Upper) *Excavations in progress on the village green at Lyminge, Kent, England in 2012. The River Nailbourne encircles the green (extreme right) and the 'Coach and Horses' public house borders it (at the bottom of the picture). The principal excavated features are the post-settings and beam slots of an early medieval rectangular hall, situated between an earlier sixth-century sunken-featured building (top left) and a medieval boundary ditch (right) which continues as a slight earthwork beyond the limits of the excavated area. Lyminge is the site of a double monastery documented in the seventh century AD. Photograph by Bill Laing using a GoPro Hero camera with 6mm lens mounted onto an Xaircraft Hexacopter flown with DJI Wookong M electronics and Hitec Aurora radio control.* ***Lower)*** *A feeling for size. Early medieval timber buildings are hard to appreciate, other than from the air (see above). In the experiment shown here, 'tea-lights' were placed in the hollows left by the vanished beams and posts to show up the form of the hall and its neighbouring sunken-floored hut in a night photograph. Taken by Gabor Thomas on 2 September 2012 using a Canon 450D with Canon 18-55mm lens, 10sec, F3.5, 800 ISO. Both photographs courtesy of Gabor Thomas, University of Reading (http://www.reading.ac.uk/archaeology/research/Lyminge/).*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003598X00048183 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Aerial photograph taken by David Kennedy over Jordan on 23 May 2012, showing features characteristic of the region, but yet to be fully interpreted and dated. In the foreground, a 'Bull's Eye Pendant'—a burial cairn surrounded by a ring, with a 'tail' consisting of a succession of 21 small cairns extending for c. *80m. These are probably the result of nomads returning to the location and adding new memorials from* c. *2000+ years ago. At the top, a 'Wheel'—*c. *60m in diameter, with multiple 'spokes' and possibly overlain by another Pendant. There are five more Wheels within 1000m. These were among features noted in an area reconnoitered by Group-Captain L.W.B. Rees VC in the 1920s (see* Antiquity *3 (1929), 389-407). (David Kennedy. Safawi Pendant 52 and Wheel 290; APAAME_20120522_DLK-96.)*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003598X00048183 Published online by Cambridge University Press

EDITORIAL

In praise of reviewers

When I was young and foolish (and addicted to Yeats and Joyce) I would send my poetry to those ephemeral plain-cover magazines that proliferated after the war, with names like *Satis* and *Stand*, and count the hours and months until my manuscript should return, garlanded with grateful acceptance. But these editors were a surly, superior lot, given to dismissive one-liners such as "no" or "no!!" or the more conciliatory "sorry, not for us". Only Howard Sergeant, editor of *Outposts* seemed prepared to address the sensitivities of a proud, mad 18 year-old nursing an escape from the day job. He laid out my gibberish like a patient on a slab, explaining that the bits that made a loud noise were not as useful as the bits that made sense—but keep going all the same, "write and write!" Courtesy costs so little and is worth so much that I'm surprised it's not more popular; but courtesy combined with encouragement is manna from heaven. Courtesy not only uplifts the promising, but inhibits the truly dreadful—much more effectively than abuse. The arrogant actually love abuse and feel obliged to return it with knobs on. Editors need to know this.

This prompts me to offer a few comments about the way this journal selects its papers. *Antiquity* publishes around 80 articles a year and rejects over twice as many, so its editor writes about 250 decision letters to go with each volume of the journal. While there are many ways a piece of research can miss a journal's target, the usual reason for our decision can be summed up in the term *global significance*. *Antiquity* exists to enable archaeologists to tell other archaeologists what they are doing and why it's interesting to all. Thus, a paper should be written as though "addressed to a professional colleague working in a different time-period on another continent". I have written variations on this phrase so many hundreds of times that I fear that authors still don't get it. Some researchers view their subject so narrowly that their articles appear to be composed solely for the benefit of the two people who agree with them and the six people who hate them. But the inclusion of the wider profession is not merely virtuous; it is the only way that the social value of a piece of research can be assessed. And that's the game we're in.

