

Editorial

On 31 March 1853, after dining with the Bishop of Salisbury, W. E. Gladstone 'drove to see Stonehenge'. He wrote in his diary, 'It is a noble and an awful relic, telling much and telling too that it conceals more.' We thought of these words a few weeks ago, looking by candlelight at the carvings of Gavrinis, sitting on the capstone of the Table des Marchands at Locmariaquer and contemplating the Grand Menhir Brisé, and walking, as we have often done before, the long lengths of the Kerlescant, Kermario and Menec alignments. These monuments tell much but conceal more: there is no reason to suppose that we shall ever know what the scribings on the walls of Gavrinis and other Breton megalithic monuments mean, or for what purpose the Grand Menhir was cut and dressed, and why the Carnac alignments were laid out.

Professor Alexander Thom, whom we introduced to the Breton megaliths many years ago over a glass of cider in a *crêperie*, is convinced that the megalithic monuments of the Morbihan and indeed everywhere else are primarily astronomical in purpose. Incidentally his eight papers on these subjects published in the *Journal for the History of Astronomy* between 1971 and 1974 are now available as reprints (boxed) from the publishers, at £3 post free. They should be set on the shelf alongside his *Megalithic sites in Britain* (Oxford, 1967), and his *Megalithic lunar observatories* (Oxford, 1971). Thom has shown us that there was a unit of measurement, the megalithic yard, used in prehistoric Europe, and that the circular, near circular and near elliptical stone enclosures in north-western Europe were laid out with great care to careful plans involving some knowledge

of geometrical principles which were later, and perhaps independently, established as a part of Pythagorean geometry. No one in their senses ever supposed that complex megalithic sites were laid out and constructed other than from careful plans drawn on parchment or on sand tables. Because the ancient Britons had no writing that has survived, it is a mistake to suppose that they did not have good methods of communication, measurement and survey, and we must always remember Baron Nordenskjöld's remark that 'Writing need not be the only way of expressing thought.'

The great work of Alexander Thom is his demonstration of the mathematics and mensuration of the megalith builders of Europe. His other contribution to our understanding of them, namely his insistence on their astronomy, is not one which has convinced all archaeologists. His use of the Crucuny *quadrilatère*, very possibly the work of an eighteenth-century land-owner, and his insistence on the role of the Grand Menhir Brisé in astronomical sightings, is alarming. We do not know for certain that these four large bits of stone were ever part of one great menhir 23 m. long, and ever stood upright.

But our doubts are not shared by archaeologists who are much better equipped than we are to deal with these problems. The editor of the *Journal for the History of Astronomy* asked Professor Richard Atkinson to assess, from the point of view of a prehistorian, 'the octet of papers on megalithic astronomy and mensuration by Professor Alexander Thom and Dr A. S. Thom which have so far appeared in this *Journal*'; and we regard Atkinson's article, 'Megalithic astronomy: a prehistorian's

comments' which appeared in *JHA*, vi (1975), 42–52, as essential reading for all. This article has been very well summarized in *The Times* for 13 March 1975 in a short article amusingly entitled *Stonehenge: foresight saga*, by Norman Hammond, who reminds us that Atkinson regarded, a few years ago, the original suggestion of Stonehenge as having an astronomical significance as 'Moonshine'.

The moon still shines bright on our wisdom and follies, our sanities and lunacies, but Professor Atkinson has written for the *Journal for the History of Astronomy* an article which can only be described, in Cartailhac's famous words, *Mea culpa d'un sceptique*. He says, disarmingly, that he has no formal grounding in astronomy, nor in mathematics beyond the age of fourteen. He is with Thom in dealing with the Grand Menhir Brisé. 'For me,' he says, 'the present positions of its four fragments leave no doubt that it originally stood upright on its broader, north-western end and that it fell as the result of some vibratory event, which can only have been an earth-tremor, a number of which have been recorded for the area in historical times. I can see no other explanation for the relative attitudes and spacing of the broken pieces, which are quite inconsistent with the idea sometimes advanced that the stone fell during its erection. The local belief mentioned by Thom, that it formerly stood on its narrower end, is contrary both to universal Megalithic practice elsewhere, and indeed to common sense.'

