

Antiquity

VOL. LI No. 201

MARCH 1977

PLATES I-III

Editorial

The ninth International Congress of Prehistoric and Protohistoric Sciences was held in Nice during the week of 13 to 18 September 1976. Of the 3,000 people whose names appeared in the list of *congressistes*, 1,700 assembled on the Sunday evening of 12 September and were greeted by thunderstorms and torrential rain. The sight of crowds of bedraggled, rain-sodden archaeologists climbing up the steep paths of the Parc Valrose of the University of Nice to the small and crowded reception centre augured ill for the Congress; but the storms passed quickly away to north Italy and the Congress developed successfully in the sunshine of the Côte d'Azur and the generous hospitality of the Niçois. At a special reception in the Villa Masséna, medals were presented by the City of Nice to twenty or so distinguished *congressistes*.

The Congress was very well organized in all but one respect, and it had the benefit that the Mayor of Nice, Monsieur Médecin, was the Minister for Tourism in the French Government. Free travel on the Nice buses made life very easy. Professors Balout and Henry de Lumley must be warmly congratulated on the work that went on for years beforehand. The immediate result, which cheered the arriving wet delegates, was a quite enormous amount of literature. First a series of guides to regions of France mainly based on the excursions planned before or after the Congress (many of which, for reasons of cost, did not take place)—the guide to Brittany is of exceptional interest and value, and secondly a series of books dealing with the various symposia and colloquia which had been carefully planned. But thirdly, and the Nice Congress is justified and will be remembered for this if for nothing else, three enormous volumes called *La Préhistoire Française*.

La Préhistoire Française is something which we have all been wanting since Déchelette and have

been unable to understand why it did not happen. It was our frustration with the apparent inability of our French colleagues to update Déchelette that forced us to produce, together with the late Dorothy Garrod, and our present colleagues Stuart Piggott and Charles McBurney, the book which appeared in French as *La France de la Préhistoire* (Paris: Tallandier, 1973) and in English the following year as *France before the Romans* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1974—but alas, sold out).

La Préhistoire Française is in two parts: Tome 1 (itself in two volumes) deals with the Palaeolithic and Mesolithic, is edited by Henry de Lumley, has 1,531 pages and weighs 5.660 g; Tome 2 deals with 'les civilisations néolithiques et protohistoriques', edited by Jean Guilaine, 912 pp. and weighs 2.830 g. The whole work, weighing 8.490 g (including a preface by the President of the French Republic) was offered at a very special rate to the *congressistes* and was being sold by the Centre Nationale de Recherches Scientifiques, 15 quai Anatole France, 75700 Paris, for the extraordinarily low figure of 320 francs (200 Frs. for Tome 1, 120 Frs. for Tome 2). We say 'was' because we understand it is sold out; 7,000 copies were printed and 3,000 of those sold before the Congress opened. We sincerely hope it is being reprinted; it is an absolute must for all libraries, museums and university departments and will be the standard work of reference for many years to come. These 2,500 pages cannot be usefully reviewed; we can only repeat that here is French prehistory and protohistory as its French practitioners believe it to be at the present day. There has been nothing like it since Déchelette. Were that great man alive would he make the same comment as we make? His own *Manuel* had one volume on the Palaeolithic and Neolithic and three volumes on the Bronze and Iron Ages. What has happened to the pre-Roman study of France

ANTIQUITY

since 1914? One simple answer: too much emphasis on the Palaeolithic, too much concern with the remote and geological past of man? Increasingly we feel as the years go by that there is as great a gap between palaeolithic studies and the Neolithic, Bronze and Iron Ages as between prehistory itself and the archaeology of the oldest civilizations. We all study some aspects of the past of man, but the men of Abbeville are as remote from those of the Carnac megaliths and the Vix burial as the Celts are from Chartres Cathedral. Because we say archaeology is the study of the material remains of man's past, as it is, we must not expect all aspects of that past to be mutually understandable. You will see what we are moving towards saying as a basis for forward discussion. The Nice Congress demonstrated that such very large conferences may have come to an end; there is already a Pan-African Conference on Prehistory. Should the successors to Nice not be several conferences? Why not a conference of Palaeolithic Studies, and another conference on the prehistoric archaeology of Europe from 6000 BC to the Roman Conquest? As a basis for congresses and conferences surely universality in time and space is no longer an archaeological practicability.

