

Antiquity

VOL. XXXVII No. 148

DECEMBER 1963

Editorial

THE Greeks called the people peripheral to them, whose language they did not understand, 'barbaroi'—the stammerers, the people who couldn't or wouldn't speak Greek but who just went 'bar, bar'. Barbarians are described in the *Oxford English Dictionary* as foreigners, non-Hellenes, non-Romans, non-Christians, non-Italians or just rude, wild, uncivilized, uncultured persons. The *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, although it admits to Celts and Goths, has no entry under barbarians. One can see the editors going through their lists of entries in padded rooms overlooking that curiously named river the Isis and saying 'Barbarians, yes; but not in the milieu of classical scholarship.'

This year the barbarians came into their own. The VIIIth Classical Conference held in Paris from 1 to 7 September was entirely devoted to them: to the influence of Greek and Roman civilization on the non-urban peripheries of those remarkable urban civilizations. This did not amuse some died-in-the-wool classicists who attended the Paris Conference, but they were few. These days, a quarter of a century after Crawford's *Man and his Past* and Elliot Smith's *Human History*, it should not be necessary to elaborate that all history is one and that archaeology is a primary source of all history, its importance declining in direct proportion to the arrival of written sources. It ought not to be necessary in English, American, German and Scandinavian countries, to say the least, to have to drum home these home truths of the universality of history and the place of archaeology as a primary source of prehistory and early history. But it obviously is necessary in the Common Market countries who have not yet fully appreciated the common nature of human history. We have often smiled at André Varagnac's notion of *archéocivilisation*, and more than smiled at the sessions he organized under the auspices of Lucien Febvre and Henri Berr, and the creation of an Institut International d'Archéocivilisation with congresses in 1949 and 1952. We were surprised to find in a new book edited by Paul Courbin entitled *Etudes Archéologiques* (Paris, 1963), to be reviewed in the next number of ANTIQUITY, and representing present French views on archaeological aims and methods, an article by Varagnac on 'L'Archéocivilisation: notions et méthodes'. It is good: but it was what was being said and done in Britain in the twenties. We accept that the past is one and that if we study the artifacts of the past we can be labelled archaeologists, and that when we have made some sense out of them, which does not always occur, we have made a contribution to history. But it is surprising that in the nineteen-sixties it still seems necessary to say this in a serious French book, and to have to explain to apparently serious archaeologists that because the VIIIth Classical Conference listened to Hawkes on the Celts and Wheeler on Gandhara

ANTIQUITY

Art it had not turned upside down; it was merely recognizing formally the universality of archaeology and the study of the ancient past.

But sometimes one wonders whether the universal lesson of the twenties in that rosy revolution in British archaeology has been generally learnt even among ourselves. As one grows older the distressing thing seems to be that basic truths have to be constantly reiterated. A BBC Press Service handout dated 30 August, 1963, declared, 'to most people the term "archaeology" implies prehistoric [*sic*], but recently a specialised branch of archaeology has been set up to investigate the remains of industrial installations in Britain. . . . Some prehistorians feel that in so recent a context the word "archaeology" is inappropriate' and then goes on to announce a programme in which Mr Charles Thomas of Edinburgh University 'will dispute these claims to recruit the term "archaeology" to cover work covering the 18th and 19th centuries'. All those concerned should be reminded of Sir Alfred Clapham's dictum that archaeology began yesterday. It actually begins today at the moment we write. Those rubbish men carrying away our dustbins filled with decaying cabbage stalks, empty Beaujolais bottles, de-gassed Sparklets, and broken rummers, those undertakers bearing away coffins to the crematorium, those roadworkers cutting through a new road and leaving behind a fossil-road as a lay-by, all Dr Beeching's merry men closing railways and producing the fossil railway landscape of the dear departed French *chemins-de-fer départementaux*, these people are burying the past and making archaeology. The workers at the new lock at St-Omer which will fossilize the magnificent five-lock lift of Les Fontinelles (1877 and surely one of the finest pieces of 19th-century industrial archaeology—no, I will settle for Les Halles of Paris), what are they doing but making archaeology? No archaeologist is worth his salt, and certainly shall not pass salt at our table, unless he finds the uncompleted Royston-Newmarket railway as much archaeology as the Neolithic cursuses of southern Britain. We admit that it *is* easier to date the railway accurately, even in an age of radiocarbon dating.



