

NOTICES OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL PUBLICATIONS

THE PREHISTORY OF SCOTLAND. By V. GORDON CHILDE, B.Litt.
Pp. 285 ; 16 plates and 82 text-figures. 8vo. London : Kegan Paul,
Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd., 1935. Price 15s. net.

Recently there appeared in this Journal a review of a substantive work by Professor Gordon Childe on the archaeology of the most ancient East. Now, less than a year later, an equally monumental work bears witness alike to Professor Childe's range of interest and to his colossal output. In his new book, the Professor of Prehistoric Archaeology at Edinburgh systematizes the Scottish material and provides a fresh starting-point for future work.

There is, indeed, work enough for the archaeologist yet to do in Scotland ; but Professor Childe's readers cannot but be impressed also with the amount which has in fact been done. Scotland has, on the whole, been well served by her antiquaries. Joseph Anderson, Robert Munro, George Macdonald, the Curles, and now Gordon Childe, stand out as leaders of a host that is worthy of them in kind if not in numbers. The *Proceedings* of the Scottish Society of Antiquaries, in Grahame Callander's time and before, are a mine of reasonably ordered information. The Scottish Historical Monuments Commission has borne its share. What is still wanting, in Scotland as elsewhere, is an adequate backing from the universities. Edinburgh has begun on the right lines with its Chair of Prehistory ; but a single inadequately endowed Chair for the whole of Scotland is neither generous nor just. That it has in practice proved adequate to an unmerited extent is due to the fortunate accident that its first occupant is Professor Childe.

In the wide view, Scotland is a scarcely distinguishable unit of the "highland zone" of north-western Europe. To the Scot, or to the antiquary in Scotland, that view disguises in an almost unscrupulous fashion a land of infinite variety in which lowland is not lacking and lowland cultures have from time to time taken root. "The plains of the east coast lie open to mariners coasting up from eastern England—one of the most civilized and populous regions of Britain—or the Low Countries or crossing the North Sea direct from Scandinavia." In the Early Iron Age, settlers from Gaul landed on the shores of the Moray Firth and the mouth of the Tay, bringing with them their typically Gaulish fashion of building timber-bonded fortifications. In the same period, the stone castles which appeared to have spread from a base amongst the accessible bays and islands of the west coast (Galloway to the Hebrides) are regarded by Professor Childe as a result of a coastwise movement from south-western Britain. Culturally, as geographically, the lowland extends its fingers into the highland, and, in treating Scotland as a unit of the

highland zone, we are repeatedly confronted therefore with the dangers of over-simplification.

Nevertheless, the fact remains that prehistoric Scotland does, on the whole, derive a definite separateness from its mountains and from its position as an ultimate promontory of Europe. It was more often a refuge for the poor than an Eldorado for the adventurous, and it received rather than gave. It may indeed be that Scotland, not Ireland, invented the gold 'lunula' which was subsequently mass-produced in Ireland; Professor Childe endorses J. H. Crow's suggestion that the lunula is derived from the essentially Scottish jet necklace of the food-vessel period. But such gifts were rare, and are scarcely augmented by Professor Childe's unenthusiastic statement of the hypothesis that certain elements in the British neolithic complex originated in Scotland and spread thence into England (p. 73). The main interest of prehistoric Scotland lies elsewhere. It lies in the long retention and slow development of cultures which, in the English lowlands, were more readily submerged by invasion. A notable instance of this disparity is the late flowering of an exuberant variety of "Celtic" art in the second century A.D. and later. More elusive examples are provided by the astonishing endurance of a Bronze Age culture, only slightly diluted by Iron Age elements, down to the eve of the historic period; and by the retarded development of types within the Bronze age itself.

Here the archaeologist accustomed to dealing with continental or southern English material must needs tread warily. Professor Childe handles the problem cannily. Thus he points out, with the aid of an important table (p. 148), that north of the Clyde the earlier Bronze Age types are more numerous than the later, in contrast with the reverse ratio established by Fox for the Cambridge region or by Childe himself for the Tweed basin. What is the explanation? 'Surely the new types of tools and weapons never "caught on" in the northerly districts . . . It can only be assumed that Middle Bronze Age types and, in the north, even flat axes were still in use in Scotland while socketed axes were already current in England.' Again, there is reason to suppose that the Bronze Age folk 'survived in considerable numbers down to the coming of the Romans.' Thus Traprain Law was certainly occupied during the Late Bronze Age, but "there is no justification for interpolating an indefinite interval of desertion between this well-documented Bronze Age occupation and that during the first century of Roman rule.' Here the conventional time-charts are stultified.