Atkinson then summarizes his views of the application of Thom's work to prehistorians and what he says must be quoted *in extenso*. 'It is hardly surprising', he says, 'that many prehistorians either ignore the implications of Thom's work, because they do not understand them, or resist them because it is more comfortable to do so. I have myself gone through the latter process; but I have come to the conclusion that to reject Thom's thesis because it does not conform to the model of prehistory on which I was brought up involves also the acceptance of improbabilities of an even higher order. I am prepared, in other words, to believe that my model of European prehistory is

wrong, rather than that the results presented by Thom are due to nothing but chance. Fortunately, recent developments in radiocarbon dating now show that some parts of the traditional picture of European prehistory will have to be abandoned, and that some innovations in the west are now to be dated so early that they must be indigenous and cannot be derived from the east.' Atkinson then refers to his paper 'Neolithic science and technology' published in the *Philosophical transactions of the Royal Society of London*, A, CCLXXVI (1974), 123–31, and goes on to say that in this paper he tried 'to outline the implications of this new chronology for the history of the early contributions which Britain and its continental neighbours may have made to the foundation of European culture'. He concludes, 'It is within the framework of this nascent model of prehistory that Thom's astonishing contribution will find its rightful place.'

Every archaeologist concerned with these matters, which really means everyone interested in the major historical contexts of barbarian Europe, must read this article and the Thom octet on which it comments. These are issues which vitally affect our appreciative understanding of the past. People talk too much about models, and about changing models as though they were changing nappies. To borrow a phrase from Peter White, whose admirable book *The Past is Human* will be discussed in our next Editorial: *the past is human*; we are dealing with the achievement of men, not astronauts or astronomers. Lyell, who died a hundred years ago, promoted the principle of uniformitarianism. Inspired by White we suggest we should promote the principle of humaniformitarianism, that is to say we should not admit as reasonable explanations of any context in the past, especially the pre-literate archaeological past, explanations which are not reasonable and understandable in terms of societies known to us today or in the recent past. The people who lived in western Europe in the fourth and third millennia BC, and built Stonehenge and the Carnac alignments and the great tombs of Gavrinis and Newgrange,

were not people outside the range of technologically neolithic societies: they were not fantastically exceptional mathematicians and astronomers, and they did not receive wisdom from space-men. They were hard-working peasant farmers, who, after all, are the backbone of much of European agriculture today: and they understood times and seasons, the wind and the weather, the good years and the bad years, life and death. We know now through Alexander Thom's fine work, that their detailed knowledge of geometry and trigonometry was of a much higher standard than we ever supposed before. We still need another Thom to tell us how they achieved their constructional skills. We recently showed a party of Cambridge undergraduates on a study field-trip of Breton sites the great *allée couverte* called La Roche aux Fées at Essé, south-east of Rennes. How were these megalithic monuments built? Many, including Atkinson, have made useful and helpful speculations. To our mind, the engineering ability of the megalith builders, and it is a proven and obvious achievement, far surpasses as a historical fact about barbarian Europe, speculations about their devotion to the moon and the stars in the setting of their tombs and temples.

Those interested in Thom's work and the possible astronomical contexts of megaliths should note that from 19 to 21 September this year there is proposed in the University of Glasgow a conference entitled *Ceremonial, Science, and Society in Prehistoric Britain*. The paper outlining this conference says:

For several years now the work of Professor Thom on the stone circles and standing stones of Britain and Brittany has been discussed in archaeological circles, but it is fair to say that his ideas have not yet been integrated with the more traditional kind of archaeological evidence from the period concerned, the Late Neolithic and Early Bronze Age. In view of the remarkable and detailed claims that Thom has made about the intellectual capacity and practical achievement of people in early Bronze Age Britain—involving the practice of sophisticated

astronomical observation and advanced surveying—it seems necessary both to evaluate his work and also to assess its social implications and whether the other available evidence supports these.

