

Antiquity

Vol. XLIII No. 171

SEPTEMBER 1969

Editorial

Our suggested contest for an article entitled 'Whither Archaeology?' has already attracted many writers, but we think it wise to leave open the closing date for entries until the end of the year. This for one main reason which we had forgotten about when the idea was first mooted. ANTIQUITY travels by surface mail and many of our readers overseas—and they are more than half our subscribers—are only reading a particular number when the next one is nearly out in England. So, in all fairness to all our readers, we have agreed to accept entries arriving by the end of the year, which means entries sent off by air mail early in December.

Meanwhile we print a delightfully amusing piece from David Hinton, of the Department of Antiquities, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, which he describes as 'an After Dinner entry':

'... used to be called Stonehenge, until it became EBA/MBA/ABC/1850 ± 870 under the 1984 Scheduled Amenities (Ancient) Act,' the Professor was saying. 'As you can see, the stones are still in Grade A condition. Now, consider the angle of declination in the 14th stone against the 27th.'

The portable computers clicked, and the students considered the angle.

'But if we take Jupiter as being in the ascendant on the 17th of the month,' the Professor went on. The computers clicked again, and a new answer appeared on the dials. A girl mis-programmed, and burst into helpless tears when her computer merely answered 'THINK'.

'Of course, that's assuming that Saturn was not in eclipse.' They all gazed up at the roof of the astrodome, where the simulated stars twinkled in

different shades of neon. 'If we analyse the histogram synthetically, then I think,' he corrected himself, 'I mean, then in the opinion of the present speaker. . . .'

His words were drowned as twelve o'clock struck, and the loud-speakers began to relay a recording of the annual Solstice Service. Several visiting tourists took off their hats.

'I was never convinced by the evidence for the Druids' cymbals,' the Professor shouted into the ear of the nearest student. 'Too raucous for a religion which was essentially mystical. But then I was always an iconoclast; I'm still not absolutely sure about the dagger.'

He peered more closely at where the carvings had been picked out in white against the Ministerial green paint on the stone, and shook his head. This sudden movement brought a warning shot from the central control tower, and an Ancient Monuments Guard moved forward menacingly. Flustered, the Professor stepped back too hastily, stumbled, lost his balance, and fell over the trip-wire on to the Altar Stone. He was electrocuted instantly.

One of the students summed up the feelings of them all, as they drove back to the university.

'Poor old Professor C. . . . Still, he was getting very old-fashioned. Fancy making us waste time by looking at the data first hand.'

To receive such a light-hearted and amusing but perceptive piece is a great encouragement to an Editor who must confess that he has received some mad, bad and strange entries and correspondence about this contest. One correspondent writes:

I agree with your sentiments concerning the growth of pseudo-scientific archaeology. Surely

though, one science that could provide the answer to the future of archaeology is being ignored—Management Science! Looked at from outside Archaeology is just like a huge, stodgy, badly run Company.



The first Colloque Atlantique was organized and inspired by Pierre-Roland Giot at Rennes and Brest in 1961. Three years later, in April 1964, Professor Waterbolk and other members of the scientific and technical staff of the Biologisch-Archaeologisch Instituut, University of Groningen organized the second Atlantic Colloquium; it was a Symposium on the Origins and Inter-relations of the Neolithic Cultures of Western Europe. This symposium was not only one of the events sponsored by the University of Groningen to commemorate its 350th anniversary, but was also in honour of Professor van Giffen's 80th birthday. The proceedings of the Groningen Colloquium were published as volume XII of *Palaeohistoria* in 1967 entitled *Neolithic Studies in Atlantic Europe* with the subscription 'presented to Albert Egges van Giffen for his 80th birthday'.