The baffling syncopation of the Scottish Early Iron Age gives a special value to Professor Childe's classification of the hill-forts and "castles" which must, in spite of the reluctance of the evidence, be supposed to represent Iron Age influence or invasion. Reference has already been made to the rare but remarkable 'Gallic' constructions of the east coast. Large hill-forts of the English type are almost equally rare, doubtless owing in part—though not entirely—to the relatively restricted areas of good tillage. But the smaller stone-walled forts or 'castles,' many of them no more than 50 ft.

across, are a different story. They pepper the map thickly along the border-hills and the west coast. They represent a unitary phase of social development, with a strong suggestion of the feudal about it. Geographically they provide a link on the one hand with the stone 'forts' of Cornwall and the duns of Ireland, and on the other hand with the brochs of the north-east. Culturally they are still something of a mystery. It would appear indeed that, like the chambered tombs of an earlier age, they represent a dominant social organization which was at the same time astonishingly casual in its cultural contacts. The difficulty for the archaeologist is proportionately great. A folk-migration, lock-stock-and-barrel, is easy enough to follow. But a migration in 'light marching order,' with few craftsmen (i.e. women), is calculated to provide just that sort of complexity with which Professor Childe is confronted in the present instance. He notes that "the agreements between the Scottish and the South-west English types are of a nature to prove that our castle complex is in fact the result of coastwise migrations up our western seaboard," but he has to add that 'now the pattern is complicated by the reaction on the invaders of earlier settlers—survivors of Collectivist and Beaker stocks, and of the 'Hallstatt' invaders as well as of the groups who built the vitrified forts—and by the repercussions of the Roman conquest.' In other words, the Scottish castle complex does not represent a transplantation of the Iron Age B or 'Glastonbury' culture in the same sense or degree that the latter was, in turn, a transplantation of a Brittany or 'Atlantic' culture. The difference is one which brings us back to the classic distinction between the *replacement* of cultures in the lowland zone and the *partial absorption* of cultures into the highland zone. The extent to which the Scottish castle complex does in fact represent a partial absorption of the Iron Age B culture of the south-west cannot be estimated without considerable further exploration of the castles themselves and of their Irish counterparts. One or two features of the Scottish castles suggest lateness; and the later they are, the less they are likely to owe to south-western England and the more they are likely to owe to Ireland. The whole problem is full of interest, and, once again, Professor Childe's synthesis is of basic importance.

A similar value attaches to the chapter on 'chambered cairns,' with its attendant map. The classification of these structures is founded on the sound principle that 'the oldest tombs will be those which reproduce accurately the most widely distributed architectural features; tombs which seem to diverge from the common plan and to be restricted to specific regions are likely to be later' (p. 24). The application of this principle has introduced into the Scottish material an element of method which is still lacking in the equivalent English material, and emphasises the need for a fresh study of the English and Welsh chambered tombs. This task is immensely complicated by the lack of evidence in regard to the original shape and structure of the encompassing earthen mound in a majority of the English examples. An urgent and obvious need of English archaeology is the careful excavation of half-a-dozen chambered

mounds in different parts of the country by experienced excavators such as Mr. C. W. Phillips or Mr. W. J. Hemp. Here, as in other respects, Professor Childe's book may serve as a stimulus for new work no less than as a statement of work done. On all grounds, it is an essential book.

R. E. M. W.

THE INDUS CIVILISATION. By ERNEST MACKAY. Pp. 210; 12 plates. London: Lovat Dickson. 1935. Price 6s. net.

A comprehensive and up-to-date account of the long-forgotten civilisation (rediscovered in the last fifteen years) that flourished in the Indus valley about 2500 B.C., is long overdue. Dr. Mackay is admirably qualified to supply the want. Not only did he direct the excavations at one great town in Sind for four seasons. He spent his leisure in observing the customs and practices of the modern inhabitants of the region. Thanks largely to this work of supererogation he can present a surprisingly vivid picture of Indian life four thousand years ago. The Indus civilization perished, leaving no decipherable literary record and comparatively little pictorial art. But articles and processes, probably also customs and beliefs, have persisted locally throughout the centuries. By combining ethnographic data with minute study of the monuments and relics excavated, Mackay really makes the dumb bricks and sherds speak an intelligible and convincing language.

The introductory chapter sketches the history of the discoveries since 1921, the vast area of the prehistoric civilization, the background of moister climatic conditions against which it flourished, and possible causes—floods, droughts, hostile inroads by Aryans or other barbarians—of its ultimate collapse. The author then describes Mohenjo-daro—a great city built of kiln-fired bricks extending over a square mile, with broad streets (one 35 feet wide) intersecting at right angles in accordance with a preconceived plan and equipped with a drainage system such as New Delhi conspicuously lacks. Those who have not had the fortune themselves to traverse its lanes between house walls still standing over 25 feet high and to climb the old brick stairs, may enjoy something of the thrill from reading this graphic account. The privileged visitor for his part will learn how to reconstruct in imagination the flat-roofed, two-storeyed houses and to recognize restaurants and waterstalls among the foundations. Note the use of lime-mortar for drain-linings (the oldest instance of this binding I know), the wooden stools with their legs carved in the shape of bulls' hoofs, as in ancient Egypt, and the playthings taken by children to the bath, as in modern Britain.

Chapter III is devoted to religion: a prototype of Siva, a tiger-goddess, mother-goddesses represented by clay figurines, sacred trees and animals depicted on seals or carved in stone, phallic emblems and magic symbols, including the swastika, can be confidently recognized. Noteworthy are representations of a goat with human face watching a ceremony before a sacred tree and of a procession in

which figures of animals are carried as standards, much as in Egypt. No cemetery has been discovered within the city boundaries; one may turn up, as last year at Troy, when the areas outside have been investigated. In the meantime it is quite gratuitous to assume that 'the ashes' of the dead after cremation 'were thrown into the water of the river.' The sentence, 'If the view be correct that the Indus valley people entered India from the north-west, they must have found that country already inhabited by a people who were in a fair state of civilisation and who were making quite good pottery on the wheel and decorating it in two or more colours,' is appropriately relegated to a chapter headed 'religion.' But this undemonstrable speculation is by no means representative of the remaining well-documented and cautious explanations advanced in the interpretation of this inevitably hypothetical domain.

