



See p. 50]

STONEHENGE: work in progress 1958.

Antiquity

VOL. XXXIII No. 129

MARCH 1959

Editorial

IT is a year since we mourned the death of O. G. S. Crawford in the pages of *ANTIQUITY* for March, 1958, and announced a new Editor and Board of Advisory Editors. It has been an anxious, exacting, and exciting year, and we are grateful to contributors and subscribers who have borne patiently with the problems of editorial change, and to the Advisory Editors, Publishers and Printers for their constant advice and help. Throughout 1958 there has been the nagging doubt as to whether *ANTIQUITY*, a brilliant and essentially personal conception in the twenties, and a wonderful vehicle for the popularization of archaeology in the years before the 1939–45 war, still had a place in these days of glossy magazines, easy archaeological listening and viewing programmes, and of new specialist journals like, for example, *Medieval Archaeology*, the first number of which we comment on below. Would the man who said when he heard of Crawford's death, 'That is also the death of *ANTIQUITY*', be proved right?

Fortunately, he was wrong, and the year 1958 has ended with over a hundred more subscribers than it began. We have printed a volume of 296 pages, longer by 40 pages than any volume since the dark days of 1943 when *ANTIQUITY* was down to 224 pages. But we can only continue in this way if we are assured of continued new support. If every subscriber would, over the next two years, produce one other, then we could give an immeasurably increased service in the publication of original articles, notes, news and reviews. It should not be forgotten that *ANTIQUITY* is the only journal in the world devoted to the past of man which is independent and all-embracing. It is the organ of no State Institute or archaeological society; it is self-supporting and succeeds by the interest and inspiration of its readers. We hope that this first number of Volume XXXIII with articles ranging from Baluchistan, through Jericho and Troy to Sardinia, the British Isles and the New World will satisfy that interest.

Of the growing and wide interest in man and his remote past there can be today no doubt. Nowhere is this so easily measured as in the growth of archaeological interest in the British universities and university colleges. Recently, in Leicester and Sheffield, meetings of archaeological societies were so well attended that there was only standing room. The Oxford University Archaeological Society has just organized an exhibition of the work of its members, and the items listed in the catalogue show the energy and wide range of interests of the members of that active Society—excavations at Madmarston Early Iron Age camp near Banbury, the discovery of a new Roman marching camp in Brecknockshire, the digging of a Gallery Grave at Cognac, participation in excavations on Iona and at Kaupang in Norway, the study of Roman coins and Mesolithic flint implements. At Cambridge, for the first time since the Anthropology Tripos was founded in 1915, the number of students reading archaeology and anthropology is over 100, with 20 research students.

ANTIQUITY

The year 1927, when ANTIQUITY was founded, saw the establishment of the first two chairs in British universities of what might be called non-classical archaeology. Twenty years before, in the first of his Ford lectures at Oxford, Haverfield stressed the gulf that separated archaeology from the academic world and declared that the greatest of our archaeologists had had nothing to do with universities. Oxford had discussed the establishment of a Chair of Archaeology in the eighties and Arthur Evans was strongly advised to stand. He refused to do so, writing to Freeman 'the Electors, including Jowett and Newton, . . . regard "archaeology" as ending with the Christian Era. . . to confine a Professorship of Archaeology to classical times seems to me as reasonable as to create a Chair of "Insular Geography" or "Mesozoic Geology"'. The Disney Chair of Archaeology in Cambridge had been founded in 1851—the very year in which the word prehistory was first used in Daniel Wilson's *The Archaeology and Prehistoric Annals of Scotland*: the Disney Professor was required to deliver at least six lectures 'on the subject of Classical Mediaeval and other Antiquities, the Fine Arts and all matters and things connected therewith'. In 1927 the function of the Disney Professor changed; he was assigned to the Faculty of Archaeology and Anthropology and was told it was his duty 'to give instruction and to promote the progress of archaeological studies within that Faculty'. In the same year Gordon Childe was elected the first holder of the Abercromby Chair of Prehistoric Archaeology in Edinburgh. The year 1927 may therefore fittingly be remembered as a landmark in the history of the study of non-classical antiquity in our universities.

