lished, have a life of their own. The packages that arrive in our editorial office with new manuscripts not infrequently cite previous articles in *American Antiquity* on the chosen topic to demonstrate the plausibility of the present offering for publication. Moreover, institutional arrangements that might seem important (for example, sponsorship by a society) may be less structuring than practical exigencies forced on editors by things like length of term or even the page limits allowed papers.

As a whole, this collection of papers leaves no doubt whatsoever that ANTIQUITY has had a key role in the development of a world archaeology, and that its back issues are second to none as a record of the development of our discipline. Thus, as a closing point, I hope soon to hear a strategy to make those back issues available electronically and globally (perhaps, for example, through JSTOR, where they would join the back issues of *American Antiquity*, *World Archaeology* and *Current Anthropology*, to name a few). We on this side of the Atlantic hold this up to you as a challenge for the next few years, and at the same time we humbly take from you many lessons: archaeologists can make themselves understood without turgid, jargon-laden prose; technical points that are worth expressing can be articulated clearly; and finally, even editors are allowed to be witty, though few will rise to the standards set over the years by the editors of ANTIQUITY.

References

BINFORD, L.R. 1962. Archaeology as anthropology, *American Antiquity* 28: 217–25.

1965. Archaeological systematics and the study of culture process, *American Antiquity* 31: 203–10.

CLARKE, D. 1973. Archaeology: the loss of innocence, *Antiquity* 47: 6–18.

CHRISTIE, A. 1951. *They came to Baghdad*. London: Collins.

EERKENS, J. 2002. Trends in the geographic focus of American archaeology: an analysis of *American Antiquity* articles and Ph.D dissertations. Manuscript in possession of author.

FUSTEL DE COULANGES, N.D. 1980. *The ancient city: a study on the religion, laws, and institutions of Greece and Rome.* (Originally published 1864 as *La cité antique.*) Baltimore (MD): Johns Hopkins University Press.

HUTSON, S.R. 2001. Synergy through disunity, science as social practice: comments on VanPool and VanPool, *American Antiquity* 66: 349–60.

LEHNER, P. & A. JULEN. 1991. A man's bones with 16th-century weapons and coins in a glacier near Zermatt, Switzerland, *Antiquity* 65: 269–73.

PYM, B. 1955. *Less than angels*. London: Jonathan Cape.

VAN DER LEEUW, S. & C.L. REDMAN. 2002. Placing archaeology at the center of socio-natural studies, *American Antiquity* 67: 597–605.

ANTIQUITY at 75

BRIAN FAGAN*

I have been a reader of ANTIQUITY since I was an undergraduate, more years ago than I care to contemplate. It occupies a special place in my heart. The journal's pages have kept me in touch with a wider archaeological world when camped in Central Africa, at sea in the middle of the Atlantic Ocean, and on Alaska's North Slope — to mention only a few locations where it has reached me. Life without it is unthinkable. I rejoice at its 75th birthday and at the chance to offer a few thoughts on the subject.

The papers in this special section are a paean of praise for ANTIQUITY, for the vision of its founder and the acumen of the editors who succeeded him. This is as it should be for we are, after all, entitled to a modicum of self-analysis and self-congratulation on this auspicious occasion. After all, how many people would have predicted that Crawford's bold enterprise would have endured for 75 years, three-quarters of a century ago?

The same distinguished contributors have also analysed the content of the journal from diverse perspectives, among them American archaeology, method and theory, and British and European prehistory. But there has been surprisingly little talk of what lies ahead. Surely the future of ANTIQUITY is far more important than its past! I believe that our revered journal stands at an important crossroads on its 75th birthday.

* Department of Archaeology, University of California, Santa Barbara CA 93106, USA.

ANTIQUITY 76 (2002): 1123–5

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003598X00092036 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The four editors of ANTIQUITY have collectively built up the editorial foundations of the journal. Crawford railed at the outset against 'the parochial'. He envisaged a 'journal with world-wide scope'. He aimed his ANTIQUITY as much at serious amateurs as he did the few professionals of the day. His objective was to 'communicate ideas in an informative, non-technical way'. That the journal survived is a measure of his success.

Glyn Daniel was a humanist, an editor who believed that archaeology was about the people of the past and the people who do archaeology.

Chris Chippindale followed through on Crawford's dream and made ANTIQUITY into a world archaeology journal. He upped the professional ante, as well as the technical level of many of the articles.

The present editors have continued in his tradition and have introduced many notable innovations, among them the brief reports with colour illustrations — widely valued by people in many parts of the world.

ANTIQUITY continues to evolve, but I believe we are at the threshold of a new era, because archaeology has changed dramatically in the past generation.

What are some of the trends?

We are witnessing an inexorable move to far greater levels of specialization, to an archaeological world where there are specialists in myriad exotica — to mention only a few: Hoabhinian choppers, plant flotation, Andean roads and medieval rabbit-keeping in Yorkshire. With this increased specialization comes a contentment with intellectual blinkers, a mushrooming intellectual myopia, which allows people to claim that they have no need to read outside their narrow specialty. What arrogant, utter nonsense! How can you study the past, even in the narrowest focus, without a broader perspective? Such people need a subscription to our journal, for ANTIQUITY provides a unique vehicle for reading about the wider world of archaeology in the broadest sense, while at the same time being academic rather than popular.

