

Antiquity

VOL. XLI No. 164

DECEMBER 1967

Editorial

NINETEEN SIXTY-SEVEN has been a year of exceptional archaeological activity and great discoveries have been made. In Ireland the fifth season of Professor M. J. O'Kelly's excavations at Newgrange has produced more fascinating evidence about the construction of the mound and revealed further examples of megalithic mural art. At Knowth, near by, Dr George Eogan has found, in addition to many new decorated kerbstones and more satellite mounds, the passage to the central chamber, and has made a preliminary examination of this new Passage Grave which had eluded the search of previous excavators. Dr Eogan has provided us with a short account of his discoveries this year (p. 302): some of the decorated stones he has found (PLS. XLI-V) are a notable addition to the repertoire of megalithic art in Western Europe. We hope to publish in March an account of Professor O'Kelly's 1967 discoveries: meanwhile his wife has produced a short and useful guide to Newgrange (reviewed below, p. 326) which gives us, in advance of the full publication of her husband's excavations, much valuable information hitherto unavailable about the 1963-6 seasons.

In England, to mention only two sites that have hit the headlines, Leslie Alcock has begun his first major season at Cadbury Hill, and Dr Geoffrey Wainwright has found two fine wooden henge monuments inside Durrington Walls. As *The Observer* baldly put it (27th September 1967), there are those 'for whom the first aim of this dig is to prove that Cadbury Hill is Camelot, the court and fortress of the legendary King Arthur': but so far Arthur has

not appeared, but many other things have appeared including zig-zag trenches and a rock-cut cross confidently claimed by *The Observer* as the 'trace of an early church', and a gold bar three inches long and weighing nearly fifty grammes. The gold bar was declared by a coroner's jury to be the property of its finder, Mr Roger Townsend, aged 19, a voluntary digger on the site who has gone up to Oxford this term to read modern history. This decision makes nonsense of the law of treasure trove which must be altered as soon as possible. *The Daily Telegraph* reports (28th September 1967) that 'After the inquest, Mr Townsend said that he did not know what he would do with the bar, and would probably take expert advice because he had no idea of its value.' There is no question what he should do with the bar: it should be returned to the director of the excavations through whose kindness this young man was allowed to partake in a dig and inadvertently to become the possessor of one of the finds, due to the inadequacy of English law, and then returned by the director to the landowner, whose property it is.

What a bizarre story this is when read in any European country where antiquities laws are better arranged than with us in England. The facts are simple: a voluntary digger on a site has been adjudged the owner of a gold bar which he found; Mrs Elizabeth Montgomery of North Cadbury Court, joint owner of South Cadbury Hill with her husband, was told, when she asked the coroner if she could make a counter-claim for the bar, that counter-claims were not a matter for the coroner's court 'but should be

ANTIQUITY

made elsewhere'. Where? To the Ombudsman? We have in England taken over in a much modified form the Scandinavian Ombudsman: should we not take over the Danish law of Danefæ or remodel our antiquities laws according to the new French law? As they pour out their Carlsberg and Tuborg lagers and address themselves to their open sandwiches our Danish colleagues must be giggling helplessly and incredulously at a situation where the most valuable find on an important dig goes not to the director of excavations, nor to the owner of the land, nor to the State, but to a young man who happened to find the bar on 17th August. If he had not been there on that day some other young man or woman would have found it. The ownership of our prehistoric antiquities should not be a matter of blind chance. Mrs Montgomery said she wanted the gold bar 'to be added to the collection of other finds made on the hill and displayed locally as items of interest'. And she is right. 'The law is a ass—an idiot' said Mr Bumble. Here it seems to be a laughing jackass, and the sooner the idiocy of treasure trove coroners' juries is altered the better for us all.

May we at this moment quote a few sentences from Dr Bruce-Mitford's note on the law and practice of treasure trove which he added to the book he edited in 1956 called *Recent Archaeological Investigations in Britain*:

Treasure in English law, means gold or silver. . . . Base materials—wood, iron, bronze, tin, bone, stone, glass, crystal, textile, leather or pottery—do not come within the scope of the treasure trove law, though they may have to be produced as evidence bearing on gold or silver objects found with them. Archaeologically, this distinction is meaningless and indeed objectionable. . . . Anyone, perhaps digging, ploughing, or laying a cable, who comes upon objects of gold or silver, or which may be of gold or silver, should always report his discovery.

