

Antiquity

VOL. LI No. 202

JULY 1977

Editorial

On 24 March of this year the rooms of the Society of Antiquaries of London were filled to capacity to hear a lecture on Mycenae by Professor Dr Jacovides, until recently Director of Archaeology in Greece, and now a Professor in Marburg. It was a centenary occasion and the President, Arnold Taylor, rose splendidly to that occasion by first asking for the minutes of the meeting of the Society of 22 March 1877 to be read. The Society has kindly allowed us to quote from them.

After the usual preliminaries—and those admitted on that famous evening included Lord Acton, Lord Houghton and the Earl of Aberdeen—"The Secretary stated that after eight days and nights of uninterrupted travelling Dr Schliemann had that morning arrived from Athens and would now proceed to lay before the Society an account of his excavations at Mycenae.

'Dr Schliemann, who was greeted with the warmest applause from a crowded meeting, then read a paper on Mycenae which was illustrated by his exhibition of about 50 out of 400 photographs of objects excavated by him and by him presented to the Greek Government. At the conclusion of his paper, after some remarks by Lord Houghton and the Secretary, Mr Gladstone addressed the meeting and dwelt especially on the value of the discoveries at Troy and at Mycenae as illustrating the transition from earlier and grosser times to the anthropomorphic tendencies which characterised the Greek mind.'

In his new book, *Memoirs of Heinrich Schliemann* (New York: Harper and Row, 1977. 304 pp. £16.85), Leo Deuel, who has already given us four of the best examples of archaeological vulgarization (namely *The treasures of time*, *Testaments of time*, *Conquistadores without swords*, and *Flights into yesterday*), describes the visit of the great man to London:

Here he met with his friends and advisers, consulted with his publisher John Murray, and had dinner

with Gladstone, who was so captivated by a photograph of Sophia and Andromache, which Schliemann had proudly shown him, that he purloined it. This time Schliemann was even more fêted in England than the previous year. He wrote, 'The Londoners overwhelm me with courtesies. Ten societies have asked for lectures. I have only taken on three. . . I continue to be the lion of the season, I receive invitations from lords and dukes every day.'

It is a pity that Schliemann never wrote an autobiography; the personal introductory chapter to *Ilios: the city and country of the Trojans* (London, 1880; New York, 1881) was something: he was 60 when he wrote it. What a pity he could not have remembered for himself, and for us, his life in 1890 before he died so tragically, alone in Naples.

¶ We feel it is time that the second *affaire Glozel* should disappear from the pages of ANTIQUITY as the first *affaire* did after a few years in the twenties. And this for three reasons. The first is that the TL dates give us less and less assurance that they are a primary and reliable chronological document. We think there is some unexplained factor at Glozel. We were not at the Archaeometry conference this spring in Philadelphia. There was a Glozel session, and a correspondent writes:

Glozel at Philadelphia was in a fairly low key and confined to reporting ten dates which grouped fairly convincingly around 100 BC (falling within the range 350 BC to AD 250), one at AD 900, one at AD 1100 and one at AD 1750. The last is the tablet in which there was vitrification over the lettering.

The second reason is the work of Dr T. D. Crawford who is a Lecturer in Linguistics at University College, Cardiff. Dr Crawford wrote to us in November last year:

I became interested in the Glozel material some four years ago, before there was any question of its being

ANTIQUITY

genuine. I was planning to do some research on the way that the structure of natural languages of different families shows through a syllabic form of script and I acquired the *Corpus des Inscriptions* as a 'control' set of data because I assumed that there would be no natural language represented in it.

