

Antiquity

VOL. XLVI No. 183

SEPTEMBER 1972

Editorial

It is three-thirty on the afternoon of the longest (but certainly not the warmest) day of 1972 and we are sitting in the Totem Bar of the Musée de L'Homme, a welcome *sérieux* in front of us, restoring ourselves after an attack of *langueur et ennui de musée* which afflicts most people after a concentrated hour and a half looking at collections. At this moment the crowds waiting to see the exhibition of the Treasures of Tutankhamun are queuing all round the British Museum courtyard and the end of the queue is far down Great Russell Street. Theirs will be *langueur et ennui* even before they get into the Museum! Many have, in the last few weeks, waited four hours to get in and some devoted, determined and dedicated people have been assembling at 11 o'clock in the evening before the museum opened at 10 the following morning.

We are witnessing all over again, but on an even larger scale, the crowd scenes that were caused by the discovery of the Temple of Mithras in the City of London in 1954. Why is this? The romance of archaeology, of course, the excitement of the boy king, and the remembrance of those breath-taking moments fifty years ago when the treasures were first seen, when, in answer to Lord Caernarvon's impatient question as to what he could see, Howard Carter replied, 'Yes. Wonderful things.'

A carefully selected fifty of these wonderful things are now on display in the British Museum, and it is good to know that the exhibition, which opened in March and was to have closed at the end of September, has now been extended until the end of the year. [At the Press preview, says *Frank Collieson*, access to the gallery in the British Museum

proved almost as difficult as Carter's way to the tomb itself; but all exhibitions have their measure of eleventh-hour chaos, and at Tut's a little kingly disorder served only to whet the appetite for the stupendous treasures within. Perhaps it was the television cameras, the trailing cables, the interviews being recorded *sotto voce* in the darkest corners—all the trappings of Press and public relations which, combined with the opulence of gold, alabaster and ivory, and the enchanting, almost Regency elegance of pieces like the gaming board and the bow-fronted box, lent to the affair the plushy excitement of a particularly exclusive sale in the Parke-Bernet Galleries.] We must all be grateful to the Arab Republic of Egypt for allowing these national treasures to leave Cairo, and to all those who negotiated and arranged this complicated international manoeuvre. The display in the BM is admirable and balances information and the aesthetic appreciation of the objects in the happiest way. We are led from the story of the discovery through to the dramatically placed fiftieth object—the gold mask. The catalogue is very well done and cheap at 75p (and for the benefit of those who cannot get to the exhibition, ought to be put on sale in bookshops—but it seems Times Newspapers are reluctant to do this: a pity). There is a free film show at the end of the tour. The proceeds go towards the UNESCO fund for the preservation of the temples of Philae. It would be nice if some of the profits from the exhibition could go back to the Cairo Museum which badly needs a great deal of money spent on it.

There is a refreshment tent in the courtyard of the British Museum and this must be

ANTIQUITY

welcome to the long lines of waiting visitors. Of course, what the British Museum, and indeed every museum, needs is a good restaurant and bar. It was a sad moment and, we believe, a false economy, when the restaurant and bar in the National Museum at Copenhagen were abolished. They do these things better in Mexico and Norwich. The Victoria and Albert Museum and the Tate Gallery have for many years sold alcoholic drinks with meals (and Dublin can be proud not only of the fine new extension to the National Gallery of Ireland—making it the largest *painting* gallery in Europe—but of the pleasant restaurant and amiable bar whose pulling power is surely reflected in the ever-growing numbers who now make their way to Merrion Square West). But without doubt licensed bars in museums are rare: surely the licensed bar and buttery opened in the Norwich Castle Museum on 5 October 1971 is unique in Britain? The Director of the Norwich Museums, Francis Cheetham, wrote an account of this project in *The Museums Journal* for March 1972 (p. 164) and we quote from this article:

It is arguable whether the provision of a licensed bar should be given any priority in view of the all too slow improvement of our museums A small open piece of courtyard at the back of the coffee bar, used mainly for storing packing cases and derelict show cases, seemed to be the only possible space where such a licensed bar/buttery might be built . . . which could be run as a single unit with the existing coffee bar. A costing of £5,000 was arrived at for such an extension, and since it appeared highly improbable that the City authorities would make such money available for such a purpose with any degree of urgency, the catering firm already running the coffee bar . . . undertook jointly to pay for the extensions, in collaboration with a firm of brewers, simply as a business investment. With annual, and rising, assured attendance figures of over 300,000 at the Castle Museum, the venture made business sense Already there is a steady, appreciative and extremely well-mannered lunch-time clientele who are now accustomed to retire from the latest Arts Council exhibition to a whisky and soda or a draught bitter The provision of the bar has resulted in the unusual situation of

all parties being more than satisfied. The general public has a new and much appreciated facility, the Museums Department has increased the income from the rent levied, and has added to the capital value of its buildings, the caterer secures a higher profit from bar sales, and the brewers sell more beer and spirits There is no doubt that a virtually guaranteed annual attendance of many thousands, together with our old enemy 'museum fatigue', provide a worth-while commercial potential which can, with care, be exploited to the benefit of all.

What cheerful and cheering news, and we hope these words will be read by all Museum Directors and Trustees, not least by those of the British Museum, who have recently shown such excellent initiative in shaking off the shackles of the Treasury in relation to their publications, postcards and slide production and sales; and in forming an independent commercial company. We lift our nearly empty *séieux* to the Norwich Castle Museum, but remember, sadly, that what we can do in the Trocadero in Paris at four in the afternoon is not yet possible in the Norwich Museum Rotunda at the same hour. The Museum bar hours are from 10.30 a.m. to 2.30 p.m. but, says Francis Cheetham, 'It may be possible to adjust these hours with the consent of the magistrates when the bar is well-established.' We suggest the magistrates be given a special course in afternoon museum fatigue.

Two admirable books dealing with fakes, frauds and forgery in archaeology have recently appeared: *Archaeological fakes* by Adolf Rieth (London: Barrie and Jenkins, 1970. 183 pp., 85 photographs. £2.00) and *Fabulous frauds: A study of great forgeries* by Lawrence Jeppson (London: Arlington Books, 1971. 185 pp., 1 plate. £3.00). These must certainly find a place on our shelves alongside the already well-known books by Vaysonne de Pradenne, Robert Munro, Frank Arnau, Guy Isnard, Otto Kurtz, Fritz Mendax and Sonia Cole—to mention a few of the extensive treatments of forgery in art and archaeology.

Both books are a little unsatisfactory in some ways: neither has an index, and although

EDITORIAL

both have bibliographies, there is no detailed documentation. Jeppson's excellently written and enthralling book has only one illustration: that of a warrior in the style of Etruscan work of the 5th century BC, but done by the Riccordi-Fioravanti organization in this century, and allegedly found in the Boccaporco site (near Orvieto) which has (quite understandably, as it never existed) never been found. It ought to have many illustrations (and let us hope a second edition will have many plates, an index and good references). The statement attributed to the publisher by Bevis Hillier in an article entitled 'The real value of fakes' (*The Times*, 24 June, 12) that 'of all the museums approached, only one would send a photograph' is disingenuous. A brief walk in those fascinating streets immediately south of the Académie Française, and particularly a little hard work in Roger-Viollet in the rue de Seine and Giraudon in the rue Jacob, should produce most of the photographs required to illustrate any general book on antiquity.

Jeppson deals with the great art forgeries: Mona Lisa, the Millet family affair, Van Gogh, and Van Meegeren; but also has clear and accurate chapters on Bastianini, Roucho-movsky, Dossena, and Malskat. He is devastatingly good on the forged Castellani Sarcophagus made by the Pinelli brothers in 1873 and displayed for sixty years (until 1936) as a masterpiece of Etruscan funerary art in the British Museum; and he tells very well the story of the Riccordi-Fioravanti faked Etruscan warriors in the Met, from the first purchase of the Old Warrior in 1915, through Gisela Richter's publication of *Etruscan terracotta warriors in the Metropolitan Museum of Art* (1937), to Fioravanti's confession to the American Consul in Rome on 5 January 1961. He concludes his chapter on 'The Hoax that Fooled the Met' with these words: 'On Valentine's Day 1961 New Yorkers (and others around the world) picked up their morning papers and learned that the Metropolitan's astounding warriors were fabulous frauds.' He does not shed a tear, as we always do, when we think of the Etruscan warriors or the Greek horse that J. V. Noble exposed (*Antiquity*, 1970, 171).