The proper authority to report this discovery to is the coroner for the district. If the coroner thinks the objects might be treasure trove, he empanels a jury whose duty it is 'to enquire of treasure that is found, and who were the finders'.

The whole object of our law of treasure trove,

which was established as far back as the 12th century, is to secure for the royal treasury objects of gold and silver whose rightful owner could not be determined. To quote Bruce-Mitford again:

The essential element in treasure trove is that the original owner never relinquished his interest in or title to the objects, but intended to recover them. If the objects were hidden, this creates a presumption that the hider was concerned to retain possession . . . and by virtue of the concealment, to recover the treasure, the *animus revertendi*

May we recommend our readers to re-read the note on the Sutton Hoo inquest by Sir George Hill (*Antiquaries Journal*, 1950, 67), who had himself written an article on 'The law and practice of Treasure Trove' (*Antiquaries Journal*, 1930, 228) and a book on the subject entitled *Treasure Trove in Law and Practice* (Oxford, 1936). At Sutton Hoo there was clearly no intention to recover but 'a deliberate relinquishment and one in keeping with the known funeral customs of the Germanic and other pagan primitive pagan peoples', to go on quoting from Bruce-Mitford, who adds 'the jury accordingly found that the great treasure was not treasure trove, but the property of the landowner'.

Similarly in Cadbury there is no *animus revertendi*, the gold bar is not treasure trove, and is surely the property of the landowner.

The Observer for 1st October 1967 had a headline 'Alarm at verdict on Camelot gold bar' and quoted Professor Richard Atkinson, Secretary of the Council for British Archaeology:

If this case is taken as a precedent, it has disturbing implications for excavators. Hitherto, archaeologists and lawyers have generally assumed that finds made in the ground, if they were not treasure trove (objects of gold or silver, buried deliberately) were the property of the landowner. Since coroners' courts are not subject to the usual laws of evidence and there is no appeal, the only thing for landowners to do would be to sue the finder to whom the object was awarded.

How right he is. The real lesson of all this is that in archaeology finders are not keepers, and coroners and their treasure-trove juries often

EDITORIAL

do not know what they are doing. The astonishing case of the Cadbury gold bar makes the provision of a new antiquities law imperative.



Durrington Walls is the largest of our henge monuments: it was unfortunate (to put it with unaccustomed moderation—many consider it an outrage) that a main road is being built through the centre of this complex of pagan temples, perhaps the precursor of Stonehenge and Avebury. Dr Geoffrey Wainwright of the Inspectorate of Ancient Monuments of the Ministry of Public Building and Works, who conducted the emergency rescue excavations, will describe his findings in the March 1968 number of *ANTIQUITY*. The battle between those who want to preserve ancient remains and those who wish to build modern towns and roads is one that goes on everywhere all the time: in France the discovery of the remains of Greek Massalia in Marseilles has precipitated a great *Past v. Present* dispute and the same sort of dispute has broken out in Greece where the Roman forum of Salonika has been discovered on the site where it was proposed to build a new court-house. It is clear that all material traces of antiquity cannot and should not be preserved: the expansion of Peterborough to the west will irretrievably destroy countless vestiges of the past, many of them revealed by the air photographs of Dr St Joseph. We must face up to the fact that much of the past that we recognize at the present cannot survive into a future of larger towns and road systems. But there should be certain high priorities for survival, and Durrington Walls ought to have been preserved. We are making no criticism of the Ancient Monuments Board or the Ministry of Public Building and Works; the Chief Inspector of Ancient Monuments, Mr Arnold Taylor, has very kindly and patiently explained to us the whole affair of the destruction of the centre of Durrington Walls. We accuse not the Board nor the Inspectorate of Ancient Monuments but the Ministers responsible and the British public who are sufficiently unaware of their ancient heritage to permit this vandalism to take place without wide public protest. *ANTIQUITY* was

founded to interest and inform the public in the material remains of its own past, and since 1927, endless books have been published, articles written, and broadcasts made about archaeology. One wonders sadly if all this effort is in vain when no cries of shame have been made over the desecration of this most ancient collection of temples. Is it, perhaps, that public imagination can be stirred by the projected destruction of visible monuments—but that a series of post-holes and a ditch 20 ft. deep need to be explained before being understood, and by that time the destruction has happened? To be fair it is quite true that until the 1967 rescue excavations at Durrington Walls took place, no one knew that these remarkable temples were there and the great importance of the site.



