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4 The aim of the present study is to see whether the archæologist can observe any cumulative tendencies, any trends in one direction in the manifestations of man's spiritual culture, comparable to those that are clearly manifest in his material culture over the long period comprised within the archæological record. Of course all the archæologist can study is Man's behaviour, the material expressions of his spiritual life. Qua archæologist, he cannot recapture Neandertal man's ideas about a future life nor the theory of Cro-Magnon magic. Indeed it may be questioned whether palæolithic 'men' had any articulate spoken language suitable for expressing in analytical words, 'ideas' or 'theories' at all. Their language may still have been 'kinetic'—gestures and grunts, capable of arousing in their fellows emotions and stimulating them to action, but not of formulating an idea as abstract as even 'bear.' We must not imagine early hominids elaborating an eschatology and then acting on it. The deep emotions aroused by the recurrent crises of life and death found expression in no abstract judgements, but in passionate acts. The acts were the ideas, not expressions of them. Certain types of act came to be recognized by societies as appropriate to certain situations, just as certain types of tool won approval as standard forms. Such patterns of behaviour became rites, but the rite did not necessarily express a theory, more probably it came to constitute one. Burial rites have been selected for study because the record of such, going back to middle palæolithic times, is peculiarly long and full.

I Disposal of the corpse

Palæolithic corpses were buried either extended (Cro-Magnon, Grimaldi) or contracted 1 (La Ferassie, etc., Mt. Carmel). Both positions are attested also in mesolithic times. In neolithic times extended burial was practised by the food-gathering Forest tribes of Siberia (till the Glazkovo stage), northern Europe and the Baltic, and in the 'transitional' collective burial place at Mariupol. Among food-producers it was normal among the northern farmers of the 'Mega-lithic' group and in the Ground and Upper Graves of the Danish battle-axe folk (in the earlier Bottom Graves the bodies were usually contracted 2), in the Danubian cemetery of Hinkelstein and some 'late Rössen graves,' 3 and in some Western graves in western Germany 3 (at Michelsberg and Altenburg), and France (Fort Harrouard 4). In southern climes this attitude is rarer, but there are plenty of examples in the al'Ubaid culture. In all other early or neolithic cemeteries and cultures in Europe, North Africa and Hither Asia the bodies were buried flexed or contracted, and this was far the commonest practice in the Early Bronze Age too.

During the Bronze Age contracted gradually gave place to extended burial. In Egypt nobles were extended already in protodynastic times; by Dynasty IV 60 per cent. of the bodies in the Qau cemetery 5 were extended, and by Dynasty IX, 96 per cent., only the very poorest being contracted. In Cyprus contracted and extended bodies are alike found in Early Cypriote graves. 6 In Mesopotamia, where contracted burial came in by Jemdet Nasr times, extended burial was adopted much more slowly, at Kish 7 not till Neo-Babylonian times, though it was practised quite early in Elam, apparently even in tombs contemporary with Early Dynastic I. In Greece contracted burial remained normal till the Middle Helladic period, but during the latter extended burial gradually became fashionable; at Aine, Persson considers a gently flexed posture to be an intermediate stage in a slow process of change. Similarly in Sicily 8 the bodies in Siculan II tombs are less strictly contracted than in Siculan I while those in Siculan III are extended. In all these cases the change of position is not associated with concomitant changes in grave-goods that would denote the infiltration of a new 'culture' or people.

In Central Europe while contracted burial was the rule in the Early Bronze Age Amunjetitz culture, 'chiefains' were already buried extended, as at Leubingen, and this was the regular practice in the
Middle Bronze Age Tumulus culture as in contemporary Danish and Swedish barrows. Hence by the Early Iron Age among inhumationists extended burial was almost universal save for some curious exceptions. In Britain contracted burial was still the rule as late as La Tène II-III in the Arras culture and occurs sporadically in Scotland even in the Roman period; it survived also in the Picene enclaves in north-eastern Italy, in Hungary and Transylvania, in Transcaucasia and in both cemeteries at Sirk in western Iran. But the general tendency to replace contraction by extension is unmistakable; it seems quite unconnected with ethnic changes but may perhaps be correlated with increasing wealth, a rising standard of living, and warmer bedding.