In *Palaeohistoria* XII, the Editor, Professor Waterbolk, says in his preface that the Groningen meeting had been deliberately called the Second Atlantic Colloquium, and that 'implicit in this designation is our sincere hope that others will in the future provide opportunities for the series to continue'. The Danes, with energy, enthusiasm and efficiency, provided the opportunity for the Third Atlantic Colloquium which was held in the Forhistorisk Museum of the University of Aarhus in May of this year. The Chateau of Moesgård is a perfect venue for a conference: how many other countries can provide such a peaceful setting for discussion? and the walk through the woods, past the family tombs in a round cemetery, down to the Skovmulle Kro with its delicious *aegge kaegge* and draft Ceres beer.

The Moesgård Atlantic Colloquium was about megaliths and the inter-relations of the megalithic monuments in the different western and north-western countries of Atlantic Europe. One participant said that it was perhaps as

unreasonable to have a conference about megaliths as about brick-built houses; he would have been amused by a recent examination answer which said that a megalith was 'anything which has been made up from large stones'. But the brick-built houses analogy missed the historical point; archaeologists have been talking about megaliths for a long time and assuming they were talking about a well-defined taxonomic category of ancient monuments. The conference wisely and predictably challenged this old view: although its members sometimes fell into the all too common error of confusing taxonomy with typology. Taxonomy is of course the classification and labelling of types in an objective way; while typology is the arrangement of types in a theoretical sequence. Typologies are always open to criticism: taxonomy is as necessary in archaeology as it is in the natural sciences. At one conference session Dr P-R. Giot said he wished that terms like Passage Grave, *dolmen à couloir*, Gallery Grave, *allée couverte*, and many another could be put in a bag together with a large megalith and dropped in the sea. But an inadequate taxonomy does not mean that clear objective labelling is not necessary: it is, and we hope that one of the results of this colloquium will be the adumbration of a scheme of objective labelling based on site names and allowing no confusion between different languages.

It is high time such an impartial taxonomy was introduced. Prehistorians have been talking about megaliths for well over a hundred years. *The Oxford English Dictionary* tells us that the words megalith and megalithic were first used in 1849 in a book by Algernon Herbert entitled *Cyclops Christianus; or, An Argument to Disprove the supposed Antiquity of the Stonehenge and other Megalithic Erections in England and Brittany*. There is something curiously vulgar about the phrase megalithic erections just as there is something vulgarly curious about the insistence of Victorian archaeologists referring to Avebury and Carnac and New Grange as rude stone monuments. But even Herbert could not train his printer to use correctly his neologism, and in his contents-list we meet the phrase, 'The rudeness of megathilic forms does

EDITORIAL

not prove their antiquity.' Perhaps these megalithic forms had something to do with those infamous Neolithic Vultures!

John Cowen (see *Antiquity*, 1969, 85-6) would have approved of the Moesgård conference. Confined to one subject, restricted to 40 participants who had had their papers circulated beforehand, and spoke for only 20 minutes to add new points and show slides, it was a model of its kind, and we hope the fourth and fifth Atlantic Colloquia, planned for Britain and Ireland and for Iberia, will be equally successful.



Every prehistoric conference these days is informed, enlivened and often confused by recitals of C14 dates, and archaeologists sometimes appear like the legendary Stock Exchange purveyors of smutty stories, taking their colleagues into corners and saying 'Have you heard this one?' as some new date is trotted out, sometimes with satisfaction and sometimes with alarm. The Moesgård conference was, of course, beset with the very early dates of some of the Breton Passage Graves. It is not so easy to go on deriving the Breton, Irish and Scandinavian Passage Graves from Iberia when we have no large series of early Iberian dates, and the re-thinking of megalithic problems must involve a re-thinking of Breton Passage Grave origins in terms other than Iberia and the south. It is always forgotten, in our post-Childe diffusionist way, that Montelius suggested a northern origin for the funerary Passage Graves, and what are the houses at Skara Brae other than non-funerary Passage Graves?

The time will soon come, we all hope, when there are so many C14 dates, and when the problems of this still new technique of dating have been so resolved, that the 'Have you heard this one?' and 'But do you think all is well?' questions will disappear from the land. It is therefore very good news that the Royal Society and the British Academy will hold a joint meeting to celebrate the Coming of Age of Radiocarbon Dating. This will be part of a Symposium on the Impact of the Natural Sciences on Archaeology. Professor Willard F.