Costume, discussed in chapter IV, can only be inferred from models and statuettes and the discovery of woven cotton fabrics, but hairpins, combs, numerous bangles, anklets (one with interesting Minoan parallels), earrings, nose-plugs, and girdles or necklaces of beads as well as kohl-pots are included among the relics recovered, and can be compared with modern Indian types. Mackay rightly insists that the Indus civilization should not be termed chalcolithic. Stone was used for implements far less than in Old Kingdom Egypt; not even arrow-heads, but only the simplest knife-blades, were made therefrom. Copper ore was actually smelted at Mohenjo-daro and the Indus smiths worked tin-bronze. The metals, of course, had to be imported and represent only one result of an extensive commerce that requires a standardised system of weights. The weights themselves have been found. Belaiew has established a closer relation of the main Indus system, through the weights from Susa, to the Mesopotamian shekel D. III, than is admitted on p. 135. Toy scale-pans conjure up pictures of children playing at shop; stone or pottery rolling-pins found must have been made expressly for producing the little wafer cakes still very popular in India; and models show that song-birds were kept in cages. A pottery candlestick, described on p. 137 under the caption 'Copper and Bronze,' seems identical with early Egyptian, Minoan and Thracian types.

Pottery styles and techniques are admirably described in the chapter (VI) on Arts and Crafts where the modern Indian and ancient Mesopotamian affiliations of the potter's craft are emphasized. Seeing several large vessels, completed at Delhi since Dr. Mackay left India, I am much more impressed with the aesthetic effect of repetition patterns in black on a polished red ground than he is. The evidence for the use of ivory vases is new. The seventh chapter describes games, including perhaps cock-fighting, and mentions indications that at least one specific of the later Hindu pharmacopeia was already used medicinally by the Indus valley people. The book concludes with a summary of the Mesopotamian evidence for the date of the Indus cities. Of course, the phase dated by contacts with Babylonia is nearer the end than the beginning of the Indus civilisation; earlier phases, drowned by the subsoil waters at Mohenjo-

daro, are to be found at Amri further down stream and await scientific exploration.

The book summarizes for the general public the most relevant results of Marshall's great three-volume work, and adds a wealth of new materials gathered in subsequent excavations. It should intensify the demand for the full report on the latter and for that on the work at Harappa, a site which will add materially to the information on town-planning and sociology presented here. In the meanwhile Messrs. Lovat Dickson are to be congratulated on publishing a book that is both popular and accurate, cheap and well-produced as the second volume of a very promising series of archaeological works. It is generously illustrated with fifty-six superb photographs of buildings or objects. All the details have been brought out, but four architectural subjects or fourteen seals to an octavo page involve such heavy reduction that very close scrutiny is needed to discern them. Fewer views on a larger scale would probably have been better suited to the objects of the book—more plates, still better, of course.

V. GORDON CHILDE.

THE ROOF BOSSES OF WINCHESTER CATHEDRAL. By C. J. P. CAVE. 8½ in. × 5½ in. Pp. 22; 13 plates. Published by The Friends of Winchester Cathedral. 1935. Price 6d.

In this little handbook Mr. Cave has given an excellent account of the roof-bosses of the cathedral, illustrated by a number of the admirable photographs taken by his own special process. The earliest of the bosses illustrated belong to the latter part of the fourteenth century and are the work of Bishops Edington and Wykeham, and the series is continued in the work of Cardinal Beaufers and Bishop Fox. The later heraldry is of particular interest, as is the series of emblems of the passion set on shields. Perhaps the most interesting of all, however, as being the most unusual, is the remarkable boss with portraits of Charles I and his Queen, set up in 1635. The handbook and illustrations are well produced and the price extremely moderate.

A. W. C.

THE EARLY HISTORY OF CHRIST'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE. By A. H. LLOYD. 9½ in. × 6 in. Pp. xviii + 447; 15 plates, and figures in the text. Cambridge: at the University Press. 1934. Price 21s.

Certain exigencies unfortunately prevent more than a brief note upon this admirable book, which concerns an earlier period in the history of Christ's College than had been previously attributed to it, and which is compiled with that scholarship and exactitude for historical detail which Dr. Lloyd possesses to such a marked degree. All who know him, and particularly those of the Royal Archaeological Institute with which he has been so long associated, will congratulate him—and also Miss Lloyd, his daughter, to whom

he gives such a gracious meed of praise—upon this outstanding addition to the historical literature of the colleges of Cambridge.

Dr. Lloyd dedicates his work in pious memory of the three founders of Christ's—his own College of which he was sometime Fellow-Commoner—the Lady Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond and Derby; her uncle, Henry VI; and William Byngham, 'a plain parochial rector' from London, the first founder, who ruled and benefited his "Godshouse" from c. 1436 to 1451.

This book is fully documented as the result of close research in the archives of Christ's and of other Cambridge colleges, and at all the national and other important sources of information. It should be added that it is published by the Cambridge University Press, and that thus the sum of its value is complete.

