

Editorial

CAROLINE MALONE & SIMON STODDART

It is a daunting task to write our first Editorial, following in the footsteps of three remarkable Editors of *ANTIQUITY*. There is certainly much to report, not only of what is in this issue, and of present events and matters, but also of past and future. *ANTIQUITY* is now in its 72nd year of production, and it is worth describing some aspects of this long history of archaeological communication. Unlike almost all other serious journals of archaeology, *ANTIQUITY* is an independent Trust, and relies entirely on its subscribers, rather than any society or larger organization. It was founded by O.G.S. CRAWFORD to be independent, and so it has remained. Crawford wrote an Editorial after 10 years of production (*ANTIQUITY* 40 (1936)) and described what he had originally envisaged for the journal. 'What I had in mind was to found a journal which would raise the general status of archaeology, and would popularize its achievements without vulgarizing them . . .' Crawford went on to encourage readers to become subscribers — 'Circulation is the life-blood of every journal' — and that is as true today as it was in Crawford's time. *ANTIQUITY* subscribers come from every country in the world, although it may surprise readers to learn that we can divide these numerically into three equal parts — Britain, North America and the rest of the World. With many subscriptions arriving in American dollars, we are rather dependent upon the whim of international money markets and the rate of exchange, and as anyone who has travelled recently will know, Sterling has been too strong for its (or indeed *ANTIQUITY*'s) good. We will have to be a little slimmer in size (just under 1000 pages annually, but with a useful new supplement — see below and p. 16) — until Sterling weakens. Following Crawford's lead, we also ask that subscribers introduce new subscribers to the journal, so that *ANTIQUITY* can publish more and better.

ANTIQUITY has had an unusual history with only three Editors in 70 years, O.G.S. CRAWFORD

and GLYN DANIEL taking equal share of the first 60 years, and CHRISTOPHER CHIPPINDALE the last 11, with a one-year sabbatical leave covered by HENRY CLEERE. After Glyn Daniel's long term of office the Trustees are tending to the view that a decade was long enough for any Editor, so the cycle of new Editors will quicken as we move into the 21st century.

Christopher Chippindale brought much that was new to *ANTIQUITY* and we wish to pay tribute to his work. From the outset of his Editorship, new electronic technology was employed, desktop publishing from its infancy in the 1980s to the routine sophistication of the late 1990s. Under the previous editor, traditional typesetting and printing was used, which was expensive and slow. Christopher and his wife Anne as Production Editor pioneered new technologies and not only speeded up the production process, but also brought down the costs, as demonstrated by the increased size of *ANTIQUITY* over the last 11 years. This enviable speed of production has ensured topicality of the latest archaeological developments and ideas. Christopher has brought a powerful international flavour to *ANTIQUITY*, and continued and developed the World perspective of archaeology that *ANTIQUITY* has always espoused, but he has done so spectacularly. Even though the first editors always included discussion and papers from much of the world, recent years have seen attention paid to regions often overlooked or disregarded. Australia, in particular, has been a subject of much debate, but so too have the emerging nations of the former eastern bloc of Europe and the southern continents generally. This trend has been welcomed by much of the *ANTIQUITY* readership, since *ANTIQUITY* has always sought to explore the broader world of archaeology and its interdisciplinary concerns, rather than to seek to satisfy interest in one or two subject or regional areas. One particular characteristic of his work was to broaden the scope of papers, and to encourage young scholars and archaeologists to publish in *ANTIQUITY*.



The three living editors at EAA conference in Ravenna, September 1997 (from left to right: Henry Cleere, Caroline Malone and Christopher Chippindale).

Several papers initiated by Christopher are printed in this issue and a planned special issue, featuring Brazil, will appear later in the year. The number of reviews has increased since the early days of *ANTIQUITY*, not only reflecting the massive increase in new books appearing on archaeological subjects, but the work undertaken by the Reviews Editor, a position that Christopher introduced to *ANTIQUITY* almost a decade ago. We pay tribute to his efforts, imagination and sheer energy which have taken *ANTIQUITY* into its eighth decade in splendid form.

This issue of *ANTIQUITY* is necessarily transitional between one editorship and another, with no deliberate changes in the journal style or structure. We have been delighted to take the *ANTIQUITY* staff with us to the new office that has been generously provided by New Hall (a Cambridge women's college with a distinguished archaeological reputation). ANNE CHIPPINDALE continues as Production Editor, LIBBY PEACHEY as Secretary and ANTHONY SINCLAIR as Reviews Editor. As for ourselves, we have only recently returned to Cambridge, our *alma mater*, to take up teaching positions, and now *ANTIQUITY* as well. Like Christopher Chippindale, we were also students of Glyn Daniel, but in the late 1970s. We too were introduced to Megaliths and the broader histori-


cal and culinary delights of archaeology that were the identity of archaeology teaching under Daniel. Following our degrees here, we have been roving far and wide. The Editor pursued the prehistory of Sicily and southern Italy, before encountering the megalithic issues of Avebury stone circle as its museum's curator. Thereafter she moved into the quasi-Civil Service (Cultural Resource Management) archaeology of English Heritage as an Inspector of Ancient Monuments, before returning to academic archaeology, first at Bristol and now at Cambridge. The Deputy Editor (and Editor's husband) undertook research in Rome on Etruscans, before doing research at Ann Arbor (MI) and Cambridge. More recently, he has taught at the universities of York, Bristol and now Cambridge. Throughout the years of varied research and work, fieldwork has been our principal passion, and excavations and surveys in Italy, Sicily and Malta have provided the essential archaeological activities that sustain us. Mediterranean our personal work may be, but we intend to pay special attention to balance in the breadth and range of our Editorial policy of *ANTIQUITY*. Here we are generously assisted by our panel of Editorial Advisors who represent many fields of our discipline.

Following Glyn Daniel's statement in his first issue of *ANTIQUITY* in 1958, we shall not introduce the formal Obituary (or *Nécrologie*) to the pages of *ANTIQUITY*, but it is appropriate to pay respects to leaders in the field, such as MARY LEAKEY, who have by example and inspiration changed what we do as a profession and discipline. The work and personality of Mary Leakey is provided by her life-long friend THURSTAN SHAW. J.B.GRIFFIN (JIMMY) is another such individual, and HENRY WRIGHT gives us an international view of this great man.

At times, commemoration will merge into *Reaction*. We plan to commemorate some significant publications and their impact past and present. The first of these will be reactions to the 25th anniversary of David Clarke's 'Archaeology and the Loss of Innocence' published in *ANTIQUITY* 1973. We have asked a small panel of scholars to react to the impact of this article in the 1990s.

The discipline of archaeology has many relations in other academic fields and areas of everyday life, but archaeologists are frequently


oblivious to these alternative perspectives. A different theme of reaction will be presented as *Another Perspective* from invited individuals (academics, professionals and politicians) who know archaeology well but are outside the discipline. They will offer their thoughts on what Archaeology is doing (or failing to do) within the broader academic milieu. We shall welcome more spontaneous papers from readers who feel they too can contribute to such debates.

