

Antiquity

VOL. XXXIX No. 156

DECEMBER 1965

Editorial

OUR first illustration (PL. XLV) is an object which will, we feel sure, be in most of the books on Celtic Art and Prehistoric European Art from now on. It is the beautifully executed bull, carved in oak, found at the source of the Seine in 1963 by Professor Roland Martin of the University of Dijon. We are grateful to Professor Martin for allowing us to publish this photograph in advance of his main publication, and for sparing time from his very busy life as Doyen de la Faculté des Lettres et des Sciences Humaines to show us once again the carved figures, to discuss the translation of his article with us, and to entertain us. (We shall not readily forget the *boeuf bourguignon* in the *Pré aux Clercs et Trois Faisans*, and the Beauce Les Bressandes, that went with it.)

We print here (pp. 247–52) Professor Martin's article on these remarkable finds. While the other great French rivers have well-defined sources, the geography books are often vague about the source of the Seine and refer in general terms to the 'Plateau de Langres', but as far as the Celts and Gallo-Romans were concerned the source is in a little wooded glade some two miles off the main N. 71 from Paris via Troyes to Dijon, and some 25 miles short of the capital of Burgundy. Here, just off D. 103, and clearly marked—there is even a *Café des Sources de la Seine* (shut, unfortunately, when we were there, in pouring rain, in late September)—the Seine starts in a pool under the supervision of a sculptured nymph in a rockery grotto. The pool and the glade in front (L and K on the sketch-plan, p. 249) belong to the City

of Paris, and it was the idea of the Baron Haussmann in 1865 that the source of Paris's river should be tidied up and commemorated: the nymph, personifying the Seine, was executed by the sculptor Jouffroy and the whole affair inaugurated in 1867.

Excavations and finds before this had revealed the important nature of this site to the early inhabitants of France; as long ago as 1763 the bronze model of a Gallo-Roman boat had been found near by at Blessey. Henry Corot dug at the sources of the Seine from 1926 to 1941 and from 1948 onwards Professor Martin and Gabriel Grémaud mounted a series of campaigns which discovered temples and other buildings identifying the sacred source presided over by the *Dea Sequana*. And in 1963 came the discovery in a pool at the southern edge of the site of 190 wooden figures. The work of preservation of these figures is proceeding very satisfactorily; like the good ship *Vasa* they are being treated with Poly-ethylene-glycol, and it is difficult now to think that some of them were not made more than a year or so ago of slightly weathered oak. But naturally and rightly the work cannot proceed quickly; the exhibition in Paris to which we have already referred (ANTIQUITY, 1965, 163) will not be held for some time, and the installation of the figures in their new and permanent home in the Musée Archéologique at Dijon may not take place for two or three years.

It is sad to know that when the new gallery at Dijon containing these wooden figures will be opened to the public, M. Paul Lebel, who

discussed this project with us so enthusiastically in May, will not be there. He died, suddenly, walking through the streets of Dijon on the 27th of August this year. He was Conservateur of the Musée Archéologique at Dijon, Secrétaire de la Commission des Antiquités de la Côte d'Or, and as his obituary notice says, with justifiable pride, 'Fondateur gérant de la *Revue Archéologique de l'Est et du Centre-Est*'. The *RAEC* was, and is, an extremely good journal; Lebel set new standards for regional French archaeological publication (even national publication) and was one of the first editors in France to publish good air photographs. Professor Martin's article which we print here is a revised version of his article first published in *RAEC* under Lebel's editorship (*RAEC*, xiv, 1963, 7). Paul Lebel is a loss to archaeology, and also to Dijon, where he was a well-known and well-loved character.



Those who do not read the French newspapers daily and carefully may not only have missed Lebel's death but that, ten days before in Vichy, of a person whose name appeared in many of the early issues of this journal. Crawford himself and Vayson de Pradenne wrote on the Glozel forgeries at the time (*ANTIQUITY*, 1927, 100, 259, 387; 1928, 4; 1929, 353; 1930, 201, 362). Many of our younger readers will not remember Glozel; now is the time to recall it when Dr A. Morlet, its chief and constant protagonist for 40 years, has died at the age of 83. In May 1925 Morlet rented from the family Fradin at Glozel, a hamlet some 20 miles south of Vichy, the field Duranton which he renamed *le Champ des Morts*, because he found there two graves.