We have said that the Congress was well organized 'in all but one respect'. That was the timing of papers. In an international conference of this kind one expects a strict and clear timetable so that one could know what was happening in which section and could write in one's diary: 'I shall hear Guilaine at 10, Maria Gimbutas at 10.30, and Giot at 11'; but everything was confusion, and papers did not happen at the right times, or at all. We very much doubt whether there will be a tenth Congress: Nice may well be the end of something that began in Neuchâtel in 1866. We felt from time to time the ghost of Gabriel de Mortillet haunting the café at the gate to the Parc Valrose where many *congressistes* spent more time (and how wise they were) than in the lecture rooms. And yet there may be a tenth Congress somewhere in 1981, for, apart from the publications, the joy of such a Congress was meeting old archaeological friends, colleagues and enemies and making new ones. The personal contacts of that week in Nice will be reflected in the life and work of many.

The exhibitions were a notable feature of the Nice Congress. The Terra Amata exhibition—which is a permanent feature of the cultural life

of Nice—was excellent, and so was the exhibition mounted by the CNRS entitled *Préhistoire Française: Vingt Ans de Recherches Préhistoriques en France*. The cover of the catalogue of the exhibition showed the Chassey statuette found at Capdenac-le-Haut in the Lot in 1973 by M. Jean Clottes, Director of Prehistoric Antiquities for the Midi-Pyrénées region, and his colleague M. Carrière, and originally published in a preliminary note in the Congrès Préhistorique de France at its XXth session in Martigues in 1974. M. Clottes has kindly supplied a photograph of this attractive and amusing female figurine which we publish here (PL. 1). It is 27 cm high by 17 cm wide and is made of arkose, a felspathic sandstone. It is a copy which was on show at Nice; the original is in the Museum at Cahors. What ghostly visions it conjures up of Lepenski Vir! Incidentally, this Nice exhibition is to be set up again at Saint-Germain in the early months of this year, and we nurse a hope it might eventually come to England.

While speaking of exhibitions there have recently been two in London of great interest. One was the exhibition of the art and archaeology of pre-Columbian north America, entitled 'Sacred Circles', which was in the Hayward Gallery on the South Bank of the Thames, and the other the Pompeii exhibition in the Royal Academy which opened on 20 November. Curiously enough, this was the first exhibition of Pompeian discoveries ever to be mounted in Britain, and was of fascinating interest. Those who could not get to it should read Raleigh Trevelyan's article in the *Illustrated London News* for November 1976 (pp. 61–9), and his book *The shadow of Vesuvius* published by the Folio Society and Michael Joseph. Trevelyan describes this exhibition as 'by far the most comprehensive ever seen outside Italy', and draws our attention to the fact that it was an archaeologist, John Ward-Perkins, for 29 years Director of the British School at Rome, who was academic adviser, and thus responsible for the assembling of the brilliant collection that went to make up this truly astonishing exhibition. We reproduce here (PL. II), as a reminder, a rectangular panel made of pentelic marble with theatre masks in relief. In high relief are masks from the Greek New Comedy—a delicate youth and a curly bearded old man, and (bottom left) a leading slave. A temple front is in low relief.



PLATE 1: EDITORIAL

Excavated at Capdenac-le-Haut (Lot) in 1973 by MM. J. Clottes and M. Carrière. This neolithic (Chasséen) feminine statue is made of arkose (a felspathic sandstone). Height: 27 cm; width 17 cm. At present in the local museum at Cahors

See p. 2

Photo: J. Clottes



PLATE II: EDITORIAL

Pompeii: rectangular panel, of pentelic marble, with theatre masks in relief. It was probably mounted on a low column. It is housed in the Naples Museum (inv. 6633); height: 29.5 cm; width: 40 cm

See p. 2

Photo: permission Royal Academy of Arts

EDITORIAL

1976 saw the loss of too many archaeologists and we have already referred to the deaths of Sir Mortimer Wheeler, Dr David Clarke, and Paul Johnstone. Elsie Clifford died on 3 September, peacefully in her house at Witcombe in Gloucestershire, in her ninety-first year. She was the uncrowned queen of Gloucestershire archaeology, the doyenne of research into the long barrows of south-western Britain, and perhaps one of the last really great amateur archaeologists. Her interest in the prehistoric past derived from her observation of artifacts found on the land of her father's farm and the gravel pits at Barnwood. Reginald Smith, Arthur Keith, and Miles Burkitt encouraged her, and after a year in Cambridge she went back to her beloved Gloucestershire to practise, as an amateur, field archaeology and excavation in the most professional way. She dug Roman villas and chambered long barrows: her most famous dig was Bagendon, published when she was seventy-five. We talked with her a few weeks before her death; with her characteristic modesty she did not realize what a contribution she had made to the development of British archaeology and the personal life of many British archaeologists. Richard Atkinson wrote in a letter to us: 'I shall never forget her visit to Wayland's Smithy on a day when Stuart Piggott and I were away. My wife took her round and expounded our latest doctrines. "Vewy interwesting!", she said. "But is it twue?" All of her juniors are in her debt, though many of them are now too junior to be aware of it.'