Accepted authors are invited to refurbish their texts and improve the pictures, a process that can be repeated more than once. Those who are rejected ("declined" in our language) are nevertheless sometimes offered suggestions about which other publisher could be interested. It is important to show declined researchers that they remain honourable members of our community, if only because their work is often exemplary. Ten years ago we still received contributions from amiable eccentrics who had unravelled this or that mysterious conundrum or discovered a link between Stonehenge, Moundville, the Knights Templar and Mars. These are unusual now: virtually all submissions to *Antiquity* are notable for their high quality and serious intent. Our journal serves academia, it serves the broader profession (the 80 per cent of researching archaeologists not in universities); it serves officials and it serves amateurs; it serves authors; but the ultimate judge and jury on the quality and relevance of what is published there are those who read it. The editor must second guess what readers

ANTIQUITY 86 (2012): 967–972 http://antiquity.ac.uk/ant/086/ant086965.htm

will think of the work now, and in 10, 50, 100 years' time. The editor carries the can, but carries it on behalf of readers.

None of this would possible, or even desirable, without the assistance of peer-reviewers, a group of unselfish, unpaid experts upon whose diligent participation the whole knowledge industry depends. When I took over this journal, responses were sent to authors in the form of a sanitized précis in which the views of the reviewers and the editor were interwoven. This was partly because some reviewers enjoy being amusingly (and woundingly) caustic at the expense of researchers, whom they see as situated, so to speak, in another room. Thinking that all reviews should be passed to authors, but aware of the sensitivity of some reviewers to exposure, I invited the latter to divide their comments into two: "for the editor" and "for the author". They are also asked to say whether they would allow their names to be revealed or remain anonymous. There is a generation divide here; older reviewers like to remain anonymous and quite enjoy the opportunity to be bitchy; the Facebook generation loves to make everything public, but is pretty bland. We also introduced a scoring system, in which reviewers were invited to rate the article numerically from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent). This scheme has defeated many, even trained mathematicians; scores of 1 and 2 are followed by verbal eulogies, and scores of 4 and 5 by recommendations for a quick reject. Some reviewers can manage to contradict their own scores and indeed their own opinions in the same review: in comments for the editor, the author is shrivelled to a piece of well fried bacon; while the section addressed to the author drips with deference. Declining these papers always requires some fancy footwork, explaining that while the reviewers were partly supportive, the editor is baffled and this is likely to be the response of the readers too.

It needs to be said that the reviews we receive are overwhelmingly helpful and some remain unseen masterpieces of critique. No praise is adequate for this legion of learned commentators (about 300 a year in our case) who make *Antiquity* happen. Your words are read over and over again and held up to the light with the aim of shaking out more meaning. They cool an angry ego, set an agenda, inspire a new alliance. Only authors can say how useful they were to them: the turning point or the terminal point in their career. But the best reviews will be treasured—even in rejection—like those of Howard Sergeant.

Union reborn

☙ The venerable UISPP, otherwise *L'Union internationale des sciences préhistoriques et protohistoriques,* is experiencing a rejuvenation. It was founded in Berne on 28 May 1931 and has been a member of the *Conseil international de la philosophie et des sciences humaines* (part of UNESCO) since 1955. Its agenda is focused on the mechanisms of human adaptation and the dynamics of human behaviour, an agenda advanced by means of a number of Commissions, each addressing a selected theme. Its remit embraces all the sciences relating to prehistory and protohistory: archaeology, anthropology, palaeolontology, geology, zoology, botany, environment, physics, chemistry, geography, history, numismatics, epigraphy, genetics, ethnology, sociology, folklore, history of art, computer science, mathematics – and others.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003598X00048183 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Tally for 2012, by *Antiquity* period. The paper relating to each topic may be located in the index, using the one author's name given in brackets.

PLEISTOCENE

1. *Before 100K BP* Towards a prehistory of primates (Haslam); ancient humans in Romania (Iovita); the Middle Paleolithic in China (Yee Mei Kee);
2. *100-25K BP* Palaeolithic cinema (Azéma); Britain's first modern humans (Dinnis); art from arctic Siberia (Pitulko);
3. *25-10K BP* Cave dwellers in south China (Zhang Chi); mound-settlement in Peru (Dillehay); cereal processing in Syria (Willcox); an amber elk from Germany (Veil); cult and feasting at Göbeckli Tepe (Dietrich); grinding grass in Israel (Nadel); 'substantial' settlement at Star Carr (Conneller);