Libby will open the symposium on 11th December 1969, with a lecture reviewing radiocarbon dating. An account will be given of the radiocarbon dating of specimens from Egypt and Arizona, and differences between these dates and dates derived from evidence supplied by astronomy and tree-ring analyses will be considered. This discrepancy may be due to changes in the earth's magnetic field, details of which, derived from excavated magnetic material, will be given.

It is well known that many techniques based on new developments in physical science have been applied in the search for archaeological remains, and in the identification, dating, and analysis of museum objects. These will be reviewed by a number of speakers from America and Europe on 12th December. The symposium will be held in the rooms of the Royal Society: full details will be published in October. Meanwhile any further questions at this stage with regard to the symposium should be referred to the Secretariat of the Royal Society or the British Academy. Incidentally, it is a matter of very considerable interest that this is the first occasion on which the Royal Society and the British Academy have been engaged on a joint enterprise of this kind.

It remains true that physicists and archaeologists do not look at C14 dating in the same way. In a letter to the Editor, Mr Euan MacKie, of the Hunterian Museum of the University of Glasgow, says of the problem of calibrating C14 and terrestrial years, 'archaeologists should not, very definitely not, translate dates from one type of year to another. There are several good reasons for this, including the confusion that will inevitably result if someone does not make it clear exactly what he is doing. Judging from what one still reads about using C14 dates confusion will certainly follow. I have a simple scheme to avoid this which I would like to send you a note about when the paper (*Editorial*, 1969, 90) by Suess and Rainer Berger appears. By all means give us comprehensive calibration tables but no translation. I would speak of T.2500 BC and C.2500 BC, meaning Terrestrial years (by tree-rings, historical records and other contemporary indicators of revolutions of the

earth round the sun), and Carbon-14 years respectively. Other extrapolations backwards of modern conditions should be similarly distinguished, for example A.1800 BC (i.e. astronomical years) for Thom's stone circles. I do think it is very important that we should decide exactly how we are going to use new knowledge before we get swamped under conversion tables and correlation charts.'

Mr Mackie's interesting comments are open for further comment before or after the December colloquium. We have been offered, in the last year, papers of very considerable interest about the chronological relations of prehistoric Europe proposing all kinds of new dates using the dendrochronological calibration tables published in *Radiocarbon* and elsewhere; but on the advice of trusted colleagues and advisers in the natural sciences have reluctantly declined to publish these papers. They will appear elsewhere, and we and our advisers may have been dragging our feet. We propose to drag them until after the London December symposium and until we have printed the Berger-Suess paper, and we remind ourselves of what Sir Thomas Browne said, 'Time we may comprehend, tis but six days elder than ourselves, and hath the same horoscope with the world.' Are we, in these days of C14 datings and undatings, happy to say, as Browne did in the 17th century, that we comprehend time? Kenneth Oakley has given us lettered forms of dating the past, and now Euan Mackie suggests T, C, and A dates. Do we have the same horoscope with the world?



To quote Thomas Browne again: 'The night of time far surpasseth the day, and who knows when was the equinox?' The answer is, certainly those astronomers who dabble in archaeology. One of the papers in Part II of the Archaeological and Anthropological Tripos this summer contained the following question: 'It has been said that religion is the last resort of the puzzled archaeologist. Do you agree?' It could equally well have been said that astronomy was the last resort of the puzzled archaeologist, or that archaeology was the last resort of the

puzzled astronomer. We had thought that in the last few years we had had more than enough of the astronomer-imposed observation of our prehistoric monuments: but no, Hawkins has allies.

Professor Lyle B. Borst of the Department of Physics and Astronomy, State University of New York at Buffalo, has put out a theory (*Science*, 163, 1969, 567-9) that peculiar misalignments in the layout of Canterbury Cathedral are attributable to the fact that the Christian builders worked on a floor plan left by megalithic predecessors. According to Borst, the nave of Canterbury Cathedral is aligned to the rising of Betelgeuse in 1500 BC, the choir to the rising in 1900 BC, and for the Trinity Chapel 2300 BC. Underneath the Cathedral, he says, there must have been a Woodhenge type structure of wood or stone. The Trinity Chapel (built in AD 1180) followed, he alleges, the geometry of Woodhenge which, he tells us, was originally aligned with the rising point of Betelgeuse in 2300 BC.