Eric Higgs died on 23 September 1976 just a few days before he was due to retire from his post in the University of Cambridge, and six months before his retirement from the Directorship of one of the first Major Research Projects set up by the British Academy, that on the Early History of Agriculture. He was Chairman and Organizer of a symposium on this subject in the Nice Congress but ill-health prevented him from being there. A group of his colleagues wrote an appreciation of his life and work in *The Times* for 2 November and we cannot do better than quote part of what they said:

Eric Higgs has left an indelible and very distinctive mark on the face of archaeological research and on the many other disciplines that impinge upon it. . . . his ideas were constantly aglow and extraordinarily catalytic No one who came into

contact with Higgs can have failed to recognize his passionate commitment to intellectual independence or to be stimulated—at times uncomfortably—by his questioning mind. The one word that can convey his effect on those who responded positively is inspiration.

There have recently been announced three important appointments which will have very considerable effect on the archaeological world in Britain and America. Martin Biddle ends his long and distinguished years of work at Winchester in 1977 and takes over from Dr Froelich Rainey the Directorship of the University Museum of the University of Pennsylvania. David Wilson, Professor of Medieval Archaeology at University College London, has succeeded Sir John Pope-Hennessy as Director of the British Museum and Dennis Harding succeeds Professor Stuart Piggott in the Abercromby Chair at Edinburgh.

It is good again to have in charge of the British Museum someone who was trained and worked for many years in the Museum: an archaeologist who can speak as an expert in one important sector of the Museum's collections. Wilson edited *The archaeology of Anglo-Saxon England* which was published last November by Methuen (532 pp., £30), to be reviewed shortly in these pages. In an amusing profile in the *Sunday Times* (31 October 1976), Kenneth Pearson calls him 'the boisterous new boy at the BM . . . Northern Man . . . conducting Friday night seminars in the Marlborough Arms in Bloomsbury over beer and bacon sandwiches.' We see Wilson as a lineal successor to those great men Kendrick and Franks, and wish him well.

It is a curious thing that the first two holders of the Abercromby Chair at Edinburgh always described themselves as Professors of Prehistoric Archaeology; but the 1923 codicil to Lord Abercromby's will declares that his bequest is 'for the purpose of founding a Chair of Prehistoric Archaeology to be called "The Abercromby Chair of Archaeology"'. The first testamentary writings of the Right Honorable John, Fifth Baron Abercromby of Aboukir and Tullibody, laid down, in 1916, the following conditions for the holder of the Abercromby Chair:

1. I limit the subject for which the proposed Chair is to be founded to that department of the science of Archaeology that treats of the antiquities and civilisation of the Countries of Europe and the Near East from the earliest times to the period at

ANTIQUITY

which the written history of each country may be said to begin.

2. It shall be a *sina qua non* that the Incumbent of the Chair shall be proficient in the French and German languages and shall have at least a working knowledge of the Italian language.

3. The Incumbent of the Chair shall keep himself at all times as far as possible abreast of the whole literature of the subject that is published in Europe; and it is my desire that he shall impart his acquired knowledge not only to his classes, but to a wider audience through the medium of the Press and otherwise.

4. I desire that the Incumbent of the Chair shall not content himself with the passive role of merely disseminating the facts and theories of other writers, but that he shall also apply himself to the investigation and solution of some of the many problems and difficulties that encompass the study of Archaeology, and to achieve this end and to insure the success of the project from its initiation, the first Incumbent of the Chair ought to be not only a specialist in Archaeology but also a vigorous man in the prime of life.

What a remarkable testamentary writing! He was 75 when he wrote it and died eight years later. John Abercromby was born in 1841; the title had been created 40 years before in 1801, and ceased with him. He served in the army from 1858–70 and then devoted himself to the pursuits of scholarship with special reference to northern Europe, Britain, and the origin of languages, and particularly the Aryans. His first book was *A trip through the Eastern Caucasus*, his second *Prehistoric and Protohistoric Finns*; and then in 1912 came his great work *The Bronze Age pottery of Great Britain and Ireland*—four years before he made his first will.