We wrote to Dr Crawford in January of this year as follows:

I wonder how you are getting on with your linguistic examination of the Glozel material? Isserlin sent me a copy of his paper published in France but it was the same paper that he had submitted to ANTIQUITY and I had turned down because it merely said what languages and scripts might have been available if Glozel was authentic, and this of course we knew before. I think that if you read through all the material—and it is very extensive—you will see that the high probability is that the Glozel inscriptions were forged in the twenties of this century. We may, of course, all be quite wrong about this, and if your statistical analysis of the material tells us that the whole thing could really be a possible genuine language then we would all have to think again. If, on the other hand, your researches show that the material is not a language at all, then those of us who believe that the whole thing was an impudent forgery between 1925 and 1927 would be helped in our ideas. Do let us please keep in touch. I have failed to get any replies to the last few letters I have written to McKerrell.

Dr Crawford kept in touch and sent us a copy of his paper 'The inscribed tablets from Glozel' which we hope will be published in the near future in some specialist journal: it is too detailed and specialized for ANTIQUITY. But Dr Crawford has kindly allowed us to quote the summary of his paper. He says that the Glozel inscriptions contain at least 133 signs of which 34 occur only once, which is of the greatest interest and significance. He says, 'One can safely rule out the possibility that the script is alphabetic, since the signs are far too numerous.' These are his conclusions:

The corpus examined does not exhibit the characteristics to be expected of texts in a natural language and linguistic methods are therefore not appropriate to the determination of the genuineness of the material. It is for representatives of other disciplines to assess the possibility of a non-linguistic function for the tablets as opposed to that of their recent fabrication. Certainly in this respect it is unlikely to be attained except by further study of the technique of thermoluminescence dating and by the

re-opening, under properly qualified direction, of the excavations at Glozel.

Dr Crawford's linguistic findings are fascinating and convincing. The writings at Glozel are not then in any natural language. They are in the very unnatural language invented by Morlet and Fradin to deceive us.

The third reason is a letter from Dr Baumgartel which she wrote to us two years ago, before her death, and which we now feel it is appropriate to publish:

Who would have thought that after so many years the ghost of Glozel would wander again?

I happened to be in Paris in the summer of 1927, just after Dorothy Garrod had given her verdict on the fakes of Glozel. I had been accepted by the late Professor Breuil at the Institut of Paléontologie Humaine to study flints under him for which I have always had a special interest. The etiquette of the Institut demanded that I had to visit the director of the Institut, the late Professor Boule first, before contacting Professor Breuil. Boule had his study in a house in the Jardin des Plantes. There I went, and after paying my respects Boule turned and showed me the Glozel finds. He then took a pin and lifted from one of the lines of an engraved bone a thin film. All at once the scratch stood out white from the yellow colour of the old bone.

That the thermoluminescence dating gave such an odd result only goes to show how careful one has to be when dealing with the latest help provided by our science colleagues. Few archaeologists will be able to understand the process by which they have been evolved, and we have to accept them on trust, though I too hope that one day they will give us the longed-for tool to date the far distant periods. Thermoluminescence is the latest of these methods, and, I think, just as with C14 we shall have to wait a little until all possible sources of error have been detected before we accept its result as unquestionable.

We do not propose to darken the pages of ANTIQUITY any more with Glozeliana: but we leave with our readers this tale. At a conference at Saint-Germain—and we have this from three sources—Henri Hubert asked Salomon Reinach why, if he thought Glozel was so important, he had not insisted on some examples of the finds being in a special exhibition in the Musée des Antiquités Nationales? Reinach flew into a rage and said 'Not while I am Director of this Museum!' How right he was: he must have realized, in his old age, how he had been fooled

EDITORIAL

by Morlet and Co., and it may be this realization, admitted only to himself, that is responsible for the Bouzonville flagons being in the British Museum and not, where of course they should be, in Paris. And perhaps the memory of the Tiara of Saitaphernes haunted him all down the years.

