

NOTICES OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL PUBLICATIONS

CONGRES INTERNATIONAL DES SCIENCES ANTHROPOLOGIQUES ET ETHNOLOGIQUES. *Compte rendu de la deuxième Session*, Copenhagen 1938. Copenhagen : Einar Munksgaard, 1939. Pp. 398.

This *compte rendu* of the second session of the International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences appears at an unfortunate moment. Founded as an Institution complementary to the International Congress of Prehistoric Sciences, the first session was held at London in 1934, and the Research Committees listed on p. 19 show how usefully the Permanent Council was interpreting its aim of fostering international co-operation. For archaeologists the most interesting was that charged with the study of the megalithic cultures, their distribution and influence on civilisations ancient and modern, a body designed to act in collaboration with a similar Committee to be appointed by the sister Congress. Any useful action on these lines now seems banished to a remote future, but the assistance that such international bodies could give in the direction and co-ordination of studies is well illustrated by the excellent report on the work of the similar Committee charged with the study of the Arctic peoples and cultures (p. 73) and the series of reports illustrating work carried out in this field (pp. 95 and 296 seq.).

Much of the work of this Congress necessarily lies outside the direct sphere of interest of prehistoric archaeologists, though the widening conception of the latter science necessarily compels workers in that field to acquire a knowledge at least of the results of anthropological and ethnological research. To that extent the *compte rendu* is useful as indicating recent discoveries. To note all these would require too much space, but we feel justified in calling attention to certain reports more closely touching English prehistory.

A series of papers in Section D discuss aspects of primitive agriculture and cattle raising, more particularly the economic and sociological aspects. In this connection, Professor Hatt's exposition of question of ownership of cultivated land in primitive communities is of importance for a study of prehistoric agriculture, and Dr. Giere's discussion of the cultivation by burning in North-East Europe may afford a clue to types of semi-nomadic agriculture over an even wider area. The various allusions to the origin of the cultivation of wheat are also of interest as showing the importance and the limitations for the archaeologist of purely biological studies. In Section F (Sociologie et Religion) attention was called to the evidence for prehistoric religion afforded by archaeology, and by primitive survivals among modern peoples. With the latter aspect

we may also connect the series of papers on survivals of early agricultural calendars in various European lands (pp. 307-23). These usages, now often dying, are in many cases pre-Christian, and a comprehensive survey should reveal primitive traits which would date back to the prehistoric period and afford invaluable evidence for the interpretation of monuments such as the stone circles. For this reason we welcome the two French contributions which reveal the work being carried out in Sologne and Champagne, both districts where delay would evidently have resulted in a loss of much valuable material. A further series of communications connected with the archaeology of Asia, and more particularly with the South-West of that Continent, may be noted in Section E (a).

C. A. R. R.

TWO BRONZE AGE CAIRNS IN SOUTH WALES: Simondston and Pond Cairns, Coity Higher Parish, Bridgend. By SIR CYRIL FOX, Ph.D., V.-P.S.A. With Appendices by L. F. COWLEY, M.Sc., H. A. HYDE, M.A., F.L.S., Professor JOHN PERCIVAL, M.A., Sc.D., and F. J. NORTH, D.Sc., F.G.S. Reprinted from *Archaeologia*, Vol. lxxxvii, pp. 129-180, and issued by the National Museum of Wales as a Museum publication. Price 2s. 6d.

The Society of Antiquaries and the National Museum of Wales have done good service to Archaeology by respectively sanctioning and undertaking the republication from *Archaeologia* of Sir Cyril Fox's brilliant record of excavation.

It is, of course, impossible to summarise adequately such a closely written record of careful observation of minute details; details which are vitally important, but which so often remain unobserved by excavators.

Here, then, we have the first record for Wales of cup marks on a Bronze Age cist of c. 1500 B.C., which contained the cremated remains of two adults and a child in 'developed' food vessels. The cist was covered by a carefully constructed cairn 43 ft. in diameter; and some 50 years later the cairn was used as a cemetery by people whose burial rites represented a different tradition—although cremation was still practised.