Rieth's *Archaeological fakes* is a translation from his original book in German, *Vorzeit Gefälscht* (Tubingen, 1967). It has been badly translated and there are careless misprints: MacErny for MacEnery, Weinert for Weiner, Roussignac and Roussgnac for Rouffignac, Marcelle Boule for Marcellin Boule, for example. But the cogency and authority of the text transcends these minor infelicities. Rieth is very good on fakes of Palaeolithic, Neolithic, Bronze and Early Iron Age times and provides the best treatment of these forgeries yet available. He is rash and unconvincing in saying that the Piltdown evidence 'all points to Dawson as the only person who could have executed a deception of this kind in all its aspects'. He is completely misguided in saying that the Rouffignac paintings are authentic on stylistic grounds, by chemical analysis and because the name 'Barry' was written alongside two of the mammoths. The authenticity of Rouffignac and the total complicity of Dawson in the Piltdown forgery remain unproved.

He is very good and fair on Glozel and reminds us of the Bautzen box, dug up in 1941 and decorated by a schoolboy with symbols taken from runes shown to him at school: these were the symbols published by Dr Morlet in the *Mercur de France* in 1927 (and still illustrated by him in 1955) as dating from the Late Bronze Age and helping to prove the authenticity of Emile Fradin's forgeries! And he is equally fair on the Bausch-faked cremation-graves of Witterau, restricting himself to the acid comment that Gustav Wolf never thought 'he was being deceived by his old worker, even though he once caught him dyeing neolithic beads with ink!' He gives us a brief account of what he describes as 'the clumsy fakes of Palaeolithic art' made by Esch at Albersdorf in 1966 of which Herbert Kuhn wrote, with immoderation, 'These finds by Max Esch are like those of Galileo Galilei . . . Archaeology has made a new start . . . these are the most extraordinary things man has ever set eyes on. I realize that from now on everything so far published on the art of early man, even my own writing, is wrong.'

ANTIQUITY

We weep for those who emerge out of these two books humbugged, tricked, cheated: Boucher de Perthes, Salomon Reinach, Dr Morlet, Smith Woodward (and many another), Gisela Richter, Herbert Kühn to mention a few, and we weep for ourselves who, but for the grace of God, might be among them and who by the luck of the Devil may join their illustrious company in years to come. Is this a Haçılar pot I see before me?

To what extent is the study of fakes in archaeology important and relevant? In his *Les faux dans la peinture et l'expertise scientifique* (Monaco, 1965), Robert Aries declared that the world art market had reached an annual volume of £300 million and claimed that the sum of £30 million had been realized from the sale of fake art. Jeppson thinks this figure too high and that a more accurate estimate would be one per cent. In archaeology the figure is surely well below this: but even so it is worth bothering about.

It has been suggested, perhaps cynically, that fakes can be more interesting than originals. Bevis Hillier (*The Times*, 24 June 1972) says:

It has long been obvious that most people are far more interested in a good fake than in the real thing. Nothing captures the headlines so easily as a big museum hoodwinked by a spurious Greek bronze horse: it is akin to the alleged pleasure of seeing a bowler-hatted businessman slip on a banana If someone could prove that the Tutankhamun treasures at the British Museum were an elaborate hoax, the queues would stretch to Islington.