It is good to know that someone at last has produced a book about industrial archaeology. It was long overdue: it appears under the imprint of John Baker Publishers Ltd, a new firm 'operating on a broad publishing front under that imprint and those of the Unicorn and Richards Presses' (the new press has as its device a charming version of the Cherrill White Horse). Written by Kenneth Hudson, BBC West Region Industrial Correspondent, it is called *Industrial Archaeology: An Introduction*. We hope to have it reviewed in the next number of ANTIQUITY. Mr Hudson is worried by the attitude of restricting archaeology to the remote past and says:

since 1878 . . . the word 'archaeology' has narrowed its meaning very considerably, mainly as the result of being appropriated by scholars whose principal evidence is normally to be found buried under several feet of soil and rubbish. This process has gone so far that in the minds of most people now living archaeology is almost a synonym for the excavation of prehistoric remains.

This is the first of what we hope will be many books dealing with the archaeology of the last few centuries.



There is very good news at the moment about museums in London. It is now officially announced that a new London Museum is to be created in the City which will combine in a new building the existing London and Guildhall Museums, and this matter is set out fully here (p. 294). The British Museum Bill is now enacted and came into force on 30

EDITORIAL

September. Both these pieces of news are matters of the warmest congratulation and approval. ANTIQUITY has in the past few years been critical of the organization and standards of the British Museum (1962, 163, 248; 1963, 50). It has pressed for the splitting up of the old British Museum into at least a Museum in Bloomsbury, a Library, and a Museum of Natural History. The British Museum Act, 1963, splits the Museum, as it should have been split long ago, into the British Museum (Natural History) and the main British Museum in Bloomsbury. In an interesting article in the *Daily Telegraph* (2 August, 1963), the present Director of the British Museum, Sir Frank Francis, sets out future plans. The Library will leave the Museum, and presumably Sir Frank will be the last Librarian to be head of the British Museum. The British Museum Library is one of the three great libraries of the world—some would say it was the greatest. It is now to be re-housed, and in two places. A new Science Reference Library, formed by the amalgamation of the Patent Office library with the scientific and technological collections of the British Museum, will be created on the South Bank of the Thames in the lower part of a new Patent Office Building which will be started in 1964. This will be 'an up-to-the-minute open-access library of scientific and technological literature on the most comprehensive basis' (we quote from Sir Frank Francis's *Daily Telegraph* article). The rest—the main portion—of the Library will be on a new site stretching from Bloomsbury Square to Bloomsbury Street. It would be wonderful—but perhaps impracticable—if at least part of this new Library were open-access.

Once the existing British Museum in Bloomsbury has got rid of its books it can really begin to plan itself anew as a National Museum. What a magnificent opportunity (and do not let us crab it by saying long overdue) for putting one of the greatest museums in the world into proper shape so that teaching display, specialist display and the reserve collections can all be properly housed. The new Act provides for new Trustees and they have been announced. They are a better lot than the last lot and their average age is lower, but they share with the previous body of Trustees this characteristic, namely that none of them seems to have much obvious experience of museums and libraries. When we mentioned this fact to a distinguished Treasury official he said, horrified, 'But why should they? That is what Keepers are for.' But then, we ask, what are Trustees for?

One of the most important and welcome provisions in the 1963 British Museum Act is Clause 4 which says

The Trustees of the British Museum may lend for public exhibition (whether in the United Kingdom or elsewhere) any object comprised in the collections of the Museum:

Provided that in deciding whether or not to lend any such object, and in determining the time for which, and the conditions subject to which, any such object is to be lent, the Trustees shall have regard to the interests of students and other persons visiting the Museum, to the physical condition and degree of rarity of the object in question, and to any risks to which it is likely to be exposed.

and which really says, having provided for all that nonsense about students and physical conditions and degrees of rarity, that the B.M. can now lend objects. All this is just a beginning. We must have the objects of the British Museum more and more on tour. An immediate tour should take place while the Department of Prehistoric and Mediaeval Antiquities is closed for the next two or three (or ? four) years. Now is the time to mount, through the Arts Council, a great exhibition of Celtic art. (The 1950 exhibition at Schaffhausen was brilliant, but it had next to nothing from the British Isles, largely due to the restrictions existing at that time on the British Museum and the non-cooperation of the National Museum of Ireland in Dublin.) A comprehensive exhibition of Celtic art, staged



NADAR. élevant la Photographie à la hauteur de l'Art

first in London and later in Dublin, Belfast, Cardiff and Edinburgh and perhaps a dozen other provincial centres, could show visitors the arts and crafts of the people who lived in what is now Great Britain and Ireland between the third century B.C. and the second century A.D.