One had thought that the whole business was forgotten until Morlet published his *Glozel II* (Macon, 1962) and M. le Chanoine Côte his *Glozel, trente ans après* (Saint-Etienne, 1959), and the whole business started again. André Billy wrote in *Le Figaro* (9th August 1962), Antoine Bonin in *Les Nouvelles littéraires* (28th June 1962), and Robert Charroux produced an article entitled 'La mafia de l'archéologie' in *Le Monde et la Vie* for August

1963. What was more serious was that Charroux and Robert Arnaux produced a television programme on the R.T.F. *France I* chain on 6th August 1963 entitled 'Chronique glozélienne', in which there were interviews with Morlet, Emile Fradin and le Chanoine Côte but none with the anti-glozélians, some of whom were vilified in the broadcast.

In *La Feuille d'avis de Lausanne* (admittedly a journal which does not often come our way, and will have little circulation in scientific circles), Dr Bénitte declared on 30th November 1964 that 'On a enfin les preuves de l'authenticité des découvertes préhistoriques faites à Glozel.' Are we then back at the beginning? Just before his death, Morlet published yet another fantastic book: this is entitled *Glozel; Corpus des Inscriptions* (Montpellier, 1965), and here he tells us, *inter alia*, two things of great interest to those who, like ourselves, find false archaeology and the growth of archaeological legends fascinating. Morlet says that had he not rented the field, there would never have been a Glozel '*car la famille Fradin avait décidé de remettre son champ en culture*', and then adds

En effet, en dehors des fouilles dites 'de control' faites par les savants aux endroits choisis par eux, j'ai pratiqué moi-même, avec un long et fort couteau, toutes les fouilles de Glozel, aidé de M. Emile Fradin et de ma femme. Nous ne prenions des ouvriers ou mon chauffeur que pour déblayer les couches superficielles de terre végétale, situées au-dessus de la couche archéologique.

So Glozel was excavated by three people with no competence or training in fieldwork and no apparent knowledge of comparative archaeology whatsoever!

In his last book Morlet gives a summary of the 1932 proceedings in the case Fradin *v.* Dussaud which, he had persuaded himself, established the authenticity of Glozel: they established only that Dussaud had libelled Fradin; and, in this delicate connexion, what about the footnote on p. 61 of A. H. Broderick's *The Abbé Breuil, Prehistorian* (London, 1963) which says, of Saloman Reinach, 'he was strongly in favour of the authenticity of the crude Glozel frauds, fragments of pottery and "inscriptions" forged by the and

EDITORIAL

designed to prove the western origin of later human cultures'. The seven-letter word is deliberately omitted on the advice of our solicitors.

Morlet quotes with pleasure the words of Monsieur Mosnier of the Monuments Historiques, who at the Fradin *v.* Dussaud trial said, '*Chaque objet porte en soi sa propre authenticité.*' We went to Glozel for the second and, we hope, the last time in September; it was a wet day and everything was sad, *vieux-jeu* and forgotten. The Museum remains the same; in our view every object carries in itself clear proof of non-authenticity to anyone reasonably well acquainted with the material remains of the pre-Roman past. We had hoped for some good photographs of these bad forgeries; none was available, only a few delicious faded postcards of the '20s, green on the back in that curious fashion of the time. No. 10 shows a café erected on the main road with the caption '*Glozel-Restaurations: "A l'Homme des Cavernes"—ses poulets cocotte—ses vins fins.*' Alas, the café is gone; we needed restoration after half an hour in this sad museum of fakes and forgotten French hopes, but there were no fine wines and chickens *en cocotte* to restore us.