During late neolithic times cremation began to compete with inhumation—allegedly in Palestine (Gezer), Syria (Byblos) and the Peloponnesse (Argive Heraeum), more certainly in late Danubian graves in the Wetterau, Central Germany, and Bohemia, later in graves with Corded Ware and Globular Amphore in the same regions and with Bell Beakers in Moravia and Hungary, in megalithic tombs in Brittany and the British Isles (especially Ulster) as allegedly in the comparable tombs of Los Millares and some of the Narro grottoes. In Brittany and the British Isles, as in Central Europe, the tradition seems to persist into the Bronze Age since cremation was practised in the early-Middle Bronze Age barrows of Armorica, Wessex, Ireland, Alsace and south-western Germany, and in fairly early graves in Hungary. By the Late Bronze Age it was the commonest rite throughout Western, Central, and also Northern Europe, and was practised also in Upper Italy and after 1400 B.C. at Troy in western Asia Minor and in North Syria. But the new rite never caught on in Russia east of the Dniepr, in Iran, nor, of course, in Egypt.

In the Iron Age, i.e., after 1000 B.C., the relations between the two rites become extremely complicated, but nowhere did cremation entirely supersede inhumation save for a time in Britain, and North and East-Central Europe. In most Greek cemeteries both rites occur side by side, with inhumations usually in the majority save for notable exceptions curiously enough on Thera and in Crete. The same holds good of Magna Graecia and Rome itself and apparently Carthage and the Punic colonies in Sardinia and at Villaricos in Spain. It is very significant that the early cemetery at Motya consisted entirely of cremation graves. Since this must belong to Semitic Phoenicians or Carthaginians, it proves that cremation is not a distinctively Aryan rite. Conversely inhumation was the rule among the La Tène Celts of Europe.

Under the early Empire cremation spread in Italy and the western provinces, even among the Celts of Gaul, presumably because it happened to be the family rite of the Caesars. But it made no headway in Asia, and precisely at this time inhumation cemeteries began to become increasingly common among the Teutonic tribes who had been most consistently cremationist in the last centuries B.C. Then from 200 A.D. inhumation, now nearly always in the extended position, began to replace cremation rapidly throughout the Empire and beyond its frontiers in the North. Nock has argued convincingly that the reversal was prior to, and unconnected with, the spread of Christianity. The latter subsequently merely accelerated a tendency already operative at the conversion of some barbarian nations.

Hence the vague of cremation interrupted, but did not negate, the general tendency to adopt burial in the extended posture. Incidentally note: (1) Robinson’s statement ‘The furniture of cremation graves is not inferior in quality or less abundant than in any type of inhumation burial’ is applicable to the whole area and period here surveyed; the furniture accompanying some cremations is in fact outstandingly rich, for instance in the early Middle Bronze Age of Armorica and Wessex, at Hallstatt, and in the Roman Iron Age of Silesia. Such wealth is contrary to what would have been expected had the rite been inspired by new conceptions of the soul’s fate such as are outlined in Rohde’s Psyche. (2) It seems impossible to derive all cremations from any single centre. (3) It is not permissible to correlate cremations with Indo-Europeans though the Bronze Age cremations in Syria might plausibly be connected with the Aryans attested there epigraphically about that time. Though India seems the only Asiatic province where cremation ever became firmly established, the rite there may be pre-Aryan, if the cremations reported by Stein be correctly dated to the IIIm millennium.

