



FRONTISPIECE: C. J. C. REUVENS (1793-1835)

*Photograph of the portrait in the Veluws Museum van Oudheden Harderwijk*

*See Editorial pp. 172-3*

## Editorial

FRONTISPIECE and PLATE XXV

Will all our readers please immediately make a correction to their copies of the June number and see that this correction is made by librarians? We learn both from Dr Switsur and from our postbag, that his note 'The radiocarbon calendar recalibrated' (1973, 131-7) is proving of use to many readers, some of whom (though, interestingly, not all) have observed that, although if they use the numerical lists in Table 1, all works well, when they use the graph, Fig. 2, pp. 136-7, the answer will appear, as it were, as a mirror image. The author and Editor apologize for this. The ordinate (vertical) should read *calendar years*, and the abscissa (horizontal) should read *radiocarbon years* on both pages. Having made this very important correction, you can now all calibrate away to your hearts' content.\*

☪ From apologies to congratulations. Three cheers for Joan Evans, who was eighty on 22 June, and who was this year awarded by the Society of Antiquaries of London its Gold Medal for distinguished services to archaeology. She was not well enough to attend the Society's Anniversary meeting in London in April and to receive the medal there. The Gold Medal was presented to her by the Society's President, Dr J. N. L. Myres, at her home at Wootton-under-Edge in Gloucestershire, on her birthday.


There have been only twenty-two Gold Medallists of the Society of Antiquaries before her, and the first, in 1934, was her half-brother

\* Though not, we learn, as we go to press, to the wholehearted contentment of Dr Richard Burleigh: his note, which we hope to print in the December issue, will probably be entitled 'The radiocarbon calendar recalibrated too soon'.

Sir Arthur Evans. It is a curious thought that this year, when we celebrate her eightieth birthday and wish her many happy returns of this day, we also remember that her father, Sir John Evans, was born 150 years ago. John Evans (1823-1908) was President of the Society of Antiquaries from 1885-92, his son Arthur Evans was President from 1914-19, and his daughter Joan from 1959-64. What a remarkable family record, which we remember and commemorate!

But at the same moment we note with sadness the death of a man who was given the Gold Medal of the Society of Antiquaries in 1950, namely Professor Dr Albert Egges van Giffen. He was the grand old man of Dutch archaeology, and in many ways, in the last few years, the doyen of European archaeology. We happened to be in Holland while van Giffen was dying and were sensible of the deep regard in which he was held by everyone. He was, apparently a power in the land, and the Dutch Cabinet was known to tremble at his approach. Here was a State Antiquary who not only created a modern State Archaeological Service of unexampled efficiency but perhaps saw that the State did precisely and quickly and unquestioningly what the State Antiquary said it should. The Dutch are a very historically minded people, and they realized, as we all do, that van Giffen was a very great man. He went on working right up to the moment of his death in his ninetieth year. Only a few months before, he had excavated, with meticulous care, a megalithic tomb in Oldenburg. He seemed to have lived three lives, one in Groningen, another in Amsterdam, and a third in Amersfoort, and was also a familiar

figure outside his own country. We first met him immediately after the second world war, when the British Council in their wisdom invited two dozen archaeologists from occupied countries to spend a fortnight in Great Britain. Driving across southern Britain from Cambridge to Salisbury, van Giffen described to us how he had recently had a car accident, and coined a brilliant off-English phrase which is now part of the language of many of us: 'How you say?' he said. 'Suddenly there was accident, and sault-a-somerset I was over the hedge in a field.' Never again did we hear such a fine off-English phrase until, several years later, the late Professor Laviosa Zambotti, clutching her throat, told Professor Sean ÓRíordáin and ourselves that she was certain that she had an infection of her tomkins. Ten years ago, many of us were delighted to celebrate van Giffen's eightieth birthday at Groningen: he then seemed eternal. Certainly his place in European archaeology is for ever.