From Yugoslavia comes most exciting news. At Lepenski Vir, near the village of Boljetina, 14 km. from Donji Milanovac, on the borders of Romania at the Iron Gates, where excavations are taking place in advance of a great hydro-electric scheme, there has been found a Neolithic settlement said to date from 6000 years BC. Dr Lazar Trifunovic, Director of the National Museum of Belgrade, is reported as saying 'I think I would not exaggerate if I compared this find in significance with the discovery of Troy', and here is an extract from *Borba* published in Belgrade on 17th August 1967:

Yesterday's date, the 16th August, 1967, will soon be marked in the world's history of art and especially in archaeology . . . at Lepenski Vir . . . one of the oldest and most complete settlements in the world has been discovered. It will change the prejudice according to which the first Neolithic civilization emerged in Central Asia, in the East, and that the Balkans and Europe in this respect were lagging behind. On a surface of 1,250 square metres, remains were discovered of 41 houses and 33 stone sculptures. These prove that all that was going on 6,000 years before our era in Mesopotamia and Anatolia, Iraq and other Middle Eastern Civilizations did not reach the level of the culture of the Neolithic settlements by the Danube. Once it has been thoroughly investigated it may change basically the assumption that Neolithic civilization emerged exclusively in the East.

ANTIQUITY

The archaeological and historical reporting in *Borba* may not be more accurate and authoritative than similar reporting in English, French and German papers, but there are two confusions in this account: first the word civilization, which by definition implies literate urban communities, is used loosely for what may be a large settlement like Çatal Hüyük or Jericho; and secondly no one today looking sensibly at the archaeological record supposes that all the peasant-village communities formerly dubbed 'Neolithic' stem entirely from one source in the most ancient Near East.

The Lepenski Vir excavations are being conducted by Dr Dragoslav Srejovic of the University of Belgrade and he has kindly agreed to give ANTIQUITY a summary account of them, and by the time these words are in print the Editor will have visited the site and discussed it with Dr Trifunovic and Dr Srejovic and Professor Garasanin and, wending his way back to England on the Direct-Orient, the ghost of Gordon Childe in the luggage-rack above his head, will be thinking hard about *ex oriente lux* and the *mirage orientale*, of Tartaria and varying chronologies, and remembering a sentence in a recent letter to him from Dr Grbic: 'I am all for long chronologies and autochthismus.' Most readers of ANTIQUITY will have read the important and interesting article by V. Bucha and E. Neustupný on 'Changes of the Earth's Magnetic Field and Radio-Carbon Dating' (*Nature*, 15th July 1967, 261): Dr Neustupný has written for us an article on the Tartaria Tablets questioning the chronology of Sinclair Hood in his recent article (ANTIQUITY, 1967, 99), and this we hope to publish in March 1968.



The British Broadcasting Corporation has for long encouraged an intelligent and informed interest in archaeology, and the widespread interest in that subject which exists today in people in all walks of life owes a great deal to the many and varied programmes put out by the Corporation: from *The Archaeologist* which Gilbert Phelps started 20 years ago from Bristol to the television programmes *Animal*, *Vegetable*, *Mineral?* and *Buried Treasure*: it was these

last in which Paul Johnstone, David Attenborough and Nancy Thomas played a key part. Now, with Attenborough as Controller of BBC-2, we have a regular monthly programme on archaeology and history—and archaeology is no more and no less than the study of the material aspects of man's history—which is called *Chronicle*, and which, after more than a year, has proved its usefulness and displayed its potentialities. That the present Editor of ANTIQUITY and several of his Advisory Editors have been much involved in many of these BBC programmes is far from surprising: what Crawford set out to do in the twenties when he founded ANTIQUITY was the same kind of task which the BBC set itself two decades later. Crawford was working through the written word, the diagram and the illustration. Television works through the moving photograph, the diagram and the interview: it can never replace the written word or get to the same level of intellectual discussion, even, we suspect, in a University of the Air—but here we may well be very wrong. But what we must always remember is that journals like ANTIQUITY, *Current Archaeology* and *World Archaeology* are bound to have small circulations numbered in thousands—the French *Archéologia* seems extraordinary with its circulation figures of between 50,000 and 70,000—whereas archaeological television programmes have audiences of millions.