The Classical Conference in Paris was preceded by a Colloque International d'Archéologie Aérienne organized by M. Raymond Chevallier of the Ecole des Hautes Etudes of the Sorbonne, who has recently been appointed to a new and specially created post there in air photo interpretation. The Colloque was held in the Sorbonne and in the Institut Pédagogique National in the Rue d'Ulm where an exhibition of photographs and allied material was on display (indeed was on show from 4 July to 9 November). A brief report of the Colloque and a comment on the exhibition has been prepared for us by Dr Scollar (p. 296). He refers to the work of M. Roger Agache, Directeur des Antiquités Préhistoriques in the Circonscription archéologique de Lille, and we shall be printing in 1964 an article by M. Agache entitled 'Aerial Reconnaissance in Picardy' which can be read in conjunction with Dr St Joseph's article published in a recent number (*ANTIQUITY*, 1962, 279). A French colleague writes:

It was nice and appropriate to see the Editor of *ANTIQUITY* at this Paris air photo Colloque, and I had a strange impression that on one occasion I saw the ghost of his predecessor peering over his shoulder. Crawford would have been delighted to see the splendid air photographs from France

EDITORIAL

and Germany: but he would have been as cross and disappointed as I was, and I am sure you were also, that there was no British participation in the Colloque except for Aitken's paper [on 'The Proton Magnetometer and its relationship to aerial photography']. I hope the British don't feel that as they invented archaeological air photography, they now have nothing to learn and are too busy to teach others. I hope there will be full British participation at Rome in 1964.

We echo this sentiment and also hope that at Rome the foreign photographs will be given proper display treatment: Dr Scollar has very properly drawn attention to this matter in his note. Incidentally, did the British invent archaeological air photography? Perhaps chauvinistically we tend to remember Crawford, Hamshaw-Thomas and Allen, and to forget Poidebard and Colonel Barradez (who was much in evidence in the Paris Colloque). We may even forget that photography from the air was suggested first as a joke in a French caricature in the mid-19th century, and that the joke became fact in 1858 when the Parisian photographer Gaspard Felix Tournachon, whose professional name was Nadar, took air photographs of Paris from a balloon. Honoré Daumier drew a caricature of this exploit, declaring that Nadar had elevated photography 'à la hauteur de l'Art', and we publish this caricature as a contribution to Christmas 1963 and to recognize that Nadar was before King and Black in Boston, and Negretti in London.

But to be first is not to be best, or always first. We now look forward to continuing and good archaeological air photographs from all countries: and in all countries the organizational problem will have to be tackled. In France, as Dr Scollar says, the present stage is one of small private enterprises and one of the final acts of the Paris 1963 Colloque was to ask for the creation of a French central air photo archive with arrangements for planning, achieving and recording air photo cover. We do very well at the moment in Britain, because of the Cambridge Committee for Aerial Photography, at present well supported by the Nuffield Trust (and we hope to publish in *ANTIQUITY* in 1964 some of the results of Dr St Joseph's reconnaissances this year in Ireland), but it may well be straining the alleged British genius for compromise to allow our archaeological air photography to be extensively organized by a sub-department of one University. Perhaps we too, in Britain, should think in terms of a central air photo archive and a national service incorporating and expanding our existing organizations in and out of the R.A.F. We commend this idea to the Council for British Archaeology, the University Grants Committee, and the British Academy.



We print in this number Jacquetta Hawkes's review of Dr Margaret Murray's *My First Hundred Years* (p. 311), and are reminded of what we wrote about this book earlier this year (*ANTIQUITY*, 1963, 87). We learn from *The Guardian* (15.8.63) that in March, two months before Dr Murray, Mr Lee Merriwether also published a book entitled *My First Hundred Years*. Mr Merriwether is the son of a Confederate colonel of the American civil war: he was born on Christmas Day, 1862, started life as a reporter, and in 1882 interviewed Oscar Wilde in Memphis, Tennessee. He has now practised for seventy years as a lawyer, and has written between 25 and 30 books of biography and travel. He arrived in London this summer, 'on the first European tour of his second century', and, saying 'I have an itchy hand', declared that he might write another book about his present trip. It is good to learn of these centenarians with itchy hands: we hope that Dr Murray and Mr Merriwether met and discussed their early childhood before Lartet and Christy had started work in the Dordogne, Napoleon III had created the Saint-Germain Museum, the Palestine Exploration Fund had been started, or even Schliemann had visited a Homeric site. Those were the days—well, anyway, they were days long ago.