No, there is one simple answer to those who go on asking our views about Piltdown and Glozel, and the answer is Bunga-bunga. This phrase may need some explanation to some of our readers. In 1910 a party of six people led by that arch-hoaxer Horace de Vere Cole (who had already hoaxed the Town and University of Cambridge by a bogus visit of the Sultan of Zanzibar's uncle) inspected *HMS Dreadnought*, flagship of the Home Fleet, then anchored at Weymouth. The party consisted of Cole and Adrian Stephen, his sister Virginia (later to be Virginia Woolf), Guy Ridley, the artist Duncan Grant, and Anthony Buxton, naturalist and author. They were supposed to represent the Ethiopian Emperor and his entourage. They were received by the Commander-in-Chief, the Home Fleet, Admiral Sir William May. It was perhaps one of the greatest hoaxes of all time. Cole had armed himself with a Swahili grammar under the mistaken impression that it was Swahili and not Amharic that was spoken in Abyssinia. Buxton was the Emperor, Cole was the Foreign Office official escorting the party; the others were supporting princes except Adrian Stephen who was, oddly enough, a German interpreter called Hauffman travelling round Europe with the Ethiopian party.

Let us tell the rest of the story in the words of Norman Moss in his fascinating book *The pleasures of deception*:

Stephen was very unsure of his ability to speak either Swahili or plausible gibberish. He got out three words of what seemed like Swahili to him and then he had an inspiration. Drawing on his rigorous classical education, he spoke chunks of Virgil's *Aeneid* to them, mispronouncing it just enough so that it was not immediately recognizable as Latin. Later, when he ran out of Virgil, he spoke some Homer, bringing the same mispronunciation to the Greek. He added plausibility by using the same phrase for a repeated situation: as they had to duck through several doorways, one line from the *Aeneid* came to mean 'Mind your head, your Majesty'. The princes repeated back to him a few of his words. Virginia Woolf, who was Prince Mendex, was worried that her voice would mark her as a female, and, pleading a cold, said only in a

gruff tone, 'Chuck-a-choi, Chuck-a-choi.' But the others found a phrase to express their admiration and delight at the things they were shown: again and again they threw up their hands and exclaimed 'Bunga-bunga.' They Bunga-bungaed their way around the ship appreciatively. The officers smiled at their simple excitement at seeing an electric light.

The only full account of all this remarkable nonsense was published in a small book written by Adrian Stephen called *The Dreadnought hoax* (1936, from The Hogarth Press run by Leonard and Virginia Woolf). It is all very well summarized in Moss's book from which we have quoted. *The pleasures of deception* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1977, 208 pp. £4.95) was, appropriately enough, published on April Fool's Day of this year. It is brilliantly good and for the most part accurate, though it does not venture much into archaeology and art history: there is no mention of Glozel, although Piltdown is treated but not very accurately. If Glozel had been dealt with we feel that Moss would have agreed with us that the epitaph of that strange story, revived to confuse us and blind us with science in the seventies, would be 'Chuck-a-choi, Bunga-bunga.'

What emerges as new to us, from Moss's book, is that Professor R. V. Jones (whose scientific work for the Air Ministry during the last war in deceiving the Germans helped win the war in the air) had always been a practical joker: while at Oxford he was the originator of the celebrated hoax when a distinguished scientist was persuaded to lower his telephone into a bucket of water in the presence of Gerald Touch, later to become a leading British Government scientist.

Winston Churchill described his meeting with Jones in his history, *The Second World War*:

For twenty minutes or more he spoke in quiet tones, unrolling his chain of circumstantial evidence, the like of which for its convincing fascination was never surpassed by tales of Sherlock Holmes or Monsieur Lecoq. As I listened, the *Inglodsbys Legends* jingled in my mind:

But now one Mr Jones

Comes forth and depones

That, fifteen years hence, he had heard certain groans

On his way to Stone Henge to examine the stones.

Now we are all on the way to Stone Henge to examine the stones without the advantage of Mr Jones but in the sure knowledge that now and

ANTIQUITY

for a long time we may well hear certain groans. To start with the public is to be denied access to the centre of the monument. At a press conference in the Department of the Environment on 15 March, Lady Birk, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State in the Department, said that wear and tear on Stonehenge caused by the increasing numbers of visitors—now more than 700,000 a year—had reached a point where the Department must soon exclude visitors from inside the stone circle. This would give greater protection to the monument. Lady Birk said she believed visitors would gain a better view of the monument without people milling about within and around the stones. The gravel around the stones is to be removed and the whole central area re-turfed, which would certainly improve the appearance of the monument.