 The most important news in British archaeology for a very long time is the proposal for a complete reorganization of regional archaeology. These proposals are discussed here in a short article by Dr Michael Jarrett (pp. 193-6) which he calls 'A revolution in British archaeology?' and where he says: 'It must be stated categorically that if these proposals can be successfully implemented they will mark the most significant change in State concern for archaeology in Britain since the appointment of General Pitt-Rivers as Inspector of Ancient Monuments.'

Ninety-one years after the General was appointed the first Inspector of Ancient Monuments, Mr J. G. Hurst, of the Inspectorate of Ancient Monuments of the Department of the Environment, addressed an extraordinary meeting of the Executive Committee of the Council for British Archaeology and said that it was proposed to organize a regional structure of 15 to 20 units to deal with specific threats to ancient monuments. These units would be manned by full-time staff and equipped to provide the necessary ancillary services: field survey, publication and preservation. The

co-operation of amateur groups was seen as fundamental to the new proposals and increased support from them would be sought when the units were established. Meanwhile a series of DoE Working Parties would consider specific topics such as motorways, rescue operations in gravel areas, and staff salaries. Discussions would also be held in both Scotland and Wales in the near future although a slightly different organization might be needed in each country.

A pilot scheme was being set up in Norfolk and the DoE would meet the entire cost at first. It was however envisaged that local authorities would eventually cover the cost of some of the salaries. An Oxfordshire Unit was being set up and the County Council had agreed to provide £3,000 in the current year and have recommended £10,000 in 1974-5. These regional units would have a Management Committee and an Advisory Board. Mr Hurst said that the Department would be sending a Circular to all local authorities recommending the setting up of Units and a subsequent Circular would make detailed recommendations. We understand that a definitive statement will be issued in October and reserve our comments until that has become available.

But meanwhile information about this scheme has been leaked out to the press and many statements, some wise, some unwise, some reasonably accurate, some oddly at variance with the known facts, have been printed. An article by David Hencke in *The Times Higher Educational Supplement* for 15 June 1973 earned a big headline and front-page space for the following paragraph:

A proposal to create between 500 and 800 new jobs in archaeology and to increase spending on archaeology from £300,000 to £5m a year within the next five years has been put to archaeologists by senior officials of the Department of the Environment.


And in the editorial of the same issue under the title 'Archaeology endowed', we read:

If the Department of the Environment does provide money for archaeology in Britain outside the universities, departments of archaeology could be forced to abandon the Hellenic [*sic*] aloofness that has been one certain characteristic.

What does this mean? And what curiously ill-informed person concluded that editorial:

Instead of functioning simply as keepers of the historic *objet trouvé* of an interesting site, archaeologists . . . can begin to provide a service within the wider community.

We must confess at once that we both love the *objet trouvé* and always want to provide archaeological service to the wider community. This DoE scheme, amended, modified and improved, should happen, and it must not be abandoned for lack of funds. We have no doubt that it will happen, in some shape or form, and all good men and true must support it as best they can, and make of it what it is: a great opportunity, and a great challenge. It still needs more thinking out by scholars and skilled administrators.

 It will demand more trained archaeologists and men and women trained especially in the craft of archaeology. Here is a challenge to those British universities who teach archaeology and train archaeologists. They obviously have in the next ten years to produce more archaeologists than they have done hitherto. There must be expansion in archaeology in our universities: it is interesting to learn that the demand for places in archaeology in universities keeps growing. But can existing university departments, with extra posts and facilities, cope with the numbers and the training required for providing these new DoE unit men?

There is now more than ever needed a central post-graduate school to train, in one year, graduates in archaeology, and others, in all the professional techniques of the archaeologist's craft from surveying through conservation to dealing with local government authorities. Where will this be? In a specially endowed existing department of archaeology in a university such as Birmingham, Leicester, Sheffield or Southampton?\* Or in an entirely new archaeological department in a university that has hitherto not included archaeology in its curriculum and might start a new department geared not to academic archaeology in the narrow sense but to professional archaeology in its widest sense of technology and craft?

York? Hull? Lancaster? East Anglia? or the new Independent University in Buckingham? Or a newly founded school of technical archaeology? This, some think, is the best solution. The place? Somewhere near Devizes, perhaps?

