be 5000 words in length, but we would particularly encourage shorter contributions (around 3000 words) for our Method section, where newly developed methods and innovative uses of existing methods are equally welcome. For the Debate section we are aiming to include responses and reactions alongside the original paper wherever possible, to capture some of the controversy that should be generated by the issues that appear under this heading. We

© Antiquity Publications Ltd.

shall also be retaining the reviews section with review articles, book reviews and the New Book Chronicle in each issue.

The *Antiquity* website has grown to become a significant source of supplementary information, as well as a means of accessing the journal electronically. We intend to make some significant changes over the coming months to make our website more user-friendly, and make it easier to find information. The cover of the journal will now feature a prominent full-colour illustration that will change with every issue. The photo will be drawn from one of the published articles: our first shows the spectacular painted ceiling from the Nawarla Gabarnmang rockshelter in northern Australia (see Delannoy *et al.* 'The social construction of caves and rockshelters: Chauvet Cave (France) and Nawarla Gabarnmang (Australia)' this issue, pp. 12–29).

As we take *Antiquity* forward with these and other changes, we are eager for feedback and we would welcome comments about the aspects of *Antiquity* our readers find particularly valuable or suggestions for areas where we might expand or improve.

Readers may notice that we have replaced the previous panel of Correspondents with an Editorial Advisory Board. Looking back, *Antiquity* has oscillated between Correspondents and Advisory Editors, but current journals practice is for an Advisory Board of some kind and we have thought it best to fall into line. Their role remains the same: to identify and encourage good quality articles from all parts of the world, and to advise the Editorial team especially on areas and issues that lie outside our areas of expertise. Around half of our Advisory Editorial Board are previous Correspondents; the others are new. I would like to thank all of them for their support for *Antiquity* in the invaluable role that they perform.

My final thanks go to the previous editorial team—Martin Carver, Madeleine Hummler and Jo Tozer—who have piloted and developed *Antiquity* so expertly and so successfully over the past ten years. Many of the standard features of *Antiquity* with which we are familiar today, including the photographic competition, the New Book Chronicle, the Project Gallery and the division into Research, Method and Debate are their innovations. They also deserve much credit for successfully encouraging contributions from authors from a wider and wider range of international backgrounds and institutions. *Antiquity* today is more global than ever before. They will be a hard act to follow!

Chris Scarre
Durham, 1 March 2013