E. A. B. B.

STONEHENGE AND ITS DATE. By R. H. CUNNINGTON. Pp. vii + 135; 14 illustrations. Methuen. 1935. Price 5s.

There has been a real need for a small book on Stonehenge, which would deal, at greater length than Mr. Frank Stevens's excellent sixpenny guide, with the problems of the monument and, in particular, summarize in accessible form the results of the excavations of 1919-1926. Col. Cunnington has gallantly attempted this difficult task in the book under consideration. In the interpretation of such involved evidence as that which confronts the student of Stonehenge a layman may present a viewpoint free from the bias that the archaeologist tends almost unconsciously to introduce, and one opens Col. Cunnington's book in hopes of an impartial statement and an unprejudiced summing-up.

The book is in two parts, and of these the first, entitled 'The Monument,' consists of a full description of Stonehenge from a structural viewpoint—a description which from the very nature of things can hardly be other than a rather arid performance. Chapter IV, however, enters upon that most delicate of subjects—orientation. In Col. Cunnington's opinion there is "very strong, if not overwhelming evidence" of an exact alignment for Stonehenge—implying, that is, an axis laid out not to a vaguely north-easterly objective, but to some accurately observed and meticulously recorded solar phenomenon. He considers that the monument has an axis accurately aligned on the rising sun at Midsummer (as has so often been claimed before); the reason being, he suggests, to correct the calendar by reconciling the length of the lunar months to the solar year. He decides on an axis which approaches to that of Petrie rather than to that of Lockyer, although such is the accuracy which must be observed in these matters of celestial mathematics that the shifting of the line an inch may mean some centuries of difference in theories of dates based on it. For although Col. Cunnington admits the enormous possibilities of error latent in this method, he is nevertheless clearly attracted by the results of his own Friar's Heel alignment, which would give a date between 500 B.C. and A.D. 500. 'It will be

seen from Part II,' he goes on to say, 'how well it agrees with other evidence.'

Part II of the book is devoted to a discussion of the date of Stonehenge, and must obviously enter on controversial ground. It commences with an introductory chapter discussing the 'Two-Date Theory'—the assumption that the ditch and Aubrey circle belong to an earlier date than the sarsen and bluestone circles and horseshoes. The author considers the Aubrey holes to have held timber uprights, and concludes that they are broadly contemporary with the stone structure (prior to it in actual order of construction, but part of the same original plan). The Four Stations are clearly later than the Aubrey holes, as the ditch surrounding stone 92 cuts into Aubrey hole 19, and it is difficult to consider it (and the similar ditch round the Hele Stone) as other than contemporary with the stone, although Col. Cunnington feels some doubt about this.

With regard to the Ditch, he minimizes the evidence of the absence of stone chips in the primary silting by pointing out that the building of the monument would be a lengthy proceeding, and that the 'rapid silt' of a narrow ditch is indeed rapid, quoting Dr. Curwen's evidence of the war-time trench which collected $3\frac{1}{2}$ feet of silt in 13 years. The correction of the disparity between the causeway of the ditch and the end of the Avenue by filling in the ditch end he likewise considers to have been a re-adjustment in the course of construction.

So far, one is prepared to agree with Col. Cunnington that there is a case for a 'one-date' monument (the Z and Y holes excepted). In the next chapter—'External Evidence'—he proceeds to discuss what this single date is, and here the reviewer began to be assailed with doubts. The second-hand reference in Diodorus Siculus to the circular temple of the Hyperboreans can hardly be used as evidence that Stonehenge was built in the Early Iron Age, but it is the first card played by Col. Cunnington in his pro-Celtic game. He next considers the monument briefly in relation to other megaliths, making the rather surprising statement that 'it seems more than doubtful whether there is sufficient likeness between Stonehenge and other megaliths to draw the conclusion of a similar date' (p. 93). In Woodhenge, however, he considers a real parallel, if not the actual prototype, can be found. The reviewer must confess that, apart from the carpentry technique of Stonehenge, he has never considered this analogy particularly apt—least so the alleged 'axis' of Woodhenge, which threads its laborious way through a close-set forest of posts. But Col. Cunnington will have it that there is every probability that Stonehenge is copied from Woodhenge (not that it is merely indebted to the timber circle idea for its peculiarities of construction, which seems probable, if not inevitable) and as he points out, this would have important bearing on the date, as a copy of such a perishable structure as Woodhenge would have to have been made a comparatively short time after the construction of the original. We will return to this point later, as it is of vital importance in the light of the author's subsequent arguments.

The section continues with a reference to the possible analogy with classical architectural methods, and then continues with 'Racial Evidence,' in which we see the author has no opinion of the builders of Avebury or of New Grange, of Arbor Low or of Maes Howe—'The first Neolithic settlers,' he says, 'who made the chambered barrows, have given no evidence of the capacity and organisation needed.' A startling statement if one recalls the organisation needed to run a flourishing trade in stone axes from North Wales to North Wilts, or to exploit the flint-mines of Grimes Graves or Cissbury. Col. Cunnington would, at this juncture, point out that Avebury was not built by the megalith-builders, but by his favourite big, beefy Beaker-men (who were 'progressive' and made 'superior' pottery, and indeed were probably, like the owl-stuffer of Montreal, persons of most respectable connections). It is needless to labour the point that although Avebury was built at a time when beakers were in use in North Wiltshire, the makers of the pots and the circles were not necessarily the same people—the West Kennet long barrow was full of 'neolithic' corpses, but part of the funeral feast seems to have been served in beakers.