This is an immediate action. But what of the future? At the same press conference proposals for improving the setting of Stonehenge and increasing public enjoyment of the monument were discussed. Lady Birk said that the Department's long-term aim was to free the immediate surroundings of Stonehenge from modern intrusions, and to provide better car parking and facilities for visitors. It was agreed that a small working group representing the Department, the Wiltshire County Council, the Salisbury District Council, the National Trust, and South Wiltshire Museum should be set up to consider the long-term problem and possible solutions. It was agreed that any proposals would be put on public view before decisions were taken.

Meanwhile the School of Three-Dimensional Design of the Kingston Polytechnic, under its head, Dr Peter Lloyd Jones, has directed its attention to the problem of tourism and Stonehenge. We quote from the statement of their design proposal:

We . . . propose to enclose the surrounding area (about 1,400 acres) owned by the National Trust and designate this as a **STONEHENGE NATIONAL PREHISTORY DISCOVERY PARK**. Access to *all* sites of interest in the Park (the Cursus, the barrow cemeteries at Fargo Plantation, Seven Barrows, Wilsford and Winterbourne Stoke) will be encouraged by a network of 'discovery trackways' through the countryside. Picnic sites and Vantage Points are to be provided. A new museum is proposed to house the prehistory collections relevant to the area at present largely housed in Devizes and Salisbury. The museum will be located at Fargo Plantation. A new 'approach experience' is proposed in the form of a broad processional avenue from the museum/

reception complex at Fargo Plantation to a small secondary pavilion designed for rest, shelter and contemplation to be recessed into the hillside near the monument on the site of the present car-park. An ornamental staircase gives access from the terrace on which the pavilion stands to the plateau of Stonehenge. From here the visitor is confined to a new track constructed of modern materials—black rubber, terrazzo and bronze. This intersects the stones and provides areas for pausing and loitering for contemplation or photography. Apart from this surface, all the rest of the gravelled area is to be returned to grass.

Our proposals involve alteration to the present road network. The A344 from Amesbury to Shrewton will be closed (except for a short stretch used as access to the new reception complex) and all traffic diverted on to the A303 at Winterbourne Stoke from a new roundabout at Airmans Cross. All other access routes to the proposed Park would be closed. However there are at present plans to enlarge this road to a dual carriageway. This could happen in the early 1980s. We regard this as a disaster—a proposal that would irretrievably damage the environment of the monument area both by its massive visual intrusion and by constant traffic noise. A public campaign to ensure that the section through the proposed Park should be sunk below ground should begin now. If this were done the necessary crossing points for the trackway system could be built at the time of road construction.

We now quote a letter which appeared in *The Times* on Friday, 21 January, signed by Dame Sylvia Crowe, Lord Esher, Professor Stuart Piggott, and the Editor of ANTIQUITY:

We have read with interest the proposals for Stonehenge from the Department of the Environment and from the study of the team from the Kingston Polytechnic. . . . They both raise issues of great public concern, since they affect the preservation not only of one of the world's great archaeological treasures, but also of one of England's most famous landscapes.

The present state of affairs is profoundly unsatisfactory and undoubtedly action is urgent. However there is far too little information on the likely impact of the Department's proposals or of their presumed benefits to the public. Perhaps part of the problem lies in the fact that responsibility for Stonehenge and its setting is divided among many different agencies. There is no one body corresponding to the curator of a major museum with the position and powers needed for an appraisal of the range of issues involved.

Any future scheme must somehow reconcile the

EDITORIAL

competing claims of archaeological conservation, the quality of the landscape and the nature and significance of the experience of Stonehenge for large numbers of visitors. In order that judgements can be made on these important matters, it would surely be appropriate to ask for a public exhibition designed not to sell a particular solution but to explore and illuminate the extremely complex and sensitive problems of this unique national possession.