Those words were written by Dr Euan MacKie who is organizing the conference and who will provide detailed information if you write to him at the *Department of Extra-Mural Education, University of Glasgow, 57/59 Oakfield Avenue, Glasgow G12 8AW*.

Some of the Breton museums still leave much to be desired. We once described the Museum of the Société Polymathique du Morbihan as a charnel house: it has been re-organized but could well be modernized in display and labelling. Surely Vannes, as the capital town of the Morbihan, needs something better than this. The Musée Miln-Le Rouzic at Carnac seems to have changed little since we first visited it in 1934; and what change there is seems for the worse. It needs thorough re-organizing and modernizing. In contrast with these depressing places, we were happy to visit for the first time the new Musée de Bretagne in Rennes. Here, since three years ago, the collections have been excellently organized and very well displayed. They are presented as a historical sequence from the palaeolithic through to the present day; here is no break, as there should not be, between archaeology and folk culture, or between prehistory and history. The displays of Breton costume are most interesting and it is quite fascinating to see some of the often illustrated mid- to late-nineteenth-century clothes with patterns derived from the megalithic art of Gavrinis and elsewhere.

We draw attention to a new enterprise launched by the British Library Lending Division (BLLD), a constituent part of the British Library which came into existence in July 1973. The Lending Division comprises the former National Lending Library for Science and Technology and the National Central Library. The principal aim of the library is to collect and make available the world's current serial literature and all worthwhile books in English. To this end the library

ANTIQUITY

acquires 44,000 current serials and buys 30,000 English-language books per annum. In addition it has extensive back runs of serials (particularly the heavily used material), a fairly comprehensive collection of English-language books back to 1960, a large collection of Russian scientific books back to 1959, and several areas of special interest. The latter include a collection of semi-published report literature in all subject fields (most of it in microform) which is unsurpassed outside the United States. The BLLD has also built up a collection of over 250,000 *ad hoc* translations of articles and has a complete collection of cover-to-cover translations. Other special material includes Conference Proceedings (over 50,000), British Government Publications (complete from 1962) and recent British and American doctoral dissertations.

The BLLD handles about two million interlibrary requests each year of which about ten per cent are from overseas. Over fifty per cent of the satisfied requests are supplied as photocopies. Loan facilities are restricted to institutional borrowers, and in the case of overseas loans, to approved national centres. The BLLD has been making and issuing translations for over twenty years, and has a stock of almost 10,000 in various fields. As these are technically 'unpublished' they have had very little publicity. The BLLD feels that many of these would be of interest to a wider public, and is therefore collecting small groups of translations in specific subject fields and making them available at a lower price as a 'package deal'. The subject of the first of these collections is archaeology. *Collected translations on archaeology* was issued in 1974: the price is £2.40. It contains Neustupný's paper on Únětice Burials in Jara from *Pamatky Archeologicke* for 1933, and six papers from *Sovetskaya Arkheologiya* for 1970 including Shramko's paper on the Manufacture of Gold Decorations by Scythian Craftsmen and Sunchugashev's paper on Ancient Copper Metallurgy in the Khakassko-Minusinsk Basin.

To obtain this collection of translations one may write to:

Translation Section, British Library Lending Division, Boston Spa, Wetherby, West Yorkshire, United Kingdom LS23 7BQ.

When we published in our December 1974 number the paper on Thermoluminescence and Glozel, by McKerrell, Mejdahl, François and Portal, declaring that the objects found at Glozel between 1924 and 1927, and widely thought to be forgeries, were TL-dated to between 700 BC and AD 100, we said: 'These startling conclusions are bound to provoke much discussion.' On 15 January the British Broadcasting Corporation presented a television programme in the *Chronicle* series dealing with the TL-dating of Glozel, and this, too, has provoked much discussion.