And now the BBC has put us all further in its debt by sponsoring the excavation and study of Silbury Hill. This was announced in September and here is part of the press release:

In a major bid to shed new light on our remote ancestors, BBC-2 is sponsoring a 3-year dig into a baffling prehistoric mound—the largest in Europe—called Silbury Hill in Wiltshire. This will be the first opportunity for television to cover such an investigation from start to finish. Most of the progress reports will be in colour.

Silbury Hill is an enormous artificial mound just by the A4 near Avebury, six miles west of Marlborough: it covers more than five acres at its base, an area that would fill nearly three-quarters of Trafalgar Square. Its height, 130 feet, would reach nearly three-quarters of the way up Nelson's Column.

EDITORIAL

Professor Richard Atkinson, Professor of Archaeology at University College, Cardiff, who will be in charge of the investigation, says: 'In terms of size and man-hours, this is certainly the greatest single achievement of our prehistoric ancestors in Britain. In spite of several attempts nobody has so far discovered who made it, or when, or why. All that is known for certain is that it was built before the making of the Roman road for Bath to Marlborough, which was aligned on the mound from both sides, but swerves to avoid its base.'

Now the BBC hopes that its investigation, using the latest techniques and involving the collaboration of a number of University departments at Cardiff, Bristol and Southampton, will throw a fresh light on this outstanding problem of our early history, and may even solve it.

Controller of the BBC's South and West Region, Desmond Hawkins, who has promoted the investigation, says: 'Mr David Attenborough, the Controller of BBC-2, will be in over-all charge of the project, and progress will be reported in television programmes, most of which will be seen in colour, and also on radio. Our London colleagues responsible for BBC-2's "Chronicle" programme, led by Paul Johnstone, have joined with us to establish a production team to cover the story from beginning to end. We shall be deploying every latest scientific skill and modern resources to solve the mystery: the unfolding of the story on BBC-2 should be one of the major events in television over the next 3 years.'

All the work will be done with the co-operation of the Ministry of Works and Wiltshire County Council.

Professor Atkinson contributes to this number of *ANTIQUITY* a summary of what we know already—and that very little—about Silbury Hill and the questions he hopes to answer in the three seasons 1968, 1969 and 1970. What is worth saying from the television point of view is that for the first time viewers will be able to watch a dig from the anticipatory phase through to the end, and to be participants in an excavation. It is hoped that when the tunnel comes to be opened there might be a five-minute live transmission every night so that viewers will see the progress of the operation all the time. All these transmissions will be in colour, and an overall film will be made of the whole operation.

All this is a most enlightened piece of patronage, and the Independent Television Companies should follow suit. Anglia has already produced *Once a Kingdom* and *Who were the British?* and a programme on the archaeology, history and present condition of York Minster, and has in preparation a series of historical and archaeological programmes on *The Dark Ages*. Every regional and network TV company should plough back some of its profits into the financing of archaeological and historical projects linked with programmes.



Paris during the summer of 1967 was full of people who had been to see the Tutankhamen exhibition in the Petit Palais or were queuing up to get in. This exhibition broke all records. More than one and a quarter million people visited the Petit Palais to see the 45 exhibits which included things like the magnificent golden funeral mask which had never left Egypt before. Half a million catalogues were sold. The crowds that walked slowly through the Petit Palais were of the nature of 13,000 a day. The previous record for attendance at a special Paris exhibition was the Picasso exhibition: 800,000 people attended that, but, admittedly, it was not open as long as was Tutankhamen. André Malraux arranged the Paris Tutankhamen exhibition on condition that all the profits be returned for the restoration of Abu Simbel and other Nubian monuments: and over three million French francs have now been earned for this project of restoration. What a pity Tutankhamen did not come to London, to the country of Carter and Carnarvon!



