

## Editorial

PLATES IX, X

Our first illustration (PL. IXa) is of a gold pendant from the Aegina Treasure, and a magnificent gold cup, with a concave rim, decorated in relief with a rosette at the bottom and with spirals running round the bowl (PL. IXb). We reproduce these photographs by kind permission of the British Museum. The pendant is referred to as the Master of Animals and may come from a dress-pin.

These illustrations come from Reynold Higgins, *The Aegina Treasure: an archaeological mystery* (London, British Museum Publications Ltd, 1979. 72 pp., 56 photographs. Paperback £3.95). The mystery began in 1891 when a rich, beautiful and very perplexing collection of ancient jewellery and gold plate was offered for sale to the British Museum by a Mr George Brown, the agent, on the Greek island of Aegina, of Cresswell Brothers, a London firm of sponge-dealers. The story of the find, given in confidence to the authorities of the Museum, was that the collection came from a tomb on the island of Aegina, some 15 miles south of the Piraeus.

It was first published by Arthur Evans in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* (XIII, 1892-3, 195-226), but the discovery of the treasure was surrounded by secrecy and no satisfactory answers could be given to many questions. Why did it suddenly appear? Where had it come from? What civilization had produced it? How had it been found? Since 1956 Dr Higgins has been pursuing the mystery and now sets out his conclusions in full. It is a fascinating story which combines the excitement of archaeology and detective work. Written clearly and cogently, this is a book which no historian of archaeology and no *aficionado* of detective fiction should miss.

 We printed as the frontispiece to our November 1979 issue a photograph of the Roquepertuse head from the Sainsbury Centre for the Visual Arts in the University of East Anglia, Norwich, and asked for comments and suggestions.

We immediately received a letter from Professor Henri Gastaut, who is President of the University of Aix-Marseille, drawing our attention to a fascinating sculpture in his private possession, which he thinks comparable with the Sainsbury head: and we publish a photograph of it here (PL. X) with his kind permission. It was illustrated in the catalogue of the 1972 exhibition in the Musée Cantini in Marseille which was called *Le Crâne, objet de culte, objet d'art*. This catalogue is long out of print but is a collectors piece: printed by the Imprimerie Municipale in Marseille (and they did a really splendid job), it is worth ordering through every known antiquarian bookseller.

We only heard of it, after eight years, through the good offices of Professor Gastaut. It is a must for all archaeological and ethnographical departments: and should be reissued in English. In his letter of 13 November 1979 Professor Gastaut wrote to us, apropos of the Sainsbury head, 'Je possède en effet moi aussi une sculpture assez comparable, que j'ai achetée en vente publique, chez SOTHEY and Cie, le 18 juin 1968, et qui était présentée comme une oeuvre celto-ligure comparable à celle de l'oppidum d'Entremont.'

We understand that the British Museum has been for some while interested in purchasing Professor Gastaut's sculpture. Our view is that it should be in the Musée Borély or the Musée des Antiquités Nationales at Saint-Germain, preferably the latter because we do not believe it to be an object of Celto-Ligurian art. We believe it to be a genuine object of Celtic art from an area in Northern France, a Gallo-Roman work probably of the third or fourth century AD, made perhaps within a hundred miles of Paris or Reims—but this is just our guess. We would value, and so would Professor Gastaut and the British Museum, the views of scholars on this object. Professor Gastaut wrote, frankly, 'Je n'ai aucune idée de l'origine de cette pièce et je serais très heureux si vous pouviez me donner votre avis à son sujet.'



PLATE IX : EDITORIAL

*Aegina Treasure : (a) Gold pendant : the Master of Animals. It may come from a dress pin. 6 cm high. (b) Gold cup. The handle is missing—originally attached with three rivets*

*See p. 81*

*Photos : British Museum*



PLATE X: EDITORIAL

*Celtic bas relief. A 'tête coupée' with closed eyes, resting on three small 'têtes coupées'. Limestone, 33 × 25 cm*

*See p. 81*

*Photo: Collection Gastaut*

📖 In the July 1978 issue we published some press comments on Mary Leakey's discoveries in East Africa, and she drew our attention to the fact that some statements we quoted were 'totally erroneous' (*Antiquity*, 1979, 1). She has now made fresh discoveries of even greater importance and antiquity and we quote again from a Press handout, but this time we do it with greater confidence since we have heard Dr Leakey lecture on the subject in Cambridge and discussed her extraordinary finds with her.