The BBC programme began with an interview between the Editor and the late Professor Dorothy Garrod which had been filmed in 1967, and the text of which we printed here the following year (*Antiquity*, 1968, 172-7). Dorothy Garrod was a member of the 1927 Commission, and so was the late Professor Bosch-Gimpera whose views we have also published (*Antiquity*, 1974, 263); neither of these distinguished archaeologists, who have, on many occasions, discussed *l'affaire Glozel* with the Editor, had the slightest doubt that all the Glozel material was faked—and we must remember that they were there at the time and much closer to the events than any of us writing today. The programme continued with an explanation by Mejdahl and McKerrell of their methods, and their conclusions that all the material they had studied was genuine. Then there was a discussion from the archaeological point of view of the material by Professor Atkinson and Lady Brogan who went to Glozel with the Editor in September 1974. They had never been to Glozel before. Their fresh reactions to the site and the material were of great interest. We quote from the recorded notes of the programme.

Professor Atkinson said:

The first thing one has to bear in mind about Glozel is that it has never been properly excavated. Indeed by modern standards it has

never been excavated at all. It's a dog's breakfast. And one can't even say of it, justly, in Sir Mortimer Wheeler's famous phrase, that it was 'dug up like potatoes'. It was worse than that. What we are dealing with, therefore, is really simply a collection of material in the museum, and here we are faced with a balance of improbabilities. There is first of all this series of TL dates running from about 700 BC to 100 AD; even allowing for uncertainties of thermoluminescent dating this means, on the face of it, that this site ought to have been occupied for something like four centuries. It seems to me very improbable on a site where the soil is sandy and easily moved, that, if it was occupied for that length of time—it is on a steep slope—all this material should be in one layer a foot (30 cm.) thick, as we are told by the excavators: there ought to be a complex stratification. Now of course, it is inherently improbable that these thermoluminescence dates are wrong, and by wrong I do not mean that things have gone wrong in laboratories, but that there may be some undisclosed factor in the material itself which is causing these very curious results. Thermoluminescence has been an established method for some time, but it isn't as old as radiocarbon dating, and there have been in the past some similar abnormalities in C₁₄ dates. I can think of two Neolithic sites in Britain where there is more than one determination from the same site and the C₁₄ dates are consistently in error, in one case by more than 2,000 years and in the other by over 1,000 years.

Then when you come to look at the material itself there are a number of archaeological improbabilities. First of all there is the improbability of much of the material, particularly the fired clay material which has no parallel elsewhere during the period in question, or, for that matter, in any other period or place. Then the bone material: much of the decorated bone work is light in colour and actually has a polished surface, yet these objects are supposed to have been buried in the soil for some two thousand years. It was perfectly clear to me from examining both the soil and the vegetation growing on it that this is an acid soil; it is highly improbable that these things have been buried for this length of time. Many of the tablets have a smooth surface and have not been fired to a very high temperature. They are not very hard and do not break evenly and smoothly as would

a dinner plate or a modern tile: the fractures are irregular and rather like the surface you get when you break a digestive biscuit or a piece of very stale cake. The pottery is soft; it is quite clear they were soft-fired, and it is extremely improbable that they could have retained their exceedingly smooth surface if they had been buried in an acid soil for that length of time. So we are faced with a balance of improbabilities: the improbability on the one hand of the TL dates being wrong, and improbabilities of equal weight on the archaeological side. Which side of the scales will eventually prove to be heavier is something we must wait for.

Lady Brogan said that she had wandered around France for many years studying the immediately pre-Roman and the Gallo-Roman periods and had excavated in the centre of France. She described the Glouzel material as 'this extraordinary assemblage of objects out of any context'. Why, she asked, if the site is to be dated from 700 BC to 100 AD does it not include anything archaeologically characteristic of that period? Why no pottery from Lezoux, not far away: why no Celtic or Roman coins, and why none of the metal work so characteristic of late La Tène and Gallo-Roman sites? She emphasized that tablets were completely alien to Celtic and Gallo-Roman contexts. She also asked why anything Glouzelien had not been found in any neighbouring site in Central France.