II Place of Burial

Since the caves in which Moustierian burials occur were also used for habitation, the middle paleolithic practice may be described as burial in or among the dwellings. So may mesolithic burials in caves in Palestine and the Crimea and in middens in Brittany, Portugal and North Africa. Among later sedentary societies burial of adults (the special case of infant burial is not considered here) in or between the dwellings was the practice of neolithic Westerners at Michelsberg and Fort Harrouard, at Ripoli and Molfetta in South Italy, at Merimde in Lower Egypt, perhaps in neolithic Cyprus, certainly at Sirk in Iran, and apparently in the Chalcolithic settlement at Alashar in central Anatolia. Nearly all other neolithic and chalcolithic villagers who have left us any graves at all, including apparently the Halafian...
and al’Ubaid populations of Arpachiya in Assyria, buried their dead in cemeteries or collective tombs outside the settled area. In the Bronze Age we find house-burial in the El Argar culture of south-west Spain, in the Middle, but not the Early, Helladic period in Greece, and throughout the period in central, but not western, Anatolia, in North Syria, and Iran. Even in the cities of Mesopotamia house-burial was the practice from Early Dynastic times in Akkad (if not in Sumer), from 2000 B.C. at Assur and almost as early at Ugarit and other genuine cities in North Syria. The unhygienic practice continued at al Mina 26 on the Orontes into the fifth century B.C., in Babylonia till Hellenistic times, and at Assur even down to the Parthian period. But the general tendency, sometimes accelerated by legislation as at Rome, has undoubtedly been to separate graves from built-up dwelling areas. Note that burials in settlements are often (as at Merimde) much less richly furnished than burials in cemeteries; on the other hand, the evidence for periodical offerings at the tomb is particularly clear in the case of house-burials, as at Assur.

III. Grave-goods

Food (joints of meat), unspecialized tools or weapons (hand-axes, ‘scrapers’), toilet articles (lumps of ochre) and ornaments were deposited in palaeolithic graves. Articles of the same general classes may be expected in graves of later periods. But with progress in material culture the number and variety of things used by men and capable of being buried with them were constantly increasing. This increase is very imperfectly reflected in the funerary record. In post-palaeolithic graves we do indeed quite often find (a) food and drink or receptacles therefor (pots); (b) general-purpose tools like knives; (c) weapons of war or of the chase; (d) toilet-articles, including cosmetics with the appropriate paraphernalia, razors, tweezers, shears, scissors, ear-scoops, combs, mirrors, strigils, and the like; (e) ornaments (including beads, pendants, ear-, neck-, arm-, and leg-rings) and articles of apparel including pins, brooches, girdle-clasps, and buttons; (f) supernatural equipment such as amulets, figurines, seals; (g) games-men, knuckle-bones and dice; (h) lamps. Nevertheless the additions made to human equipment after the Old Stone Age and the consequent multiplication of possessions are very imperfectly represented in the sepulchral record.

(A) While the cultivation of plants was the basis of the neolithic revolution, the instruments connected therewith are very seldom found in graves.

(i) Hoe-blades.—While the shoe-last celts that do occur in Danubian graves (though not very regularly) may have been so used, I know no other really likely instances; for the Mesopotamian ‘transverse axe’ was almost certainly a weapon.

(ii) Sickles.—Save perhaps for the crescentic flint knives of the Stone Cist period in Northern Europe, I know no probable examples of sickles in neolithic graves. Flint knives with serrated edges do occur in Badarian cemeteries 27 but only with male interments and they are not described as lustred by use as sickles. Bronze sickles are conspicuously absent from Danish and British barrows, from the cemeteries of Ur and Kish in Mesopotamia, of Hissar in Iran, of Greece, Sicily and south-east Spain. In fact I have been able to discover in the whole Bronze Age only half a dozen sickles in the tumulus culture of Wurtemberg, a smaller number in contemporary Bavarian barrows, a few in Lausitz urnfields and one in a Late Copper Age barrow in South Russia, though in nearly all these areas they are common in hoards or as Astray. In the Iron Age sickles are almost equally rare. I have, for instance, come across none in the published contents of the very rich cemeteries of Italy, Bosnia, south-western Germany and Alsace, and Koban, but there are examples from the urnfield cultures of East-Central Europe, 30 from Santa Lucia and from both the iron age cemeteries at Sialk. 31 In fact it is only in the Roman and Migration periods of northern Europe that sickles and even scythes begin to be at all common in graves.