 Time and the clarification of past chronologies have always been predominant concerns in archaeology, and this issue includes several papers that address time measurement. Especially topical at the moment is the question of dating the earliest humans in various parts of the world. An appreciation of the work of the late Mary Leakey is especially appropriate in this context. Discussions continue over the dates of early humans in Europe, and discoveries by **Gibert** and colleagues in southeast Spain provide new dates indicating very early occupation. *ANTIQUITY* published the first news of possible early TL dates for both early human occupation and rock-art in Australia at Jinmium (Fullagar *et al.* 1996, *ANTIQUITY* 70: 751–73). Now, re-analysis by **Nigel Spooner** of the TL dates suggests that some of the exciting possibilities may have been mis-interpreted, as questions are raised over the reading of the TL curves. ¹⁴C dating has been usefully re-calibrated in recent years, and **Tjeerd van Andel** discusses their application to the Middle and Upper Palaeolithic. Several other papers focus on various aspects of early archaeology, with less space in this issue for later prehistory or historic archaeology, a balance which will be redressed later in the year.


Pompeii has featured in both the December 1997 and this March issue of *ANTIQUITY*. It is therefore appropriate that the same interval should have been marked by the first listing of this, perhaps the most famous archaeological site in the world, as a World Heritage Site. In many ways, it is astounding that a site of the importance of Pompeii should have been listed so late by UNESCO, (although we suspect the meeting venue in Naples may have hastened the process) but of course site listings are frequently highly charged with political activity. This is certainly the case with Agrigento in

Sicily, which has also been listed, largely through the activities of conservationists working to control the unabated and commercial building that has scarred the historic landscape surrounding the major Greek colony. It is significant that the Mayor of Agrigento was not part of the pressure group who ensured the successful listing, but is also significant that a new era has opened in Sicily's regard for its heritage. At a conference at Corleone (Sicily) in July 1997, a declaration was made by the delegates, including the Deputy Editor, in support of the proper protection and management of the site, and control of future development. Italian cultural sites featured prominently among the newly listed sites (10 out of 38) — the 21st Session of the World Heritage Committee included (in addition to those above) the archaeological examples of Piazza Armerina (the grandiose imperial Roman villa in the province of Enna (Sicily)), and the fine *nuraghe* (fortified complex) of Su Nuraxi di Barumini in Sardinia (see <http://www.unesco.org/whc/events/naples/pages/main/main.htm>). Another classic archaeological site listed for the first time is that of Hallstatt. The UNESCO listings, however, retain a statistically disproportionate European definition of cultural and natural value. Over 40% of all sites are in Europe, and in spite of the 1997 addition of sites such as Lake Turkana, Kenya (listed for its natural value) and Volubilis, Morocco, over 50% of the new sites were also European. Such bias towards Europe does not really fulfil the original aspirations of the World Heritage Convention. It should be supporting developing countries in their protection of monuments and sites rather than continuing to acknowledge the cultural dominance of European history.


<http://www.unesco.org/whc/heritage.htm>

 On 7 January 1998 a meeting was held at the Natural History Museum, London, to celebrate and review the progress of the first five years of research on Ancient Biomolecules. Since £1.9 million has been invested by the Natural Environment Research Council in 17 different projects, variously examining the fate of biological molecules in archaeological and fossil materials, a major public announcement was appropriate. Archaeologically, the research has involved the extraction of DNA and protein from ancient human and animal bone, fos-

silized plants and insects, where it is hoped that benefits to archaeology, tourism, anthropology, agriculture, veterinary and forensic science may be tangible results. As the publicity of the meeting made clear, materials of up to 75 million years old were 'providing insights into history and challenging accepted archaeological and scientific theories'. Examples of the archaeological side of the work included 'New insights into the travels of ancient people in the Pacific and Indian Oceans, and the journeys of pioneer farming communities taking wheat, barley and domesticated animals across Europe several thousand years ago' and 'Studies of life in ancient South American civilisations'. Such experimental work is now becoming reproducible and the limits and optimum conditions for its implementation increasingly clear. The transition from the experimental to the commonplace is crucial. This has been seen with radiocarbon, but not always yet achieved in other promising fields of scientific archaeology. Further information is available from Ursula Edmunds, NERC Communications, Polaris House, North Star Avenue, Swindon, Wilts SN2 1EU (e-mail uwe@wpo.nerc.ac.uk). More details can be found on http://www.nerc.ac.uk/press_releases/abi.html

 Oetzi, the Copper Age Ice Man (reported in *ANTIQUITY* 68 (1994): 10–26) discovered near the Brenner Pass on the borders of Italy and Austria, has finally returned 'home' to Italy. The ice mummy was discovered in September 1991 by German ramblers and was instantly claimed by Austria. From the outset, there have been undignified wrangling and some miscalculations in the treatment of what is one of the most important discoveries for European prehistory in recent years. Bureaucracy, in the form of the Tyrolean coroner called in to complete the death certificate, delayed scientific removal of the body until it was decaying and souvenir-hunters had removed parts. The body was then taken to Innsbruck University, where it has been subjected to study for the last six years, with the Austrians making a strong claim for keeping it. However, the Italian nationalists have been both vocal and active, and proved, with a tape measure, that the body lay 92.57 m within the Italian border and thus belonged to Italy. Whether such modern trifles as political borders should really be the concern of scientific

archaeology is debatable, since no such border existed in the Copper Age, 3300 years BC. But that is neither here nor there — Oetzi will now be on public display in a specially refurbished museum in Bolzano, seen by perhaps 300,000 people a year. The Austrians, particularly PROFESSOR KONRAD SPINDLER, are outraged since they had protected the mummy from public view, and regard the exhibit as 'sensationalism' and 'ethically and morally intolerable' (quoted from an article by Imre Karacs, *Independent on Sunday* 18 January 1998: 15).

 Ethical issues and antiquities are subjects that we, like our predecessor, will continue to debate with relish. We have been fortunate to work in Malta where, in spite of a prehistory with artistically important objects, little plunder has taken place in recent decades, unlike comparable ancient objects which have found their way into the Ortiz Collection. Sadly, in most of the Mediterranean, Asia and Central and South America, plunder of antiquities is rife. Even worse, perhaps, is the semi-legalized sack of existing museum collections and monuments in some unstable political systems, where officials seek to denude their national heritage for individual monetary gain. There are always museums happy to take the dodgy goods, as was recently demonstrated by an outcry in the Boston press when local institutions acquired some 'stolen' old and new world artefacts. Responsible archaeologists and heritage managers throughout the world are properly concerned about the continuing plunder of ancient sites, and the still-buoyant art market that both provides the incentive for plunder and conveniently disposes of stolen materials.