Certainly the first and second holders of the Abercromby Chair matched up to his requirements; they were proficient in the languages, read all the literature, and were vigorous men in the prime of life. Professor Piggott has certainly taken his special knowledge to the 'wider audience' through the Press and the media of broadcasting of which Abercromby could naturally have known nothing, and we salute him for this, for his scholarship and his distinguished tenure of the Chair for 30 years. Abercromby would indeed have been proud of the first two holders of his Chair. He might have got on more easily with Piggott than Childe, but he would have looked at *The dawn of European civilisation* (as he would have *Ancient Europe*) and realized that his dream, so

specifically set out in his will, had been realized—and brilliantly so. Fifty years after he went to the Edinburgh Chair we publish a photograph of Gordon Childe (PL. III) taken in Czechoslovakia in 1949. It comes from Jaroslav Malina's book *Archeologie: jak a proč?* (*Archaeology: how and why?*) which we can read only in the brief English summary where she talks of the methods of archaeoscopy, archaeometry and archaeography. This book was published in Břeclav in 1975, and in addition to the Childe photograph has pictures of Lubbock, Montelius, Pič, Kossinna, Hoernes, Menghin, Aitken, Binford, David Clarke, John Coles, Roy Hodson, Bob Heizer, Colin Renfrew and Carl-Axel Moberg, to mention a few in this large gallery of archaeological worthies.

☞ We printed in our last issue the charming and emotive poem by John Betjeman written for the Piggott Festschrift; and now by kind permission of his publishers and his literary executor, Edward Mendelson, we print the poem 'Archaeology' by W. H. Auden which appears on pages 662–3 of the *Collected poems of W. H. Auden*, edited by Mendelson and published by Faber and Faber in 1976. We first saw this poem, written in August 1973, in a magazine in New York two years ago, and were enormously impressed by it. Since then in correspondence with Edward Mendelson we have learnt that Auden was deeply interested in archaeology from his childhood. We have learnt, to our delight, that in one of his poems he used the words 'gallery-grave' which we invented in 1938.

☞ 'Our school text-books lie', writes Auden, but it is not so much lying school text-books that worry us these days but the proliferation of lying rubbishy books about ancient man.

The lunatic fringe of archaeology closes in on us and even in the hot, dry summer of 1976 the river of unreasoned folly was in spate. Fernand Navarra, an industrialist of Bordeaux, in his *The Noah's ark expedition* (London and Eastbourne: Coverdale House Publishers, 1976)—an English version of the book published in America by Logos International in 1974 entitled *Noah's ark: I touched it*—describes how he found, or thought he found, on Mount Ararat on the borders of Turkey and the Soviet Union, a piece of the ark. He has conducted expeditions from 1952 until 1970. Spain's *Instituto Forestal*, in conjunction with



PLATE III: EDITORIAL

Visit of Gordon Childe to Czechoslovakia in 1949. The man on the left is Professor F. Kalousek, now of the Department of Prehistory, Brno University (Slavonic archaeology); in the middle is Dr B. Svoboda, now in the National Museum in Prague (Romanist)

See p. 4

Photo: Jaroslav Malina

Archaeology

The archaeologist's spade
delves into dwellings
vacancied long ago,

unearthing evidence
of life-ways no one
would dream of leading now,

concerning which he has not much
to say that he can prove:
the lucky man!

Knowledge may have its purposes,
but guessing is always
more fun than knowing.

We do know that Man,
from fear or affection,
has always gravely His dead.

What disaster'd a city,
volcanic effusion,
fluvial outrage,

or a human horde,
agog for slaves and glory,
is visually patent,

and we're pretty sure that,
as soon as palaces were built,
their rulers,

though gluttoned on sex
and blanded by flattery,
must often have yawned.

But do grain-pits signify
a year of famine?
Where a coin-series

peters out, should we infer
some major catastrophe?
Maybe. Maybe.

From murals and statues
we get a glimpse of what
the Old Ones bowed down to,

but cannot conceit
in what situations they blushed
or shrugged their shoulders.

Poets have learned us their myths,
but just how did They take them?
That's a stumper.

When Norsemen heard thunder,
did they seriously believe
Thor was hammering?

No, I'd say: I'd swear
that men have always lounged in myths
as Tall Stories,

that their real earnest
has been to grant excuses
for ritual actions.

Only in rites
can we renounce our oddities
and be truly entired.