HOLOCENE

4. *8000-5000 BC* A coastal camp in Chile (Ballester); textiles from far eastern Russia (Kuzmin);
5. *5000-4000 BC* Prequel to the Indus civilisation in Baluchistan (Petrie); rondel forts in Poland (Kobyliński);
6. *4000-3000 BC* Sailors and settlers in Tierra del Fuego (Morello); copper age complexity in Armenia (Areshian); arable failure in Britain (Stevens); rock art on the Nile (Hendrickx); the occupants of *kurgans* (Gerling);
7. *3000-2000 BC* Beaker strategies in Provence (Lemercier); the Bronze Age sanctuary on Keros (Renfrew); soilscapes in Hungary (Salisbury); herders and monuments in east Africa (Hildebrand); textiles in Kazakhstan (Doumani); Stonehenge remodelled (Darvill); domesticating camelids in Argentina (López);
8. *2000-1000 BC* Prehistory of the Congo (Denbow); twins in South-East Asia (Halcrow); bronze recycling in the British isles (Bray); sailing to the Marianas (Winter, Hung)
9. *1000-0 BC* Flooded farmers in Han China (Kidder); development of an oppidum in Provence (Armit); defining the Dian kingdom, south China (Yao); the Tophet at Carthage revisited (Schwartz); ritual midden in Peru (Matsumoto);
10. *AD 0-1000* The dust veil event of AD 536 (Gräslund); agricultural recovery in 8th century S Italy (Arthur); trade on the south-east coast of Africa (Sinclair); Muisca gold figurines from Columbia (Villegas); Maya routeways in Guatemala (Doyle); Viking ship-burials neutralised (Bill); agro-urban Maya (Isendahl); Performing the Nazca lines, Peru (Ruggles).
11. *AD 1000-1500* Wanar, a megalithic monument in Senegal (Laporte); obsidian and Maya collapse (Golitko); the afterlife of Hadrian's Wall (Hingley); tortoiseshell in a Maya mask (Frazier); strategies for the conquered in Argentina (Acuto);
12. *AD 1500- present day* An African house in Louisiana (MacDonald); archaeology of the Spanish Civil War (González-Ruibal); dance, trance and the southern San (Lewis-Williams); playing mancala at Meroe, Sudan (de Voogt).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003598X00048183 Published online by Cambridge University Press

UISPP's mission has been especially re-stated for this editorial and I am happy to include it – and in deference to their constitution do so in its original language:

L'Union internationale des sciences préhistoriques et protohistoriques, association internationale de savants, rappelle que l'universalité de la science est à la base de ses activités. Son but étant la collaboration des savants de tous les pays à des entreprises pouvant contribuer à l'avancement des sciences préhistoriques et protohistoriques, elle déclare son attachement total à la liberté académique. La connaissance de l'Humanité concerne toutes les sociétés actuelles. Pour cette raison, elle refuse toute forme de discrimination fondée sur le concept de race, de conviction philosophique ou idéologique, d'appartenance ethnique ou géographique, de nationalité, de sexe, de langage, ou autres ; discrimination qui, par son intolérance et par définition, est la négation même de toute démarche scientifique. Elle refuse également toute tentative de réécriture fictive du passé et de négationnisme. Organisation non-gouvernementale, elle n'exclut aucun savant bona fide de ses activités scientifiques.

The union takes stock of the work of its commissions (and of all other researchers), at periodical international conferences held at different venues all over the world. The next one will be at Burgos, Spain on 1-7 September 2014. It also seeks permanent support from the world's researchers and invites everyone interested in its agenda and principles to join. Keep track of events at http//uispp.org

A thousand stories

☙ The tally for the year (see previous page) shows that our researchers have dug deep—noting the arrival of ancient hominins in Romania and China, and the first moderns in Britain. We've visited Palaeolithic artists in Arctic Siberia, Mesolithic mound-builders in Peru, Neolithic canoeists in Tierra del Fuego, Bronze Age pilgrims on Keros, an Iron Age *oppidum* in Provence, early medieval agriculture (blighted in Sweden and recovering in Italy), gold figurines in Columbia, megaliths in medieval Senegal, and the house of an African in eighteenth-century Louisiana. Some will see the exhilaration generated by such sparkling small stories, widely spread in space and time, as a rather decadent kind of anecdotal history, lacking the thrust of grand theory. But, as in science, these encounters at the front line are where all grand theory comes from. Whatever else might be happening in the world, archaeologists, at least, are fully engaged in learning more about what happened to it and why.