How much of the past is still plundered and marketed to collectors and 'respectable' museums? This question has never been properly addressed, let alone accurately quantified. Efforts by some researchers have demonstrated alarmingly high percentages of unprovenanced material in London auction houses. Thankfully, times may be changing, because on November 13 1997 a brave new initiative, The Illicit Antiquities Research Centre (IARC), was launched at the Institute of Advanced Legal Studies, London, by PROFESSOR LORD RENFREW OF KAIMSTHORN, Director of the McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research at Cambridge University: 'The greatest single threat to the

archaeological record today and to the world's cultural heritage is the damage inflicted by looters on archaeological sites to provide antiquities for the illicit trade for collectors who ask no questions. This is a national and international disgrace that must be stopped.' The Centre will compile data about illicit antiquities and the damage done through plundering. A major task will be to focus publicity on the damage of the trade, and thus change public and political opinion and attitudes towards collections containing stolen antiquities. IARC is urging the British Government to follow the lead both of the USA in ratifying the 1970 UNESCO Convention on the illicit transfer of cultural property, and that of the Swiss, Italian, French and Dutch governments, by signing the 1995 UNIDROIT Convention on Stolen and Illegally Exported Cultural Objects. Many antiques dealers/auctioneers, such as Sotheby's, are responding to recent embarrassments and unwelcome public opinion, and have stopped the sales of antiquities in London, transferring them instead to New York. Indeed, the response to the formation of the Research Centre has been mixed, and a succession of vitriolic attacks in the editorial comments of the art collectors' journal, *Minerva*, show that the IARC has far to go before persuading all collectors of the value of the initiative. In particular, the Editor-in-chief, and New York coin dealer, JEROME M. EISENBERG, Ph.D, has found it necessary to condemn absolutely the IARC attack on the antiquities art market. His words, in the Sept/Oct 1997, Nov/Dec 1997 and Jan/Feb 1998 issues of *Minerva* offer an important, if depressing, insight into the mentality of dealers and collectors. They ostensibly sign up to the 'Dealers code of Ethics', but fail to acknowledge the current and future archaeological damage that their trade encourages, indeed, that it is the generating force of plunder. In particular, Eisenberg's Nov/Dec 1997 commentary is worth quoting: 'We can well do without any more of this "tabloid journalism" and hopefully these ill-informed individuals will exercise their formidable talents elsewhere, especially in helping to bring about a legally sanctioned export of antiquities worldwide. This to the writer seems to be the only rational solution which would not only enable ancient objects to be enjoyed and appreciated by people throughout the world, but also significantly increase much needed income to the

antiquity-rich states, income which could be used to better preserve and explore the constantly expanding number of archaeological sites.' Far from opening up access to antiquities, Eisenberg and his kind are exclusive, as was amply demonstrated by the First Courtauld Debate on 20 November 1997, at the Courtauld Institute in London. The occasion was chaired by LORD HOFFMAN, and included speakers from the art world — DR TIMOTHY CLIFFORD of the National Gallery of Scotland, MR RICHARD JENKINS of Oxford University acting for the motion, and LORD RENFREW and BERNIE GRANT MP against it. The motion was 'This house believes that the trade in antiquities is fundamental to the proper study of the past'. In spite of efforts by Lord Renfrew and Grant to put the case against the trade, the motion was enthusiastically carried by perhaps as much as 4:1 in an audience made up principally of rich art connoisseurs. The cost of a ticket to enter the debate was much more than an annual subscription to ANTIQUITY.

The Institute will be publishing a twice-yearly newsletter *Culture without Context* and worldwide support is requested for this important work. For further information on the IARC, write to Dr Neil Brodie, The McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research, Downing Street, Cambridge CB2 3ER, England. It is salutary to examine the World Wide Web pages on the antiquities trade that are all too accessible to public view. Most archaeologists will be appalled by the suggestive prose, that advises on antiquities for sound financial investment and social image (see especially

<http://www.financialinsights.com/FI-art.htm>
the so-called Dealers Code of Ethics on
<http://anamarket.money.org/EthicsCode.html>
and Eisenberg's own page for his gallery in New York on
[wysiwyg://199/http:www.royal-athena.com/intro/invest.html](http://www.royal-athena.com/intro/invest.html)

☞ One theme that we plan to develop from time to time is that of commemoration while avoiding obituaries, which can be morbid things, and are all too often a long recitation of good lives and deeds. However, there are those in our subject who have been so central a part of the evolution of what we do and know, that a few apt words enlighten us on the development and fruition of their careers, and perhaps our

acknowledgement of the work is vital to our collective self respect. Here we have a remarkable piece by the well-known Africanist, THURSTAN SHAW, on his long-time friend and colleague, MARY LEAKEY. Mary died in December 1996 in Africa, and to enable her relations and friends to pay their respects, a memorial service was held at Jesus College, Cambridge on 3 May 1997, in recognition of her honorary D.Sc which Cambridge University had awarded her in 1987. This is the address which Thurstan Shaw read, and which we present to the readers of ANTIQUITY.

Mary Leakey born 6 February 1913, died 9 December 1996

Mary Douglas Leakey was the daughter of a Scots father and an English mother. Through her mother, Mary was directly descended from John Frere, who is famous for his 18th-century recognition of flint handaxes at Hoxne in Suffolk as humanly made implements. Mary always considered she had inherited her artistic talent from her paternal ancestry, as her father and grandfather were artists. Mary's ability in this field was displayed especially in her consummate drawings of prehistoric stone implements, in which she caught so exactly every ripple and every flake-scar, as well as conveying so faithfully the surface texture of different kinds of stone. Curiously, it was this facility which first brought her in touch with her husband Louis, because he was looking for someone to draw the illustrations for his book, *Adam's Ancestors*. He had asked Gertrude Caton Thomson if she knew of someone who could do this, and she introduced him to Mary. Within a short space of time Mary was not only drawing artefacts for Louis but also assisting him in his archaeological work in East Africa.

Of course, funeral ceremonies and memorial services are not for the benefit of the dead but for the benefit of the surviving, to help us come to terms with our loss and with the reminder of our own mortality. I miss Mary personally, both as a friend and as an archaeological colleague. She was always a good correspondent, and in recent years when the continents continued to separate us, I used to see her every year when she was passing through England. That is my own personal loss, but the loss is much more widely felt, because there are hundreds of archaeologists and palaeoanthropologists who

know that they have lost one who contributed immeasurably to the knowledge of our subject and to our understanding of how humankind evolved and developed, physically, technically and socially. That knowledge is crucial to the understanding of that strange and enigmatic species, the *Homo sapiens* of today, which has such amazing achievements to its credit and at the same time has wrought such devastation in the world.

Archaeology has usually designated, both by the usage and by the derivation of the word, the study of what is ancient, above all of ancient people — but in fact, archaeology's significance is about the people of today. The great gap in human knowledge at the end of the second millennium, when we know more than ever about the physical universe, including the universe of living things, is the gap which concerns ourselves, about what is 'a person', about what makes us tick in the extraordinarily contradictory way we do. Archaeology traces the story of how we come to our present point, both in our physical and in our behavioural development, and over approximately the last 10,000 years, how this odd creature has developed social forms and social behaviour which seem largely out of control. To understand any organic evolving system, you need to know how it evolved to the point you are observing. Mary Leakey must rank as one of the greatest contributors to our knowledge of this story, and as such all humankind is in her debt. In the last hundred years the concept of organic evolution, and of man as participating in it, has gained wide acceptance. Instinctively humankind recognizes the importance of the story of its roots. The study of fossils and stone tools commonly used to be thought a dry specialism belonging to a small body of experts, but in the last 40 years the story of early man has captured the imagination of a wide spectrum of people, and it is the work of Mary and her colleagues in this field, where she was a leader, which has wrought this transformation in public awareness.