Already the expansion of archaeology in British universities in the last fifty years is more considerable than many people recognize. In 1927, when this journal was founded, there were not more than six posts in general archaeology in British universities (and half of them were in Cambridge!): that year saw the foundation of the Abercromby Chair of Prehistoric Archaeology at Edinburgh. Today, if we exclude departments and named posts in Classical Archaeology, Egyptology and Assyriology, but include extra-mural posts in archaeology, there are about 150 posts in general archaeology in the universities of Great Britain and Ireland.

And this number is steadily growing as existing departments expand and new departments are created. Glasgow has recently created a Chair of Archaeology to which Leslie Alcock, who already held a personal chair at Cardiff, has been appointed, and we understand a Chair of Archaeology is soon to be created at Sheffield. A personal chair has been created for T. G. E. Powell in Liverpool, and though not exclusively an archaeological chair, Cambridge has created a personal Professorship of Aerial Photographic Studies for J. K. St Joseph, who has been publishing his 'Recent results' in *ANTIQUITY* for many years. While we are speaking of these matters, our readers may like to know that J. D. Evans is to succeed Professor W. F. Grimes as Director of the Institute of Archaeology in the University of London, that F. R. Hodson has been appointed to the Chair of Prehistoric Archaeology in that University (formerly held by John Evans), and that the Editor of *ANTIQUITY* has been pre-elected to

\* The University of Southampton has recently approved the institution of a two-year M.Sc. course in Conservation and Archaeological Science in which close co-operation with the DoE and local regional units is envisaged; we will write more fully about this in our next number. Those immediately interested should write to Professor A. C. Renfrew, Department of Archaeology, University of Southampton.

succeed Professor Grahame Clark as the Disney Professor of Archaeology at Cambridge University, on 1 October 1974.

☞ The Disney Professorship of Archaeology was founded in 1851 and was the first such Chair in Britain. John Disney (1779–1857) was a collector of classical antiquities, and lived at Ingestone in Essex. His *Museum Disneianum* was published in three volumes in 1846, 1848 and 1849. Nearly all his marbles were bequeathed to the University of Cambridge where they now form an important section of the Fitzwilliam Museum. His original bequest for the founding of the Chair was £1,000 and this was increased by £3,250 in 1857. Disney was not an undergraduate at Cambridge though his father was. He was a frequent visitor to Cambridge and knew Edward Daniel Clarke, nicknamed 'Stone' Clarke to distinguish him from 'Tone' Clarke, the Professor of Music, and 'Bone' Clarke, the Professor of Anatomy.

E. D. Clarke (1769–1802) was a very remarkable man. Traveller, antiquary and mineralogist, he entered Jesus College, Cambridge, as chapel clerk and won strange fame by constructing a balloon which he sent up from his College, bearing with it his kitten. After graduation, as a tutor to the sons of gentry, he travelled extensively, including visits to Lapland and St Kilda, and wrote a lively account of the liquefaction of St Janarius's blood at Naples. In his travels in Sweden and Russia he was accompanied by Malthus, and William Otter, later Bishop of Chichester. He became the first Professor of Mineralogy at Cambridge when that Chair was established in 1808. He presented his collection of Greek statues to the University of Cambridge, and John Disney followed his example.

The Disney Professor was required to deliver six lectures, at least, during the academical year, 'on the subject of Classical, Mediaeval and other Antiquities, the Fine Arts and all matters and things connected therewith'. The first Professor was the Reverend John Marsden, Fellow of St John's College, Cambridge, who said this in his inaugural lecture:

Archaeology may be defined in general as the investigation of all that remains to us of the

ancient works of *man*; with a further limitation to such of those works as are *material*—visible and tangible—objects of sense. . . . Archaeology has been called the hand-maid of history, but this term does not assign to her a position sufficiently dignified. She is the correcter and verifier of history. . . .two thirds of the written history of Greece and Rome have been lost and nothing is left to supply the loss but Archaeology. . . . Archaeology, in furnishing facts, becomes history itself.