We are living through a massive population explosion of professional archaeologists in all parts of the world, not only in academia, but many of them in cultural resource management, heritage, and the private sector. Archaeology has become a profession as much as a scholarly discipline, a community of astounding intellectual and practical diversity. Apart from academic specialization, we see fragmentation by occupation, and a general erosion of the intellectual quality of much research. One reason may be because we lack a common forum for general intellectual communication and for reading about archaeology as a whole, a place where we can meet in print as a community. I stress the word 'community', for we are just that — a small number of people interested in the past living in every part of the world. ANTIQUITY with its editorials, eclectic articles and wide-ranging book reviews offers the potential to be a major hub of this community, if the editors eschew parochial British and European interests. I hope that ANTIQUITY will offer a place where the future generations of archaeological professionals can explore the wider world of the past and feel comfortable.

There are times when I wonder if archaeology is still a stand-alone discipline, simply because so much research is now driven by issues rather than disciplines. The emergence of archaeology as a truly multidisciplinary enterprise is one of the great scientific triumphs of the past century. Today, like ANTIQUITY, it covers all time periods of the human past, and contributes to a maze of basic historical problems, everything from human evolution to the landscape of mind and the impact of short-term climate change on Medieval Europe. Archaeology is eclectic as never before. So are we. ANTIQUITY is about the only place where this eclecticism flourishes unchecked. The same eclecticism nourishes the world archaeological community.

Today's archaeology grapples with issues that were but shadows in Crawford's day — ethics, looting and destruction, mass tourism, to mention only a few. The list is enormous. ANTIQUITY offers one of the few venues where literature dealing with these issues for the archaeological community *as a whole* can appear. I am certain that debates on them will be a major feature of future issues, because many of them, like the perspectives of indigenous peoples, transcend national frontiers.

At the same time, we have experienced an enormous increase in our student audience, everything from high schoolers to college freshmen, graduate students and adult learners. At the same time, many more people teach archaeology than ever before. There are few journals, which provide them with the latest on archaeology as an eclectic whole. ANTIQUITY does.

I am sure that I am not alone in receiving e-mails from dozens of people a year asking for journal references. Much of the time, I send them to ANTIQUITY.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003598X00092036 Published online by Cambridge University Press

We now live in a world where the pernicious, nay ferocious, publish-or-perish culture rules much of the archaeological universe. This means a flood of ever-more specialized papers cascade across our desks, many of them of minimal significance and written in passive-ridden, jargon-laden prose of unbelievable turgidity. Standards of archaeological writing are generally appalling. Jargon and passive tenses reign, as does technical paperwriting by formula.

ANTIQUITY has a different literary tradition— of clear exposition and interesting prose, and has from the beginning. Here we set an example to the rest of the archaeological community. Long may this continue!

I believe that ANTIQUITY's future lies in the broad tradition set by Crawford and his successors, but with some important differences for the future.

First, we must not think of the journal as one where specialized academic subjects reign. Nor is ANTIQUITY either *Archaeology Magazine* or *Current Archaeology*, which cater admirably to the general public and amateur archaeologists. When Crawford started the journal, there was no competition for the public audience. Now other magazines fill this void and ANTIQUITY has turned its attention to ever more academic coverage, but with a difference. It is a periodical of world-wide scope, even more so than before, where papers are expected to deal with broad, substantive issues, with basic problems and with a properly balanced global perspective.

Second, let us now abandon the fiction that today's ANTIQUITY is aimed at both serious amateurs and professionals. There will always be some gifted, deeply committed avocationals, who will always subscribe, but our real audience is the now infinitely larger archaeological community, ourselves.

Why? Mortimer Wheeler put it best in his tribute to Crawford as long ago as 1958. He said that Crawford taught 'the world about [archaeological] scholarship, and scholars about one another'. In today's archaeological world, we do little to teach each other about our thinking, our research. This, I believe, is ANTIQUITY's primary role in the archaeology of the future — to inform us about ourselves, whether Classicists, palaeoanthropologists or archaeologists working in the private sector. This vital task will require aggressive commissioning of articles, the encouragement of younger scholars to write clearly and well and a tolerance for all kinds of archaeology.

The short find reports of recent issues are a good start — provided they are not too obscure. How many of us are interested in the minutiae of the Sarmatians or Han Changan?

It is not enough for any of us, whether academics or on the applied side, to live all the time in an archaeology of legal requirements and compliance, obscure methods and arcane theory. You have to know the entire beast of which you speak. Many of us do not.

The basic tradition of ANTIQUITY is there — the editorials, surely one of the best parts of the journal — if the writers do not take themselves, or archaeology, too seriously. We need more in the editorials about people, less about purely British issues, more about the universe of world archaeology and its denizens, for the world of archaeology is now much larger than it was in Crawford and Daniel's day. (If I read one more editorial on Stonehenge, I will scream!)

An aggressive policy of guest editorials would pay rich dividends — and bring in a global perspective. What about guest editorials from Africa, India, or South America, so that the perspective rotates to different regions? (This would also take a heavy burden off the editor, who has to write four 6,000-word editorials a year. And editorials, especially for ANTIQUITY, are very hard indeed to write.)

After all these years, ANTIQUITY is my favourite archaeological read, if nothing else for the editorials and the diverse book reviews, one of the best features. What we now need to do is to make it every archaeologist's favourite read, by making it *the* place where you go to be informed about the vibrant, engaging archaeology of today. We have the potential to become the voice of an entire community, not just a narrow segment of the archaeological world.

ANTIQUITY should be *the* archaeological journal for those of us who are *curious* about the past as a whole. Mortimer Wheeler once memorably remarked that some archaeology was the 'driest dust that blows'. I would add that this dry dust is alive and well, largely because many of us are too narrow in our interests and incurious about what others are doing. ANTIQUITY offers the best hope for changing this, provided it remains literate, engaging and not too academic. Let us appeal to the curiosity in us all — and increase the subscription list at the same time. If we don't, we will join the many among us who are consciously, or unconsciously, engaging in archaeology as a self-indulgent hobby at others' expense.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003598X00092036 Published online by Cambridge University Press