Mary's early education was in the hands of a series of governesses, and in the inspiration she received from her father, who introduced her to archaeology, especially the French caves. He died when Mary was 13, which was a deep blow to her. She was sent to Roman Catholic convent schools, where her independent char-

acter revealed itself in ways that resulted in her expulsion, the second time for intentionally causing an explosion in the chemistry laboratory. In her mid-teens, Mary decided she wanted to become an archaeologist, especially of the real ‘dirt’ variety, so she offered her untrained services to a number of excavators, usually to be met with polite refusals. She started work with Mortimer Wheeler at St Albans, but left after a week because she decided nobody knew what they were doing and that it was not the sort of place where she would learn much. She had better fortune in joining Dorothy Liddell at Hembury Fort in Devon, where the impressive Iron Age hillfort was underlain by a Neolithic causewayed enclosure. Dorothy Liddell was sister-in-law to Alexander Keiller, who put his marmalade fortune into Avebury and its archaeology, and for whom Dorothy Liddell had been excavating at the time Mary and her mother paid a visit there. So at the age of 17 Mary took part in her first excavation under the tuition of not only Dorothy Liddell but also W.E.V. Young, Keiller’s experienced foreman, who taught us both how to use a trowel. For it happened to be my first excavation also, when a 16-year-old schoolboy, and this was when I first met Mary; four successive seasons followed at Hembury for all of us. Dorothy Liddell was a meticulous excavator, much underrated in English Archaeology, partly because she died prematurely during World War II. When reminiscing in later years, Mary more than once commented on what a good training we had under her.

However, the most important thing that happened to Mary in the early 1930s was that she met Louis Leakey. This was the beginning of a partnership pregnant with the most wonderful discoveries in the field of palaeo-anthropology, which have since rightly become world famous. The partnership was largely so fruitful because of the complementary nature of their characters. Initially, of course, Louis was the leader, being older and more experienced, full of fire, enthusiasm and exuberance, for ever rushing off to his next project. He was the inspirer, who set people alight — including Mary. Louis supplied the drive, and more than a dash of academic adventurousness; Mary provided a meticulously methodical way of working, was slower and more careful to reach judgement and paid great attention to detail, and was more

ready to consider the differing views of others. Both enjoyed bush life, and both had a gritty determination, which stood them in good stead, particularly in the early penurious days. Louis was the romantic — Mary was not without passion herself. Her passion was for truth. Philosophically ‘truth’ — and even more ‘the truth’ — is a difficult concept — yet we all know what is meant by a seeker after truth. Bertrand Russell said ‘I may have conceived theoretical truth wrongly, but I was not wrong in thinking that there is such a thing, and that it deserved our allegiance.’ It had Mary’s allegiance — she was a seeker after truth and she sought it in her work. That is why she brought such rigour to her excavation technique, to her meticulous recording, to her classification and analysis, to her interpretations, to her conscientious writing and publishing. Many archaeologists come to identify themselves with their discoveries and their interpretation of them. Because they are so identified, they are reluctant to modify their views when later evidence — particularly when turned up by someone else — suggests that the earlier interpretation was wrong. Louis’ excitable enthusiasms tended to make him one of those. Not so Mary — for her goal of laying bare the discoverable truths was more important than a personal reputation. Nevertheless, she was no stranger to controversy, and she was able to put her side of an argument with some cogency. Louis was a natural showman, Mary was content to let him occupy the front of the stage. It was really only after Louis’ death in 1972 that Mary found she could enter, and succeed in, the realm of lecturing and publicity. She felt compelled to embark on these new ventures in order to raise funds to continue the research to which she was committed, for she was dedicated to her quest for truth, and she stepped out onto hitherto uncongenial paths with characteristic courage. Some have delighted to point to the difficulties in Mary and Louis’ partnership, particularly during the latter’s later years. Mary acknowledged these difficulties but as late as 1967 she commented to me one evening when we were sharing a tent at Engaruka that it had been a good partnership. I have always regarded as one of Mary’s greatest achievements that she kept that partnership going for over 30 years.

Mary’s introduction to Africa came in 1935 when she travelled to Cape Town and through what was then the Rhodesias. On the way she

assisted John Godwin with his excavations at the Oakhurst Shelter, and she has paid tribute to him for the further lessons in excavation technique which she received on top of her training by Dorothy Liddell. She finally met up with Louis at Moshi in Tanganyika. He had left England many months before to organize his fourth East Africa expedition, in which he had decided to concentrate on Olduvai Gorge as the most likely place to produce evidence of early man. He had long believed that man evolved in Africa, not Asia, as was then believed according to the received wisdom, and to find evidence for his views was a powerful motivation for Louis. He and Mary did a lot of reconnaissance and collecting at Olduvai, and they also travelled to Laetoli to look at the promising deposits there, which 30 years later, as well as producing important fossil hominids even older than those of Olduvai, became known as one of Mary's greatest discoveries, the three-and-a-quarter million year old trail of hominid footprints, preserved in an exceptionally favourable layer of volcanic ash. The Getty Foundation has recently financed the covering and conservation of these precious footprints.

Present-day visitors to those sites can have little idea of the difficulties of 1935, when it took Mary and Louis three days to get from Olduvai to Laetoli, whereas now it can be driven in under one-and-a-half hours. When a breakdown to their support vehicle occurred, Mary and Louis once found themselves spending a day and two nights digging their own vehicle out of a ditch into which it had slid with no tools other than table knives and a couple of enamel plates. When presenting Mary for her honorary degree here in Cambridge in 1987 the Orator vividly described the hazards of those days as '*invia terrarum, itinerum pericula, aquarum inopias, morbos febriculosa, monstra formicarum, incursus leonum et semi-barbarorum*' (trackless terrain and perilous journeys; shortage of water; tropical diseases; giant ants, marauding lions and hostile tribesmen). A later generation of palaeoanthropologists who have worked in East Africa has sometimes denigrated the slowness with which Louis and Mary achieved results compared with their own later slick efforts, failing to give credit to Mary and Louis for their genuinely pioneering efforts, all done on a shoe-string, which paved the way for better-resourced latter-day successes.

A little after a year later, Mary and Louis set up house together in Kenya and pursued their researches, jointly and separately. Money was always very tight, even after Louis' appointment at the Coryndon Museum. Mary carried out the important excavations at Hyrax Hill and the Njoro River Cave: she always insisted that she was an archaeologist interested in any prehistoric period, not just in the Palaeolithic in which fate decreed that her more famous discoveries should be made, and on which she concentrated in later years. It is good to know that the Leakey Foundation has established the Mary Leakey Fund for African Archaeology, to benefit research workers pursuing interests similar to those of Mary. She was fascinated by the Kisese and Kondoa rock paintings, and spent many hours precariously perched on ladders tracing them; she would only allow her autobiography to be published on condition that her book on them should also be published. It was during the war that Mary and Louis, with the help of Catherine Fagg and an Italian prisoner of war on parole, discovered the remarkable site of Olorgesailie. It required persistent searching to find it, following up an imprecise clue recording the much earlier finding of handaxes by the geologist J.W. Gregory. When Mary found the incredible handaxe-covered scree, now preserved as an open-air museum, she let out a shout that brought the others running, thinking that an accident had befallen her.