We quote from Adrian Berry, the science correspondent of *The Daily Telegraph* (6 February 1980) in a note entitled, 'Footprints of a family 3½ million years ago.'

Three human-like creatures who made footprints in northern Tanzania some 3,600,000 years ago may have belonged to the same family, a scientist said yesterday. The prints suggested a male and a female holding hands with an infant.

The three creatures are in step, and any slight deviation in course is followed by all three, suggesting that 'they may have been holding on to one another', said Mrs Mary Leakey, the British anthropologist, in Washington.

The sizes of the feet indicated that the two larger creatures were between four and five foot tall. She classified them as 'hominids', a type which had not yet advanced to being true 'homo'.

The footprints, in the Laetoli region of Tanzania, had been preserved by a rain of volcanic ash. The exposed trail of prints was 89 feet long. 'It's quite extraordinary to be able to get this amount of information from so long ago', Mrs Leakey said.

No tools had been found in the area, which indicated that the creatures had not yet developed sufficient brain or sufficient knowledge to put their hands to productive use.

The world's earliest known tools are about two million years old, although some scientists believe that they date back for three million years.

📖 We draw attention to two new and important journals. The first is *Early Man: Magazine of Modern Archeology* which was first published on 30 March. It is a quarterly published by Northwestern Archaeology, which is a programme of archaeological research and teaching sponsored jointly by Northwestern University and the Foundation for Illinois Archaeology. Since its inception ten years ago Northwestern Archaeology has drawn widespread support from businesses and individuals as contributing members. It is a quarterly which presents archaeology in an

attractive format and easily readable style. The Publisher is Stuart Struever and Europeans unused to American usages may not realise that this means it is edited by Struever. He says, 'Never before have Americans had a deeper longing to identify with the history of their own country. *Early Man* is published with the conviction that archaeology is relevant to today's living . . . Archaeology has gone through dramatic changes in recent years. We will help you understand its new goals. We will tell you about the new techniques being used to learn more about ancient human behaviour from excavated remains, the controversies that stimulate public discussion and need reasoned, intelligent handling to keep them in perspective, and the effect that new federal laws are having on archaeological sites endangered by the public works construction.'

The annual subscription to *Early Man* is \$15 and this includes membership of Northwestern Archaeology. Subscribers should write to *Northwestern Archaeology, P.O. Box 1499, Evanston, Illinois 60204*. It seems to us that this is a good journal, well planned and likely to succeed. The first issue has very interesting articles on Hopewell by John B. Carlson (who is Executive Editor of *Early Man*), and we have never read a clearer and more interesting account of what is, perhaps too hopefully, or Hopewellfully, called 'Prehistoric America's Golden Age', excavations in El Salvador, and an article by Michael Zimmerman on the palaeopathology of mummies.

The second new journal is *The Archaeological Advertiser* with the subtitle of 'announcing recent and forthcoming titles on archaeology, classics, ancient and medieval history'. This valuable magazine is compiled, published and distributed by *Moreland and Co., D-2357 Bad Bramstedt 1120, West Germany*. The firm are publishers and international booksellers and their Managing Director is Dr Frank Schappach, who taught for many years at Hamburg, and whose work on iron age topics in Germany and France will be well known to readers of ANTIQUITY. He tells us that his research work will carry on together with his direction of this publishing firm, and has promised us an article on his newest views of the Early Iron Age in northern France. Meanwhile this journal, with its articles and extensive advertisements of archaeological books, should be with every head of an archaeological department, every director of a museum, and every archaeological librarian in the world. It seems to be distributed free: the last

issue (Autumn 1979) has articles by Valentin Rychner on 'L'âge du Bronze final à Auvernier', Barry Raftery on 'The Irish Iron Age—problems of Origin, Development and Chronology', and John Onians on 'Hellenistic Art and Thought—the Greek World View 350 BC–50 BC'.