We had to take restoration further on at St-Pourçain, and there we were able to study the bibliography in Morlet's last book. It is called *Bibliographie Glozélienne*, with hundreds of items of rubbish, many written by himself. He says '*J'espère avoir un jour le plaisir de publier la bibliographie anti-glozélienne.*' But he has gone from us, and his *long et fort couteau* will no longer unearth palpable forgeries. Had he survived to produce this additional bibliography, Crawford, Vayson de Pradenne and perhaps this present Editorial, would have featured in it. He remained to the last quite furious at the *Commission Internationale* and had a special spite against Dorothy Garrod. This is perhaps not unnatural; she it was, a very experienced fieldworker, who rumbled what was going on and how. We have asked her to write for us an account of what really went on in the '20s—her memories of the Commission and all those stirring days. She has agreed to do so and we hope to publish 'Glozel quarante

ans après' in 1966 or '67; and we have no objection if *Figaro*, *Les Nouvelles littéraires*, *La Monde et la Vie*, and for that matter *La Feuille d'avis de Lausanne* wish to reproduce this article in whole or in part.

Dr Curtis D. MacDougall, Professor of Journalism at Northwestern University, in his absorbing book *Hoaxes* (first published 1940, revised edition 1958), says that Hunter Charles Rogers, arrested in England for the sale of some spurious relics of William Penn, confessed that he had done the Glozel forgeries; he said that he placed a few genuine articles among the fakes. This is nonsense: there are no genuine articles, as Dr David Riesman, of the University of Pennsylvania, who made a detailed study of the Glozel affair, made quite clear.



Returning from Dijon to Cambridge via Glozel we found on our review table a collection of books such as surely no autumn season of archaeological publishing has produced for many a long year. Stuart Piggott's *Ancient Europe*, Grahame Clark and Stuart Piggott's *Primitive Societies* (the first volume in the *History of Human Society* edited by Dr Jack Plumb), Stanley Thomas's *Pre-Roman Britain*, the great volume on *The Dark Ages* edited by David Talbot Rice, James Mellaart's *Earliest Civilizations of the Near East*, and Margueron's *Mesopotamia* published by Nagel of Geneva and Frederick Muller of London—to mention only a few.

All these books will be reviewed fully in due course. We make here only a few general comments. In the Josiah Mason Lectures given in the University of Birmingham during the academical year 1956–7, and subsequently published as *The Idea of Prehistory* (London, 1962), we said that 'we still await a good book telling the public what went on in Europe before the Roman conquest'. We await it no longer: Professor Piggott's courageous, ambitious and admirable *Ancient Europe* tells the public what went on in Europe before the Roman conquest. There will be many books of this kind—though not necessarily of this quality—in the next quarter-century; they must all be indebted to

this book, as Professor Piggott himself rightly says he is indebted to Grahame Clark's *Pre-historic Europe*, Gordon Childe's *Dawn of European Civilisation*, and Christopher Hawkes's *The Prehistoric Foundations of Europe*. Clark, Childe and Hawkes covered only half the field—Clark the economic basis and Childe and Hawkes by stopping at the fall of Mycenae. It needed a bold man and a learned man to attempt the complete picture. Professor Piggott is bold and learned—and he has produced as complete a picture as any man could in this present generation.

In the bar of the Imperial Gymkhana Club in New Delhi in 1946, the author of *Ancient Europe* and ourselves decided that what was wanted for the British and extra-British public to appreciate British prehistoric archaeology was a picture book of the fine things from the past. This was the genesis of *A Picture Book of Ancient British Art*, published by the Cambridge University Press in 1951, still in print, and now joined by Studio Vista's welcome and handsome production of Stanley Thomas's *Pre-Roman Britain*. British readers will know most of the objects and sites photographed, though not many of the excellent photographs like the author's close-up of one of the Roos Carr figures (no. 320), and Vincent Megaw's brilliant photograph of the man on the handle-mount of the Aylesford bucket (fine on the jacket but sadly reduced in the plates themselves). To our continental and American friends this book will come as a great and interesting revelation.

The Dark Ages edited by David Talbot Rice is the fourth in the succession of very large, very beautifully illustrated books on ancient history and archaeology which started with *The Dawn of Civilization* edited by Stuart Piggott. It is the best-produced and most lavishly illustrated of the lot, and the public seems to have appreciated this because when we asked for a copy to be sent to Dr Raleigh Radford who is going to review it for ANTIQUITY, we found that all copies were sold. But it is reprinting and we hope to print Dr Radford's review in the March number, 1966.