The first Panafrican Congress on Prehistory which Louis had organised in Nairobi in 1947 enhanced in many parts of the world the already growing interest in the Leakeys' work, and this led to the improvement of the financing of their investigation of the fossils of Rusinga Island in Lake Victoria. This brought Mary her first great palaeoanthropological discovery — the almost complete skull of the Miocene ape *Proconsul*, which aroused quite a scientific stir. More work was done at Olduvai, but the real breakthrough did not come until 1959 with Mary's discovery of the skull of *Zinjanthropus*, as Louis christened it, or *Australopithecus boisei* as it was later called, the tale of which has often been told. With his flair for publicity, Louis made the most of this find, so that the scientific world began to sit up and take notice as they had not done before. Nicknamed 'Nutcracker Man', *Zinjanthropus* captured the popular imagination,

and American funds began to flow Louis' way. This marked the beginning of a new epoch in palaeoanthropological research in East Africa, and happily coincided with the introduction of the new potassium/argon method of dating the volcanic tuffs which interbanded with the deposits of the lake around whose shore the ancient hominids had lived and left their remains; thus the lake deposits could be bracketed between the dated tuffs. The discovery of *Homo habilis* the following year further boosted world-wide interest, and gave satisfaction to Louis as being assignable to the genus *Homo* and a more likely candidate as a tool-maker than an australopithecine. Later came the discovery of the *Homo erectus* skull, the so-called 'Chellean Man'. In the years that followed Louis was less often at Olduvai, and from 1968 onwards Mary did all the work there, concentrating especially on Beds III, IV and the Masek Beds, to complement the earlier work on Beds I and II. She added a great deal to the data Olduvai has yielded, fleshing out still further the possible scenarios in the mosaic of human evolution over nearly 2 million years.

Mary was well aware that archaeological discoveries are of limited value if they are not properly published. Her monument lies in the series of carefully compiled volumes on the sequence of beds and their contents at Olduvai and Laetoli, recording her detailed observations and painstaking analyses, in which she insisted on relating the finds to the geology and the stratigraphy, with which she received invaluable help from Richard Hay. It was characteristic of her interdisciplinary approach that she did not hesitate to enlist the aid of specialists in related disciplines. Her Laetoli volume, which she wrote and edited with John Harris, contains the reports of some 30 experts who worked with her there or on Laetoli material. Mary did not succumb to the common temptation of archaeologists hastening into the field again seeking the excitement of new discoveries while neglecting the tedious chores of what should be the obligatory slog in the laboratory, the workroom and the study. She continued to write up the results of her researches to within a short time of her death.

To many, Mary was a very formidable lady: she had strong likes and dislikes — and certainly she was not one to suffer fools gladly. When in camp at Olduvai I have seen a gradu-

ate student express a criticism too forcibly — and in Mary's eye, too impertinently — and then be dismissed from the mess table and sent packing back to his tent. On another occasion, when Mary and I were quartering the floor of the Ngorongoro crater looking for prehistoric burial cairns, I almost felt sorry for a colleague who failed to keep our pick-up rendezvous with the Landrover. This had left us stranded on our own, on foot, at dusk with the hyaenas actually sniffing round our heels. Although I was equally angry, my anger was a little diminished by the gratification of hearing the virulence of the language in which an enraged Mary gave the errant driver of the Landrover, when we actually joined up with him, a dressing-down I guess he never forgot. However, Mary was not the cold, intimidating scientist, inflexibly pursuing her research for the facts of man's early history, as she has sometimes been portrayed. Determined and persistent she was, but she was also a human person, with a liking for whisky and cigarillos, and a capacity for friendship to which many could testify. My wife often used to complain that many of my archaeological friends had little time and regard for her because she was not an archaeologist. It was not like that with Mary — in fact the two of them became good friends on their own, and sometimes used to swap horror stories about the grim disadvantages of being married to an archaeologist!

Mary was the mother of three sons. She was very proud of them and their achievements, and of her grandchildren. Her eldest son Jonathan became a distinguished herpetologist, her youngest, Philip, became a highly regarded Cabinet Minister in the Kenyan government, and her middle son, Richard, has achieved fame for himself in his own right. In young adulthood he initially made up his mind to avoid competing with his parents in their chosen field — and then decided to do just that — resulting in his important discoveries around Lake Turkana. It was also in line with his parents' interests that he successfully took on the poachers to save Kenya's population of elephants. He has now taken on the politicians.

Mary was not only an archaeologist of world-wide distinction, she was also a passionate lover of animals. She once broke off a long-standing friendship because the friend had reintroduced myxomatosis onto her English farm to keep down the rabbits. Throughout the last 60 years


of her life she was devoted to her beloved Dalmatians. I don't think she quite reached a score of 101 but she was seldom without three or four; they had their added usefulness at Olduvai of giving warning when there were lions or leopards about.

After Louis died, Mary came to have an even greater personal affection for Olduvai than before, and for a number of years made it her home. That gash in the Serengeti plain which is Olduvai has been changed in its significance for ever by Mary and Louis Leakey. Is it fanciful to see her spirit still presiding over Olduvai?

THURSTAN SHAW

Selected works

- LEAKEY, M.D. 1971. *Olduvai Gorge 3: Excavations in Beds I and II, 1960–1963*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
1979. *Olduvai Gorge: my search for early man*. London: Collins.
1983. *Africa's vanishing art: the rock paintings of Tanzania*. Garden City (NY): Doubleday.
1984. *Disclosing the past*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- LEAKEY, M.D. & J.M. HARRIS (ed.). 1987. *Laetoli: a pliocene site in northern Tanzania*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- LEAKEY, M.D. with D.A. ROE. 1994. *Olduvai Gorge 5: Excavations in Beds III, IV and the Masek beds, 1968–1971*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

 JIMMY GRIFFIN was a figure whom we have had the privilege to meet and who deserves international exposure. We have, therefore, commissioned HENRY WRIGHT to give an international view of this great man, otherwise principally recorded in asides by Lewis Binford. The second photograph is Jimmy's, taken of CHILDE at Swanscombe.

James Bennett Griffin 1905–1997

The man responsible for organizing our knowledge of the archaeology of the Eastern Woodlands of North America and for nurturing many innovations in archaeological method and theory, James Griffin, died on 22 June 1997.

Born in Kansas and raised in Colorado and Illinois, Griffin was steeped in the values and perspectives of the American Midwest, the land to whose prehistory he brought systematic order. He received a BA from the University of Chicago in 1927. He continued in that institution, receiving his primary excavation training in the Illinois field school of the polymathic anthropologist Faye Cooper Cole in the summer of 1930. Later that year he received a MA with a thesis on mortuary variability in eastern North America. There were few posts open

for young archaeologists in the tumultuous first years of the Great Depression. In 1932, however, Griffin was fortunate to find support as research assistant in charge of the North American ceramic collections at the University of Michigan Museum of Anthropology, with the support of the pharmaceutical entrepreneur Eli Lilly, an Indiana native fascinated by American Indian cultural traditions.

Until that time, there was little appreciation of the long span of occupation in the Americas and archaeological assemblages were ascribed to ethnic groups mentioned by early European explorers. This approach had broken down as more and different assemblages were found in each limited sub-region. Griffin joined those who argued for the purely archaeological classification of material, without reference to putative ethnic associations. Masses of well-excavated ceramics — at first from excavations occasioned by federal reservoir construction in the Tennessee Valley and then from other Depression-era projects — came to Michigan's 'Ceramic Repository' for description and classification. Griffin brought order to this mountains of sherds with a 'binomial system', larger groupings based on clay body named for type sites, subdivided into smaller groupings based on surface treatment, producing not only precise descriptive studies, one of which (Griffin 1938) became the basis of his doctoral dissertation at the University of Michigan, but also the first of many syntheses of the prehistory of Eastern North America (Griffin 1946) based on ceramic sequences and correlations. The binomial system developed into the 'type-variety' approach to ceramics, used throughout the Americas today.