The fate of the Dead Sea Scrolls, which were housed in the Palestine Archaeological Museum (Rockefeller Museum), has been the subject of some misgivings since the Israeli-Arab war of last June. It was rumoured that some Scrolls had disappeared or had been damaged. From a reliable authority, reassurance can be given that, on the eve of the war, the bulk of these manuscripts was packed up and put for safety

ANTIQUITY

in a strong room in the basement of the Museum. Shortly after the Cease Fire they were found there by the Israeli authorities, who checked that the collection was complete and undamaged.

In the last days of July, a meeting was held between Dr A. Biran, Director of Antiquities of Israel, Dr Yigael Yadin, Chairman of the Shrine of the Book, and Father R. de Vaux, Chief Editor of the Scrolls kept in the Palestine Archaeological Museum. As a result of the meeting it was officially announced that all the scientific rights of the foreign scholars, who had started work on these Scrolls for publication, would be preserved. Since then there has been no change. Contrary to statements made in the Press, Father de Vaux is still acting as Chief Editor of these Scrolls and the collection of the Palestine Archaeological Museum is kept separate from that in the Shrine of the Book.



The Race Relations Act was clearly not devised with the assistance of physical anthropologists and archaeologists and it is not surprising, therefore, that its strict application has resulted in stupid muddles. It has been invoked by the Race Relations Board because they allege it involves the status of gypsies. The Board, in its unwisdom, has decided that the gypsies are members of '*the Romany race*' and therefore come within the terms of reference of the Act. They have told publicans in Kent and Surrey that in refusing to serve gypsies they are committing an offence under the Race Relations Act and have brushed aside the defence of the publicans that they did not discriminate on the grounds of *race* but on the grounds of *smell*. 'They smelled so badly', it was reported, 'that if they were allowed in, regular customers would leave.' The Race

Relations Board—what a strange body it must be—said that 'discrimination on the grounds of smell could be a valid defence under the Act'. What nonsense! Race is not a matter of smell but of inherited physical characteristics: unwashed gypsies should be precluded from visiting public-houses as should all other unwashed clients, of whatever race or ethnic group they may be. This is not a matter of race but hygiene.

Earlier this year the Lord Chief Justice, ruling in the Queen's Bench Division, said that a gypsy was 'a person leading a nomadic life without either fixed employment or abode', and added that the definition of a member of the Romany race was 'too vague', to which the Race Relations Board says that this does not concern them. This ruling they say 'was made only in the context of section 127 of the Highways Act, 1959, and cannot affect their definition'. May we advise the Lord Chief Justice, the Queen's Bench and the Race Relations Board as follows: (1) a person leading a nomadic life without fixed employment or abode is not necessarily a gypsy—witness the tramps sleeping off their drunken orgies in All Saints' Churchyard outside the window as we write, (2) there is no such thing as 'the Romany Race', and (3) the gypsies are an ethnic group not a race: they were the Rom of India who travelled to the western world in the Middle Ages preserving their nomadic habits, their ancient crafts as tinkers, and, naturally, as they did not outbreed, their racial characteristics (they are physically like Indians from Rajputana) and their language. Our lawyers may not know that a form of Sanskrit is spoken in Snowdonia by clean gypsies with Welsh names. But if we cannot educate the public to protect Durrington Walls, it is too much to hope we can educate the High Court to understand the gypsies. ANTIQUITY will go on trying.



Stop Press. The attention of our readers is drawn to a splendid exhibition, *Trésors de Chypre*, on show in the Musée des Arts Décoratifs in Paris until 3rd January 1968. Some 200 exhibits come from Cyprus museums, churches and monasteries, and from the Department of Oriental Antiquities at the Louvre. They have been arranged in 3 sections: *Préhistoire et Antiquité*, *Art Byzantin*, *Art Populaire*. This admirable exhibition has been mounted under the expert guidance of MM. Karageorghis, Papageorghiou and Diamantis, and is directed by M. Spitéris.