

ing phases one would expect some sites with relatively unrolled Palaeoliths in considerable numbers, and one might expect some difference in style from the artefacts of the preceding period. If however the area were abandoned at the time, no rich sites could be found in the terrace and only rolled tools from the earlier periods would be present.

Provisionally the evidence seems to support the latter hypothesis, and from this stems the importance of any opportunity to test this view of the Taplow terrace.

The evidence for equating the Taplow terrace with an intensely glacial period derives principally from the gradient and the fauna. Hare recognised the gradient as being distinctly steeper than that of the succeeding interglacial terrace, and the Taplow terrace is possibly the only one so steep as to be lost beneath later terraces downstream of London. This might suggest that it flows into the very low sealevel of late Gippingian times. Secondly, the fauna at Taplow itself included the musk ox, woolly rhino and mammoth. The first two of these are not found in Ipswichian or Hoxnian deposits or even in early

Gippingian deposits, and this may indicate tundra conditions.

The explanation that occupation ceases in Taplow times because of the rigorous climate is an attractive one, but not wholly satisfactory. A similar break should exist contemporary with the first Gipping glaciation (the most extensive) unless it were distinctly less rigorous in climate. Such a break might be represented by the gap between the Lynch Hill and Taplow terraces and especially by the extensive Coombe rock deposition of the time (though there does seem to be a culture associated with this phase at Bakers Hole near Swanscombe).

The pattern of occupation by Palaeolithic man during the ice ages will be somewhat elucidated when we know more of the environment of different parts of the Gipping glaciation and when more checks on possible occupation sites in the Taplow terrace have been made. As far as it goes, our work confirmed the idea of a gap, but it would have been better if the lower part of the gravels could have been better studied and if more sections were available.

---

## London Museum's new Director



“IT IS UP to us to show people how the excavated material once fitted into the pattern of life in London. The Victoria and Albert Museum would demonstrate the significance of the decoration on a pot, a museum of by-gones would show it as a simple relic of the past—but we should show what the pot was used for, what sort of household could afford to use it and what other vessels would have stood in the kitchen with it.”

John Hayes, Assistant Keeper at the London Museum since 1954 and now appointed Director, thus emphasises his views that the Museum is not just a collection of day-to-day relics, but a means of displaying the living tissue of London history.

His detailed research into the museum's collection of topographical pictures and drawings, culminating in the publication this year of an illustrated and descriptive catalogue of the oil paintings has given him what he calls a good working knowledge of the growth of London and of how city life has been changing since the Romans first established a port here. His book for Batsford, *London, An Illustrated History*, is one of the most concise and illuminating on an unwieldy subject.

But he will now exploit an extra dimension: the London Museum's collections include domestic and decorative wares excavated from city sites, the tools and products of London industries, the goods sold in London shops and some of the shop-fronts themselves, the costume people wore and the vehicles they rode in. With these, and the paintings, and with maps, topographical models and blow-up photographs he will be able to convey a vivid and exciting impression of London's past in human terms, emphasising the Londoner as much as London itself.

Temporary exhibitions by professional designers will pinpoint moments in the story: November this year, for instance, will see the opening of “Time Off in 1870—Out and About in Victorian London” and show how the leisure problem is by no means a new one. Londoners a hundred years ago were as much in need of diversion as we are and as much addicted to a miscellany of sports and hobbies even if ballooning rather than bingo was the order of the day.