☞ The world of archaeology has, alas, lost many distinguished scholars in the last few months, and we mourn their passing and salute their achievements. Sir Francis Hill (1900–80) was a man who admirably combined his legal profession with public service and was at the same time a distinguished educationalist and archaeologist. His four volumes of local history telling the story of Lincoln from Medieval to Victorian times were published by the Cambridge University Press between 1948 and 1974. Rhys Carpenter, the distinguished classical archaeologist, died at Philadelphia at the age of 90. He was Professor Emeritus of Archaeology at Bryn Mawr College, where he founded the Department of Classical Archaeology, and was its head for 40 years. One of his noted discoveries was the identity of the sculptor of the ancient Greek bronze 'the Boxer'. Professor Sidney Smith died last year and there is a very good account of his life and work in the current *Bulletin of the Institute of Archaeology* of the University of London. He, like Rhys Carpenter, was in his ninetieth year. He dug with Woolley at Ur in 1923; was Director of Antiquities in Iraq from 1928 to 1931. His many distinguished pupils included Rachel Clay, Barbara Parker, Joan du Plat Taylor, Margaret Munn-Rankin and Veronica Seton-Williams, and his own son, who is now Edwards Professor of Egyptology in University College, London.

Tony Arkell, who died in February at the age of 82, was a close friend of Sidney Smith and Stephen Glanville and all those grand men to whom our generation owes so much. Like Crawford he fought in the 1914–18 war, but, unlike Crawford, who navigated his aircraft to the wrong side of the lines and spent a fruitful time in a German Prisoner of War camp, writing *Man and his past*, Arkell shot down a German bomber on Whit Sunday 1918 and was awarded the MC. After the war he joined the Sudan Political Service and was awarded the MBE for abolishing the slave trade between Ethiopia and the Sudan. The MBE seems by present standards a minimal award for works which in the Wilberforce nineteenth century

seemed heroic. *The Times* obituary (5 March) says, laconically, that his abolition of the slave trade was 'a task which had eluded others. The victims were often little girls who believed the British would illtreat or even eat them.' He turned from these wholesome and worthwhile tasks to become Commissioner for Archaeology in 1938 and held this important post until he became Reader in Egyptology in the University of London. On his retirement in 1963, he took Holy Orders and became Vicar of Cuddington with Dinton in Buckinghamshire. He was always a kind, generous and inspiring man, whether civil servant, archaeologist or priest.

These are all men who had achieved the three score years and ten of the Biblical span of man's life and were all living on borrowed time. Charles McBurney died five years before his seventieth birthday, at the height of his powers, and has left a great gap in the small list of British prehistorians working on Palaeolithic studies. The Editor misses him not only as a scholar but as a much appreciated academic colleague and close friend. He was the doyen of practising Palaeolithic archaeologists in Britain and was held in the very highest esteem by the late Abbé Breuil, and by Dorothy Garrod, who taught him and thought of him as one of her most brilliant pupils. It is good to know that his work at the Cotte de St Brelade in Jersey, where he had worked so successfully for so many years, and on the publication of which he was working so manfully when he died, is being carried on.

Of the Jersey excavations the Master of Peterhouse wrote: 'His final years were concentrated on studying the great quantities of archaeological, geological and palaeontological data meticulously recorded by him during the Cambridge excavations of 1961–71 . . . McBurney's intense personal commitment has inspired a devoted band of assistants and it is fortunate that before he died he had the satisfaction of knowing that his close colleague, Dr John Coles, had undertaken to ensure the completion of a task of which the outcome is awaited by prehistorians all over the world.'

McBurney taught the Prince of Wales and the present Queen of Denmark when they were undergraduates reading archaeology at Cambridge, and both sent representatives to his Memorial Service. Countess Waby Armfelt, Lady-in-Waiting to the Queen of Denmark, and herself a pupil of McBurney, writes from Copenhagen (*in lit.* 23 February):

Although, naturally, Charles McBurney's death was commented upon in the March issue, 1980, I am grateful for the opportunity to add a few words in his memory. As an old pupil and great admirer of Charles McBurney, it is hard to avoid, without a touch of sentiment, looking back on the 'good old days' in 'Arch. and Anth.', and to relive the many hours spent in his 'studio', toiling away at innumerable 'backed blades' from his famous Haul Fteah excavation in Libya. With enthusiasm and energy he had taken it upon himself to lecture to us on the subject of 'statistical calculations applied to archaeology'—this was the academic year 1960–61. 'Noughts and crosses', I believe it was called among colleagues when they beheld his blackboard splashed with graphs and diagrams. But those of us privileged to practise these statistical methods—admittedly with sweat on our brows, and McBurney declaring it 'elementary'—on those never-ending 'backed blades' in their biscuit-tins, know today how much we owe to one of the real pioneers of 'The New Archaeology.'