Most archaeologists have dismissed Borst's theories as they have the Stonehenge interpretations of his colleague Gerald Hawkins. A colleague of ours, curiously enough an expert in both mathematics and Anglo-Saxon churches, described Borst's ideas to us as 'pure fantasy', and so do we, expert in neither, but experienced in megalithic monuments. But others have fallen for Borst as they have fallen for Hawkins. Nigel Calder, writing on these matters in the *New Statesman* for 14th February 1969, in an article entitled 'The Megalithic Newton', praises Hawkins, Borst and Thom (and Thom may well have established the existence of a megalithic yard of 2.72 ft. or 0.829 m.) and says, 'Unless you presume marked variation of innate talent in human populations, from place to place and from era to era, it may be more likely than not that the megalithic folk had their Newton, as they so conspicuously had their Brunel.' Such is the acceptance by some of the astronomical interpretation of megaliths that Calder declares roundly 'the fact remains that you can go to Stonehenge today and use it to compute forthcoming eclipses'. Can you, Mr Calder? Can you, Professor Hawkins? Can you, Professor Thom? The last-named can reply in person when, next

May, he is demonstrating to us on the ground the astronomical significance of the alignments at Carnac.



The Ordnance Survey has a record, unparalleled by any other state map organization in the world, for its interest in archaeology, shown by entries on maps and the production of special historical maps, and, most of all, for its creation of an Archaeology Office in the Survey. The first Archaeology Officer was O. G. S. Crawford, the founder and first editor of *ANTIQUITY*: he took up his job in October 1920. 'My arrival at the Ordnance Survey was (to put it mildly) not greeted with any enthusiasm' he wrote in his autobiography *Said and Done* (London, 1955). We now celebrate the first 50 years of that appointment. Crawford had a distinguished assistant, Professor Grimes, and two successors: Mr C. W. Phillips, who has written the history of archaeology and the Ordnance Survey in the official history of the Survey shortly to be published, and the present Archaeology Officer, Mr Richard Feachem, who contributes to the next number of *ANTIQUITY* the sort of article which Crawford as field-worker, Archaeology Officer, and editor of *ANTIQUITY*, would have been delighted with.

This year the Ordnance Survey set up, 50 years after the creation of an Archaeology Office, an Advisory Committee on Archaeology, and the first meeting of this annually meeting committee was held in Southampton in January 1969. Major-General Edge, the Director of the Survey, said that it was the practice of the Department to hold regular consultations with map users, but that this was the first to deal specifically with archaeology and history. The committee consisted of eight members of the Survey's staff and seventeen archaeologists and administrators from outside. Speaking personally as one of the seventeen, this was a first-rate occasion: many important matters were discussed, the importance of period maps was emphasized, the necessity of co-operation with outside bodies (including the Sub-Department of Aerial Photography in the University of Cambridge) was insisted upon, and warm

appreciation recorded of the way in which archaeological information was depicted on standard maps.



The Department of Adult Education in the University of Leicester announces a residential course on *Economy and Settlement of Neolithic and Early Bronze Age Britain and Europe* to be held at Leicester from Friday evening, 12th December to after tea on Sunday, 14th December. The principal speakers will be Professor Stuart Piggott, Professor R. J. C. Atkinson, D. R. Brothwell, Dr J. G. Evans, P. J. Fowler, Dr Isobel Smith and Dr D. D. A. Simpson. The original instructions said that the conference was restricted to 240 but that unless a minimum of 160 applications had been received by 21st August, it would not be possible to hold the conference. We have persuaded the Leicester authorities to postpone this date until 5th September, when readers of *ANTIQUITY* may have heard of the course for the first time on receipt of this issue. Applications should be addressed to *The Administrative Officer, Department of Adult Education, 6 Salisbury Road, Leicester LE1 7LT*. It occurs to us that the London-Leicester trains on the evening of Friday, 12th December, may be full of archaeologists rushing away from the British Academy/Royal Society colloquium to Stamford Hall.



