Antiquity

VOL. XLI No. 163 SEPTEMBER 1967

Editorial

IT will be well known to most of our readers in the British Isles and Ireland, if not to our subscribers in the Andamans, the Falkland Islands and the Faeroes, that the faculties of arts, letters, *sciences historiques*—call them what you will—of French universities are engaged in a development of archaeological studies into their main schedules, and that, as a result of university expansion (now halted) in the last ten years, archaeology has recently been developed in several British universities. There are two new Professorships in Britain, Barry Cunliffe in Southampton, and Charles Thomas in Leicester, and there are rumours of others elsewhere. In these universities and in others which, without *catedraticos* at the moment, are still planning degree courses in prehistory and archaeology, the questions arise: What are we doing? Who are we trying to train? and, most searching of all, Why could they not be better trained elsewhere?

Question 5 of the 'History and Scope of Archaeology' paper in Part II of the Cambridge Tripos in Archaeology and Anthropology this year was as follows: *Several universities are embarking upon, or planning new courses in archaeology leading to a B.A. degree. In broad outline, what subjects would you wish to include in such a course?*

There are many answers to this question, and the one advantage of the development of teaching in archaeology in many British universities is that there is room for variation in scope, emphasis and detail. There is even room for the identification of archaeology with different faculties. While archaeology is, in most universities, in the faculty of arts, it is in the Faculty of Sciences in Belfast and Rennes. At Cambridge, where there is a separate Faculty of Archaeology and Anthropology, one of the two archaeological teachers with Senior Doctorates is a Doctor of Science, and the other a Doctor of Letters.

The first words of the preface to *The Archaeology of Ancient China* by Kwang-chih Chang (whose new book *Rethinking Archaeology* is reviewed in this number, p. 237) are these: 'Archaeology in the College curriculum rightfully belongs to both the humanities and the social sciences.' One of the very best definitions of archaeology is provided by Maurice Dunand in his *Byblos, its History, Ruins and Legends* (Beirut, 1964) when he says:

> The archaeologist is often asked by the public to talk about 'his digs'. They expect from him dramatic accounts of the unveiling of past worlds preserved intact, arrays of gold still blazing with its antique lustre, wonderful treasure-tombs. They see in his work mystery and romance: he digs by intuition, marvellous things are brought to light, and all is wonder and rejoicing. The truth is otherwise. Archaeology is no longer the science of digging up statues, precious objects and inscriptions . . . . It must aim at reconstituting the life of towns, the sequence of their multiple settlements, the way of life of their inhabitants. It must investigate the main turning points of their history, in order to relate them with similar points in time known elsewhere, so as to reconstitute the historical and cultural evolution of peoples that time has brought together or set against each other. An excavation is an attempt to open a dialogue with the past.

We continue with a passage written by the present Editor of ANTIQUITY in *The Cambridge Review* for 20th May of this year:

'Maitland once said at a meeting of the Eranus Club that anthropology had either to become history or become nothing. Archaeology *must* become history: years ago I warned against the danger of the new antiquarianism when the classification of flints, the typology of megaliths, and the analysis of dreary Bronze-Age pots became a substitute for the difficult task of wresting a few facts of history from the defaced antiquities and dry bones that survive (*A Hundred Years of Archaeology*, 326). There are, broadly speaking, five archaeologies. The first concerns man from the moment he could be so called and had artifacts, to the beginnings of agriculture in the Near East, China and Mesopotamia, until what Elliot Smith called the Food-Producing Revolution and Childe the Neolithic Revolution. This is, to use the outworn neo-grecisms, the Palaeolithic and Mesolithic: what the present Disney Professor in his inaugural lecture called "primary prehistory".

'The second archaeology is that of the early peasant village communities of the world which in due course and in seven different regions of the world led to the first civilizations—those of Sumer, Egypt, the Indus valley, Shang China, the Olmecs, the Maya, and Peru. The archaeology of these protohistoric civilizations and the many others that followed them, like the Hittites and Phoenicians, the Minoans and Myceneans and Greeks, the Aztecs and Incas, is the third archaeology: protohistory in its widest and most exact sense. This third archaeology is also the archaeology of those societies whom Kroeber and Toynbee and others would not classify as civilized: the barbarian Celts, the Anglo-Saxons, the Vikings, the Scythians, the Sarmatians. The fourth archaeology is that comprised at present by the society for Medieval Archaeology and reflected in its journal. And the fifth that comprised by the new society for post-Medieval Archaeology, whose work carries on to the new and fashionable Industrial Archaeology.