It also rejoices the heart to see (in the present issue) landmark attempts to tidy up the two most iconic sites in Britain—Stonehenge and Star Carr. Before the present generation, both had been victims of the "nose first" school of archaeology: i.e. no need for deposit-modelling or design, just "follow your nose", bang in a trench, and if that doesn't do it, bang in another one. The kindest verdict on these efforts is that they have provided evaluation of a sort for the leaders of the newer campaigns, enabling them to design programmes more nearly resembling the state of the art. The Star Carr team has broadened its inquiry from the lake, with its fallen trees and juicy debris, and found a building on the dry land—the more likely location (let's face it) for people to live. Site survey suggests a substantial settlement extended over 2 ha, evoking something rather different to small bands squatting in the reeds. The language for this kind of precocity doesn't yet exist, but it will surely develop as the full extent of one of Europe's earliest and most intriguing Mesolithic sites is progressively unpeeled.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003598X00048183 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Antiquity on tour: (left, from top) SAA Vancouver 2008; PANAF, Dakkar, Senegal 2010; UISPP, Florianopolis, Brazil 2011, trustee Colin Renfrew on the stall; (right) IPPA, Viet Nam 2009, correspondents Charles Higham and Li Liu in conversation; EAA Malta 2008, former editors on Gozo; WAC Dublin 2008, editor making bronze.

Stonehenge has also moved swiftly into modern archaeological design in recent years, and its landscape is beginning to emerge from the mist. This part of England, cradled in the downs of Wiltshire, must have been a stunning place in the third millennium, with its giant mound at Silbury, standing monoliths at Avebury, stone circles and trilithons, all walkable one to the other along ritual paths. Now that we know something about the place, English

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003598X00048183 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Heritage is soon to present it to the public. We needn't waste energy regretting that the proper curation and presentation of the site has taken so long. Look on the bright side: the delay has allowed the new research to happen and visitors from the countries of the world will reap the benefit.

Our tally for the year would not complete without the mention of some good news from Edinburgh, where the University has rediscovered the Abercromby Chair, dusted it off and offered it to a prominent international prehistorian, Ian Ralston. Created by Lord Abercromby, soldier, lawyer and Beaker enthusiast, the chair was first occupied by Gordon Childe in 1927, the year *Antiquity* was born.

Time to say goodbye

☙ My own tenure as *Antiquity*'s editor ends with this issue, so at the same time as bidding you farewell, I have the great pleasure of introducing you to our successors. The headquarters of the journal will move from York to Durham, where the editor is to be Professor Chris Scarre, the reviews editor Rob Witcher and the manager Jo Dean. You are in excellent hands. As for me, I have had the great good fortune to have been served by Nick James and Madeleine Hummler as first-rate reviews editors, and Kate Wescombe, Emily Smyth and Jo Tozer as supportive, inventive and ingenious managers. All these, but especially Jo, have had a role in bettering the journal and keeping it sane, relevant and wanted.

The members of *Antiquity*'s Trust and Board of Directors (listed on our inside cover) rarely receive any public expressions of gratitude, so this I gladly do now. It was the Trust's adventurous spirit that allowed us to go digital in 2004. The financial prospects looked lean at the time, but courage filled the void and courage has been duly requited. Resisting all temptations to sell itself to corporate publishers, the Trust has built a rampart around its journal. *Antiquity* is independent of any learned society, commercial company or official institution. Such independence, vanishingly rare, will need to be guarded vigilantly as governments strive to bend knowledge to the yoke of national missions, and large publishers seek to devour small. It should be remembered that *Antiquity* is a global, not a British journal; its subject is the experience of every person who has lived on the planet. Its drivers are the researchers who reveal more of that experience—and understand it better— every year. Its clients are its readers, and it is in their hands that its future (and that of the subject) will rest.

A ten-year tour of the world, such as *Antiquity* offers its editor, is a privilege given to very few, and of course only to one person at a time. It is this that makes it the best job in archaeology.

Martin Carver
York, 1 December 2012

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003598X00048183 Published online by Cambridge University Press