If he cannot have the Beaker folk, the author's second choice falls to the Early Iron Age Celts, who (as he points out) were 'warlike, able and enterprising,' and had sacked Rome.

Finally, the 'External Evidence' section draws attention to the important fact that a piece of 'blue stone' was found in a long barrow (Bole's Barrow) 14 miles west of Salisbury, showing that one blue stone, at least, was in Wiltshire at a time when long barrows were being built.

We next pass to Internal Evidence—that derived from Col. Hawley's excavations. This evidence is scanty enough in all conscience, but we cannot say that we are favourably impressed by Col. Cunnington's treatment of it. With regard to the Ditch, the primary silting produced no artifacts typical of any narrowly defined culture or period, but surely some weight should be attached to the beaker sherds found embedded in the upper part of this silt, as if trodden in. Col. Cunnington implies (p. 109) that the evidential value of these is negligible: he attaches far greater importance to the Romano-British sherds in the upper earthy rubble. He says, of Col. Hawley's suggested Neolithic date for the ditch, 'no other ditch has been so called on such complete absence of evidence,' but in the next paragraph, and presumably on the same absence of evidence, considers 'an Early Iron Age date is much more likely' (pp. 112-113). So eager is he to dispose of all Early Bronze Age finds that the mace-head associated with a cremation (which has really no bearing on the date of the monument) is tentatively assigned to a modern Druid of 'antiquarian tastes.' The incense-cup from Aubrey Hole 29 is explained as having accidentally fallen in when the hole was dug: a method of disposing of conflicting evidence more convenient than convincing. The Z and Y holes alone have yielded evidence of Iron Age date, and the contrast of the abundant material from these and the paucity elsewhere, serves to emphasise the chronological isolation of these two circles.

The last point of internal evidence is the mollusca determinations from the ditch silting, but it is convenient to leave these for the moment and return to the comparison made earlier in the book between Stonehenge and Woodhenge, which is re-affirmed in the concluding pages (pp. 128-129). The author clearly would like to regard Woodhenge as the prototype, but on the other hand is in favour of an Early Iron Age date for Stonehenge. He is, therefore, driven to make the remarkable statement (p. 129) that 'the date of Woodhenge itself is not certain.' In actual fact the evidence for placing this site in the Early Bronze Age is abundant and convincing. Fragments of two beakers were found under the lowest old turf line in the ditch west of the entrance; in the adjacent ploughed-out barrow containing a beaker interment the characteristic Woodhenge pottery was found in postholes and in the ditches—in one instance on the bottom.¹

Furthermore, it is now well established that the type of pottery first distinguished at Woodhenge (Early Bronze Age groove-ware), but since recognised at numerous sites in England, is itself of the early Bronze Age, with analogues among the megalithic wares of Holland. With it is frequently associated the 'petit tranchet derivative' form of flint implement,² which independent evidence assigns to a Neolithic-Early Bronze Age horizon—at Woodhenge four such objects came from postholes, three from the ditch and two from the old ground surface beneath the bank. Woodhenge, again, yielded the long-horned ox so characteristic of Neolithic-Early Bronze Age sites, and totally distinct from *Bos longifrons*, the Celtic ox. Quite apart then from the evidence of such Continental analogues to our English timber circles as those in Holland described by Van Giffen, internal evidence is consistent in the dating of Woodhenge as Early Bronze Age. And if Stonehenge is to be regarded as a stone version of a timber circle, or of Woodhenge itself (Col. Cunnington has missed one link between the two sites—the chalk axes from Woodhenge and the piece of a similar axe found at the bottom of the rubble in the ramp to stone 55 at Stonehenge³) it can hardly be later than the end of the Early or beginning of the Middle Bronze Age.

There remains the question of mollusca. Those from Stonehenge are claimed as evidence of dry climate similar to that of the Early Iron Age, but it would be dangerous to date a site on this alone. Fortunately we have the authority of Messrs. Kennard and Woodward that there is a series with which they may be compared, for in their mollusca report in Mrs. Cunnington's book on Woodhenge (p. 72) they state, 'The fauna from Stonehenge does resemble that from Woodhenge, the differences being merely local.' Woodhenge, as we have seen, is a site archaeologically dated as Early Bronze Age: it is clear then that the Stonehenge mollusca cannot be used to support a claim for an Early Iron Age date.

STUART PIGGOTT.

¹ Neither of these pieces of evidence is mentioned by Col. Cunnington.

² Clark, in *Arch. Journ.* xci, 32-58.

³ *Ant. Journ.* vi, 12.

THE PROGRESS OF EARLY MAN. By STUART PIGGOTT. The How-and-Why Series, no. 18. Pp. 96; 7 illustrations. London: A. & C. Black. 1935. Price 2s. 6d.

The advent of the 'little book' designed for the diffusion of knowledge is a fact of modern life which is now long past deploring. Indeed, it has become part of the specialist's duty to his unlearned neighbour to see that a half-crown's worth of Reading Without Tears is as sound in substance as it should be attractive in treatment.