(iii) Querns.—I know some saddle-querns from neolithic Danubian 33 and Cypriote 34 graves. In Alsace and at Khrokittia in Cyprus they were laid upon the skeletons as if to keep them down. Otherwise I know no examples of querns of any kind being deposited in the grave as a possession to be used by the defunct, though querns were undoubtedly valuable. It is, of course, no exception that model querns with model figures working them were buried in Egyptian tombs, nor that a rotary quern with a real serving woman to work it and the rest of the kitchen equipment was buried with Queen Aase in the Oseberg Ship.

(B) Textile appliances are much less common than might have been expected. Of those that might survive, whorls cannot always be distinguished from ornamental beads nor loomweights from net-sinkers. Weaving combs and bobbins, so common in domestic sites in Great Britain, are unknown from graves. At Olynthus loomweights were found in two graves only and whorls in three graves out of 600. I do not think this proportion was seriously exceeded in any earlier barbarian or civilized cemetery, but it was in the Migration period of northern Europe. 35

(C) Craft tools are very rarely found in graves.

(i) Carpenters’ equipment.—Stone axes and adzes that do of course turn up in neolithic graves might also be classified as weapons. The only unmistakably
specialized wood-working tool of the Stone Age—the
gouge—is found frequently in Boat-axe graves in
Sweden 36 and in some tombs at Los Millares in south-
eastern Spain. The more specialized and varied
woodworking tools of copper and bronze are just as
rare in graves. Saws come from a couple of tombs at
Los Millares and one at Alcalá, but they are not
uncommon in Early Dynastic Sumerian graves,
notably at Shuruppak (Fara) and Ur, and occur again
in Early Dynastic Egyptian tombs. Chisels and
adzes from the same periods must also be reckoned as
carpenters’ tools. Later such implements become
very rare in civilized burials; in the large Qau 37
cemetery, for instance, there is only one chisel to be
classed here, assigned to Dynasties VII-VIII. Model
and miniature carpenters’ tools and pictures of such in
Egyptian nobles’ tombs, including those of ladies,38
from the VIth Dynasty on obviously come into the
same category as the quern models mentioned under
A. iii, and do not represent the implements personally
used by the deceased. The carpenters’ tools from
‘royal tombs’ at Abydos and Ur (perhaps therefore
also at Fara) and the gouge or drill-bit from the
princely tomb of Novosvodobnaya on the Kuban may
fall into a similar category. In the Late Bronze Age
of Europe woodworking implements are recognizable
in many hoards but hardly ever recur in graves; some
winged adzes from barrows in south-western Ger-
many39 are the most notable exceptions. The still
more varied and efficient carpenters’ kit of the Iron
Age seems virtually unrepresented in graves though
the implements are faithfully depicted on craftsmen’s
tombstones in the Roman period as later.

(ii) The smith must have been a specialized crafts-
man from the dawn of the metal age and must have
had from the start appropriate craft implements.
But such were never normally buried with him. The
best exceptions to this generalization I can cite are the
mould for a West European dagger from a Beaker
grave in Moravia,40 a mould for a shaft-hole axe from
a South Russian kurgan of the Late Copper Age,41
and a couple of unspecified moulds from Lausitz unri-
field. A grave in cemetery A at Sialk 31 contained a
complete bronze-smith’s outfit, but the anvils, ham-
mers, and gravers so well known from Late Bronze
Age hoards in Central, Northern and Western Europe
never seem to be found in graves, nor yet the tongs,
hammers, anvils, files, and other appliances used by
civilized smiths in the Mediterranean Iron Age and the
La Tène period this side of the Alps (though they are
depicted on smiths’ tombstones in the Roman
Empire). But in the Roman and Migration period a
smith’s full outfit, sometimes accompanied by his
weapons, is not seldom found in barbarian Teutonic
cemeteries.42