We have eagerly awaited the first volume of

Archaeologia Mundi since, two years ago, Nagel announced this new series of 21 archaeological books. The series is edited by Jean Marcade, Professor of Archaeology in the University of Bordeaux. This first volume on *Mesopotamia* by Jean-Claude Margueron (whose previous writings on this subject have hitherto escaped us, and none of which are listed in his bibliography) is a great disappointment. The text is thin, it seems to be selling archaeology to us all the time—we have already bought it, for better or worse—and is full of promise of what is going to come, but never does, because the book ends. Some lovely photographs, many well produced in colour, but also a strange illustration (p. 128) which looks as though it were reproduced directly from a museum catalogue or the *Aleppo News*. No index, no chronological charts, no adequate maps and plans—just some endpaper diagrammatical maps. The author has not been helped by his translator whose many infelicities include turning 'resistivity survey' into 'measuring resistibility' (p. 99)—and how nice it would be to have such a device when discussing matters with one's colleagues—archaeological, academic, and political! But one cannot blame the translator for the most remarkable collection of banalities that has come our way for a long time. Here are some:

In Mesopotamia, as elsewhere, archaeology did not develop in a day . . . after centuries and millenia (*sic*) the accumulated evidence of man's activities can attain impressive dimensions. . . . Whatever the height of the mound, the principle that remains true for all human settlements is that the vestiges of life and industry pile up and are buried with the passing of the centuries. . . . once the excavation is finished the archaeologist must publish his findings without delay, whatever their apparent importance, so that all can benefit from them. Such accounts must be accurate, detailed and as complete as possible. . . . Some people have been surprised—even shocked—at the scientific character archaeology has assumed in this century . . . only rigorously scientific methods can, stroke by stroke, make the face of ancient man emerge from the twilight of the ages.

But we must not be too critical: we know only too well the teething troubles of a new series,

and the difficult problems of translation. The next two volumes advertised for 1966 are *Persia* by Jean-Louis Huot and *Crete* by Nicholas Platon, and we eagerly await this latter volume.

The *Library of the Early Civilizations* began as enlarged and revised chapters of *The Dawn of Civilization* (ANTIQUITY, 1965, 239); it is edited, as was the parent volume, by Professor Stuart Piggott. James Mellaart's chapter in the volume was called 'Roots in the Soil': for this new format, when it is called *Earliest Civilizations of the Near East*, he has completely rewritten his chapter. As he says in his introduction, 'In the five years that have passed since this chapter was written for *The Dawn of Civilization*, archaeological research in the Near East has progressed so much that most of it is now out of date.' He has therefore provided us with a most admirable and up-to-date summary of recent work in the Near East from the beginnings of agriculture to the rise of city life, including a most welcome summary of his own sensational discoveries in Catal Hüyük. The title of the book is a misnomer; we deal here with the development of culture before the crystallization of the urban civilizations of Sumeria and Egypt—it is the story, in the words of the subtitle to his original chapter, of 'the beginning of village and urban life'. But let us not waste time ungratefully looking in the mouth of this fine gift-horse.

Reading Mr Mellaart's text prompts one immediate general reflexion, the need for a revision of the archaeological nomenclature of the ancient Near East. What a muddle we have got into talking about ceramic and aceramic Neolithic cultures and pre-Pottery A and pre-Pottery B Neolithic cultures at Jericho. Mr Mellaart himself proposes the following terminology:

Mesolithic, c. 10,000 to 9000 B.C. (frequently called 'Final Upper Palaeolithic').

Proto-Neolithic, c. 9000–7000 B.C. (instead of 'Mesolithic').

Neolithic, c. 7000–5600 B.C.

Early Chalcolithic, c. 5600–5000 B.C.

Middle Chalcolithic, c. 5000–4000 B.C.

Late Chalcolithic, c. 4000–3500 B.C. or later.

Surely with an accumulating roster of C14 dates we need not use labels like pre-Pottery Neolithic B or Middle Chalcolithic. We might, if we like, use in the Near East the general terms of American archaeology, which would mean that Mellaart is writing about the Archaic and Formative periods of Near Eastern prehistory, whereas the volumes in the series by Mallowan and Aldred deal with the early Classic periods of the Near East.