Not that all rites
should be equally fonded:
some are abominable.

There's nothing the Crucified
would like less
than butchery to appease Him.

CODA

From Archaeology
one moral, at least, may be drawn,
to wit, that all

our school text-books lie.
What they call History
is nothing to vaunt of,

being made, as it is,
by the criminal in us:
goodness is timeless.

ANTIQUITY

the University of Bordeaux, said in 1956 that the age of the wood sample he brought back was 'oscille aux alentours de cinq mille ans': but a sample subjected to C14 dating was no older than 1,500 years. The story of Noah's ark is generally considered to be part of the mythology of the ancient world and is not to be taken as an exact historical record. The ark is not anywhere for the finding but doubtless there are bits of old wood to be found in the remote borderland where Turkey, Iran and Soviet Russia meet: as in every other part of the world.

Professor Cyrus H. Gordon's *Riddles in history* (London: Arthur Barker, 1974) repeats and carries on the collection of tall stories he has already published in *Before Columbus* and *Forgotten scripts*. He believes—or at least asks us to believe—in the Paraiba Inscription, the Vinland Map, the Kensington Stone, the Spirit Pond Runestones and many another nonsense. He says, 'No man of science should be asked to believe or endorse what he cannot understand.' But all men of science should be *au fait* with the facts. Gordon does not seem to have read the June 1974 issue of *Antiquity* with Walter Cran's deathbed confession. The perpetrators of the Kensington forgery are now known to be Ohman, Fogelblad, Anderson and Cran who described it as 'a hell of a good joke' and 'the biggest haha'. As Russell Fridley said, 'The Kensington runestone should be viewed for what it is—as a great monument to American/Scandinavian humour.' It is a pity Cyrus Gordon cannot share the joke. But then his book is dedicated to Alf Mongé!

Gordon naturally approves of O. G. Landewerk, whose *Runic records of the Norsemen in America* was published in 1974. Landewerk and Mongé believe that the American runic inscriptions are dated cryptograms. Gordon himself does 'not rule out the possibility that the stones were planted at Spirit Pond some time in this century by ethnocentric Scandinavians or plain pranksters'. This, at least, is a sign of grace but it is clever and skilled, not plain, pranksters that archaeologists have to deal with when they try to unravel many of the riddles of history from Paraiba to Piltown, from Rouffignac to Glozel.

R. A. Jairazbhoy's *Ancient Egyptians and Chinese in America* (London: George Prior Publishers, Rugby Street, 1974. £3.50) is the first volume of a two-volume work on Old World origins of American civilization: the second

volume is to be called *Asians in Precolumbian Mexico*. The author says he believes 'the high civilizations of ancient America are the result of an amalgam of ideas from the Old World—modified, extended and continued by the genius of the New. At the core lies the imported heritage.' He argues that the imported heritage is Egyptian and Chinese: there is little new here and we are mostly back to Elliot Smith. The best comment on this sad nonsense is provided by the author himself when he thanks 'Professor Arnold Toynbee for his kind encouragement, the late Professor Paul Kirchhoff for caution and criticism, Dr Ignacio Bernal for scepticism and courtesy, and Miss Ann Kendall for expressing the other side of the coin.' The truth is surely on the other side of the coin but Jairazbhoy makes a brave, if ill-informed case.

John Michell's *The old stones of Land's End* (London: Garnstone Press, 1974. £4.25) is an account of 44 megalithic sites within a few square miles of the Land's End peninsula: it is, curiously, dedicated to the Prince of Wales and Duke of Cornwall 'in acknowledgement of his interest in the preservation of these monuments'. Michell's earlier books are *The flying saucer vision*, *The view over Atlantis* and *City of revelation*. He is devoted to the theories of Alfred Watkins which O. G. S. Crawford very properly described as 'quite valueless'. He adopts a mystical, intuitive approach to the past and says, 'the reason why little is known of the civilization, religion and science of the megalith builders is that there has been little inquiry'. But surely Michell has at some time been in a good archaeological library, and read about the fruitful enquiries that have been going on for the last two hundred years?