We recollect that hardly anyone went to see the Tiara of Saitaphernes when it was first displayed in the Louvre as an authentic antiquity: the crowds came when it was suspect and then declared to be a fake; and that Phineas Barnum offered to buy the Tiara for the 200,000 francs the French Government had paid for it only if he was given a special certificate saying it was *the genuine fake!*

There have been references in the Press and in Parliament to the reorganization of the aspects of the Department of the Environment which deal with ancient monuments and

historic buildings, and the Chief Inspector, A. J. Taylor, has kindly supplied us with this account of what is happening:

The absorption of the former Ministries of Public Building and Works and Housing and Local Government in the new Department of the Environment has enabled the staffs involved on the one hand with ancient monuments work and on the other with work on urban conservation and historic buildings to be drawn more closely together.

To give administrative effect to this process, a new Directorate of Ancient Monuments and Historic Buildings was brought into being on 1 April 1972, with responsibility for the whole of the Department's functions under the Ancient Monuments Acts and the Historic Buildings sections of the Town and Country Planning Acts, together with its services in connection with royal parks and palaces, the Houses of Parliament and museums and galleries. The Directorate is responsible to the Secretary of State for the Environment through the Minister for Housing and Construction.

On the professional side there will be a closer association between the Inspectors of Ancient Monuments and Investigators of Historic Buildings all of whom will henceforward be responsible to the Chief Inspector of Ancient Monuments and Historic Buildings. An early result of this integration will, it is hoped, be a rationalization of the categories of monument qualifying for protection by 'scheduling' or 'listing' as the case may be and the avoidance of unnecessary overlap in operating the two codes. This and a number of other topics where opportunities for improved working arrangements suggest themselves are under active review.

The account of excavations undertaken under the auspices of the Department of the Environment in 1971 makes interesting reading. Eighty-one archaeological sites threatened by destruction in Great Britain were directly investigated by the Department in that year and the Department made, in addition, 71 grants to local or county excavation committees, museums and extra-mural departments towards the cost of similar emergency excavations. Details of these and other investigations are contained in the annual report *Archaeological*

EDITORIAL

Excavations 1971 published in June by Her Majesty's Stationery Office (94 pp., 4 pls. 65p). Among the most interesting sites described in this report are Baker's Hole, Kent, the horned long barrow at Dalladies in Kincardineshire with its rectangular timber-built mortuary structure originally roofed by sheets of birch bark, and the rich Early Iron Age chariot burial at Garton Slack, Yorkshire (see *Antiquity*, 1971, 289). At Dover, excavation on the line of a new road uncovered a fort associated with the Roman Fleet, which was singularly well preserved, with walls standing from one to three metres high. The level of the new road has been raised so that much of the fort will remain intact.

The Department of the Environment is raising by £100,000 its total allocation for archaeological rescue work to over £300,000 a year. This will, among other things, enable expenditure on surveys and excavations of potentially important sites in advance of motorway and highway construction to be doubled from £25,000 to £50,000.

Meanwhile *Rescue: A Trust for British Archaeology* continues its energetic activities; and those who wish to help it should write to *The Honorary Treasurer, V. C. Carter, Esq., Manager, National Westminster Bank, 3 The Cross, Worcester, England* (minimum subscription £1.00). *Rescue* now announces a series of £500 scholarships in field archaeology. As the closing date for 1972-3 is 31 July and the details are fairly lengthy, time and space preclude us from reprinting them here. They can however be obtained for next year's application (by 31 July 1973) from *The Secretary, Rescue, 25A The Tything, Worcester*. The scholarships will be named after the principal sponsors and donors, e.g. the Shell/Gulbenkian/J. Bloggs Scholarship in Rescue Archaeology, 1972. The admirable purpose of this initiative is to bridge the gap between the increasing number of non-university full-time archaeological posts now being created and the availability of people properly qualified to fill them in rather more than just academic terms. It is hoped thereby to enhance the quality of archaeological work as a public service.

Until quite recently archaeologists have seemed wary of using mechanized methods of information retrieval, but now there is a perceptible movement in this direction and several individuals are devising systems to deal with specific problems. Some are using 'optical coincidence' cards while others are compiling data banks for computer use. One problem being tackled is the collection, recording and processing of field-survey information for areas of county size; another is the collection of published and unpublished data for given categories of archaeological material; yet another, though on a much larger scale, is the Museums Association's multi-disciplinary project for storing and retrieving information on museum collections. Indeed, we wonder how many people are working in this field within Great Britain and Ireland? Is the time ripe for a research seminar for the interchange of ideas and experience?

