



THE SO-CALLED SHEIKH-EL-BELED
Cairo Museum
(See *ANTIQUITY*, March 1935, p. 14)

facing p. 129

Antiquity

A Quarterly Review of Archaeology

VOL. IX No. 34

JUNE 1935

Editorial Notes

OUR Editorial Notes are usually addressed to all who may read them; but for once a more limited audience is visualized, though we hope that all will read and be interested. We are writing mainly for the contributor this time. There are several ways in which those who write articles for publication in ANTIQUITY, or for any other illustrated journal, can assist the Editors. It is, for instance, the business of every writer, and particularly of those who do research work, to get to know the processes involved in publication; how maps should be drawn for reduction, and how photographic prints should be made, and so forth.



It is necessary to acquire this knowledge because the work of research is not complete until it has been published. Without it no archaeologist, therefore, is properly equipped. This is not the place to give a course of instruction in how to submit articles (or books) for publication, but the subject might with advantage be added to the syllabus of courses in archaeology. It is, for instance, no part of the editorial duty either to find, or to make illustrations, though, because

ANTIQUITY

he wants the article, the Editor often does both. Maps, too, should be drawn with due regard to the size of a page in the journal for which they are intended, and for the amount of the reduction they will have to stand. Articles should begin at the beginning of the subject treated and not in the middle, and should end at the end. They should also be written in plain, straightforward English, with as little technical jargon as possible.



We hasten to add that these defects appear only in the articles rejected, and further that most of the work thrust, as we think, unfairly upon Editors is the result of lack of knowledge and not from mere laziness (though that may sometimes contribute!). We are often complimented upon our illustrations, but the secret of them is quite open—to get good negatives and make *good, enlarged* prints from them. This could be done, and should be done, by the contributor in the first instance, when he is submitting the article; actually it very rarely is. In most cases it is necessary to write for the negative, sometimes (as we had recently) to the Antipodes, only to discover that the negative is lost and nothing but a poor little contact-print is available.



Up to now we have usually done the work and said nothing, but in future we may become more hard-hearted, and return articles that would entail the extra work we have referred to above—we think it would be quite reasonable to do so and thus conform to the usual practice.



The excavating season will soon begin in grim earnest. Many important sites are to be tackled, some for the first time. Maiden Castle will no doubt be the centre of attraction, as it deserves to be. An article by Dr R. E. M. Wheeler has discussed in *The Times* of 1 March last the results obtained from the first season's work. Of the smaller digs we shall watch the excavation of the Norwich Woodhenge with great interest. Ireland is well to the fore as last year, and Dr

EDITORIAL NOTES

Hencken's expedition will no doubt continue their pioneer work. Dr Hencken has chosen for himself a big task, but he has big ideas and is going to make archaeological history on a large scale.



In a letter to *The Times* (13 February) Mr Harold Peake, F.S.A., asks the Conservator of the Museum of the Royal College of Surgeons for the evidence upon which he attributes the Ovingdean skull to the Bronze Age (Mr Peake says 'the late Bronze Age'). It is true that, as Mr Peake points out, the inhabitants of England at that date usually cremated the bodies of their dead; so that naturally we have no evidence of their head-form. But even if we had it would be impossible for an anatomist to say 'this is a Bronze Age skull'. (See also *MAN*, 1935, nos. 55 and 56).



It is impossible for an anatomist, acting as such, to assign a skull to any given period, that is to say, to date it; to do that is the business of the archaeologist, and he does so from associated grave-goods, when present, or from the type of grave it was found in. *Ex cathedra* pronouncements of this kind are unscientific and misleading. The bases of physical anthropology, and the racial inferences built upon them, need re-examination. The future lies with such devices as the coefficient of racial similarity, so far as physical anthropology has a future. Personally we think too much attention has been focussed on race and racial differences. The results are apt to stimulate just those passions that lead logically to war and should rather therefore be damped down.



How revolutionary the new method can be is shown by some of the results already obtained. Like most of his generation the present writer was brought up to believe that the neolithic inhabitants of Britain were 'small dark Mediterraneans'. He ventured to question the correctness of this theory some twenty years ago, and was supported by one who is now an eminent anthropologist. It appears that he was

ANTIQUITY

right, and that the neolithic long-barrow skeletons have the closest affinity with the inhabitants of the North German plain. In other words, our neolithic ancestors belonged to the Nordic long-heads, not to the Mediterranean long-heads. In modern terms this means that they were more akin to Norwegians than to Sicilians. (For references see ANTIQUITY, 1934, VIII, 106).



The promised article on 'Arthur's Battles' has again been unavoidably held over but we hope to publish it definitely in our September number. It will be followed by one on Western Seaways, dealing with intercourse between the Celtic west and the Continent during pre-historic times and the Dark Ages.