That letter will be six months old when these present words are read. Since then Lady Birk has held her conference and we are now assured that both in London and Salisbury there will be, probably in September of this year, exhibitions and models of various proposals. It is good to know that a unit in the Kingston Polytechnic took the whole problem so seriously. We have one major criticism of their scheme and that is the proposed new museum. The objects from Stonehenge and the surrounding barrows should, in our view, remain in the present museums at Devizes and Salisbury; what should happen at Stonehenge is something like the excellent small house set up at New Grange—part museum (with replicas), part instruction by photographs, plans and diagrams, and part sales shop for books, pictures and slides.

Both the existing museums in Devizes and Salisbury need our continued support and encouragement, not their destruction. The Devizes Museum sent out at the end of April an appeal: it was an appeal from the Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Society which aims to raise £12,000 to improve their Museum and Specialist Library and we commend it to our readers. Mr Bonar Sykes, the President of the Society, writes:

Our problem is somewhat unusual. We are one of the few surviving county societies still owning and administering a museum and library of international importance. There is a potential conflict between our scholarly and popular functions. In the past private support has been sufficient to sustain scholarship. Now private resources are dwindling at a time when greater reliance on public funds tends to mean that a higher priority should be given to the needs of the non-specialist public. We accept this change of emphasis. But, quite apart from the immediate aims of our appeal, we thus now have a longer term need to find additional sources of financial support to enable us to continue our traditional service to scholarly research and to higher education.

Anyone interested in helping the Wiltshire

Archaeological and Natural History Society—one of the greatest of our local societies—should write to Mr Bonar Sykes at *The Museum, 41 Long Street, Devizes, Wiltshire SN10 1NS*.

☞ The ever-increasing costs of printing and publishing which we, in common with other editors, must from time to time bring to the notice of readers, emphasize the vital importance of getting the best value for one's money. A well-intentioned but ill-considered plunge into print may waste cash long and painfully scraped together. And the result? An unlovely journal or report, badly designed or not designed at all, produced to the wrong page size on unsuitable paper, uncomfortable in its illustration, inconsistent in its references and abbreviations, with too many or too few copies printed (and little thought of how they are to be distributed), and more often than not underpriced, to the grave detriment of the publishing organization's funds. An over-gloomy chapter of accidents, perhaps: but all of us who publish have suffered most of them at one time or another. The very idea of publishing is so alluring that we can easily be led astray: but how to avoid these technical and costly pitfalls on the path to print?

Signposts for archaeological publication points the way. It is an admirable and most welcome booklet prepared by the Council for British Archaeology's Publications Committee under its energetic Chairman, Professor Vincent Megaw of the University of Leicester. Although subtitled 'A guide to good practice in the presentation and printing of archaeological periodicals and monographs', two dozen of its immensely helpful and well-ordered 36 pages could be studied with interest and profit by anyone printing or publishing anything less ephemeral than raffle tickets or bingo cards. Compiled from questionnaires completed by societies affiliated to the CBA, and from information contributed by experienced archaeologists, printers, publishers, and booksellers, *Signposts for archaeological publication* deserves the widest possible circulation. It costs only £1.50 including postage; orders to *The Secretary, The Council for British Archaeology, 7 Marylebone Road, London NW1 5HA*.

☞ UNESCO has done it again. We drew attention last year (*Antiquity*, 1976, 91) to the December 1975 issue of *The UNESCO Courier* which dealt

ANTIQUITY

with the Celts and said that everyone must buy it. Now we draw attention to the December 1976 issue of the same journal which is called *The Scythians: nomad goldsmiths of the open steppes*. It is as brilliant as *The Celts* and as beautifully illustrated, with articles by Piotrovsky, Domansky, Raevsky, Artemenko, Bidzilia, Mozolevsky, Otroshchenko, Zavitukhina, and Gryaznov. The eight pages in full colour of Scythian art are wonderful; they and all the 50 pages of text can be obtained for the ridiculous figure of 2.80 French francs: in Britain from HM Stationery Office and all Government Bookshops, and in the United States of America from *Unipub, Box 433, Murray Hill Station, New York, NY 10016*. Sandy

Koffler and his merry men and women in the Place de Fontenoy in Paris are doing a wonderful job.