Miss Cherry Lavell, Assistant Secretary of the Council for British Archaeology, tells us that she is willing, but only in the early stages, to act as post office so that the depth and spread of interest may be gauged and plans laid to keep various workers in touch. She believes herself that the time is ripe for a research seminar, if not a regular news-letter, and has drawn our attention to the German publication *Archäographie* which treats all aspects of the archaeological use of computers. It is published by Verlag Bruno Hessling in Berlin. Volume 1 appeared in 1969 and volume 2 in 1971.

Professor Dr Walter Krämer has felt, on translation from Frankfurt to Berlin, that he should resign as Advisory Editor to *ANTIQUITY* and, while appreciating his help and encouragement during the years since the death of Gerhard Bersu, we regretfully accept his decision and wish him well in Berlin. We are happy that Professor Dr Otto-Herman Frey, Head of the Seminar für vor-und Frühgeschichte of the University of Hamburg, has agreed to succeed Walter Krämer as our German Adviser. We much value *ANTIQUITY*'s connexion with German archaeology and

ANTIQUITY

remember the close and friendly help which Gerhard Bersu gave to Crawford, and to the present Editor in the years since his death.

Mrs Elsie Clifford has, at the age of 86, retired from being a Trustee of ANTIQUITY and her place has been taken by Dr A. C. Renfrew, Professor-Elect of Archaeology at Southampton. It is not, we can assure everyone, decay and decline that have made Mrs Clifford resign, but her feeling that it was 'appropriate in the fullness and fitness of time'. She was very well when we last sat on a Cotswold barrow together recently, and long may this be so. Meanwhile we welcome Dr Renfrew, but will *The New Diffusionist?* (*Antiquity*, 1972, 96).

☞ We publish in this number (p. 218) a report by Dr John Alexander on the 1971 Belgrade Congress which was admittedly very badly attended by archaeologists from Great Britain. (The writer of these words had every intention of attending were it not that he was packing his bags and sailing to America to teach at Harvard for a term at the moment the Congress was happening. Nothing, save death or decay, will prevent his attendance at Nice in 1976.) Meanwhile Dr Alexander, whose report was at first called 'The Writing on the Walls of Belgrade', concluded his report with seven propositions which we print here:

1. That the European Continental Conference be separated from the World Congress; perhaps the Union could hold them alternately at five year intervals.
2. That the World Congress be held outside Europe at crossroads like Cairo, where communication between the continents is easiest.
3. That the papers accepted at meetings of the World Congress be such that there is a balance between the different continents.
4. That there be a greater emphasis on new methods and techniques of generally considering, as well as of locating, excavating and assessing, evidence.
5. That the 'General Reports' be commissioned and the programmes be arranged on grounds other than that of simple chronological or regional summaries. Perhaps particular kinds of evidence (such as that of the spread of iron-using or the utilization and domestication of

cattle or of tubers and rhizomes) could be included and discussed as world problems.

6. That some consideration be given to the wider implications of the study of the pre-history of humanity as a species and of the inter-continental problems involved.

7. That some discussion of the world-wide 'political' problems of archaeology, for example, the wholesale and increasing destruction of evidence, or the illicit traffic in objects, might be regularly undertaken. This would fit well with the Union's representative position as the only archaeological member of the International Council (Philosophy and History) of UNESCO.

Before we comment on these interesting and important proposals, we invite comments from our readers, and we hope that in framing their remarks and criticisms, they will bear in mind the excellent account given by Professor Sigfried J. De Laet at the end of the *Actes du VII-ième Congrès Internationale des Sciences Préhistoriques et Protohistoriques: Prague 21-27 août 1966* (published in Prague in 1971). It forms pp. 1423-39 of Volume II of the *Actes* and is entitled 'Un Siècle de Collaboration Internationale dans le Domaine des Sciences Préhistoriques et Protohistoriques: du Congrès de Neuchâtel (août 1866) au Congrès de Prague (août 1966)'. De Laet ends his article with the sentence 'Et maintenant, en avant, pour un nouveau siècle.' This is precisely the point of Alexander's questions and proposals: what sort of international co-operation in archaeology by congress and conference do we want, and can we achieve in the 'nouveau siècle'? We ourselves do not believe that the monster gatherings of Hamburg, Rome and Belgrade are the best way of achieving our ends, though they can be jolly reunions of old friends (and not so jolly reunions of old enemies).