The How and Why series edited by Mr. Gerald Bullett aims at a lighter touch than the pioneer Home University Library, but for that very reason it demands no less but rather more of its authors in carefulness and skill. Mr. Stuart Piggott's essay in this difficult art of honourable *vulgarisation* is by no means unworthy of its fellows. In 96 pages he tells an outline story of prehistoric man which should be of real value to a wide public, aided not least by his own clear diagrammatic sketches. His brief exposition of what archaeology is and how it works is clearly and refreshingly written, even if a mildly self-conscious sentence may here and there be detected. His presentation of the prehistorian's aim as the recreation, in the mind, of an enormous and varied stretch of human life—in other words, of archaeology as a means to a living end—should be sure of its welcome. And if he makes game of Victorian ideas of universal orderly progress, he is soon combining evolutionary ideas with objective modernity. True, the Wellsian attack on historians of medieval and later wars and dynasties may be carried too far: the Crusades were no meaningless inter-tribal squabble, and Hohenstaufen can be written off no more lightly than Hohenzollern in the annals of Europe. But no one to-day can deny that the prehistorian's perspective has an irreducible value.

On man the primitive hunter Mr. Piggott is judicious and vivid; slips like the 'hastily-lit fire' of p. 37 are rare, and the appreciation of cave art (which, however, is not 'entirely' naturalistic) is well given and illustrated. The 'Dawn in the East,' which gave the world agriculture and the settled life, metals and trade, takes its rightful place of pre-eminence in the story, though it is wrong to wait for this moment to call man 'no longer guided solely by blind instinct.' In fact, a creature solely so guided would not be a man at all. But the opportunities given by a settled existence for mental as well as material advance are rightly stressed. With the spread of civilization a too-crowded stage is wisely avoided by restriction of the field to Britain, and a lifelike picture of Neolithic existence on Windmill Hill leads to some sensible remarks on Avebury and Stonehenge—though it is surely not 'ridiculous' (p. 69) to believe that Druids *used* the latter, but only that they were its first builders.

The change that brought in the Heroic Age and its prosaic urnfields is emphasized, though to put the first chieftains of truly 'heroic' stature in the Iron Age only is rather unfair to the bucklered swordsmen of the Late Bronze Age, with their bronze-mounted chariots and peytrelled ponies. But the picture of Iron Age life is

a good one (though cloth (p. 76) was then no innovation), and soon the Celts and their art and culture are paving the way for Rome. France is actually too far west for the La Tène cradle, despite Mr. Piggott's adherence to the older literature, and 600 B.C. on p. 78 is clearly a misprint for the date of La Tène art's arrival in Britain, which (for the Glastonbury culture, at any rate) is on the next page put as low as 100. Also on p. 82, for 61 read 58 B.C. The 'centralization' effected by Cunobelin is probably over-rated, and Mr. Piggott takes the peasant's point of view to minimize the difference made to him by Roman rule—though the *coloni* of the Later Empire would hardly have agreed. Still, the native side of Romano-British life deserves its emphasis, and though later some mention of the Celtic Church would serve to keep up the balance against 'Romanization' by Augustine and Paulinus, we are left on the threshold of historic times with a definitely well-introduced feeling. Many will rather not cross that threshold at all, but will turn back to the archaeology of the open air with Mr. Piggott. But if any cross, let us welcome the open air with them.

C. F. C. H.

CATALOGUE OF ANTIQUITIES IN THE MUSEUM OF THE WILTSHIRE ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND NATURAL HISTORY SOCIETY AT DEVIZES. Part II, 2nd Edition. By MRS. M. E. CUNNINGTON and the REV. CANON E. H. GODDARD. 8½ in. × 5½ in. Pp. 294; 92 plates. Devizes: published by the Society at the Museum. 1934. Price 2s. 6d. (post free, 3s.).

There are few museums in Great Britain which so adequately fulfil the proper functions of a local collection as does the Museum of the Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Society, at Devizes. All things 'foreign' to the district are, and for the most part always have been, rigorously excluded from it, with the result that the visitor is presented at once with a clear and unencumbered picture of the natural history and the archaeology of this distinguished county. The importance of the picture, at least to the archaeologist, requires no elaborate demonstration at the present time. The archaeology of Wiltshire is, to a great extent, the archaeology of southern England, and the Devizes Museum is thus a focal point in English archaeology.

Part I of the Devizes Museum catalogue was published as long ago as 1896, and is devoted solely to the Stourhead Collection of objects found between 1794 and 1810 by Cunnington and Colt Hoare in the Wiltshire barrows. The first edition of Part II followed in 1911, and dealt with the remainder of the Society's collections. It ran to 154 pages but, though it has remained a valuable work of reference, it has long been out of date. Its increasing inadequacy has been due primarily to the field-work carried out—and, be it emphasised, faithfully and punctually published—by Captain and Mrs. Cunnington during the interim. It is fitting, therefore, that Mrs. Cunnington herself, who shared with Canon E. H. Goddard the task of compiling the first edition, should have been largely responsible for the

new and greatly enlarged version. Students of British archaeology once more owe her a deep debt of gratitude.

