

## ANTIQUITY

plough. In July, when the wheat was well up over the site, there was no further doubt. Five or six or perhaps even seven closely-set rings of spots appeared, and were photographed [see frontispiece]. I climbed on to a hayrick in the same field a few days later, and although a few dark patches could be seen in the standing wheat, no pattern was visible, and they would have passed unnoticed. From the air the details of the site were as clear as shown on the photograph, if not clearer."

Since Mrs Cunnington's article was set in type, an account of a not very dissimilar monument has been printed. It is situated at Har-endermolen, south-east of Gröningen and in that province, in Holland. The earliest interment belonged to the beaker period, and was surrounded by a broken ditch and two concentric circles of holes which had held wooden uprights. A full account will be found in the *Prae-historische Zeitschrift* (Berlin) vol. xv. (1924), pp. 52-61, by Dr A. E. van Giffen, of Gröningen. The significance of these facts will be apparent, but we refrain from comment until the excavation of the site is completed.

### " L'AFFAIRE GLOZEL "

For some years past a number of strange objects have been found at Glozel in France, not far from Vichy. They attracted little attention over here until M. Salomon Reinach referred to them in a letter to *The Times* (27 September 1926). The objects consist of clay tablets with incised characters, stones (some in the form of axes) with engraved representations of animals and with characters like those on the tablets, and the débris of a glass-factory ! At first the whole of this heterogeneous collection was assigned to the neolithic period by its discoverer, Dr Morlet. Later, however, the glass-factory was allowed to fade into the background. M. Reinach expressed the opinion that the style of the animal-engravings was " degenerate Magdalenian ; " and on the strength of this, proposed to assign an age of five to six thousand years to the Magdalenian period. In other words he suggested that the Cave period might have continued to 3000 or 4000 B.C. ! Such a suggestion, coming from any lesser authority, would be laughed out of court ; but M. Reinach's reputation, and his official position as Director of the S. Germain Museum, compel respect, even if assent be withheld. Accordingly the Editor determined to investigate matters for himself. He went to Vichy, and saw the site of the discoveries and the objects ; some of them are in Fradin's farm at Glozel, and some in Dr Morlet's

## NOTES AND NEWS

collection at Vichy. From both he received a most courteous welcome, which he wishes once again to acknowledge. He wrote an objective description of his experiences in the *Observer* (31 October 1926), in the hope that readers would draw their own conclusions. Perhaps it would have been better frankly to have expressed his scepticism at once; but he did not wish to be drawn into a controversy which might waste much valuable time and energy, and which would certainly be acrimonious and unprofitable.

This scepticism was not removed by a report of the proceedings at the Academie des Inscriptions et Belles-lettres (*Temps*, 14 November), and by a letter from Professor Loth (*id.* 20 November). At that meeting M. Camille Jullian read a paper, explaining the discovery as a witch-doctor's outfit, and dating it to 250-300 A.D. M. Jullian was even able to translate some of the phrases! In the discussion M. Reinach defended his opinion, entirely disagreeing with M. Jullian's interpretation. He was supported, with qualifications, by Professor Loth, who regards the discovery as "perhaps the most important in the domain of archaeology which has been made in France for a century." Finally, in the current number of the *Antiquaries Journal*, M. Reinach summarized the discoveries, repeated his opinion that "all the finds . . . were undoubtedly genuine and neolithic" and that "any expression of scepticism is now out of date, and need not even be discussed." The glass-factory was referred to, but left unexplained.

In view of M. Reinach's last-quoted remark, it will be interesting to see what happens now that Abbé Breuil's report is published in *L'Anthropologie*, xxvi, 543-58. The Editor had the privilege of discussing Glözel with M. Breuil at Paris, on his way back from Vichy, when the Abbé was good enough to read this report to him. There is no greater authority in the world on palaeolithic art; and his analysis of the engravings, as well as of the harpoons and other small objects, seems to an impartial observer to be conclusive.

It is always a thankless and unpleasant task to bring an accusation of forgery; but when such far-reaching conclusions are involved it becomes a duty. We went to Glözel hoping for the best, but prepared for the worst. We saw the site, the method of excavation and the objects found; and we were not favourably impressed. We do not say that none of the objects found are genuine; but when a site has been 'salted,' it ceases to interest, though not to amuse, the serious student. Our views will be published in the next number of ANTIQUITY.