The VIIIth International Congress of Pre-historic and Protohistoric Sciences will be held in Belgrade in 1971. The dates of the Congress are 9th to 15th September. Those interested in attending who have not already received forms should write, not later than the 30th of September of this year, to *Secretariat du VIIIe Congrès, Institut archéologique, Knez Mihailova 35, Belgrade, Yugoslavia*.



A welcome to two new journals. The first is *Amgueddfa: Bulletin of the National Museum of Wales*. This attractive journal will be published

ANTIQUITY

three times a year: single copies are 5s (postage 6d) and the annual subscription 12s 6d (postage 1s 6d). Subscribers should write to *The Director, National Museum of Wales, Cardiff CF1 3NP*. Its aim is to 'record new developments in and about the Museum as they occur, and examine the best in other museums'. The first issue of 40 pages has, *inter alia*, an account by R. L. Charles, Keeper of Art, of two French pictures acquired by the Museum; an appreciation of the retiring Director, Dr Dilwyn John; an account of his tour of North American museums by the new Director, Dr G. O. Jones, and an article by Dr Bassett, Keeper of Geology, entitled 'New Exhibits and Old Problems in the Department of Geology'. There is one tiresome feature if the journal is to be read and appreciated, as it should be, outside Wales—an article in Welsh. The Editor of ANTIQUITY, being accidentally privileged to be a bilingual Ancient Briton, can understand it, but what of many of the friends of the National Museum whose interest this journal is trying to foster and retain? At least there should be an English summary at the end as is almost standard practice in Danish, Swedish and Norwegian journals. It is, *en passant*, wryly amusing that the captions to the photographs illustrating this Welsh article are in English only!

The second is *World Archaeology* which we have written about before (*Antiquity*, 1968, 254) and which was advertised in our last issue. Its delayed appearance, 'for which neither the contributors nor the present publishers are in any way to blame', as the editorial note says, enhances our eagerness in looking at it. It consists of 144 pages, with eight pages of plates (numbered by their included photographs as fourteen plates). There is no editorial—merely an editorial note, no reviews, and no notes and news, but there are useful abstracts of the articles. The notes to contributors are clear and sensible: quarto paper and the Harvard system of referencing. There are not more than ten footnotes in the whole journal, which is admirable, but they are numbered by the pages on which they occur. The journal has an editorial board of seven, one executive editor (Colin Platt of the University of Southampton), and an

advisory board of nineteen. It is published by Routledge and Kegan Paul, who are described as 'the proprietors', and well printed by the Camelot Press. (We are flattered by *World Archaeology's* choice of typeface—Monotype Imprint as used in ANTIQUITY—but we wonder whether its reading line is a little long: see our remarks (*Antiquity*, 1964, 86) when we adopted double-column layout, though, to be fair, *World Archaeology* has adequate white space between the lines, a vital aid to legibility sadly lacking in ANTIQUITY before the change-over.) Nowhere does the price of *World Archaeology* appear on the first issue, but from advertisements we know that each copy costs one pound and that the annual subscription is three pounds three shillings. An interesting note on the verso of the title-page tells us that the copyright is held by the publishers and proprietors. ANTIQUITY has been advised that the copyright of individual articles and notes rests with the contributors, and always refers requests for reproduction of photographs and text to the originators. The copyright of a complete issue of ANTIQUITY or an annual volume of four issues rests with Antiquity Publications Limited.

We will look forward to future issues of *World Archaeology*. It declares itself to be 'the voice, essentially, of a fresh generation of professional archaeologists' and to be 'designedly a journal of debate, not of record'. 'Individual issues', we are told, 'will be planned, for the most part, about a central theme.' The theme for the first issue is 'Recent Work and New Approaches'.