Charles McBurney was a dynamic and inspiring teacher, whether lecturing in the dingy back rooms of Downing Street or, boyishly high-spirited, charging up the ramparts of Maiden Castle, ahead of his panting students—those same students to whom he opened his home, not only for reasons of supervision, but also as friends of the charming McBurney clan. Indeed, in all parts of the world we, his old pupils, will cherish the memory of Charles McBurney.

Our light-hearted banter about the appropriate patron saint for archaeology, which stemmed from Timothy Ambrose's letter recommending Saint Barbara (*Antiquity*, 1980, 5–6), has produced more correspondence than we have had for a long time about more serious matters, which shows that in the end, and thank God for it, archaeologists and antiquaries are dilettanti; and long may they delight in the past.

Tom Greaves, who is archaeological assistant to the Dartmoor National Park, writes, 'May I suggest St Mina of south-east Europe as a candidate for the patron saint of archaeologists? St Mina was drawn to my attention and offered as patron saint of archaeologists in July 1974 by Bogdan Nikolov, Director of the Museum at Vratsna, Bulgaria'. In Bulgaria, Romania, and Yugoslavia St Mina is the saint to whom one prays, 'when one finds something and when one wants to find something'. But Percival Turnbull, of the County Planning Department of the North Yorkshire County Council, thinks otherwise. He writes,

'I would like to point out that, among those concerned with stimulating due interest in the pre-history of northern England, it has long been traditional to light candles to St Jude.'

But the main support has come for St Helen. Dr Lloyd-Morgan of the Grosvenor Museum, Chester, writes, 'I suggest St Helen who may (or most probably may not) have been Welsh and the Elen of Sarn Helen, and who certainly spent much time exhuming or "inventing" fascinating archaeological material—the Holy Cross for example.' He goes on to say, 'If not you could try invoking Suphlatus, the angel or genius of dust in the Nunctemeran of Apollonius of Tyana!'

Mrs C. van Driel-Murray, of the Sub-faculty of pre- and protohistory of the University of Amsterdam, has no doubts about the role of St Helena. She writes (*in lit.*, 7 March): 'I am surprised that you are unaware of the fact that we have long been under the protection of St Helena, mother of Constantine the Great. Though born in Trier, her Yorkish connexions are well known. Her search for the True Cross is, technically, surprisingly up-to-date. Her hypothesis was that the Cross could indeed be found. She mounted an expedition to the Holy Land, surveyed suitable sites, as indicated by previous study of the textual material (Christian traditions: the ideal cooperation between history and archaeology), and exploited local knowledge. Though the recalcitrant Levite Judas was subjected to more pressure than would be advisable today, he was eventually converted and, changing his name, later became a saint in his own right (a suitable patron for other guardians of antiquities?). Then followed the excavation, observing stratigraphic principles in first demolishing a Hadrianic temple to Venus in order to reach the earlier wooden crosses below. The independent test of the hypothesis (a corpse was restored to life by the True Cross) proved its correctness. The discovery was displayed in a specially built sanctuary on the site.'

And finally, if we are to believe later traditions, samples were spread all over Europe.

It was all financed by the State. Surely an exemplary saint? On the other hand, an archaeologist of my acquaintance habitually invokes the aid of St Clement, 'patron of hopeless cases'.

Mr J. K. Knight, Inspector of Ancient Monuments, writes from the Ancient Monuments Branch of the Welsh Office in Cardiff as follows (*in lit.* dated the Feast of St Winwaloe, 1980): 'You ask

for possible patron saints of archaeology. Whilst you will no doubt receive many suggestions, may I put in a word for St David, who was conceived in a Pembrokeshire megalith, and also mention one or two other possible candidates.