(iii) Generalized wealth, money, whether in the
form of ‘spits’ or of coins, was represented in tombs
(mostly after 400 n.c.) only symbolically by one or two
obols or small coins that evidently bore no relation to
the defunct’s actual wealth. The only possible excep-
tions are certain late ‘royal tombs’ to be mentioned
below.

In brief, of the new sorts of possessions and wealth,
created by technological progress, only a few classes,
and mostly those approved by tradition from the
pleistocene, were generally regarded as suitable grave
furniture.

(D) Even within the approved classes of possessions
while the number and variety owned and used by a
prosperous individual must have grown with the
advance of material culture, there is no corresponding
increase in the richness of grave furniture. On the
contrary in many regions, or more exactly among most
societies, the graves grow progressively poorer as
material wealth, the number and variety of available
articles of use or enjoyment, increased.

This is conspicuously true of Bronze Age Britain
where, in contrast to the comparative wealth of
Beaker and still more of Wessex graves, burials of the
Late Bronze Age are disappointingly poor, though
the hoards are larger and more numerous than before.
Kruglov and Podgayetsky 43 have demonstrated a
similar impoverishment in the Copper Age graves of
South Russia with elaborate statistics and offered an
explanation for it in terms of Marxist sociology. In
Sicily early Siculan II graves are richer than those of
Siculan I, but in later graves of period II miniatures
begin to replace real bronze weapons while various
metal types such as bronze girdles and lance-heads,
common in contemporary hoards, are never found in
graves of Siculan III.44 In Denmark the same
phenomenon is observable though less conspicuously.
In contrast to the extravagant wealth of the Middle
Bronze Age inhumations and the earlier cremations,
Late Bronze Age graves look rather poor, and mini-
ture weapons take the place of useful ones. Then
after a period of rich burials about the beginning of
our era when Roman trade enriched native society—
but disturbed its economy—after A.D. 200 ‘in general
apart from magnates’ graves, one observes that the
‘graves are ever more poorly furnished.’45 Again in
Anglo-Saxon Britain full-size toilet-articles came to be
replaced by miniatures.

The same tendency was even more marked in
civilized States. In Egypt even in predynastic times
the Amratian figures of oxen may be regarded as
substitutes for real oxen belonging to the deceased,
and later we find models of fine knives and similar
valuables. Under the Pharaohs almost any sort of
real wealth from bread to slaves, bodyguards, houses,
and boats might be represented in the tomb by models
or pictures. In Sumer and Akkad Early Dynastic
graves were well furnished with arms, implements, and ornaments of metal, seals, and other valuables. But at Ur by the time of the IIIrd Dynasty and therefore of the city’s greatest prosperity the graves seem to have contained (no full report has been published after twenty years!) only vases, figurines, and models of clay and some modest personal ornaments. And at Kish by the time of Hammurabi the burial furniture had been reduced to a few pots and strings of beads unaccompanied by any metal objects or even seals. In Assyria the process, and the formation of a stable State, began later. The house-graves at Assur about 2000 B.C. were well furnished with copper weapons, cylinder seals, and ostrich-eggs; later graves of precisely the same type, were almost as poor as those of Kish.

In Bronze Age Greece such impoverishment is less noticeable for reasons to be adduced below. Nevertheless in Minoan Crete Seager contrasts the rarity of ornaments and similar non-ceramic relics in the M.M. III-L.M. I cemetery of Paethymmos with the wealth of such objects from the Early Minoan tombs of Mochlos. In the Iron Age, however, it is well established that there was a tendency to place less ‘furniture in the graves as time went on.’ At Athens graves from the golden age of Pericles contain actually less furniture than those from the poor Dark Age when Geometric and Dipylon vases were current. So too in Magna Grecia; the poorest graves at Syracuse, for instance, are those of the fifth and fourth centuries, the era of the city’s greatest prosperity.