As ceramics could be formally classified in hierarchical taxonomies, so could entire material assemblages. Griffin became a strong partisan of the 'Midwest Taxonomic System' (McKern 1939) and produced its finest exemplification, a study of the latest Prehistoric sites of the middle portion of the Ohio Valley. The trait lists from individual sites were compared; sites with similar assemblages were grouped into a 'focus', and the foci of this region were grouped into a 'Fort Ancient Aspect', an element in a broader 'Mississippian Pattern' (1943). Only after formal classification did Griffin consider the chronological, social relations, and ethnic affiliation of these units. As editor of a massive *Festschrift* for his mentor Cole, *The*

archaeology of the eastern United States (1952), Griffin oversaw the ordering of much of the cultural evidence from the entire region in terms of McKern's scheme. Griffin joined James Ford of the American Museum in New York and Phillips Phillips of Harvard in an extensive survey of the major archaeological sites in the Lower Mississippi Valley, using a ceramic sequence based on both stratigraphic excavation and Ford's Seriation method, and considering the relation of sites to ancient channels of the Mississippi and its tributaries. It was thus one of the first archaeological surveys to map settlements on to palaeoenvironmental features (Phillips *et al.* 1951).

In 1946, Griffin was appointed Director of the Museum of Anthropology, a post he was to occupy for almost three decades. The post-war years saw an expansion for archaeology within new anthropology departments, and Griffin used Michigan's Department of Anthropology to provide advanced academic training for archaeologists already experienced in the Depression-era programmes or in post-war reservoir construction. With such resources as a museum Director could marshal, Griffin turned to unresolved problems in archaeological research.

The first of these was the issue of absolute chronology. Before 1949, the dating of prehistoric sites depended on tenuous correlations across the Great Plains to the southwestern cultures dated by the newly-developed dendrochronological method and on simple guesses. Griffin was well aware of the promise of Willard Libby's work on radiocarbon dating at the University of Chicago, and provided Libby with some Eastern Woodland samples. He was puzzled that the age determinations made in Chicago were in several cases the reverse of what he expected. He and his colleague in physics, H.R.Crane, were convinced that the problems had two sources: the imprecision of Libby's technique of measuring the radioactivity of solid carbon and the use of samples which had been contaminated during the excavation and museum storage. They built their own lab which accepted only samples which met Griffin's standards of unambiguous context, which pre-treated samples as carefully as current knowledge permitted, and which measured the radioactivity of gaseous carbon-dioxide. In its years of operation, more than 2000 age determinations were made and published, mostly in the journal



Presentation of ^{14}C samples by James B. Griffin to Gloria Thornton in the ^{14}C laboratory of the University of Michigan (1962). (Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan, Photographic archives.)

Radiocarbon. It was shown that the archaeological sequences proposed in Griffin's various syntheses were correct, but that the time-spans involved were longer than suspected. The lab also pioneered in the dating of Formative cultures of Central and South America, of the very early Jomon ceramics of Japan and of many other areas.

It was during this period that interests in the Siberian roots of North American cultures led Griffin to travel in western Europe, and in 1961 to visit Poland and Russia. Though he did not to his satisfaction resolve the issue of Siberian-American contacts (Griffin 1970), he indefatigably visited sites and museums and learned much of new European approaches to studying the environmental contexts of archaeological sites. He made many friends, launched collaborative projects in Poland and then Yugoslavia, and became a US representative to the UISPP, for many years serving on its Executive Committee.

With the basic framework of North American prehistory well established, in the later 1950s Griffin turned to the problem of understanding cultural change, particularly the impact of environmental change on human communities. He



A photograph of Gordon Childe at Swanscombe taken by James B. Griffin. (Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan, Photographic archives.)

planned research on this problem with Albert Spaulding in the Great Lakes region, where the uplift of Holocene beaches had left magnificent archaeological landscapes available for study. The proposal received one of the first National Science Foundation grants for archaeology. In this research, he could draw on Michigan's geologists and palaeo-botanists, on the Museum's own strong Laboratory of Ethnobotany under Volney Jones and on an energetic generation of graduate students. The specifics of the field research were largely in the hands of Mark Papworth and Lewis Binford. The resulting influential studies of human ecology (Cleland 1966; Yarnell 1964), artefact variability (Binford 1963) and social organization (MacPherron 1967), mark a transition towards a new approach to archaeology in North America.

Foreseeing the accelerating changes within the field, Griffin transformed the Museum of

Anthropology from an institution focused on North American culture history to an institution conducting training and research on issues of cultural evolution throughout the world. Beginning in the mid-1960s, he added curators with research interests in Mesoamerica and the Andes, Europe and the Near East; the long-standing programme in ethnobotany was complemented by others in ethnozoology and human biology; individuals with strong skills in statistical analysis and computerized data management replaced the departed Spaulding. If his museum in Ann Arbor became a centre for new developments toward a 'processual archaeology', however, Griffin was not about to shirk his responsibilities as an intellectual patriarch. He made it plain that he saw little value in evolutionary or behavioural theory. Ever-supportive with resources and requests for time away for field research, he was firm in criticism of what he saw as over-blown or patently wrong theory, inadequate evidence and impolite behaviour.

Another area of interest to North Americanists has been wide transport of exotic materials important in ritual display, among which are marine shell, native copper, galena, mica and obsidian. Griffin organized a study of obsidian from the pre-Mississippian Hopewell ritual centres using the neutron activation technique developed by chemist Adon Gordus, demonstrating the 'dark black glass' had been transported up to 2300 km from what is today Yellowstone Park (Griffin *et al.* 1969). In these studies, Griffin also set very strict criteria for recognizing probable exchange, as opposed to simple procurement, delivering sharp lessons in rigour to deserving enthusiasts in many subsequent trade disputes.

By the early 1970s, Griffin was deeply involved in a project designed to provide data to evaluate ideas about the identification of communities of the Mississippian culture as chiefdoms. It seemed logical to him that only a project which combined the strategy of complete settlement excavation (used previously in America only in a few salvage projects) with detailed plotting of artefacts in and around houses and sieving and flotation for subsistence remains, could show enduring differences in social rank. In southeastern Missouri, James Price had discovered a series of Mississippian villages burned after only a few years of occupation, and Griffin obtained funds for a near complete excava-

tion of two hamlets, two villages and part of the ceremonial centre of the Powers Phase (Price & Griffin 1979; Smith 1978). Final analysis of these excavations by a team under Bruce Smith of the Smithsonian Institution is near completion. The massive interstate highway programme gave archaeologists trained in the Powers Phase project, and many others, the opportunity to apply the same approach of complete excavation and intensive debris sampling to the hamlets and centres of the greatest of the Mississippian societies, that at Cahokia near modern St Louis, where Griffin sponsored excavations as long ago as 1950. In his own overview of his career, Griffin (1985) makes little of his contribution as an advisor to the later work at Cahokia, but his stamp, not only on the names of pottery types and cultural phases, but on the basic research approach, is profound. The prompt publication of almost 20 detailed monographs on this work is due in no small part to his encouragement. Perusal of the recent overview publication edited by Timothy Pauketat & Thomas Emerson (1997) or a visit to the magnificent interpretative centre at Cahokia itself is certain to fascinate any serious scholar of archaeology.