In the three decades since then many new professorships, readerships and lecturerships have been created. This academic year has seen R. J. C. Atkinson become the first Professor of Archaeology at University College, Cardiff, and J. M. Cook (formerly Reader) become the first Professor of Classical Archaeology at Bristol. As far as one can make out from the indexes of Calendars and Handbooks—and we welcome corrections in this matter—of all our universities there now seem to be no posts in archaeology only at Hull, Sheffield, Southampton, Reading, Aberdeen, Glasgow and St Andrews. To these should be added the university colleges at Aberystwyth, Bangor and Swansea, and the University College of N. Staffordshire, where, even in the first year Foundation Course, human history begins in the 6th century B.C.

Yet, if there is growing agreement on the need for the teaching of archaeology in our universities, either independently, or in close association with Ancient History, the Classics, Fine Arts or Anthropology—there seems to be no general agreement how it should be taught. In some universities (as for example Cambridge, Edinburgh, Birmingham, and Wales) archaeology can lead to an Honours degree (of course in association with other subjects); elsewhere it is part of a General degree or leads to a Diploma. In his inaugural lecture as Professor of Roman-British History and Archaeology in the Durham Colleges, Eric Birley said: 'Archaeology, by its very nature, cannot well be treated as a full and free-standing academic subject in its own right'; and W. F. Grimes, who chose as the subject of his inaugural lecture as Professor of Archaeology and Director of the Institute of Archaeology in the University of London, 'Archaeology and the University', said: 'I am by no means the first archaeologist to make the point that archaeology is not so much a "subject" in itself as a method: or an aggregation of methods. It is a method of augmenting history; and its purpose is history.' (*Annual Report of the Institute of Archaeology, London, 1955-6, 40*).

Here is the crux of the matter. The very nature of archaeology is that we sometimes mean by it method and technique, sometimes history. There is the study of the aggregation of methods whereby history is wrested from the material, mute remains of the

EDITORIAL

past; and there is the study of the history which has been achieved from the material. The achievement is, from the point of view of historiography, on two levels: before 5,000 B.C. all our sources are archaeological—we are in what Herzfeld called *absolute prehistory* and Hawkes in his *Cognitional System of Nomenclature*, *antehistory*; after that moment, in varying degrees we are in a state where the past is illuminated by material and written remains, in a time which by modern English usage would be called protohistory and which merges into the ancient history of the founders of civilization. There is then to be considered, ideally and notionally, the *student of archaeology*, and the *student of antiquity* whether he be an absolute prehistorian, or a protohistorian (or ancient historian). In practice these two students cannot, of course, be divorced, but unless we realize that this difference exists we are not in a position to think clearly about how the study of man's early past should fit into our university education.

It seems to us that British Universities should provide teaching both in the methods of archaeology, and in the study of antiquity. It may be that the first can best be done by Diplomas, and the Institute of Archaeology in London, with its magnificent new home in Gordon Square, is admirably equipped to provide instruction in a one-year Diploma of Technical Archaeology. Such instruction can also be combined with the study of antiquity as part of a university course, and it would be as unthinkable to train graduates in the study of antiquity without training in the methods of archaeology as to train mediaeval historians who did not understand palaeography and diplomatic. By now the study of antiquity is something which, in our view, has as much right to a place in university General and Honours degrees as those other branches of human history which deal with Ancient History, Medieval History and Modern History. And, like them, it has no right to constitute a degree alone, but as part of one in collaboration with other disciplines such as, for example, Anthropology, Ancient History, Human Geography.

Archaeology has by many been claimed to be a science, while the study of antiquity is declared by most to be a part of History. Professor Grimes, in the inaugural lecture from which we have already quoted, says 'archaeology occupies . . . a sort of no-man's land between the sciences and the arts', and thinks that this is 'somewhat uncomfortable'. But it is not uncomfortable; this is the no-man's land which the human sciences must conquer. This is their field, gradually being explored by anthropologists, human geographers, archaeologists, and, when British universities will recognize them, sociologists. For too long, in schools, at universities, at educational conferences, at political meetings and in the press, there has been talk of the divide—the Great Divide between the sciences and the humanities. On analysis this divide is between specialization in the natural sciences on the one hand, and the study of Plato and English constitutional history on the other. It is a function of established British 19th-century education, and its perpetuation is naturally encouraged by that establishment. Of course, chromosomes and Cicero appear at VIth form and university scholarship level to be mutually unintelligible, and separated by an unbridgeable divide. But the divide is something we are taught to recognize, and the no-man's land is a country of imagination we then assume to exist.