To quote Willey and Phillips, 'local sequences are the very stuff of archaeology' (*Methods and Aims in American Archaeology*), and we shall never do without our Uruk IV and Ninevite I and the rest of it. But this is only the second stage of our knowledge about the buried past. The first stage is the buried past itself, undisturbed by the archaeologist, the past in itself, which is not recoverable in its entirety. The second stage is the past as the archaeologist in one place interprets what he sees of its remains as he cuts and chops, with the assistance of a wealth of auxiliary scientific disciplines. The third stage is the interpretation by the prehistorian of the evidence from all sites into a history of man. There may still be room in stage two or between stages two and three for the use of subdivisions of the 19th-century technological model. We think there is no room whatsoever in stage three for the Neolithics and Chalcolithics of yesteryear. The Braidwoods have never had any difficulty in writing cogently and clearly about the beginnings of peasant-village life in the Near East without recourse to those outmoded labels; indeed Robert Braidwood himself wrote an admirable little book called *Prehistoric Man* which eschewed all the three-age derivative labels—and no reviewer noticed! And Professor Atkinson wrote a book on *Stonehenge* which similarly eschewed the unusable words and their outdated concepts, and hardly a reviewer noticed they were not there. We want a simple clearing of the mind of many Near Eastern archaeologists: Neolithic and Chalcolithic are meaningless and unnecessary concepts. Describe what you have in terms of local sequence and general significance, and let Thomsen and Lubbock rest in peace. We are all perhaps loth

ANTIQUITY

to kick away from underneath us the scaffolding on which our own knowledge of prehistory seemed to be built; but it is only the scaffolding of a model and we need not kick it—just leap lightly to the next and most suitable model. It is this leap that Mr Mellaart and Dr Kenyon and Mr Anati and many another must make if the future is to understand the fantastically interesting past of man between 10,000 B.C. and 3500 B.C. in meaningful terms. The old divisions and elaborations of the Three Age system of Thomsen and Worsaae, and the Four Age system of Lubbock, are no longer meaningful. This is not surprising; it is exactly a century since *Prehistoric Times* was published.



On the very day that we were taking the typescript of this Editorial to the printers we learnt the sad news of the sudden death of Sir Ian Richmond on 5th October at the age of 63. He had been Professor of the Archaeology of the Roman Empire at Oxford since 1956, moving to his old University from King's College, Newcastle, where he had been from 1935, first as lecturer, then reader, and from 1950 Professor of Romano-British History. He had been President of the Society of Antiquaries of London since 1964. There is no need here

to recall any more details of his distinguished career; his work and scholarship are well known to the world. His death will be mourned not only in this country but everywhere from North Africa to Romania where his energetic travels took him and his sympathetic interest won him a wide circle of friends.

He had just completed his last season of excavations at Inchtuthill, and, as part of his activities as successor to Miss Clare Fell, the present President of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian Society, he was planning during his forthcoming tenure of the Presidency of that Society in its centenary year, to carry out a special excavation at Maryport. While not formally an Advisory Editor of ANTIQUITY he was always ready with advice and ideas, and when we last saw him during the Classical Conference in Cambridge in August of this year he was full of ideas and suggestions and comments. The historian of Roman archaeology will assess his place as a scholar, and we believe it will be a very high place. All of us, whether RB or non-RB, will remember him as a counsellor and friend. He had a gift for friendship, and cultivated his friends. Not for nothing did we all know him as 'Uncle Ian': indeed it is as this kindly, wise avuncular figure we shall always think of him.



Antiquity

NEW SUBSCRIPTION RATE

A reminder of what we announced in the last number, namely that from 1st January 1966 the subscription to ANTIQUITY will be £2 10s. (or 8 dollars) with individual copies priced at 15s. It will be noted that Bankers' Orders now date from 1st January, a change which was made some five years ago with all new subscribers. Some of our original subscribers, whose orders have hitherto dated from 1st March, and who want to spread their subscriptions to learned societies and journals over the year, may find this inconvenient. Our trouble is, that, not being good at gazing into crystal balls, we cannot tell how many copies to print of the March number in any year unless we have a fairly firm idea of our subscribers. With a January date for all Bankers' Orders we shall know where we stand before we start printing in February, and we shall not in future send the March number to subscribers who have not renewed their subscriptions beforehand. Readers may be assured that they are not 'missing out' on one number at the old rate by this streamlining: payment has always been in advance since the first number published in March 1927.