'All these five archaeologies need to be taught and practised in a University such as ours which, in the second half of this century when many of the new University experiments in Britain may collapse, is one of the three or four which can, with difficulty, survive with world status. What we need is a School or Institute of Prehistoric and Protohistoric Studies where the techniques and practices of archaeology can be taught and where students, whatever . . . they may be reading, can attend courses . . . varying from Palaeolithic Cave Art to the beginnings of Agriculture, from the origins of City Life in the Near East to an analysis of Viking Ships, Anglo-Saxon linear earthworks, and Teotihuacán. . . .

'When, recently, in a review in *The Spectator*, I criticized adversely some of the remarks made about prehistory and protohistory by Professor Jack Plumb in his editorial preface to *Prehistoric Societies* by Grahame Clark and Stuart Piggott, he retorted that I was not a historian. And here is the essence of the matter: we are all historians, we are all studying the past of man, whether we concentrate on Walpole, *Beowulf*, Stonehenge or Lascaux. Manuscripts, microliths, megaliths—it is all one. The past is the goal of the historian whether he is text-aided or not . . . there are historians, in the strict sense of the word, who are frightened when they see archaeologists advancing toward them with dirt on their boots and a brief case full of air photographs and Carbon 14 dates. Dugdale, Aubrey, Lhwyd and Stukeley did not think they were other than historians, and, for that matter, historians who could be members of the Royal Society. We have taken the distinction between a history that is mainly derived from material sources and one that is derived from the aid of texts, too far.'

Thus ends that polemic. All universities, old and new, have this problem of organization: it should not be difficult to organize in a wide variety of ways if the end is always the right one: to pursue the whole story of man and his past from the beginning to the end examining all sources and using all auxiliary methods that the natural sciences and others can offer. It is a mistake, and of this there can be no doubt, to

divide the study of the results of the five archaeologies from the study of the way in which those results are obtained, and this is why so many study-bound historians still look with wonder and dismay at men who dig and look through microscopes and use computers and still claim to be historians. It will be interesting to see, in a decade from now, how the new universities have matched up in planning and achievement to the new opportunities for archaeology, and what changes the older universities will have made. There are persistent and credible rumours of reorganization and development in Oxford: and more than rumours in London that an Honours Degree in Archaeology will appear on the Statute Book there in the next few years. Perhaps we could persuade our Advisory Editor, Sir Mortimer Wheeler, to comment on this when it happens, in the light of what he said in his Foundation Oration in Birkbeck College in 1957, namely, 'Archaeology was still on the substantive B.A. syllabus of this university; and it is a not irrelevant source of gratification to me to reflect that I was able twenty years ago to play a part in the seemingly perverse act of securing its removal from that syllabus' (R. E. M. Wheeler, *Alms for Oblivion*, 1966, 44). From the seemingly perverse of the '30s to the seemingly reverse of the '60s is an intriguing way of looking at the development of academic archaeology in Britain in the last 30 years.

We have already described the new journal *Current Archaeology* and hinted that there was yet another new archaeological journal in the offing. There is: it is to be called *World Archaeology*: it will be published by Weidenfeld and Nicolson and the first issue will be out in the late spring of 1968. The publishers' Autumn/Winter 1967 catalogue described the journal as follows:

Its aim is to treat archaeology, both the art and the science, in the context of its related disciplines: mathematics and botany, geology and history. It will admit no restriction of period or of area, and each issue will develop a special theme. Space will also be found for the rapid publication of important new material, and for review articles on the major fields of international archaeological research. Special themes for the first year will include *The New Archaeology*, *Chronology*, and *The First Farmers*.