The second cairn, dated to c. 1300 B.C., had an earthen centre surrounded by a stone ring. It was 61 ft. in diameter, and covered the ashes of an adult contained in a cinerary urn with overhanging rim, but contained no secondary burials. The ritual must have been elaborate, and Sir Cyril Fox adds immensely to the value of his report by attempting a reconstruction of the ceremonial acts which preceded and followed the burial, and may well have taken a year or more to complete. As he says:

'It is for students of comparative religion to assess the significance of the manifestations of ritual here discovered. The cumulative importance of (a) the human burial (sacrifice) in the rite with which the work was begun, (b) the employment of the symbol of fertility in the central rite, and (c) the choice of vegetation (corn

in particular) for the act which must be regarded as the final dedication, cannot be ignored. Fire played a part in each of the three main phases of the action. The observed facts, then, suggest that the person whose ashes were in the urn occupied a position of exceptional importance in the economic life of the savage community which occupied the area about 1300 B.C.'

Finally, it may well be regarded as a national disgrace that the great Government Department, whose activities involved the complete destruction of these monuments, should have contributed nothing to the cost of their examination.

W. J. H.

MEGIDDO I. *Seasons of 1925-34. Strata I-V.* By LAMON and SHIPTON.
University of Chicago Press, 1939.

The conception of the Oriental Institute's excavations at Megiddo was on a grand scale. It was planned to strip the whole Tell, layer by layer, right back through the millenia of occupation which it was realised would be found there. It had been intended to spend some fifteen years on this work, and experience in fact showed that this would have been insufficient. There is no doubt much to be said for such a method, since by it a complete picture can be gained of each successive stratum. It does, however, imply a great faith in one's infallibility, for even if the methods employed are the most up-to-date known at the time, the horror with which one often looks on the work of archaeologists of only twenty years ago does suggest that twenty years on our methods may seem equally unscientific, and it may thus seem wise to leave some portion of the Tell for future explorers. The fate of the Megiddo excavations, too, show the weakness of such a grandiose plan. The altered circumstances of the Oriental Institute have curtailed the scheme grievously, and at one time it seemed likely that it would have to be suspended entirely. It may, I think, justly be said that such an enormous expenditure might have produced a far more complete history of the Tell than has been done by the complete stripping of the upper levels and the sounding of the lower ones, to which the work has been reduced, if the programme had been less ambitious. Circumstances can never be sufficiently settled for such an enormous scheme to be carried out. Visits to the tell, too, did often give the impression that time was felt to be so unlimited that exceedingly little was happening.

The present publication is admirably complete. It deals with the buildings and objects of the first five strata, from the eleventh to the fourth centuries B.C., with the exclusion of certain subjects, such as the water system, already published elsewhere. The commanding position occupied by Megiddo on the main route from Egypt to Asia Minor and Babylonia meant that at all periods it was an important town. The strata all have their individual interest as regards the layout of the town, and the evidence for purposeful town-planning in most of the five strata is remarkable. In stratum V, in

which the buildings are small, but fairly well-planned, it is suggested by the authors that there was no town wall, but that a continuous row of houses round the edge of the summit served for that purpose. But since the outer edges of the houses have disappeared, it is surely more likely that the wall has done so too, for a town in the position of Megiddo is not likely to have been unwalled at a time which was far from peaceful.

The chief interest of Stratum IV lies in the evidence of the autocratic control of the town indicated by the fact that the whole of the summit of the hill was occupied by well-planned public buildings. In the first stage of the period, there was apparently only a fortress, but after a very short interval, this was abolished, an elaborate wall built all round, and the summit covered by official buildings. The most completely excavated of these were clearly stables, and both literary evidence and the pottery dating concur in suggesting that these were built by Solomon, long famous for his chariots.

Strata III and II have a most un-Oriental appearance in their regularly laid-out, right-angled streets. The gate of the period is, however, typical of many near-eastern towns, with an outer double gate, having a guardroom between the gates, separated by a courtyard from a similar inner gate. Stratum I remains were very fragmentary.