To the rule of the progressive reduction of grave-goods there are of course many apparent exceptions. Hallstatt graves are generally richer than Bronze Age ones in the same area. Picene, Astetine, and other Iron Age graves in Italy are often extravagantly furnished and so are many barbarian cemeteries of the Migration period on both sides of the Alps. No impoverishment can be asserted as between Early, Middle, and Late Helladic burials, nor yet between the burials of Hisar I, II, and III. These and similar ‘exceptions’ are really very instructive. The rich Hallstatt cemeteries of barbarian Europe do not belong to the same archeological culture and so not to the same people or society as had occupied the area in the Bronze Age, but to newcomers who had ousted or at least absorbed the older population. The same remark applies to the barbarian cemeteries of the Migration Period, or again to such equally rich cemeteries as those of Sialk A and B. At Hisar, though the several settlements succeed one another continuously on the same site, radical changes in pottery and other relics show that each represents a distinct culture. We are not dealing with one society but with three distinct societies. So in Mainland Greece the Middle Helladic period begins with the violent destruction of many Early Helladic townships and the establishment of a new culture, phenomena generally admitted to indicate conquest by new people. And then the new barbaric society was exposed to the intense radiation of the high civilization of Minoan Crete. Anthropologists know well enough the solvent effect on social organization of such contact between civilization and barbarism. In Greece it seems to have produced a new social order, that of the Heroic Age as described by Chadwick. In the same way the Northern barbarians had been exposed to penetration by Roman civilization just at the time when grave-goods became richer again after a period of poverty.

We can thus formulate a general rule as follows: in a stable society the grave-goods tend to grow relatively and even absolutely fewer and poorer as time goes on. In other words, less and less of the deceased’s real wealth, fewer and fewer of the goods that he or she had used, worn, or habitually consumed in life were deposited in the tomb or consumed on the pyre. The stability of a society may be upset by invasion or immigration on a scale that requires a radical reorganization or by contact between barbarian and civilized societies so that, for instance, trade introduces new sorts of wealth, new opportunities for acquiring wealth and new classes (traders) who do not fit in at once into the kinship organization of a tribe.

IV Sepulchral Monuments

The variety of grave forms is too great to warrant any comprehensive generalizations. But in respect of certain forms, and the societies that favoured these, it is easy to see that with the advance of material culture and consequent increase of wealth and control over nature, a diminishing proportion of social labour and energy and of individual wealth has been expended upon the construction of tombs. The erection of megalithic tombs and long bars by small groups, equipped only with stone tools and lacking block-and-tackle, the excavation of spacious family-vaults with sculptured doorways and façades, like those of the Early Cypriote phase in Cyprus, Siculan I and Anghelu Ruju, with stone implements supplemented by rare and costly copper chisels and even the piling of the larger barsrows of Bronze Age Britain or Denmark, quite obviously absorbed a larger proportion of society’s still exiguous resources than the construction of the finest Greek or Etruscan painted tombs or the excavation of catacombs at Rome with the aid of a large variety of cheap and efficient iron tools and the mechanical devices developed from the fifth century.

Megalithic tombs, rock-cut chambers, and round barrows are larger, sorder, and more spacious than the flimsy one-roomed huts inhabited by neolithic and
Bronze Age Britons, or Siculans. Among the civilized peoples of the Iron Age, as to-day, the dwellings of the living were more spacious and more sumptuous than the houses of the dead. Hence, in every domain accessible to the archaeologist, with progress in civilization a dwindling proportion of society’s growing wealth has been devoted to the preparation of tombs and their furnishing. Of course, the lying-in-state, the cortège, the wake, and other accessories of funerals have left no mark on the archaeological record.

