

giving facilities to architectural and other students of the British School to follow and study his excavations on the Palatine.

G. McN. R.

Richard Seager: A communication from Greece appeared in *The Times* this summer which was sad reading, and not only for archaeologists. It was from Sir Arthur Evans, and briefly announced the death of Mr. Richard Seager. Mr. Seager was, it appears, on his way from Egypt to Crete: he was taken ill on the voyage, and landed unconscious at Candia, where he presently died. The Greek authorities gave him a public funeral.

The writer's acquaintance with Seager began in the spring of the year 1903. It was Seager's first season as an excavator in Crete; his health hardly allowed him to go to a university, and, between visits to Nauheim for the cure there, he had come to help Miss Boyd, now Mrs. Hawes, in her excavation of Gournià. He took the opportunity to visit Eastern Crete, and spent a day at the excavation which the British School was then carrying out at Palaikastro. From that time his work in Crete, interrupted only by the War, continued with short intervals until his recent death. He built himself a roomy house in a semi-native style at Pachyammos, where the head-quarters of the Gournià excavators had always been. This he made his centre, and from it he carried out a series of excavations: first, at Vasiliki, as a member of Miss Boyd's expedition, and later independently. In this way he explored Minoan settlements and cemeteries on the islands of Pseira and Mochlos, the cemeteries of Pachyammos and Sphoungaras, and several less important sites in the neighbourhood. He had a happy genius for discovery, and most of his sites proved to be of first-class importance, especially for the Early Minoan period. For this earliest phase of Minoan culture the evidence elsewhere is apt to be scanty; it was given to Seager to throw a flood of light upon the early stages of Cretan civilization. He found not only objects remarkable for their beauty, notably the stone vases and the jewellery of Mochlos, but also stratified deposits, which have been of the utmost value in determining the chronology of the earliest products of Minoan Crete. For example, a series of vases found in tombs at Palaikastro and Zakro, whose relative dates would have otherwise remained quite uncertain, can now on the evidence of Seager's stratified sites be arranged in their true chronological order. All these discoveries he made known in a series of publications, of which the most notable are: *Excavations at Vasiliki*, 1905; *Report of Excavations at Vasiliki*, 1907; *Gournià*, 1908, the report of Mrs. Boyd-Hawes' work at Gournià with papers by Seager and others; *Excavations on the Island of Pseira*, 1910; *Explorations in the Island of Mochlos*, 1912; *The Cemetery of Pachyammos*, 1916. In these publications his friends see a picture of Seager's character. All that he wrote was marked by a careful sobriety and a sound sense of evidence; by a delightful personal modesty and the complete absence of any idea of glorifying himself and his own work; although he had for all that a very sure touch in pointing out and dwelling upon what was either beautiful or of scientific importance. He had a sympathetic

understanding of the aims of the Minoan artist. In the conduct of his work he set an example of extreme care and conscientiousness; he was always on the field himself, he employed comparatively small numbers of men, and few could give him lessons in the various arts of arranging finds and of preserving every scrap of evidence. This skill and devotion was rewarded, as we have said, by discoveries which will always retain their importance in Aegean archaeology. When he died he was young; hardly more than forty, if as much, but he had already made his mark.

R. M. D.

Reviews

Villanovans and Early Etruscans. A Study of the Early Iron Age in Italy, as it is seen near Bologna, in Etruria, and in Latium.
By DAVID RANDALL-MACIVER, M.A., D.Sc., F.S.A. 11¼ × 8¾.
Pp. xvi + 270 + v. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1924. 84s.

The Early Iron Age of Italy has been obscured, even more than that of Greece, by the circumstances of its discovery. In both countries the first excavations were made before the development of accurate method, but while in Greece the consequent damage did not go beyond the lack of records and the loss of small articles which were thought to be insignificant, it has been enlarged in Italy by rivalries, prejudices, and theories which have sometimes controlled the presentation of the evidence. Even the nomenclature of Italian archaeology has a personal taint; the Villanovan periods bear the names of land-owners on whose properties some of the early finds were made. There is, moreover, a vast mass of material in Italy, largely accumulated in provincial museums; much of it is unpublished, and the rest is mostly scattered through numerous volumes of periodicals. To make a way through these formidable barriers an impartial scholar was wanted, with time and means for travel, to survey and sort the documents. This has been done by Dr. Randall-MacIver, at least for the Villanovans, with complete success. He has isolated the phenomena of their culture, defined its geographical limits, traced the history of its discovery, displayed the sequence of its material, and formulated a very reasonable chronological scheme. There is still no better means of dating than dead reckoning upwards from the latest (Arnoaldi) period, which is more or less fixed by contact with Etruscans; but even this is a welcome relief from the absurdities which the system of Montelius involves. In his conclusions about the origin and relations of the Villanovans, Dr. Randall-MacIver maintains a detached and sanely critical view. He does not examine their external connexions in detail, for his purpose here is simply to present the relevant Italian documents in proper order. The presentation of the Etruscan material, however, is less satisfactory, partly because the finds are complicated by the presence of certain foreign elements, with which Dr. Randall MacIver is not competent to deal, partly because he has prejudged the Etruscan question by accepting the statement of Herodotus that the Etruscans