EDITORIAL

In this issue of *Archeologické rozhledy*, we present readers a set of three research articles and one discussion paper. The first two articles share much in their methodological approach, as they apply petrography and X-ray fluorescence analyses on excavated pottery. Jan Volf and colleagues examined finds from the Křinec site to seek potential technological changes in pottery production at the end of the La Tène period. The analysis thus operates within the context marked by the decline of oppida and Celtic culture in Central Europe (bearing in mind all the issues that the terms 'Celtic' as well as 'culture' may be affected by). The paper by Zdeněk Beneš and his colleagues expands on this topic and, based on a case study from the Mlékojedy site, they explore the (dis)continuity in pottery production during the transition from the La Tène to the Roman periods.

With the following paper, we are moving beyond the usual chronological scope of archaeological research. Jan Hasil and colleagues present their analysis of the waste dump excavated in the World War II POW camp in Sauersack/Rolava to illustrate how modern artefacts can enrich our knowledge of the intricate history of the 20th century. With Martin Schönfelder's discussion paper on Celtic migrations, we return to Iron Age archaeology, but even here historical sources play an important role. Livening up the archaeological inquiry with the names of tribes, their leaders, and precise dates for major events, it may, on the other hand, blindfold us from seeing the true testimony of the archaeological record. Links between historical accounts and artefacts will never be straightforward. Moreover, research in protohistoric and historic periods is and will always be inevitably burdened by current political, and mostly nationalist, connotations, as Jiří Macháček noted in his review of two volumes dedicated to medieval lead seals in Central and Eastern Europe.

Although it may not be apparent at first glance, all four papers in this issue are linked by a common theme. They address, more or less directly, past migration, as their authors try to identify different social groups behind the archaeological record – groups that probably migrated to the area the excavated objects come from. While Jan Volf and his colleagues address the processes that preceded and set the ground for the migration on which Zdeněk Beneš and his team focus, the discussion paper by Martin Schönfelder examines migrations more directly; in the case of POW camps, forced migration and relocation were key aspects. Fortunately for most of the inmates, it was a reversible act. Thus, whether it is a prehistoric ceramic vessel or a glass bottle for medicaments, these objects can reveal much about the identity and behaviour of their users. The problem is – as is always the case with archaeological finds – that such objects are mute and it is left to archaeologists to employ all their ingenuity to decipher their stories.

By studying past migrations, archaeologists have entangled themselves, quite paradoxically, in the same process. Mobility constituted medieval university communities the same way it is an essential, virtually mandatory part of academic careers today. To sketch some scholarly classification, which is so enjoyed by archaeologists, such academic migration is structured by the subject of study itself (i.e. by specialisations in archaeology) as well as the age cohorts of the participants (younger members are usually more involved in migration than older high-ranking individuals). Academic migration is mostly short-term. It would probably leave no detectable traces for isotopic analysis of the travelling scholars' bodies,

https://doi.org/10.35686/AR.2024.1

with the exception of academic expats who set out for migration with no return. Based on these principles, an intricate community of shared practice with translocal connections is woven. Writing these lines at Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel during my postdoc fellowship, I am living proof of these words.

Václav Vondrovský