According to his biographer Rhigyfarch (*obit* 1099), the son of Bishop Sulien of St David's, the event took place 'in a small meadow, pleasing to the eye . . . in (which were) . . . two large stones, which had not been seen there before . . . one at her head and one at her feet, for the earth opened . . . both to preserve the maid's modesty and to declare beforehand the significance of her offspring' (*Vita Davidis* c. 75, ed. and trans J. W. James, University of Wales Press, 1967). As you know, many Welsh prehistoric sites bear names like Ty Illtyd or Bedd Branwen and presumably in the late eleventh century a (chambered tomb?) near St David's was known as Bedd Nonnita, or some similar name, Nonnita being the alleged mother of St David, though there is I understand a distinct possibility that Nonnita was originally a male saint. There is a much more detailed account of an Irish chambered tomb in one of the early lives of St Patrick, who summoned up a giant who had been buried there and questioned him about the tomb (a prerogative of sainthood of some archaeological potential). This perhaps displays greater interest in field monuments, but I cannot allow St Patrick precedence over St David.

The Patrick story is one of a number where a saint's attention is drawn to an archaeological site, often by a ghost, and where he often ends up excavating the site for relics or to give the ghost Christian burial and so lay it. The basic story goes back, of course, as far as Pliny's famous ghost story of the buried treasure. One possible candidate for an archaeological patron saint on these grounds is Germanus of Auxerre, whose fifth-century life (best known, of course, for the account of his visits to Britain) tells us he once excavated a ruined Roman villa in the French countryside to recover the bodies of some executed criminals buried there and lay their ghosts. The story is of considerable archaeological interest as perhaps the only contemporary account of the state of a ruined Gallo-Roman villa in the mid-fifth century.

Much as I revere the memory and example of that Bretonophile South Walian St Samson (and wish that someone would produce a new edition of his *Life* to answer some of the problems raised about its date by Fawtier), perhaps it would be

unwise to put him forward for archaeological patronhood for defacing an ancient monument—by carving a cross on it—an act for which he would today be prosecuted by the Department of the Environment, and no doubt castigated in the editorial columns of *Antiquity* should the matter come to your attention.' Mr Knight then offers us an article about the way people thought in the early middle ages about archaeological sites and we have readily accepted his suggestion. Incidentally for those whose dictionaries of saints are not easily available, St Winwaloe's day is 3 March and many readers will remember the old weather jingle about the saints for the first few days of March:

First comes David, then comes Chad,  
Then come Winnol, roaring like mad.

There has been support for St Barbara, and General Sir James Marshall Cornwall canvassed the views of General Sir Henry Tuzo, the Master Gunner, who wrote (*in lit.* 12 March 1980), 'Poor St Barbara. In my view she has enough on her plate—The Royal Regiment, all gunners in other western countries, the RAOC and no doubt other organizations. What is more she suffered downgrading at the hands of John XXIII, along with St George. She should not be asked to take on the archaeologists even though she might stop the real grave diggers.'

Dr David Trump is also against St Barbara who, he says (*in lit.* 5 March) 'must be too overworked, even if she actually existed, to give the attention they deserve to the frantic prayers of a small group like the archaeologists'. He then goes on to say, 'St Samson, though historical and having some association with an archaeological site (for entirely non-archaeological purposes however) seems to be hardly more appropriate.' And he, too, comes down in favour of St Helena, excavator of the True Cross, 'eminently suitable as a patroness of archaeologists in general—and if there is any truth in the reputed connexion, of the York Trust in particular.'

It is years since Emile Fradin, then a young man aged 16, was ploughing the field called *Duranthin* on the family farm of Glozel near Vichy when, on 1 March 1924, one of the oxen fell into a hole. The hole seemed to have been part of a medieval glass factory and/or, possibly, an earlier tomb. Since then the field has been known as the *Champ des Morts*.

Here was the beginning of *l'affaire Glozel* which has divided, confused and tantalized archaeologists and the general public ever since. Now, at 71, Fradin has written his version of it all in a book entitled *Glozel et ma vie* (Paris, Editions Robert Laffont, 1979, 278 pp., 12 pls.). It is, appropriately enough, in the series *Les Enigmes de l'Univers* (which contains many bizarre books), and is said to be a 'récit recueilli par Pierre Peuchmaurd'.