One might say why bother about the books mentioned in the last two pages: why not use our precious space for detailed accurate archaeological publications. Do they matter? They do, and ANTIQUITY has a wide and growing circulation all over the world. Our readers must know that there is *off-archaeology*: and that it sells well. Some fine people manage to take time off from their professional work (and the Editor is being urged to write a book called *The wilder shores of archaeology*) to rebut the follies and fantasies of the lunatic fringes. Wauchope's *Lost tribes and sunken continents* (1962) is one such, and brilliantly done. Now there are two

EDITORIAL

more which, somehow, we must get read by the enthusiastic amateur archaeologists and ancient historians. The first is Peter White's *The past is human* (London: Angus and Robertson, 1976. £3.80) first published in Australia in 1974. It is as admirably modest and clear as the author himself. He says in his introduction, and we quote these passages with pleasure: 'Archaeology is like a detective story. We may believe the butler did it, but can we prove it? Where is the mud on his boots, who saw him on the stairs at 9.23 pm precisely, are we quite certain that only he had access to the key to the room? We accept these standards of proof in a detective story, in courts in everyday life. Archaeologizers demand similar standards of proof about the past . . . Men are more creative than some of us will admit . . . ancient men were able to carve statues, build pyramids and move mountains . . . Ancient maps are not based on satellite photographs, . . . astronauts did not have their portraits painted by primitive man . . . accounts of superhuman feats by flying gods are about as trustworthy as little Billy's story of the great big bully who stole his report card on the way home from school.'

The second is Jean-Pierre Adam's *L'Archéologie devant l'imposture* (Paris: Robert Laffont, 269 pp., 36 figs., 40 photographs, 1976. 46 Frs.). Adam is, like Peter White, a young man, a pupil of Professor Roland Martin and Pierre Coupel, and, since 1970, head of the *Bureau d'architecture antique de Paris*. We hope some enterprising publishers in London or New York are already producing an English edition of this fascinating and brilliantly written book. How can we see that it is read and understood by the Cyrus Gordons of this world and that unhappy band of TL men who in all good faith persuaded us to publish their conclusions that Glozel dated to between 700 BC and 200 AD?

Adam writes with a rapier-pen dipped in vitriol 'pour le secteur de l'archéologie, disons qu'à chaque information authentique présentée par un savant, correspond, hélas! la publication d'une sottise ou d'une mystification? What a pity the English language has not such a fine word as *sottise* with its delicious under and over tones of rubbish. Alas, hélas, this is sadly what the Gordons, Michells, McKerrells and the too many rest of them are at; they *débitent des sottises*.

Adam is brilliantly scathing about Glozel which he describes as a *delirium atlante*, and the whole

affair *rocambolesque*, a word to set beside Professor Renfrew's description of it all as 'a load of rubbish' in the BBC's *Science Now* programme on 24 July. Adam re-publishes the fascinating photographs from Bayle's report showing the allegedly ancient Glozel tablets dissolving in water and then addresses himself to the basic problem of the Glozel forgery. 'L'auteur de la mystification glozélienne avait indiscutablement une culture archéologique d'un certain niveau; c'est pourquoi Fradin, modeste cultivateur, s'il a participé à la réalisation des objets, a du recevoir l'aide ou les directives d'une personne, demeurée dans l'ombre, le "cerveau" de l'entreprise.'

Colin Renfrew in his BBC broadcast said that the forger of Glozel was still alive and living in the south of France. We think that the 'cerveau de l'entreprise' died many years ago and lies with his evil secrets in a cemetery in Vichy. McKerrell, Mejdahl, François, and Portal should pay a sentimental visit to Morlet's tomb: we shall be happy to accompany them and to read over the grave the words from page 269 of Adam's book: 'Que deviennent alors les objets "magdaléniens" présumés vieux de 15,000 ans et destinés à dater les tablettes? Les analyses faites à Gif-sur-Yvette commencent à faire la lumière sur cet étonnant bric-à-brac, ou les dents de vache modernes côtoient les os authentiques?'

Those who have followed with keen interest the second *affaire Glozel* will have read with growing excitement the Barbetti and Peacock papers in the June and September issues of the *Journal of Archaeological Science* (Barbetti's paper was summarized in *The Times*, 30 June 1976). As Peacock says this is no longer a dispute between archaeologists and scientists but a dispute between scientists, and a test of the reliability of TL dating. We have already said that we found the TL Glozel dates 'inconclusive and unconvincing' (*Antiquity*, 1976, 2).

☞ We print in this number a careful and thoughtful article by Martin Aitken on TL dating and archaeology. There may be something wrong with TL dating in some circumstances and it is having its teething troubles as did C14 dating. The circumstances may be places or materials. Certainly Julsrud and Glozel are skeletons that cannot be kept in the cupboards. As Peacock says, the second Glozel affair may be of the greatest value to us all—scientists and archaeologists.