The Editorial Board of *World Archaeology* consists of Martin Biddle, Barry Cunliffe, Henry Hodges, F. R. Hodson, Ian Longworth, Derek Roe and C. P. S. Platt, who is the Executive Editor, and there is an advisory board of 16 distinguished scholars from all over the archaeological world. This new journal, whose appearance we welcome, eagerly await and warmly support, is a quarterly; each issue will cost 15*s* and the annual subscription is 50*s*. It is a bold venture in a world of rising printing costs and of people who, with the best will in the world, are having to cut down their subscriptions to learned journals. It is also a brave venture, and to organize a quarterly journal devoted to one theme per issue is a task which strikes midnight nightmare terror into the heart of this Editor: but then he and all his advisers are over 50, while no member of the Editorial Board of *World Archaeology* has yet reached the decent and obscure comfort of middle age and at least one of them was a prominent organizer of the Conference of Young Archaeologists. *World Archaeology* is not necessarily the 'new' archaeology; but it looks as if it might be a young and fresh influence in archaeological publications. We wish it all success.

One of the members of the advisory Board of *World Archaeology* has recently agreed to join us as one of the Advisory Editors of ANTIQUITY. This is Gordon Willey, Bowditch Professor of Mexican and Central American Archaeology and Ethnology at Harvard University. Professor Willey is a member of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States and a past President of the American Anthropological Association. He was awarded the Viking Fund Medal for Achievement in Archaeology in 1953. He will be known to many of our readers for the book he wrote with Philip Phillips entitled *Method and Theory in American Archaeology* (Chicago, 1958) and the book he edited with Robert Braidwood entitled *Courses towards*

Urban Life; his new book *An Introduction to American Archaeology: Volume I: North and Middle America* published last year will be reviewed in the next number of ANTIQUITY by Dr Warwick Bray.

The addition of Professor Willey to our Advisory Editors strengthens us in American Archaeology, hitherto represented, albeit with great learning and distinction, by Dr Geoffrey Bushnell, and it is good to know that Dr Bushnell has recently been made a Reader in American Archaeology in the University of Cambridge, England. This is, we believe, the first academic post in American Archaeology in Britain, and now we are delighted to learn that the University of London has a Lectureship in New World Archaeology, to which Dr Warwick Bray has been appointed. And interest in all aspects of archaeology grows in America itself. We have learnt only recently of the existence of the *Art and Archaeology Newsletter*, started in 1965. The ninth issue is on our desk as we write: it is edited and published by Otto F. Reiss, at 243 East 39th Street, New York, N.Y. 10016. The subscription rates are one issue 60 cents or 2*s* 6*d*, four trial issues $2 or 10*s*, and a ten-issue subscription costs $5 or 25*s*. Perhaps the extraordinary growth in interest in archaeology in America can be attested by the Artificial Dig-In School Project reported in *The Daily Telegraph* for 25th April 1967 as follows:

> Central Park, New York, has been chosen as the site of an unusual archaeological dig-in for school children later this year. A mound of earth will be erected and filled with several shards of ancient pottery, statuary and glass contributed by the Israeli Government. The Parks Commissioner explained that what the young archaeologists found they would be allowed to keep.

Gordon Childe said more than once that he was not interested in American archaeology because it did not contribute to the main stream of history. It was possible to have such an attitude 20 years ago, but the progress of American archaeology in the last two decades has shown that, while America is not in the stream that led from the most ancient East through Greece and Rome to western Europe, it provides a mirror of the development of culture and civilization of a new, startling and exciting kind. The demonstration of MacNeish and his colleagues of the origins of maize in Mexico and of the independent origin of agriculture in at least four separate areas in Nuclear America (ANTIQUITY, 1965, 87) has forced archaeologists to think again about their easy conceptualization of 'agriculture'. The new Committee on Agricultural Origins, financed by the British Academy and the Viking Fund, and under the Chairmanship of Sir Joseph Hutchinson of the University of Cambridge, may well achieve another MacNeish in south-eastern Europe and the Near East. And what we want as well is field-testing of the theories of Vavilov, Murdock and Sauer that there may be separate domestications of crops in Abyssinia, Nigeria and south-east Asia.

For an admirably clear and scholarly account of these matters readers should see the article by Dr David R. Harris entitled 'New Light on Plant Domestication and the Origins of Agriculture: A Review' in *The Geographical Review*, LVII, 1967, 90–107, in which books like P. M. Zukovskij's *Cultivated Plants and Their Wild Relatives* and the volume *Essays on Crop Plant Evolution* edited by Sir Joseph Hutchinson, neither of which has been reviewed in ANTIQUITY, are discussed.