☞ John Marsden was not the first Professor of Archaeology. Worsaae was before him, and until recently we and many others who concern ourselves with the history of archaeology had thought that that charming and percipient Dane was the first Professor of Archaeology: the 'first professional archaeologist' as Brønsted said. We have never agreed with Brønsted in this since surely the first professional archaeologist was Edward Lhwyd. And now we learn that the first Professor of Archaeology in Europe, and therefore in the world, was not Marsden or Worsaae but a remarkable Dutchman called Caspar Jacob Christiaan Reuvens. Perhaps it is fitting in this year, which has seen the death of van Giffen, that we should salute his great predecessor Reuvens.

Reuvens was born in The Hague in 1793. Although he read law his main interest was classics and in 1815 he became professor of Latin and Greek at the University of Harderwijk. (Yes, there was such a university: we have learnt only recently that there were two Dutch universities, Harderwijk and Franeker, which came to an end. Shades of Stamford!) When the University of Harderwijk was closed in 1818, Reuvens was appointed to the newly created Chair of Archaeology at Leiden and his field of learning was specified as 'Egyptology, numismatics, architectural history, classical and non-classical archaeology'. He lectured first in Latin, and then when the great change occurred in Dutch teaching gave the first lectures in the vernacular. His job in Leiden was threefold: first of all he was director of the National Museum of Antiquities founded by King William I (and Reuvens had direct and personal relations with his monarch as did

Worsaae with King Frederick VII). Secondly, he was Professor of Archaeology and displayed his special interest in the prehistory of his own country in his inaugural lecture. He asked this question, 'What do we know in our country about the Huns? the makers of the *tumuli*?' And thirdly, he published his researches which included his study of Celtic fields in Drenthe.

Reuvens made two tours in Drenthe. The first was in 1819 when he studied prehistoric trackways and saw the famous megalithic graves, studied in such detail by his late lamented and very distinguished successor, van Giffen. His second tour was in 1833 and he then proposed the preparation of a general map of antiquities of the province. He was especially interested in the so-called *Romeinse legerplaatsen* (Roman military camps) which we know now to be prehistoric fields. He kept a notebook of his second tour and this has just been published under the title *1833: Reuvens in Drenthe*. It is an outstanding achievement, even for those masters of fine book production, the Dutch. A splendid piece of typography by Chris de Goede gives us the notebook in facsimile on the *recto* pages with, *verso*, parallel transcriptions of Reuvens's notes in Dutch and in English. The whole has been lovingly transcribed and edited with scholarly care by Dr J. A. Brongers of the Rijksdienst voor het Oudheidkundig Bodemonderzoek, and published by that organization (at Kleine Haag 2, Amersfoort, Holland) at the low price of 50 Dutch guilders. Low, because in addition it contains in colour all Reuvens's maps and diagrams in a pocket at the back.

Concurrently with the publication of this book the National Museum at Leiden has mounted an exhibition of Reuvens where one may see his notes, drawings and sections. He understood stratigraphy: he produced brilliant oblique views of sites and excavations. Reuvens was Pitt-Rivers and Wheeler a hundred and more years before these practitioners, and his techniques and expertise went on into the main body of Dutch archaeology. Van Giffen stems back to Reuvens, and we feel ashamed that, due to pure bloody ignorance, Reuvens does not appear in anything we have hitherto written


about the history of archaeology. We print a portrait of him as our frontispiece and two of his drawings as PL. XXV (one a megalithic tomb between Borger and Broninger, and the other a view of the excavation of a Roman town at Arentsburg near The Hague). Van Giffen wrote a note on the Dutch prehistoric fields in the second volume of *ANTIQUITY* (1928, 85-7) and his plan of fields at Zeyen included some drawn by Reuvens (his Plate 5: '*Legerplaats Zeyen* looking west, 4 p.m. middle of April'). Van Giffen did not refer to Reuvens but did to John Picardt who, in 1660, was calling the fields '*Heidensche legerplaatsen*'. His last archaeological activity was the excavation of a barrow in 1834. The following year he went to an auction of Egyptian antiquities in London, and, on his way home, died suddenly at the early age of forty-two.