The catalogue is arranged, so far as possible, chronologically, and every major site is prefaced by a short explanatory paragraph with bibliography. Plans are excluded—perhaps wisely, since they would have added materially to the bulk of an already substantial volume. The objects themselves are profusely illustrated. The plates are uniformly useful, but they have suffered unnecessarily at the hands of a printer who has clearly much to learn in the art of inking. This may be the penalty of cheapness, but the point deserves attention in a future reprint. For the rest, the highest praise that can be given is that the catalogue is worthy of the notable museum which it represents.

R. E. M. W.

ESSAYS PRESENTED TO C. G. SELIGMAN. Edited by E. E. EVANS-Pritchard, Raymond Firth, Bronislaw Malinowski and Isaac Schapera. Pp. 385; 20 plates. 8vo. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd. 1934. Price 21s. net.

The immense variety in the subject-matter of this valuable collection of essays is perhaps the greatest tribute that could be paid to the man in whose honour they have been written. Among his vast circle of colleagues and students, thirty have contributed monographs on matters of which Dr. Seligman himself has an extensive and peculiar knowledge, and on which they, as specialists, are most fitted to discourse. Limitations of space, moreover, have imposed a conciseness which helps to emphasise the variety of the matter, and is at the same time refreshing to the reader.

To the functional anthropologists the most stimulating essays are those on African social customs and psychology. Dr. Audrey Richards and Dr. Gordon Brown, in their respective studies on *Mother Right among the Central Bantu* and *He He Cross-Cousin Marriage*, have produced useful material for comparative study. Dr. Richards points out the importance of the grandparents in the clan's social structure, while perhaps not stressing sufficiently the fact that the family eventually becomes patrilineal, despite the matrilineal basis of society. Cross-cousin marriage is common among African native peoples, and in Dr. Brown's essay several points relating to the reasons for desiring it are made clear, though there is a tendency to obscure the regularity of the procedure by a description of the difficulties in the path of the young man who seeks the hand of his maternal uncle's daughter in marriage. An account by Professor Evans-Pritchard on *Zande Therapeutics* opens up a new field of investigation where much is yet to be done by students, both of medicine and of psychology; while an insight on the curious belief in the effect of the mental attitude of one being on the health and safety of another is given by Isaac Schapera in an essay on *Oral Sorcery among the Natives of Bechuanaland*. Dr. Edwin Smith's wide experience has enabled him to produce an enlightening and thoughtful paper on *African Education*.

Two essays on African material culture are presented. One is by Mr. Henry Balfour, whose description of the technique of Tandu pottery-making is particularly interesting and excellently illustrated; the other is a long and highly technical essay by K. C. Lindblom, on spears with two or more heads, particularly in Africa.

The workings of the subconscious primitive mind is the subject of several papers, including one by Mrs. Brenda Seligman, in which her well-known and reasonable views are set down, and alongside it are three other papers by Marie Bonaparte, Melville J. Herskovitz and Geza Roheim which may cause, as indeed was possibly intended, a certain amount of discussion and controversy because of the marked display of adherence to Freudian theories. Some antagonism to this point of view (which judges the actions of a healthy savage in the same light as those of a so-called civilized neurotic) is perhaps explicable when one finds oneself asked to credit such a statement as this: 'Le petit garçon convoite pour lui toute la tendresse, toutes les caresses maternelles, avec désir d'élimination du père, rival gênant . . . Le "retour infantile du totemisme" peut . . . s'observer dans les phobies d'animaux de tant de nos enfants. Le coup, le cheval, le chien et autres animaux sont pour l'enfant qu'ils terrifient autant de substituts du père à la fois aimé et redouté. L'enfant reproduit d'ailleurs en général au cours de son évolution les attitudes du primitif.'

Primitive Origins of Sacrifice, and Food Rites are dealt with by such able exponents as Professor Gunnar Landtmann and Dr. Marrett, who take respectively the Kiwai Papuans and the Arunta to illustrate their theories. Professor Landtmann's knowledge of the Kiwai is wide and first-hand, and his essay is proportionately authoritative.

Professor Malinowski's contribution takes the form of a description of the stone implements from one of his special areas, Eastern New Guinea. The technical information is clear, the photographs good, and the uses to which the implements are put have been fully described, providing knowledge which should be of considerable value to the student of material culture and social anthropology. The crisp style of Dr. Robert Lowie's paper on 'Religious ideas and practices of the Eurasiatic and North American areas' adds to the interest of his subject. His suggestion that information of the region between N.W. Europe and N. America should be systematically collated and tabulated is to be commended, for there are notoriously vast archaeological as well as anthropological gaps in the knowledge of that area.

Two essays which are less strictly anthropological are by Mr. Louis Clarke and Mr. R. S. Rattray—and by their divergence from the general line pay further tribute to the diversity of Dr. Seligman's interests. Mr. Clarke has contributed a study of a Sumerian chatelaine found at Ur, and of succeeding types, while Mr. Rattray's translation and explanation of an ode by the Arabian poet, Imruil Kais' (A.D. 492–542), is an extremely charming and delicate piece of work.