From cultigens to crackpots. In the wake of all the fussation about the Vinland map and what really has been found at L'Anse-aux-Meadows, and the fruitless discussion about who discovered America, and after whom was it called, comes Richard Deacon with a book, *Madoc and the Discovery of America* (London: Frederick Muller, 282 pp., 12 pls., 3 figs., 42*s*.), in which all the old stuff is trundled out again—Nicholas of Lynne, the Duke of Veragua's claim that his ancestor Christopher Columbus discovered America in 1467 and not 1492, Peter Martyr's assertion that Columbus had marked on one of his charts somewhere in the direction of the West Indies 'Questo he mar de Cambrio' (but does this mean, as Deacon claims, 'These

are Welsh waters'?), the Mandan Indians, the strange expedition of John Evans of Waunfawr in 1792, and the charlatan variously known as 'King', 'Chief' and 'General', William Bowles. We have all been here before and do not wish to revisit these arid pastures. What is new in this book which enables Deacon to claim that 'in the light of more recent evidence there are equally sound reasons for claiming that Madoc did reach the shores of the New World some 322 years before Columbus'? A careful reading of this book produces only two new facts: the first is a photograph of 'the old stone pier said to be the departing point of Madoc's first expedition, now a garden rockery at Rhos-on-Sea', and the second the fact that the Daughters of the American Revolution have set up a tablet at Mobile Bay in Alabama inscribed 'in memory of Prince Madoc, a Welsh explorer, who landed on the shores of Mobile Bay in 1170, and left behind, with the Indians, the Welsh language'.

Deacon mentions in his bibliography Thomas Stephens's *Madoc* (1893) and Professor David Williams's *John Evans and the Legend of Madoc* (Cardiff, 1963), but does not, alas, seem to have understood their arguments. Of Thomas Stephens's essay David Williams himself wrote, 'it is such a critical examination of the legend that one would have thought that this was now disposed of, once and for all'. But obviously not. History, according to John Clapham who died in 1618, 'ought to be a Register of things, either truly done, or at least warrantable by probabilitie'. The rockery at Rhos-on-Sea, the plaque set up by the Daughters of the Revolution at Mobile Bay, and the fact that Mr Deacon himself sailed a small flat-bottomed landing-craft from Norfolk, Virginia, to North Africa, do not warrant the probability that a man called Madoc discovered America in 1170. In one thing Professor David Williams is wrong when he refers to 'the legend of Madoc': legend is undocumented and doubtful history. Invented history is myth, and Madoc's discovery of America looks at the present moment, despite Mr Deacon's valiant efforts, to be a mythical invention.

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.

Early Rome by Einar Gjerstad. *Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup*, 1966. *Skrifter utgivna an Svenska Institutet i Rom*, 4°, *xvii:* 4 (*Acta Instituti Romani Regni Sveciae in* 4°, *xvii:* 4). Vols. IV:1 and IV:2 are subtitled 'Synthesis of Archaeological Evidence'. 348 *pp.*, 8 *pls.*, 203 *figs.* *SW. Fr.* 250.

History of Merioneth by E. G. Bowen and C. A. Gresham. *Dolgellau: The Merioneth Historical and Record Society*, 1967. Vol. I: 'From the earliest times to the Age of the Native Princes'. 314 *pp.*, 12 *pls.*, 110 *figs.* 63*s.*

Water, Weather and Prehistory by Robert Raikes. *London: John Baker*, 1967. 208 *pp.*, 18 *pls.* 45*s.* Foreword by Sir Mortimer Wheeler.

Epirus by N. G. L. Hammond. *Oxford: Clarendon Press*, 1967. 871 *pp.*, 25 *pls.*, 34 *figs.*, 23 *plans*, 18 *maps.* £12 12*s.* Subtitled 'The geography, ancient remains, the history and the topography of Epirus and adjacent areas', this study in depth of a Greek canton is by the Professor of Greek in the University of Bristol.

A History of Greece to 322 BC by N. G. L. Hammond. *Oxford: Clarendon Press*, 1967. 691 *pp.*, 12 *pls.*, 34 *figs.* 50*s.* A 2nd edition of this valuable work first published 1959 (reprinted 1963), printed lithographically from corrected sheets of the 1st edition.

continued on p. 180