With his colleague Nicolaus Westendorp he started and published for several years the precursor of *ANTIQUITY*. It was entitled *Antiquiteiten, een Oudheidkundig Tijdschrift* and it is sad that it did not continue through the 19th century to be the magnificent predecessor of all our 20th-century archaeological journals. The title page of each issue had printed on it from Martin's *Religion des Gaulois* (1727):

Je prie ceux qui font leur étude des écrits des anciens, de faire attention que les Monumens sont souvent des guides plus sûrs que les Historiens. These words could well be printed still on the cover of *ANTIQUITY*.

¶ We warmly recommend our readers to visit the Reuvens exhibition in Leiden, which will remain open until the end of September. But there are so many exhibitions to see this year: *Egypt before the Pyramids* in Paris, *The World of the Vikings* in Gallery 3 of the National Maritime Museum, Greenwich, until the end of September, the exhibition of *The British in India* at Brighton due to close, alas, on 31 August, and the exhibition of the Golden Jubilee of the Research Laboratory of the British Museum which is open until early September. And then at the end of September, as we mentioned in a previous number, there begins in London the Chinese exhibition which

has been such a success in Paris all through the summer. We print in this issue two articles dealing with Chinese archaeology. Dr Chêng Tê-k'un's clear statement of the independent origins of Chinese agriculture, metallurgy and civilization will be received with horror by the new diffusionists—the Adullamites of Sandy, Beds. But how nice to be able to provide them with names other than Daniel and Renfrew to heap with their Egyptocentric abuse.

 We asked Professor Hawkes to give us his views on the so-called 'new' archaeology, especially as preached in Britain by Dr David Clarke, and he has done so in an article which we print in this number. Meanwhile our post-bag fills with letters about the David Clarke article. We print three more comments and then this is, at least for the present time, over. The first is a crisp postcard from Frances Lynch, who says:

I'm *amazed* to see from your Editorial this month that David Clarke actually *did* write that article—I'd thought it was a spoof by Hogarth! It's interesting that when he *wants* to convince, as in *Beaker Pottery*, Clarke *can* write in English. And the second a letter from Oliver Dickinson of the Department of Ancient History and Archaeology in the University of Birmingham:

In his oblique rejoinder-by-review to his critics, David Clarke seems in great danger of persuading himself that, while protesting against his mode of expression, they are in reality opposing everything which he advocates. Nobody likes to be told that they write unintelligibly, but I feel that he should give more thought to this, and especially to Peter Salway's comments. It is not merely a matter of a few technical words, nor is it simply his august seniors who are complaining; his contemporaries and juniors are likely to have just as much trouble unless, like Peter Salway or his own students, they have been exposed to the vocabulary over a period of time.

Part of the problem may be that he frequently uses words with a Greek base, whereas the common learned language, current for a considerable time, derives mainly from Latin. Most archaeologists will be familiar with the latter, but few nowadays will have enough Greek to work out the meaning of an unfamiliar

word or the patience to consult a large dictionary, which will give a variety of definitions (when faced with bastard words like taxonomy and taxon, even the classically-trained may feel doubts; the former has the blessing of the *OED* (1933) as an irregular formation (*taxis* goes *taxeos* in the genitive), but seems to be equivalent to classification (your definition is of taxology). Why use taxonomy instead of classification, or paradigm instead of model?

But this is a relatively minor point; it seems to me that it is the form of Clarke's writings that gives most difficulty. The close packing of concepts, in complex adjective-noun groups occasionally broken by verbs or prepositions, makes for heavy going. While this sometimes appears to be gratuitous (e.g. 'rapid generational turnover' for 'short life-span'), it seems on the whole to derive from an admirable desire for succinctness (and also from the less admirable latinity to which all scholars are prey?). But it is no good straining for brevity when dealing with such unfamiliar matter; if he does not wish to remain a voice crying in the wilderness, Clarke must simplify and expand. Otherwise his prose will continue to resemble those translations of Greek and German philosophers in which the meaning is continually concealed in the terminology and syntax.