As a piece of scientific writing, perhaps the most striking example is the essay on 'The anthropological value of the skull,' presented by Professor Aleš Hrdlička of Harvard. His summary of the history of physical anthropology and tabulation of the fundamentals of craniology are of great interest and importance, and not least valuable of all are his concluding sentences to which too much attention cannot be paid: 'Modern craniology calls for broad professional preparation, for experience, constant care, critical sense, and a full consciousness of the limitations of the subject. These conditions must be realised if craniology is to be saved from falling into a very undeserved disregard or even disrepute.'

As evidence of the methods of investigation employed by the functional school of anthropology, this volume is an invaluable document. It is indeed, so far, the only one of its kind, bringing together as it does many of the most distinguished members of that school, of which the editors are recognised as some of the protagonists, and Dr. Seligman as one of the most widely-experienced and most dynamic leaders. In the words of Dr. Haddon, himself an instigator in the creation of this branch of science and lifelong upholder of it, and under whose guidance Dr. Seligman took the first steps towards the position so justly attributed to him:

'No anthropologist has had a wider experience in the field or has studied so many aspects of human life. He has found interest in the most simple objects, in the relation of man to man, and in human ideas and ideals, and in all he has appreciated the broader implications.'

The collection is enhanced by the excellent illustrations, both sketches and photographs, which accompany a number of the essays; the frontispiece is a portrait by Sir William Rothenstein of Dr. Seligman himself.

N. C. de C.

TELL EL-AMARNA. By J. D. S. PENDLEBURY. Pp. xxiv + 175; 8 plates. Cr. 8vo. London: Lovat Dickson & Thompson, Ltd. Price 6s. net.

We have had many books about Akhenaten. Some have dwelt with a good deal of sentiment on that 'idealistic monotheist,' others have attempted to solve the difficult questions of family history, of Home and Foreign policies; and there have been several excavation-reports on Tell el-Amarna, the city he founded. With these as a background, Mr. Pendlebury, the Director of the Egypt Exploration Society's Excavations at Tell el-Amarna since 1930, has dealt with the problems from a practical and archaeological point of view. His book is intended for the general reader as well as the expert, and on that account many tentative theories have been given perhaps an unduly robust and facile appearance.

The book starts with a useful preface containing suggestions for the tourist as to ways and means of reaching the site, what price to pay for donkeys and what to see in the way of rock-tombs and in the excavated town itself. There follows an introduction dealing with the previous history of the site, and then the book proper begins with

a brief account of the history of the period, that is from about 1411 B.C.—the accession of Amenhotep III—to 1356 B.C., the date assigned by the author to the seizure of the throne by Horemheb. The chapter on the site itself and the two following ones dealing with Public and Private Buildings unfortunately lose most of their value by being inadequately supplied with plans. The expert can look up the drawings in the original publications, but the general reader anxiously following Mr. Pendlebury from gangway to columned hall and from court to court might be pardoned if he returned to his original opinion that archaeology was a tiresome subject. Two more chapters deal with Art, Religion and Letters. In his conclusion, Mr. Pendlebury points out with so much vehemence the problems that still require elucidation by excavation that we are left wondering whether this is an appeal to our pockets or merely to our archaeological consciences. Both alternatives could in fact be justified.

The book as a whole gives an excellent summary of the current view of the Amarna period, but certain statements should be read with caution—for instance, the account of the position and rise of Amen on page 7. Other points again which rest on slender evidence are laid down as definite facts. I need only quote here the 'violent family quarrel' between Akhenaten and Nefertiti, Akhenaten as 'the most hated man in Egypt,' and the sending of Smenkhkara the young co-regent to attempt a reconciliation with the Amen priesthood. And sometimes modernism goes too far. 'The work of centuries was undone. The lives of countless men had been sacrificed in vain to give peace to Syria.' In the Annals of Thothmes III's campaigns it is the amount of booty and the number of prisoners that are emphasised. No Pharaoh was ever portrayed as a kindly pacifist but rather as a warrior 'smiting that wretched enemy.'

After reading this book we, too, join with the author in hoping 'that a few grave shafts have escaped the notice of the native robber and the European excavator'; and we may add the further hope that the gap between the two categories of explorer may steadily widen.

L. McN. S.

EXCAVATIONS AT THE ROMAN FORT AT BROUGH, E. YORKSHIRE, 1934. By PHILIP CORDER, M.A., F.S.A. 8vo. Pp. 37; 8 illustrations. Hull University College Local History Committee. 1935. Price 1s. net.

This second interim report summarizes a further season's work by Mr. Corder on the fortified site at the Yorkshire end of the Humber ferry. The first year's work had suggested a fort, but, though this view may still be correct, the fortified area is now known to have been of such size that Mr. Corder prefers at present to 'bear in mind the possibility that the site is a fortified town rather than a military station.' The east wall, indeed, has been proved to continue in one line for no fewer than 610 ft., and the south wall remains undiscovered. The east rampart seals pottery of the Trajan-Hadrian period and may be approximately of that date. Subsequently it was

reinforced by the addition of one or more projecting rectangular towers and apparently by a semicircular bastion, which awaits further exploration. Whether these late Roman additions imply the use of the site as a coastal fortress at or after the time of the lay-out of the Saxon-Shore system, or whether they are merely the normal fourth-century reinforcement of a small town, cannot yet be conjectured, and on all grounds the coming season's work is eagerly awaited. The interim report includes an admirable publication of the 'small finds.'

R. E. M. W.