In his last years, Griffin was a Regents' Scholar at the Smithsonian, working on summary articles and overviews of conferences, both with the humour and the acerbic criticism for which he was justly known. Many remember best, however, his inimitable ability to pause, to look at you, and leave you thinking about an issue in a completely new way, without uttering a word.

HENRY WRIGHT
Museum of Anthropology
University of Michigan

References

- BINFORD, L.R. 1963. The Pomranky Cache, in A. Montet-White, L.R. Binford & Mark L. Papworth, *Miscellaneous studies in typology and classification*. Ann Arbor (MI): Museum of Anthropology. Anthropological Papers 19.
- CLELAND, C.E. 1966. *Prehistoric animal ecology and ethnozoology of the Upper Great Lakes*. Ann Arbor (MI): Museum of Anthropology. Anthropological Papers 29.
- GRIFFIN, J.B. 1938. The ceramic remains from Norris Basin, Tennessee in W.S. Webb (ed.), *An archaeological survey of the Norris Basin in Eastern Tennessee*: 253–8. Washington (DC): Smithsonian Institution. *Bulletin of American Ethnology* 118.
1943. *The Fort Ancient Aspect, its cultural and chronological position in Mississippi Valley archaeology*. Ann Arbor (MI): University of Michigan Press.
1946. Cultural change and continuity in Eastern United States archaeology in F. Johnson (ed.), *Man in northeastern North America*: 37–95. Andover (MA): Peabody Foundation. *Archaeological Papers* 3.

1952. *Archaeology of the Eastern United States*. Chicago (IL): University of Chicago Press.
1970. Northeastern Asian and northwestern American ceramics, *Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences* 3: 327–30. Tokyo/Kyoto: Science Council of Japan.
1985. An individual's participation in American archaeology, 1928–1985, *Annual Review of Anthropology* 14: 1–23.
- GRIFFIN, J.B., A.A. GORDUS & G.A. WRIGHT. 1969. Identification of sources of Hopewellian obsidian in the Middle West, *American Antiquity* 24(1): 1–14.
- MACPHERSON, A. 1967. *The Juntunen Site and the Late Woodland Prehistory of the Upper Great Lakes Area*. Ann Arbor (MI): Museum of Anthropology. Anthropological Papers 30.
- MCKERN, W.C. 1937. The Midwestern taxonomic system as an aid to archaeological culture study, *American Antiquity* 4: 301–13.
- PAUKETAT, T.R. & T.E. EMERSON. 1996. *Cahokia: Domination and ideology in the Mississippian world*. Lincoln (NE): University of Nebraska Press...
- PHILLIPS, P., J.A. FORD & J.B. GRIFFIN. 1951. *Archaeological survey in the Lower Mississippi Valley 1940–47*. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press. Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology 25.
- PRICE, J.E. & J.B. GRIFFIN. 1979. *The Snodgrass site of the Powers Phase of Southeast Missouri*. Ann Arbor (MI): Museum of Anthropology. Anthropological Papers 66.
- SMITH, B.D. 1978. *Prehistoric patterns of human behavior: a case study in the Mississippi Valley*. New York (NY): Academic.
- YARNELL, R.A. 1964. *Aboriginal relations between culture and plant life in the Upper Great Lakes region*. Ann Arbor (MI): Museum of Anthropology. Anthropological Papers 23.

 The Royal Commission on Historical Monuments for Scotland has recently completed its Sites and Monuments Record and has placed it on the World Wide Web, where it can now be widely consulted and used. DIANA MURRAY writes:

The National Monuments Record of Scotland — Online

The National Monuments Record of Scotland (NMRS) receives over 12,000 enquiries from around the world each year, many of which could be answered by users for themselves if they had direct access to the data. Many enquiries are received from overseas, particularly from those in search of their 'roots', from Canada, USA, Australia and New Zealand. Closer to home, difficulties of topography in Scotland mean that access to visitors from the Outer and Northern Isles and the Highlands of Scotland is restricted. Distance learning is taking off in a big way in Scotland and it is hoped that the initiatives of the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland (RCAHMS) will contribute some of the raw material for education and research over a much

larger constituency than has hitherto been possible.

To promote the NMRS to a wider number of users in higher education, in research, and those who have a general interest, RCAHMS has developed a user interface that allows direct access to the NMRS database over the Internet. CANMORE-Web (Computer Application for National Monuments Record Enquiries) allows users to query the NMRS database online, using a number of criteria including name, location, type and keyword, and is designed to ensure that users with the barest minimum of computer experience will be able to operate it effectively.


CANMORE-Web has been developed in partnership with ORACLE UK Ltd. This is an interface which is embedded in the RCAHMS Home pages on the WWW which are currently being further developed to include information about the work of RCAHMS and the public services offered by the NMRS. CANMORE-Web allows the user to enter a query which is then sent over the Internet to the NMRS database located in the RCAHMS.

The computerization of the NMRS archaeology records was completed in 1990 and work is now progressing on the capture of the catalogue to the architectural collections which is due for completion in 1999. This project has already encompassed 40% of Scotland's land mass including the areas covered by the old Regions of Highland, Fife, and Borders and work is well under way on the 34 catalogue volumes relating to the City of Edinburgh. The available data comprises locational information, statutory data — linked directly to Historic Scotland's database in a live link, descriptions of the site taken from OS cards, RCAHMS field reports, selected publication summaries, a summary of the archive collections held by NMRS relating to the site — which may include aerial photographs, archaeological archives and architects' plans and drawings, and bibliographical references.

Restrictions are in place to avoid extensive commercial use of what is intended to be (in its development phase) a free research tool, but a charging mechanism may be introduced in due course for some functions. Up to 100 sites can be retrieved as the result of each enquiry in a summary list and they may be selected to be viewed individually. National Grid references are available up to 6-figure accuracy.

Access is restricted to the catalogue of collections because of issues of interpretation of information, much of which has been designed in the past more for internal retrieval purposes than for elucidation of content. Warnings are in place relating to responsible use and access to sites. RCAHMS' policy is that information should be made available where possible as irresponsible and anti-social behaviour relating to sites on the ground is not prevented by restricting information.

CANMORE-Web is available at <http://www.rcahms.gov.uk> and will be on trial until April 1998, when it will be launched to a wider audience. We would welcome readers' comments on this service. The NMRS is open from 9.30 a.m.–4.30 p.m. Monday–Thursday and 9.30 a.m.–4.00 p.m. on Friday. Tel. (0)131-662-1456, FAX (0)131-662-1477/1499, e-mail nmrs@rcahms.gov.uk

 We are pleased to announce ANTIQUITY's continuing support of the Theoretical Archaeology Group (TAG) Conference Quiz. A team composed of ALASDAIR WHITTLE, SARA CHAMPION, CLAIRE WHITTLE and NADIA JACKSON won the December 1997 quiz, which consisted of an imaginative range of questions composed by the previous editor. They will receive a subscription to the best source for next year's quiz answers, which will be prepared by PROF. ALASDAIR WHITTLE (see below for TAG 1998).

Prizes¹

You may remember the first award of the BEN CULLEN PRIZE last year to a young researcher 'of the new generation', a fitting memorial made possible through the kind generosity of IAN GOLLOP. This year the BEN CULLEN PRIZE, a prize to the value of £500, is awarded to GLENN R. STOREY for his article 'The population of ancient Rome' published in December 1997. Glenn is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Anthropology in the University of Iowa.