☞ We apologize to Dr Jaroslav Malina for describing him as a woman (*Antiquity*, 1977, 4), and also to his wife, Madame Malinovka.

☞ The General Index to ANTIQUITY for the years 1927–51 was published in 1956. The Index for the years 1952–76 has now been prepared and will be published later this year. The first Index is still available price £5; the second index will, alas, be £10 or \$30 (cloth-bound) or £8 or \$24 (paper bound), both sums to include postage. Order your copies now. An order form is enclosed with this issue.

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, of interest to readers of ANTIQUITY. The listing of a book in this chronicle does not preclude its review in ANTIQUITY.

Excavations at Salona Yugoslavia by Christoph W. Clairmont. *Park Ridge, Nj: Noyes Press, 1975. 252 pp. (text), 64 pls. \$36.00 cloth.*

Archaeological sites of Britain by Peter Clayton. *London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1976. 239 pp., 178 figs. £4.50.*

Notes on the prehistoric metallurgy of copper and bronze in the Old World by H. H. Coghlan. Pitt Rivers Museum, University of Oxford. Occasional Papers on Technology, 4. 2nd edition. *Oxford: University Press, 1975. First published 1951, reprinted 1962. 158 pp., 16 pls., 36 figs. £3.00.*

The art of Palmyra by Malcolm A. B. Colledge. (Studies in Ancient Art and Archaeology series.) *London: Thames and Hudson, 1976. 320 pp., 150 pls., 62 figs. £16.00.*

The archaeology of early man by J. M. Coles and E. S. Higgs. *Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1975. First published by Faber in 1969. A Peregrine book. 455 pp., 183 figs. £3.00.*

Greek and Roman art in the British Museum by B. F. Cook. *London: The Trustees of the British Museum, 196 pp., coloured frontispiece, 150 figs. £4.95 cased, £2.75 paper.*

The plans and topography of medieval towns in England and Wales edited by M. W. Barley. CBA Research Report No. 14. *London: Council for British Archaeology, 1976. 98 pp., 45 figs. £4.50. Obtainable post free from CBA, 7, Marylebone Road, London NW1 5HA.*

Guide to Cretan antiquities by Costis Davaras. *Park Ridge, Nj: Noyes Press, 1976. 384 pp., 198 figs. \$18.00 cloth.*

Power adaptations and changing cultures by Thorne Deuel. *Springfield: Illinois State Museum, 1976. 114 pp., 4 figs., 4 tables. \$4.00 (plus 20c. sales tax for Illinois residents). Available from State Museum Society, Springfield, Ill. 62706.*

Die jüngere Trichterbecherkultur auf den danischen Inseln by Klaus Ebbesen. *Arkaeologiske Studier Volume III. Copenhagen: Institute of Prehistoric Archaeology, University of Copenhagen, 1975. 391 pp., 253 figs., 1 diagram in end pocket. No price.*

Collecting antiquities: an introductory guide by Charles Ede. *London: Dent, 1976. 160 pp., 373 pls., 1 fig., 4 maps. £9.50.*

Hala Sultan Tekke II. The Cape Kiti survey. An underwater archaeological survey by Olaf T. Engvig and Gaul Aström. *Studies in Mediterranean archaeology Vol. XLV: 2. Gothenburg: Åstrom, 1975. 24 pp., 49 figs. Swk200.*

The rape of the Nile. Tomb raiders, tourists and archaeologists in Egypt by Brian M. Fagan. *New York: Scribner, 1975. 413 pp., profusely illustrated. \$14.95.*

An illustrated encyclopaedia of mysticism and mystery religions by John Ferguson. *London: Thames and Hudson, 1976. 228 pp., many figs. £6.50.*

continued on p. 105