New work on the archaeology of Africa is described by Glynn Isaac and Bernard Fagg. Professor Witold Hensel presents an archaeological interpretation of urban origins in Eastern Europe. Professor Michel de Bouard writes on the Centre for Medieval Archaeological Research in the University of Caen. Professor H. D. Sankalia contributes an article entitled 'Problems in Indian archaeology, and methods and techniques adopted to tackle them'. Professor and Mrs Ralph Rowlett and Michel Boureux describe an Early La Tène Marnian house in Champagne. A statistical approach to sequence-dating is presented by Professor

David Kendall, and computer techniques in archaeological survey and data evaluation are discussed by Irwin Scollar and Roy Hodson.



Current Archaeology has now got to number fourteen, and established itself as a most useful and stimulating journal. The editors (Andrew and Wendy Selkirk) have bared their teeth in their May editorial and snapped them, as we all do from time to time, at the British Museum. Their target is the new 'British Museum Society' which the Trustees are organizing, and they say, in a curiously unhelpful sentence, 'The new society will do little to help, for the main policy of the true Friend of the British Museum must be, not "Back the Trustees", but "Sack the Trustees!"' Fiery stuff: bold and fiery like grocer's port. We might read their comment in conjunction with the introductory words by Lord Plymouth to *Amgueddfa*: 'A National Museum must keep its fences in repair and hold its friends. But if it is to play a living part in the community it must try also to

refresh itself constantly, to re-examine its aims, to change at least as fast as the times.' ANTIQUITY, which has often criticized the British Museum, believes that at the moment the Trustees are trying to live up to Lord Plymouth's words, and that their Society is to be encouraged.



The Musée des Antiquités Nationales at St-Germain has organized in a most splendid way an exhibition of the great works of Upper Palaeolithic Art. These are naturally objects which can be moved to St-Germain, or which were already in the very rich collections of that museum. So here we see all the great objects of *l'art mobilier paléolithique* of France and one or two outstanding reliefs from the walls of rock shelters such as Laussel and Angles-sur-l'Anglin. (These were kindly lent by the Musée at Bordeaux and by Mademoiselle de St-Mathurin.) This exhibition, which no one interested in early art should miss, will be on until mid-December. The catalogue (Fr. 15) is an excellent record, and is well written.

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 or American, of interest to readers of ANTIQUITY.

The listing of a book in this chronicle does not preclude its review in ANTIQUITY.

The Deep Well by Carl Nylander. London: Allen and Unwin, 1969. 210 pp., 18 pls., 32 figs. 45s. This is a delightful and well-written collection of essays, articles and broadcast talks on a wide variety of archaeological subjects from the Elgin marbles and Troy, Isfahan and Takht-i-Suleiman, to Atlantis and Palenque. The author is a research scholar at Uppsala who has travelled widely and excavated in Italy and the Near East. The title comes from the words Thomas Mann put in the mouth of Joseph: 'Deep is the well of the past. Should one not call it unfathomable?' When first published in Swedish in 1964 under the title of *Den Djupa Brunnen*, the book was described as 'a thrilling archaeological book of adventure, written in a language that everyone understands', and Nylander's writing and treatment compared, and justly, with that of Arthur Evans and Leonard Woolley.

Archaeology in Sarawak by Chêng Tê-K'un. Cambridge: Heffer; Toronto: University Press, 1969. 33 pp., 12 pls., 1 map. 30s.

The Bog People: Iron-Age Man Preserved by P. V. Glob. London: Faber and Faber, 1969. 200 pp., 76 illustrations, 2 maps. 50s. A translation by Rupert Bruce-Mitford of the fascinating book first produced in Denmark by the Riksantikvariat. A fine collection of most remarkable photographs.

The Etruscans and the Survival of Etruria, by Christopher Hampton. London: Gollancz, 1969. 271 pp., 16 pls., 1 map. 42s.

The Ancient Mediterranean by Michael Grant. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1969. 394 pp., 71 illustrations, 19 maps. 55s.

continued on page 207