The ANTIQUITY PRIZE, of £1000, now in its fourth year of award and for a contribution of

1 The ANTIQUITY Prize is funded out of our own resources, accumulated out of subscriptions. The judges for both prizes were Christopher Chippindale and Anthony Sinclair, as the two editors associated with the running of the journal on an everyday basis, and Warwick Bray and Anthony Harding as ANTIQUITY Trustees. The choice was made from all contributions to volume 71.

special merit, is awarded to JOHN E. TERRELL and ROBERT L. WELSCH for their stimulating article 'Lapita and the temporal geography of prehistory', published in September 1997.

Noticeboard

Please note that the *ANTIQUITY Supplement* will be gathering information on Events, Conferences, Exhibitions, Post-graduate Courses, Meetings, Archaeological Services and publishers information in future. Please see below for the details of this new service to ANTIQUITY readers.

Seminar

Finds Research Group AD 700–1700 Religious Sites, Religious Artefacts?

Guildford Museum, Surrey

Monday 27 April, 1998

Details from *Quita Mould, Christmas Cottage, Choseley, Kings Lynn, Norfolk, PE31 8PQ, England*. Tel. (0)148-512443.

Conferences: announcements and calls for papers

26th Computer Applications in Archaeology

Barcelona, Spain

24–28 March 1998

New techniques for old times, Old towns, virtual towns, 1st Festival on virtual reality for archaeology. Details from *Juan A. Barceló, Divisió de Prehistoria, Facultat de Lletres, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 08193 Bellaterra, Spain*.

E-mail ilphd@blues.uab.es

and website <http://blues.uab.es/~ilphd/caa98>

Society for American Archaeology — 63rd meeting

Seattle (WA), USA

25–29 March 1998

Further information from *Society for American Archaeology, 900 Second Street NE #12, Washington DC 20002, USA*.

Cambridge Conference on Archaeology and World religions: The examples of Judaism, Islam, Christianity, Hinduism and Buddhism

St John's College, Cambridge, England

14–16 April 1998

Details from *Dr Tim Insoll, St John's College, Cambridge CB2 1TP, England*. FAX (0)1223-337720.

E-mail TA11000@hermes.cam.ac.uk

Settlement and landscape

University of Aarhus, Denmark

4–7 May 1998

Details from *Secretariat of Conference Settlement and Landscape, Forhistorisk Arkæologi, Moesgård, DK 8270 Højberg, Denmark*. FAX (45)-86-27-23-78.

E-mail farkbr@moes.hum.aau.dk

Research Strategies for Independent Archaeology Society of Antiquaries, London, England

16 May 1998

Details from *Andrew Selkirk, 9 Nassington Road, London NW3 2TX, England*. Tel. (0)171-435-7517

14th International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences. The 21st Century: The Century of Anthropology

The College of William & Mary, Williamsburg (VA), USA

26 July–1 August 1998

Details from *ICALES, PO Box 8795, Williamsburg VA 23187-8795, USA*. FAX 757-221-1734.

E-mail oxcasa@facstaff.wm.edu

and website <http://www.wm.edu/ICAES>

Neolithic Orkney in its European Context

Kirkwall, Orkney, Scotland

10–14 September 1998

Orkney Heritage Society. Details from *Conference Secretary, Katherine Towsey, c/o Tankerness House Museum, Broad Street, Kirkwall, Orkney KW15 1DH, Scotland*.

E-mail 113277.554@compuserve.com

European Association of Archaeologists 4th Annual Meeting

Göteborg, Sweden

23–27 September 1998

Details from *Meeting Secretariat of the EAA Annual Meeting 1998, Dept of Archaeology, Goteborg University, S-412 98 Göteborg, Sweden*. FAX (46)-31-773-51-82.

E-mail EAA-98@archaeology.gu.se

and website www.hum.gu.se/~arkeaa

TAG

Birmingham, England

19–21 December 1998

For further information of dates and programme see <http://www.bham.ac.uk/tag98>

World Archaeology Congress 4

Cape Town, South Africa

10–14 January 1999

Further details from *Congress Secretariat, PO Box 44503, Claremont 7735, South Africa*.

E-mail wac@globalconf.co.za

and website <http://www.uct.ac.za/depts/age/wac>

Roman Archaeology Conference

University of Durham, Durham, England

Friday 16–Sunday 18 April 1999

To include Research agendas for Roman Britain, Gallia Narbonensis. Further information from *Dr S.T. James, Dept Archaeology, University of Durham, South Road, Durham DH1 3LE, England*. FAX (0)191-374-3619.

E-mail s.t.james@dur.ac.uk

Symposia

Archaeology, New Techniques, New Knowledge.
Institute of Field Archaeologists in association
with the University of Cambridge
New Hall, Cambridge, England
27–28 March 1998

GIS, Conservation, Internet, Virtual Reality, Scientific Analysis, Dating Techniques, Computer Aided Design, Terrain Modelling, Geophysical Techniques, Electronic Publishing. Parallel events on Saturday 28 March, activities, workshop, displays, for all ages. Details from *IFA Office, University of Reading, 2 Early Gate, PO Box 239, Reading RG6 6AU, England*. Tel/FAX (0)118 9316446.

Siberian Panorama through the Millennia, commemorating the 90th anniversary of Academician A.P. Okladnikov

Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography,
Novosibirsk, Russia

19 July 19–2 August 1998

Sessions and field trips, Russian and English presentations. Details from *Organizing Committee, Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography, SB RAS, 17 Lavrentiev Ave, Novosibirsk 630090, Russia*. FAX 3832-357791.

E-mail root@archaeology.nsc.ru

Workshop

Thinking through the Body

Department of Archaeology, University of Wales,
Lampeter

20–22 June 1998

Sessions include The Consuming Body, Death and the Body, Decorating/modifying the Body, Bodily Memory, Bodily Metaphors and Material Culture. Details from *Dr Mark Pluciennik, Department of Archaeology, University of Wales, Lampeter, Ceredigion SA49 7ED, Wales*. FAX (0)1570-423669.

E-mail m.pluciennik@lamp.ac.uk

The Antiquity Supplement

From June ANTIQUITY will be including a supplement to the main journal. It replaces the Noticeboard and will include publicity on a wide range of archaeological publishing, events, programmes and services. Sections will include:

Publishers and Journals**Conferences, Symposia, Seminars and Meetings**

Education: Masters and Postgraduate programmes, Summer Schools and Adult Education

Research: Studentships, Research Assistants, Research Grants, Research Searches

Appointments: Academic, Museum, Field Archaeology, Consultancy

Archaeological Services: Laboratories, Specialist Services, Supplies

Exhibitions: Museums, Galleries, Sites, Special Events

Websites and Computer Archaeology

Advertising space will be available at two rates, non-commercial and commercial. A box or multiples of (c. 45x60mm/1.35x2.35") will cost from £10/\$20 per unit. Commercial space is available at £235/\$450 per full page. Third World countries should inquire for special arrangements. The Supplement will be printed on A5 (148x210 mm/5.8x8.3") in black and white. For further information on placing notices please contact Libby Peachey at Antiquity, New Hall, Cambridge CB3 0DF, England. Tel/FAX (0)1223 357075 or e-mail catm20@cus.cam.ac.uk

ANTIQUITY retains the right to select advertising material appropriate to the interests of archaeology and the journal.