The Editor emphasized the impossibility of all the material coming from one genuine ancient context. He said that what had impressed him most on seeing the material again was that we were being asked to believe that palaeolithic decorated bones, neolithic polished axeheads, and sexual idols and inscribed tablets of La Tène or Gallo-Roman times were all found undisturbed in one genuine *gisement*. No experienced archaeologists in their senses could believe this. The 1927 Commission had insisted these varying objects had been placed there in the twenties of this century. The only new factor was the TL dates and in thinking about them he was reminded of Sherlock Holmes's remark in *A study in scarlet*, 'When a fact appears opposed to a long chain of

deductions it invariably proves to be capable of bearing some other interpretation. . . .'

Most of the correspondence following the ANTIQUITY article and the BBC *Chronicle* programme suggests that the answer may lie in the Glouzel material having been re-radiated, and we are told that this is possible. Meanwhile we must record the fact that no one archaeologist to whom we have talked about this curious affair, and their numbers run to between seventy and a hundred, has the slightest doubt that the material is modern, or that most of it is modern, and that sooner or later some explanation will be provided for the TL dates. But the TL dates *may* be right and *all* the archaeologists wrong, just as nearly all the scientists were wrong when they were taken in by Piltdown. What we need is independent dating. We have recently all been startled by the very early dates produced for the finds of man in Kenya and Ethiopia. Dr E. T. Hall, Director of the Research Laboratory for Archaeology and the History of Art at Oxford, in an excellent article entitled 'Old bones—but how old?' (*The Sunday Telegraph*, 3 November 1974) urges on archaeologists the necessity of not relying on one scientific dating technique. He writes: 'My plea is that archaeologists should exercise the right degree of caution before drawing conclusions based on these measurements. They should never find themselves in a position where a key argument or interpretation is based on a single measuring technique which cannot be cross checked by an independent method. Archaeologists must also learn which techniques are more likely to give reliable results. It must be a great temptation to an archaeologist when a unique process comes up with a date which changes his work from the merely interesting to the sensational . . . the greatest temptation is the one which leads an archaeologist selectively to believe evidence which seems to confirm the theories on which he thinks his professional reputation rests.'

Fair enough. We do not want to rely on one dating technique for Glouzel. Are we not right, are we not exercising the right degree of caution if we do not accept the Glouzel TL dates until they are cross-checked by an

independent method? We offer Dr Hall the hospitality of these columns to answer this point and to reflect on this. No one denies that the palaeolithic engravings and the neolithic hafted axe with strange scribings are fakes: if they were found associated, as the incompetent excavators of Glouzel allege, with the TL-dated material of 700 BC to 100 AD and these dates are confirmed by independent methods, then they are forgeries *made in that period*, and of course there were forgeries in antiquity. Camille Julian thought the only explanation of Glouzel was the equipment of a Gallo-Roman sorceress, and it is indeed a witch's hellbroth of nonsense. It might perhaps be the stock in trade of a Gallo-Roman dealer in *farces et atrapes*. These are amusing possibilities but let the scientists who are urging caution on archaeologists remember that no one between 700 BC and AD 100 *could* have forged palaeolithic art. Mobiliary palaeolithic art was not known to the general public until the last quarter of the nineteenth century. *Ergo*, Glouzel was salted: it may have genuine Gallo-Roman material but everything about it stinks. We wait with interest the resolution of the dating problem and remember that the only known C14 date so far gave a zero reading and was deliberately not published by Morlet.