The photographs, description, and reconstructions of these buildings are excellent. The overhead photographs of the different levels, taken from a captive balloon, could not be bettered, and will be the envy of many archaeologists. It might perhaps be wished that there was more discussion of the cultural and historical implications of the evidence of the various periods. For instance, one of the chief interesting features of the Solomonic period is the style of the masonry, in which ashlar piers are placed at intervals in rubble walls. The stones of these piers are so close in style of drafting to those of Samaria as to suggest the same masons. But such an odd use of ashlar does suggest a people not really used to building in stone. In one building, in fact, the ashlar piers seemed to have served as substructure to timber beams in mud-brick walls. The people of Megiddo thus show more affinity to the southern plains than to the uplands of which the Tell forms an outlier.

The pottery and objects are all carefully recorded under the various strata, but it is nowhere said what this implies, whether they come from the make-up of the floors, the occupation over the floors, destruction debris, and so on. It is highly probable from the evidence given of alteration to the building that the strata could in fact have been subdivided far more. It is quite obvious that in many cases the actual floor level was only inferred afterwards, and not observed at the time. This results from what most English archaeologists would regard as a great weakness of method, that no sections were left standing or detailed sections drawn. The published sections are inadequate and primitive in the extreme. It is entirely a fallacy that stratification cannot be observed just as well in the east as in England.

The actual publication of the objects is excellent. The use of a corpus form has its drawbacks as well as its advantages, but the cross-

referencing is so complete that all information about any particular object can easily be obtained. All Palestinian archaeologists will welcome such a notable addition to the regrettably few carefully published pottery groups, and it adds a great wealth of material to available comparative matter. They will look forward eagerly to further volumes of what, though criticisms may be made of the digging methods, is undoubtedly a first-class publication. Though emphasis in this review has perhaps been laid on some of the weak points, that is only because lack of space prevents discussion also of all the good points.

K. M. K.

ARCHAEOLOGY AND SOCIETY. By Dr. GRAHAME CLARK. Methuen, 1939. Pp. 220, xxiv Pls., 31 Figs. Price 7s. 6d.

Dr. Clark has provided the best introduction to modern pre-history to have been written in our language. Here the interested layman and the new student will find an easy and correct approach to the subject: its fundamental aims, its achievements and its limitations. Too often in the past their enthusiasm has been dashed between the two extremes of arid typological studies and imaginative historical reconstructions whose factual basis they are too bewildered to apprehend. However conscientiously these disciples of archaeology may memorise all, for the improvement of their minds or the passing of their examinations, it remains unnecessarily difficult for them to see the subject as a whole and in perspective. If now they will begin by digesting this book, the widely different pieces of information that come their way should fit far more readily into a single intelligible story.

Probably the student will find most to interest him in the comprehensive chapters on Excavation and Chronology, and the layman in the vivid descriptions of dramatic discoveries in many parts of the world that are included in the chapter on Preservation. Both should find much to stimulate thought in the treatment of Interpretation that represents the modern trend in prehistory at its best, with its determination to make every find tell all that it can about the peoples of the past, their means of livelihood, their homes, beliefs and social structure. Indeed the title 'Archaeology and Society' has two meanings, one of which concerns this important ethnographic aspect of archaeology, while the other and more obvious one refers to the position of archaeology in modern society. It is, therefore, to be expected that throughout the book Dr. Clark emphasises the claims of ethnographic prehistory at the expense of the older but still vitally important historical method that interests itself with movements and developments of peoples, and the diffusion of cultures.

The book makes easy and even exciting reading, and is so well produced that it shows a niggling spirit to point out that there are ten rather conspicuous mistakes in the index. It is illustrated by a large number of most admirably chosen drawings and photographs,

the latter including several of faintly grizzly objects that all excavators know have a strong appeal to a public that loves a skeleton only less well than a mummified corpse.