☞ The second number of *Archaeology Abroad* was published in May 1972. We hope as many institutions and individuals as possible are subscribing to it: all enquiries should be addressed to *The Secretary, Archaeology Abroad Service, 31-34 Gordon Square, London, W.C.1.* It carries, as well as details of excavations, news of a scheme worked out with Lloyds Underwriters to provide, at economical pre-

EDITORIAL

miums for archaeologists abroad, insurance against accident, medical expenses, repatriation and loss of baggage. Under this scheme coverage for £1000 for accident, £500 for medical expenses and £300 baggage for one month in Europe would cost £4.65 and for other countries £5.65. We are told that if this insurance is widely used by archaeologists abroad, the costs of the scheme may well be reduced. We warmly recommend all archaeologists working abroad to make use of the service. Details from the *Secretary, Archaeology Abroad Service*.

The highly inventive Mexican Aztecs knew about wheels which they used as children's toys, but forbade their use on the roads, lest they should assist a surprise attack on the capital. And the medieval Pyramids not far from Mexico City, have been cut so exactly that this can have been done only by the use of laser rays—but this secret was withheld from the Spanish conquerors and took five centuries to rediscover.

Two bizarre items from our department of folly and nonsense: first the poet and author Robert Graves (whose *The White Goddess*, published in 1948, had more folly and nonsense crowded between two covers than one would have thought possible). In an article on 'Science, technology and poetry' (*New Scientist*, December 1971) he says:

Graves gives no sources for these strange statements and our American Advisory Editors say this is understandable: he is not quoting facts. (Wasn't *Poetic Unreason* an early work of his?)

Secondly a novel called *Stonehenge* by Leon Storer and Harry Harrison (*London*:

Peter Davies, 1972. 251 pp. £2.10). Storer is Associate Professor of Linguistics and Anthropology at the Illinois Institute of Technology; Harrison is a novelist, short-story writer, lecturer and broadcaster. Their novel begins in 1473 BC when, we are told, Atlantis and Mycenae were at war. Ason, son of the Mycenaean king, escapes from prison in Atlantis, during an earthquake, with the help of Inteb, an Egyptian architect, sails westward, lands in the Isles of Scilly, crosses to the mainland ruled by the Yerni (Wessex chieftains), defeats them, and to consolidate the new unity builds 'a colossal parliamentary centre, with five triliths for the chiefs and a sarsen ring for the warriors'. The publishers declare that this book is 'based on meticulous research' and 'casts a brilliant if controversial light on life in Celtic Britain'. The authors themselves, in an 'Afterword', say, 'Stonehenge was built in 1470 BC by our reckoning . . . This date is fixed by a dagger carving on the inner face of stone No. 53, a type of dagger that also occurs in the Shaft Graves of Mycenae.'

It is a pity that their meticulous researches did not include any knowledge of C14 dating and that though they list R. J. C. Atkinson's *Stonehenge* in their bibliography they either have not read it or regard it as fiction like their own book. 'We sincerely believe that this may mark a new departure in the writing of historical novels', they say; 'we dare to hope that our novel will be cited in academic discussions on the subject.' What a hope! In *The Times* Diary for 8 April 1972 Harrison is quoted as saying 'our book is fact—the most popular and modern way of presenting facts'. The heading of the Diary paragraph is, wittily and appropriately, 'Unhenge'. Enough said.

A Numismatic Index to American Journal of Archaeology and Hesperia 1885–1932–1970

By J. R. Jones, *University of Western Australia*

Heffer/Cambridge, £2