We, in the middle of the 20th century, can break down this divide, can reconquer this artificial no-man's land by making science historical and history scientific. The human sciences are here to bridge that gap; the true student of antiquity will range from Carbon 14 dating, clay varves and archaeomagnetism to the analysis of culture change, the description of the development of ancient civilizations, and the study of early art and architecture. The man who is brought up in the university to read and understand this and the last two numbers of *ANTIQUITY*, for example, has bridged the divide, and is conquering the no-man's land.

ANTIQUITY

Let us be bold enough here to make a prophecy (with which we know only too well some of our Advisory Editors will disagree). It is fifty years since Haverfield recorded the lack of interest in archaeology in our universities, and thirty since the Abercromby Chair was founded and the Disney Chair redefined. We think that in between thirty and fifty years from now, most British universities will have Honours schools of antiquity in which students may devote themselves to the early past of man in association with a study of ancient history, anthropology, geography, the techniques of archaeology or other subjects.

Professor H. M. Chadwick once called what is now the Anglo-Saxon Tripos in Cambridge (but is still enshrined in the hearts of most students of antiquity as 'Section B'), 'the Classics of the North'. He realized that the study of what Freeman called, in criticizing the *Greats* tradition, the study of 'the Europe of a favoured period and a very limited area', was not the total study of antiquity. Sir Edward Burnett Tylor in 1871 in his *Primitive Culture* wrote happily 'the history and prehistory of man take their proper place in the general scheme of knowledge'. Tylor and Chadwick were far-sighted visionaries and scholars of unusual breadth and tolerance; so were the other founders of anthropology and antiquity as university disciplines—Haddon, Ridgeway, Frazer, Myres, Balfour, Marett. By 1971 we may well find that the history and prehistory of man have taken their proper places in the general schemes of university knowledge—even in the Foundation Course at Stoke.

* * *

MEDIEVAL ARCHAEOLOGY

Welcome to the first issue (Vol. I, 1957) of *Medieval Archaeology; the Journal of the Society for Medieval Archaeology*. We have already (ANTIQUITY, 1958, 126) referred to the foundation of this Society. The first issue of the journal (Vol. II is already in the press), lives up to the hopes engendered by the Society. It is well produced and, in addition to reviews and a survey of medieval Britain in 1956 by David Wilson and John Hurst, has eight articles, including C. A. Ralegh Radford on 'The Saxon House', Rosemary Cramp on 'Beowulf and Archaeology', and Juston Schove and A. W. G. Lowther on 'Tree-rings and Medieval Archaeology'. The subscription to the Society and the journal is £2 2s. a year (*bona fide* students under twenty-five £1 1s.). Addresses: *Secretary, c/o Society for Medieval Archaeology, The British Museum, London, W.C.1*; and the *Editor: Dr D. B. Harden, The London Museum, London, W.8*.

* * *

EXPEDITION

The first number of *Expedition* was published in the autumn of 1958. It is a revised form of the *Bulletin of the University Museum of the University of Pennsylvania*, whose Director, Dr Froelich Rainey, is well known to readers of ANTIQUITY. The Editor of *Expedition* is Geraldine Bruckner, and the Editorial Board consists of Alfred Kidder II (Chairman), Carleton S. Coon, Loren C. Eiseley, Samuel N. Kramer, and George F. Tyler, Jr. The first issue contains articles by Rodney Young on 'The Gordion Tomb', Marianne Stoller on 'Te-Moana-Nui-O-Kiwa', and Edwin Shook on 'The Temple of the Red Stela'. Not surprising in a journal published by the Museum which invented the American prototype of *Animal, Vegetable, Mineral?* there is a picture quiz called 'How is your Museum I.Q.'. *Expedition* will be issued quarterly; annual subscription \$2 a year. Address: *The University Museum of the University of Pennsylvania, 33rd and Spruce Streets, Philadelphia 4*.