If the review could stop here, having treated *Archaeology and Society* simply as an Introduction to Prehistory, it would offer unqualified praise for a valuable and highly individual achievement. But there remains that other implication of the title which leads one to hope for a full treatment of the function of archaeology in modern society. As the heading of the final chapter that deals with this subject repeats the title of the book, it is not unnatural to assume that this meaning is paramount in 'Archaeology and Society.' Such an assumption leads to some disappointment. In the Introductory pages there is a penetrating, if brief, history of past developments in archaeology, and the impetus given first by the Romantic Movement and later by the work of Charles Darwin. But in the final chapter there is no space to do more than hint at the many outstanding problems. Indeed, the opening statement: 'The existence of an intense popular interest in the past which characterises society in many parts of the world to-day has created untold opportunities for influencing public opinion. To trace in detail the use to which these opportunities have hitherto been put, and to speculate on future possibilities would fall outside the scope of this book,' is immediately disappointing to all those led by the title to expect that these very matters would form an essential part of it.

There is a widespread and growing feeling abroad to-day that any hope that there may be for Western civilisation lies in the development of a rich and varied scientific humanism; in this archaeology is exceptionally well-fitted to play a part, for in few subjects do the humane and scientific disciplines unite so inevitably and directly. But it cannot play it without at least a foothold in the educational system. It is, therefore, all-important to consider how general archaeological knowledge of the kind so brilliantly supplied by Dr. Clark can be introduced into school curricula, and how more specialised branches can be used to make the advanced teaching of history more scientific and of science more humane. Professor Lancelot Hogben gives an example of this when he suggests in his essay, *Naturalistic Studies in the Education of the Citizen*, that university departments of geography could greatly advance the cultural claims of science if they made a course in the methods and history of cosmography and calendrical practice compulsory; and again he welcomes the introduction of a course on the history of technology for students of education at University College. To provide material for many such historical perspectives the discoveries of archaeology are indispensable: if any one doubts it let him read Professor Childe's *Man Makes Himself*.

After education, there follows the question of how best to make those citizens who are 'irreparably divorced from the land, and . . . condemned to dwell in cultural deserts of brick and concrete . . . conscious of their heritage' from the past. One would like to hear far more on this theme: it is among the intentions of a scientific

humanism not to be satisfied with the old Liberal ideal of producing the greatest number of commodities for the greatest number of consumers, but to plan for a new social order providing not only material plenty, but also beauty and interest. That is to say a partial return to the doctrine of men like Morris and Robert Owen. The role of archaeology in such a scheme might not be a major one among those of other arts and sciences, but it could be considerable. It would have to operate principally through museums, field monuments and publications, and how these could be made attractive to the public without loss of scientific value is a matter for earnest debate. For an instance, would it be feasible for this country to reconstruct on its southern chalk a representative series of camps and settlements, after the manner of the German drawings reproduced by Dr. Clark? Such a project could form part of the larger one for a national park and open-air museum.

The more purely political aspects Dr. Clark treats in somewhat greater detail. He sees that 'it is among the new nations struggling for self-expression and among the authoritarian states . . . that some of the most startling progress in prehistoric research has been made in recent years.' This is certainly part of the truth, but it is to be feared that by giving prominence to the achievement of such countries while relegating the wonderful successes of the Scandinavians to a later and inconspicuous page, he helps to give the false impression that the best work is confined to countries with a youthful or violent nationalism. Many will feel also that the threat to archaeology in Nazi Germany, though admitted, is underestimated. It is true that there have been state subsidies, that the subject has suffered less than natural sciences in personnel, and therefore that the harvest of good work from men trained in the old traditions has hardly fallen off, although already mixed with a quantity of Nordic tares. But there cannot fail to be a gradual infiltration of men without scientific detachment, set to prove, in the words quoted without criticism from Professor H. Schneider, that 'the best of what is German is Germanic, and must be found in purer form in early Germanic times.' Perhaps the author is less painfully aware of the peril because of his interest in the ethnographic rather than the historical method in archaeology. Subsidised excavations and their publication are safe enough, but when the results have to be related to the outside world, then there is a great danger of perversion by the Nazi racial creed. It runs intolerably against the Schneider type of dictum that Germanic culture should require constant help and stimulation from abroad for its progress. Again, it is not wholly irrelevant or spiteful to mention the fact that the nascent enthusiasm for their past among Czechs and Poles that the author praises has not been encouraged by the inevitable outcome of the Germanic mission.