It is, understandably, a one-sided account of the controversy, and contains grave omissions and some very strange statements and errors. We are told that Vayson de Pradenne, signing his name in the visitors' book as Pradennes-Lozé, visited the site in 1927, declaring himself to be an American and saying he wished to buy the site and the museum! Then there is a completely misleading account of the famous hole in the control section during the visit of the 1927 International Commission, and the row between Dr Morlet and Dorothy Garrod, in which the latter is made to say (p. 110), 'Eh bien, oui . . . c'est moi qui ai fait ça.' The true story has been clearly set out in her article 'Recollections of Glozel' (*Antiquity*, XLIII, 1968, 172-7), which should be re-read by anyone who dips into *Glozel et ma vie*. It is clear that Fradin and Peuchmaurd have not read Miss Garrod's article or the testimony of Professor Bosch-Gimpera which we printed in 1974 (*Antiquity*, XLVIII, 263).

They refer to Vayson de Pradenne's papers in the *Bulletin de la Société Préhistorique Française*, but not to his devastating and convincing article on 'The Glozel forgeries' in *ANTIQUITY* (IV, 1930, 201-22), in which he says: 'The history of Glozel is useful as well as diverting, because it lays bare so cleverly the workings of imposture and the development of a controversy.' Crawford, in an editorial footnote, referred to official reports which 'give categorical proofs of forgery'. These are not seriously discussed in this book.

Fradin alleges that Peyrony was ill-disposed to accept the authenticity of Glozel because he thought, if properly established, it would take tourists away from Les Eyzies! But he does record that Peyrony once said to him, 'Mon petit Emile . . . Vous avez fabriqué une grande partie de ces choses la, n'est-ce-pas? Allons, dites la vérité.' This book, in our view, does not do that. It ends with cries of triumph that thermoluminescence-dating has at last vindicated the truth and antiquity of Glozel and that Emile in his old age can rest happy that he has been proved not to be a *faussaire*.

He may think this, and as the coffin lid gapes open for him, as it does for us all, this may be comfort for his soul. But what is the truth about Glozel?

We print an interesting letter dated 12 November 1979 from Dr Mejdahl, who is now back working in the Risø National Laboratory at Roskilde in Denmark.

I read with interest your comments about Glozel in the latest issue of *ANTIQUITY* and noted that although your conviction is unshattered, at least your remarks seemed slightly less acrid than they used to be.

I feel that the only hope of ever unravelling the mystery lies in fresh excavations, and note with satisfaction the continuing revival of the case in *ANTIQUITY* and elsewhere, which no doubt helps to maintain the pressure on the French authorities. In the publication of my letter a disturbing misprint has crept in: the date obtained for the glass-covered clay ball was AD 1200 and not AD 200. The result thus confirms the dating of the glass-smelting activity to the medieval period.

As you know, the authenticity of the glass furnace and the finds associated with it (bricks from the wall, fragments of stoneware ceramics, etc.) has never been disputed. The correct assessment of the date of the glass furnace by TL is thus a strong indication of the validity of the TL dates of the controversial finds as well.

However acrid the Editor of *ANTIQUITY* may appear to those scientists who work north of Copenhagen and south of Paris (there are, alas, no squeaks from Scotland these days!), he should say he is feeling rather picric as he writes these words: the problem remains. To most archaeologists and to most sensible people who have carefully studied the history of Glozel from 1924 onwards, the whole thing is a nonsense. The objects (apart from some genuine things picked up from neighbouring fields or from other collections (what was Dr Morlet doing in the Pyrenean excavations of the twenties?) are hocus-pocus, palpable forgeries. How come they have TL dates of reasonable antiquity? This is a question for the scientists to resolve. In the early days of C14 dating there were archaeologists who found some C14 dates 'unacceptable'. We think that the Glozel controversy should resolve itself around the simple issue that most archaeologists find the TL dates unacceptable.

Where do we go from here? Science or archaeology? The Editor of *ANTIQUITY* is, not surprisingly, on the side of archaeology.