

The editors of *Kleos*, the Amsterdam Bulletin of Ancient Studies and Archaeology, proudly present the first issue of this new bulletin. With regard to the terms 'first' and 'new', the basic question that may come to mind is: is there a need for yet another journal, magazine or indeed bulletin? Our answer is yes. In the current competitive academic climate, which notably affects the Netherlands, newcomers to the world of research and academic debate need every opportunity to present themselves and their research. There are several paths to achieve academic excellence; publishing your work and thus making it available to a larger audience is one of them. However, writing a sound (research) article or review requires skill and experience. Mastering such skills takes time; at least, it used to. In a world that is developing and innovating at an accelerating rate, whether this is on a technical, social or academic level, even junior authors need to publish quickly and effectively, so as to contribute to an increasingly global conversation. Further challenging the ambitions of (post)graduate students are the reduced opportunities to study for a Master or PHD degree; in addition, students are expected to complete their studies within a fixed, limited time. Therefore, *Kleos'* primary aim is to offer an accessible international platform to (post)graduate students to publish their work. As editors we have pre-screened and selected the proposed articles by junior authors and employed the help of supervisors as well as invited (international) non-public peer-reviewers to further the quality of the articles appearing in the first issue of *Kleos*.

We are pleased to present a total of four articles, a two-way dialogue section and two book reviews. This first issue is dedicated to the theme of materiality, and the four articles, all taking an archaeological approach, deal with several overlapping facets of this concept.

Materiality is not a novel concept to archaeologists, who easily borrow theoretical approaches from other disciplines. However, the very nature of archaeological data and in particular its materiality (combined with its long-term character) increasingly offer new insights to other disciplines.¹ When we try to define the concept of materiality used in the many different archaeological contexts and fields of interest, we are confronted with diversity in usage and multiple theoretical approaches.² The theme of materiality clearly provides ample and challenging opportunities for students of ancient studies and especially archaeology to contribute to a broad and integrated academic debate. Below, I briefly summarize the contents of this issue and evaluate the significance to materiality of the four articles.

Iris de Fuijk explores the meaning of a single artefact from Early Iron Age Greece. She applies the perspective that the nature of the relationship between people and material culture is shaped and reshaped differently, depending on the socio-historical context. And that the adhered meaning depends on significant material characteristics which will differ per context, challenging us to think about their properties, qualities and physical affordances when engaging with material objects from the past.

Natalia Zhuravska engages with the perspective of neuro-psychology to explore the effects of seeing, handling and objectifying human remains on academic professionals such as field archaeologists, specialists examining these remains or those involved in displaying them. The focus of the article is on the cognitive processes involved and discusses the subject in the tradition of the 'sapient mind',³ bringing together archaeology, anthropology and neuroscience in an attempt to illustrate the vast analytic potential of neuro-psychological research for archaeologists attempting to understand the effect of the material world on people.

Berber van der Meulen and Vincent van der Veen challenge the current interpretation of the inscription on a Late Roman bridge pile discovered in the river Meuse. Their multidisciplinary approach touches upon the relationship between people and their material world. By exploring different scenarios and using the archaeological record and epigraphical evidence, Van der Meulen and van der Veen venture beyond explaining the inscription as a personal name. Thus, identifying and understanding the effects that people have had on the material worlds.

In the final article Nick Mussert familiarizes us with the intricate interrelationship between material culture and identity by reviewing the existing literature on the materiality of identity. Similar to the concept of materiality he perceives identity as a multi-faceted and scaled concept, investigated from various theoretical viewpoints. He focusses on the construction of identity in the past through the production, consumption and adoption of material culture.

With our dialogue section we hope to encourage junior authors to invite established scholars to engage in a thorough examination or discussion of a subject or theoretical approach. Opening the first *Kleos'* dialogue section, my own paper discusses a lecture given on 2 October 2013, at the Free University of Amsterdam by Manuel Fernández-Götz on the proto-urban beginnings of the Heuneburg an extensively excavated site of the Early Iron Age. He was so kind to write a response for the first *Kleos* dialogue. First, he reflects on the diverse nature of the concept of Early Iron Age urbanism. He then discusses the early process of centralisation and urbanisation that led to the development of the *Fürstensitze*. Finally, he elaborates on the next phase – decentralisation – that set in at different times in different areas.

The review section includes two book reviews. It begins with the book '*1177 B.C.: The year civilization collapsed*' by archaeologist and ancient historian Eric H.Cline, the launch of which received high media exposure. The

second review is of the edited volume on historic aerial imagery for archaeology or other purposes.

The editors of *Kleos* hope that this first issue will contribute to and promote the discourse concerning the disciplines of ancient studies and archaeology. In our next issue we intend to explore the technical possibilities of online publishing. If you are interested in submitting an article or review on ancient studies or archaeology or if you have a recently published book or exhibition catalogue that you would like us to review, or if you would like to discuss co-editing a themed issue of *Kleos*, please email us at kleosbulletin2.o@gmail.com or visit us on vu-nl.academia.edu/KLEOSBulletin.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This first issue of *Kleos* would not have been possible without the support and coaching of several members of the teaching staff of both the Free University of Amsterdam and the University of Amsterdam. Our special thanks go to Jan Paul Crielaard, Nico Roymans, Vladimir Stissi and Gert Jan van Wijngaarden for listening to our ideas and giving us advice when needed. We thank the authors of the articles and reviews for believing in our project and for their patience. We are indebted to Manuel Fernández-Götz of the University of Edinburgh for accepting the invitation to contribute to the first dialogue section. The editors are particularly grateful for the assistance given by Joost Crouwel, Shanna Wielinga, and the six anonymous reviewers who commented on earlier versions of the papers in this issue. We would like to thank Mike Hanney, Joost Crouwel, Camiel Fijnenberg and Olga Scharringhausen for improving the English. Finally, we are grateful to Bert Brouwenstein for designing the logo of *Kleos* Bulletin and to Bert Steensma for the layout and the cover of this first issue.

KARIN SCHARRINGHAUSEN
Editor-in-chief

NOTES

- 1 I. Hodder, 2012: Introduction, in I. Hodder (ed.) *Archaeological Theory Today*, 2nd, Cambridge, 2.
- 2 C. Knappett, 2012: Materiality, in I. Hodder (ed.) *Archaeological Theory Today*, 2nd, Cambridge, 188.
- 3 D. Kaniewski et al., 2011: C. Renfrew / C. Frith / L. Malafouris, 2008: Introduction. The sapient mind: archaeology meets neuroscience, *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society, Biological sciences* 363, 1935.