Yet, undeniably, the totalitarian countries are pursuing a far more active and expensive archaeological policy than the 'democracies,' and we must work for reform here in the hoped-for new order. If there are rulers who realise that not only can man not live by bread

alone, but that he is even dissatisfied by bread and cinemas, then archaeology should share in the general cultural awakening.

Meanwhile it is much to be hoped that Dr. Clark will set himself to write a substantial essay expanding his last chapter on Archaeology and Society, for he has said enough even in that confined space to show that there can be few people better qualified to undertake this absorbing and urgent task.

J. J. H.

THE ROYAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE
OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND
(INCORPORATED)

LANCASTER HOUSE, ST. JAMES'S, S.W.1

OFFICERS AND COUNCIL FOR 1939-1940

PATRON

His Most Gracious Majesty The King

PRESIDENT

Prof. A. Hamilton Thompson, C.B.E., M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A., F.S.A.,
Hon.A.R.I.B.A.

HONORARY VICE-PRESIDENTS

The Very Rev. D. H. S. Cranage, Litt.D., F.S.A., Dean of Norwich
Miss Rose Graham, C.B.E., M.A., D.Litt., F.S.A.
A. W. Clapham, C.B.E., F.B.A., P.S.A.
W. H. Godfrey, F.S.A., F.R.I.B.A.

VICE-PRESIDENTS

V. B. Crowther-Beynon, M.B.E., M.A., F.S.A.
E. A. B. Barnard, M.A., F.S.A.
J. Holland Walker, M.B.E., F.S.A.
Colonel C. de W. Crookshank, J.P., D.L., F.S.A.
Sir Cyril Fox, Ph.D., F.S.A.
C. W. Phillips, M.A., F.S.A.

COUNCIL

F. Clayton	A. W. G. Lowther, F.S.A., A.R.I.B.A.
W. L. Hildburgh, M.A., Ph.D., D.Lit.,	Mrs. Stuart Piggott
C. C. Oman, M.A.	E. J. Rudsdale
Owen F. Parker, M.A., F.S.A.	E. M. M. Alexander
F. Coston Taylor, M.A., F.S.A.	Prof. Tancred Borenus, Ph.D., D.Lit., F.S.A.
D. A. J. Buxton, M.A., F.S.A.	A. W. Clapham, C.B.E., F.B.A., P.S.A.
John Charlton, M.A.	E. S. M. Perowne, F.S.A.
Mrs. M. A. Cotton, M.B., B.S.	Miss K. M. Richardson
Miss Joan Evans, D.Litt., D.Lit., F.S.A.	R. S. Simms
J. N. L. Myres, M.A., F.S.A.	Miss M. E. Wood, M.A.
The Rev. Eric P. Baker, M.A., F.S.A.	Philip Corder, M.A., F.S.A.
T. D. Kendrick, M.A., F.S.A.	

HONORARY TREASURER

H. L. Bradfer-Lawrence, F.S.A.

HONORARY AUDITOR

H. A. A. Cruso

HONORARY SECRETARY

E. K. Waterhouse, M.A.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY

Miss V. M. Dallas

MEETINGS SECRETARY

Lieut.-Col. B. S. Browne, F.S.A.

HONORARY EDITOR

R. E. Mortimer Wheeler, M.C., M.A., D.Litt., Sec.S.A.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

A. W. Clapham, C.B.E., F.B.A., P.S.A.

J. N. L. Myres, M.A., F.S.A.

J. Holland Walker, M.B.E., F.S.A. C. C. Oman, M.A.
Miss Joan Evans, D.Litt., D.Lit., F.S.A. Mrs. Stuart Piggott