Those who run and publish excavations (of whom I am not one, I hasten to say) are forever being nagged to add to their quota of skills. The adoption of new methods of recording is one thing; but if they are expected in addition to grapple with *theory* expressed in such forbidding terms, one can hardly wonder if some refuse to try. I feel that David Clarke should leave the pulpit and mix with the congregation; he might then learn how and why what he is saying goes over people's heads.

(Mr Dickinson might also mix with a scientific congregation, who have for years regularly and usefully used the word taxonomy not just to mean classification but as the *OED* says: 'Classification, especially in relation to its general laws and principles; that department of science, or of a particular science or subject, which consists in or related to classification'. We have always been trying hard to persuade archaeologists that taxonomy and typology are two quite different things, as they are. Taxology is new to us, and the dictionaries available in

Artois, where this is being written, do not distinguish between taxonomy and taxology.)

And the third comment is from Dr Peter Salway, who is Regional Director of the West Midlands Region of The Open University (10 Greenfield Crescent, Edgbaston, Birmingham B15 3AU). We printed an earlier comment from him in the June number of *ANTIQUITY* and regret, as he does, that David Clarke replied to that very sensible comment in an oblique and evasive way.

It is sad and ironical that Dr David Clarke's oblique reply to the criticisms of his article quite missed the point. My own had nothing at all to do with willingness or not to make use of techniques recently imported into archaeology from other disciplines. It was about *communication*. Dr Clarke may not like it, but the main medium of communication is still the common English language.

In choosing to reply through a review about a particular application of computing to archaeology Dr Clarke reveals an innocence perhaps even more alarming than the obscurity of his language. I am not in the least surprised that a carefully run experiment such as that he reviews should have produced a very low percentage of error. The real question is what happens when these techniques become large-scale and routine. As director of a regional organization that handles substantial quantities of computerized information daily and as chairman of a committee at the national level that takes the policy decisions for a large computer operation, it is an everyday fact of life for me that there are strict practical limits on how flexible, how complex and *how accurate* the output can be, imposed by the equipment and staff available—mostly, but not entirely, a matter of money. Some things can only be done by computer but it is often a finely balanced question whether to employ manual or computer procedures, particularly as the more computerized a system the less easy to prevent errors remaining undetected to the point where they require much time and trouble to put right. And there are some consequences—such as reputation for reliability—that cannot be quantified in terms of 'cost-benefit-analysis'.

However, Dr Clarke's innocence goes even further. We are to believe such techniques more objective. As far as computers go, this barely conceals a basic misapprehension. Current computers do not *think*. They can only answer

the questions put to them. Even in an ideal world this would involve human decisions and under the pressures of the real world this means the establishment of priorities—what data to put in and what analyses to require. Since these priorities have to be established before the computer operation can be designed or run (and in the case of a system intended to produce results in the course of excavation that means long before the start of digging), it implies predicting in advance what is likely to be significant. However rigorous the 'decision-making process' the element of 'subjective' or 'intuitive' opinion based on experience is central to it. If Dr Clarke does not recognize the crucial role of 'intuitive' recognition of what is significant he must have overlooked the history of science and the nature of scientific method.

These controversial issues must now be discussed elsewhere. We are always happy to start discussion and promote sensible controversy, but, with the material we hope to print in the next three numbers already bulging suspiciously large in our files, we must for a while forget the new clarke-aecology, however she is wrote.

☪ And now, alas, sad news for our faithful subscribers whose numbers have gone up steadily year by year. Last year saw 700 new subscribers, the most in one year since our journal was founded in 1927. But costs go up relentlessly. When we put the subscription up to £2.50 we hoped we might avoid another rise for ten years, and we have nearly succeeded. But from 1 January 1974 the subscription will be £4 a year in Europe and \$12 in America. In the December number we will include new bankers orders. This increase in subscription will naturally mean a loss of some subscribers, who like most people today have to count carefully the way they spend every penny. But we do not anticipate a large falling-off in our numbers. Though it may seem a thing which an Editor should not say, we still think that at £1 a copy, *ANTIQUITY* is good value for money. In three years' time, in 1976, we shall be in our fiftieth year (and hope to publish the second Index volume in 1977). We hope that in our jubilee year we shall be able to report our biggest number of subscribers hitherto.