And has the mysterious Dr Foat been traced? Readers will remember (*Antiquity*, 1975, 3) that he was on the 1928 Comité d'Études. Söderman described him as 'an English specialist in Hellenic cultures', and Emile Fradin proudly points to him in pictures hanging up in Glouzel museum, lauding him as the great English scholar who rectified, as he thinks, the grave errors encouraged by the English scholar on the 1927 Commission, Dorothy Garrod, who was his, and also was Dr Morlet's, *bête noire*. We asked for information about Foat and Sonia Cole writes, 'You may be amused to hear that a friend of mine knew Dr Foat—at least he knew *a* Dr Foat, and as the name is so uncommon and the data would fit it seems quite likely that it was *the* Dr Foat. But as he was young in the late twenties unfortunately he does not know if Dr Foat ever mentioned excavation in France.

He also thinks it unlikely that Foat had a family so I'm afraid you are no nearer to discovering his testimony on Glozel.

'My friend's father was Dr George Farquharson, who was a doctor and town councillor in Southampton, and both he and his wife were well-known for their "progressive" views. Dr Foat became a friend of theirs in the late 1920s, but my friend, Maurice Farquharson (former Secretary of the BBC), thinks that Foat was a bird of passage and did not actually live in Southampton. Foat apparently expounded on many subjects and was generally regarded as a savant, but Maurice said his father was sceptical about him. Foat regarded himself as an expert on the obscurer poems of Browning, and particularly *Sordello*, and he and the Farquharson parents used to act Shakespeare parts in the drawing room. He was then grey-haired and probably in his early sixties. Maurice says he never discovered what kind of doctor Foat was, nor does he connect him with Hellenic studies, though he thinks this sounds quite likely. He remembered him mainly as a very talkative extrovert. In fact, from the description, he sounds just the sort of chap who might be mixed up in Glozel and—if he was the same chap—his testimony would presumably not be very reliable.'

Thank you, Sonia Cole and Maurice Farquharson. Perhaps someone else has recollections of this character. Everything that can contribute to the history of the events of 1924 to 1928 is important for here is the key to the Glozel mystery. Of course in the passage of fifty years facts get forgotten and memories fail, but the documents from the time are with us: surely our colleagues who make these TL determinations and boldly speculate on the archaeological and historical implications of their new dating of Glozel do not deny that the French police raided a barn at Glozel and found inscribed tablets waiting to be fired, and various tools suitable for inscribing bones on what was the forger's desk. Incidentally, where is this material which was then impounded by the French police?

It would be a great mistake if anything we

have written in this or the last few Editorials should be taken to suppose that we entertain doubts about the validity of TL-dating. Far from it, and as we write there has arrived the February 1975 issue of *Archaeometry* (vol. 17, part I) with a most important article by E. H. Whittle and J. M. Arnaud, 'Thermoluminescence dating of Neolithic and Chalcolithic pottery from sites in Central Portugal'. Here is a new and dated framework for Iberian prehistory. In their conclusions the authors write: 'C 14 dates, where available from sites associated with the sites dated in this programme, and where calibrated, are consistent with the TL dates obtained.' And so they should be: it is Glozel and the Julsrud material from Mexico that make one believe that in some and, we hope, rare cases, something goes wrong with the method. Or does it? Do the authors of the December article really know what they are subjecting to their machines? The authenticity of their material is much open to question. Some of us think they are dealing with a rag-bag of oddities, some of which were never in the ground at Glozel, and some of which may have been re-radiated by highly skilful forgers in the last few years.

¶ We cannot say too often, and it is not really necessary to do so, that it is the detailed history of the circumstances of finds like Glozel and Rouffignac and Piltdown that will solve much of these mysteries. Piltdown is now a long time ago, but we look forward with great interest to Professor Weiner's revision of his famous book on the subject. Meanwhile we have been reading with very great interest Harry L. Shapiro's *Peking Man* published in 1974 in New York by Simon and Schuster, and soon to be published in England. We have been given permission to quote some sentences from Shapiro's summary of the strange affair of the disappearance of Peking Man:

'Certain events seem clearly established. There can be little doubt that the fossils were, in fact, packed and prepared for shipment to the United States by the Chinese and American officials of the Peking Union Medical College

and the Cenozoic Research Laboratory . . . It is also well authenticated that at least two boxes containing these relics were delivered to the Marine Corps in Peking for transferral by train to Camp Holcomb in Tientsin, where they were to await the S.S. *President Harrison* for shipment to the United States. But from this point, the conflicting testimony increases. I am inclined to discount Colonel Ashurst's conclusion that the boxes were seized on the train at Camp Holcomb and rifled by Japanese soldiers . . . I see no reason to question Mr Davis's account, that the boxes were removed from the train before the Japanese appeared and had been stored in his own room. From

here on, one's imagination and guesswork take over . . . Is it possible that the boxes stored in Tientsin still survive with their contents? . . . There is no easy solution. Although some authorities have resigned themselves to the complete and irretrievable loss of the fossils, somehow this last possibility strikes me as the most devastating of all . . . I am not yet prepared to accept that until every clue has been explored and pursued. I would hope that an international group or committee, co-operating fully with the Chinese, might be established to carry out such a responsible investigation. At this stage, however, we can only speculate while we mourn.'

Book Chronicle

We include here books which have been received for review, or books of importance (not received for review) of which we have recently been informed. We welcome information about books, particularly in languages other than English, of interest to readers of ANTIQUITY. The listing of a book in this chronicle does not preclude its review in ANTIQUITY.

Handbuch der Vorgeschichte by Hermann Müller-Karpe. *Munich: Beck, 1974. 379 pp., DM152.*

Excavations of the Godin project: second progress report by T. Cuyler Young, Jr. and Louis D. Levine. Occasional Paper 26, Royal Ontario Museum, Art and Archaeology. *Toronto: Royal Ontario Museum, 1974. 181 pp., 33 pls., 52 figs. (2 pull-out). \$4.50.*

The human mirror: material and spatial images of man edited by Miles Richardson. *Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1974. 390 pp., 103 figs., 23 maps, 19 tables. \$15.00.*

Heinrich Schafer: principles of Egyptian art, edited with an epilogue by Emma Brunner-Traut. *Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974. 498 pp., 109 pls., 330 figs. £10.00.*

Landscape archaeology: an introduction to fieldwork techniques on Post-Roman landscapes by Michael Aston and Trevor Rowley. *Newton Abbot, London and Vancouver: David & Charles, 1974. 217 pp., 19 pls., 51 figs. £5.50 (board), Canadian \$12.65; £1.00 (paper), Canadian \$2.30.*

Four Minster houses by Stanley R. Jones. *Lincoln: The Friends of Lincoln Cathedral, 1974. 56 pp., 20 figs. £1.00.*

British prehistory: a new outline edited by Colin Renfrew. *London: Duckworth, 1974. 362 pp., 42 figs. £2.50 paperback.*

Legends of the earth: their geologic origins by Dorothy B. Vitaliano. *Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, 1974. 314 pp., 38 pls., 2 tables. \$12.50; £6.00.*

Minster Yard by Kathleen Major. Lincoln Minster Pamphlets Second Series No. 7. *Lincoln: The Friends of Lincoln Cathedral, 1974. 31 pp., 2 figs. 50p.*

Ancient China: the discoveries of post-Liberation Chinese archaeology by William Watson. *London: BBC Publications, 1974. 108 pp., 9 pls. (in colour), 85 figs., 1 map. £1.00.*

An Attic country house: below the cave of Pan at Vari by J. E. Jones, A. J. Graham and L. H. Sackett. *London: Thames and Hudson, 1973. Offprinted from The Annual of the British School at Athens, Vol. 68. 98 pp., 24 pls., 20 figs. £2.50.*

The shaft tomb figures of West Mexico by Hasso von Winning. Southwest Museum Papers 24. *Los Angeles: Southwest Museum, 1974. 197 pp., 1 pl. (in colour), 355 figs., 1 map. \$12.50.*

continued on p. 97