V Royal Tombs

Certain peculiar tombs that may occur at any archaeological period since the beginning of the Bronze Age seem to constitute exceptions to the foregoing rule inasmuch as in them a quite substantial portion of their occupant’s wealth seems to have been deposited in them or expended on their construction and embellishment. To such I confine the term ‘Royal Tombs’ and I class here the Egyptian tombs of the first four dynasties, the ‘Royal Tombs’ of Ur and the comparable tombs at Mari and in the cemetery at Kish; the Shang tombs at Anyang; the Shaft Graves and tholoi of Mycenaean Greece; chieftains’ barrows of the barbarian Bronze Age like Leubingen, Maikop, Seddin, Bush Barrow; and the great barrows of Kerma in Nubia, the archaic Scythian barrows on the Kuban; south-west German ‘chieftains’ barrows’ of Hallstatt D and La Tène I like Klein Aspergl, and perhaps all Celtic chariot-burials; Sutton Hoo and Viking ship-burials like Oseberg; many other barbarian burials like Pazyri in the Altai. All such are sharply contrasted to contemporary commoners’ graves by the magnitude and magnificence of the tomb, the extravagant wealth of the furniture, and the presence (when the tomb was found complete and intact) of human victims.

By no means all tombs of royalties exhibit these peculiarities. On the contrary, even in Egypt, if we take into account the immense increase in wealth resulting not only from the advance of civilization, but also from the tribute of a flourishing Asiatic empire, the tombs of New Kingdom Pharaohs like Thothmes III and Tutankhamen must be regarded as small in size and modestly furnished when compared with those of Hor-Aha, Hetepheres, and Mycerinus. The graves of the Assyrian kings at Assur were of the same kind as those of private citizens, only naturally larger and presumably more richly furnished but insignificant in comparison with their palaces. The same remarks will apply to the royal necropolis of Sidon, the mausolea of Augustus and Hadrian, the tombs of Darius and most other Iron Age monarchs.

In fact ‘royal tombs’ of the peculiar type distin-
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ROYAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL INSTITUTE: PROCEEDINGS


The paper summarized the author’s researches on two field-trips in Mexico and Peru in special connexion with a literacy campaign among the Indians.

THE CASE FOR APPLIED ANTHROPOLOGY IN THE RECONSTRUCTION OF BURMA. A Communication by H. N. C. Stevenson, O.B.E., 10 October, 1944.

This communication is printed in full, MAN, 1945, 2. Before presenting it, Mr. Stevenson made it clear that he was speaking for himself, and not as a representative of the Government of Burma.

His proposals were referred to the Officers of the Institute with a view to a memorandum to the Burma Office recommending that members of the Burma service should have some training in anthropology; that in view of the destruction of official records there should be immediate investigation by trained anthropologists of the tribes and peoples of Burma; that there should be a Department of Ethnography in the University of Rangoon, and a Survey of Burma, including the whole of Burma—not only the Hill Tribes—and that the inhabitants of Burma should be enlisted ‘widely in this work.’


An administrative officer in Northern Nigeria, with archaeological experience in excavation at Elvedon, Suffolk, for the Cambridge Museum of Archeology and Ethnology (1938) summarizes the present state of archaeological knowledge of Northern Nigeria, describes excavations undertaken by himself and his wife at stone-age sites in the Bauchi Plateau, and makes suggestions as to the future development of prehistoric and proto-historic studies in the Northern Provinces.

The HUXLEY MEMORIAL LECTURE. ARCHAEOLOGICAL AGES AS TECHNOLOGICAL STAGES. By Professor V. Gordon Childe, D.Litt., D.Sc., F.B.A., F.S.A.

The Huxley Memorial Lecture was delivered in the rooms of the Royal Society, Burlington House, W.1., on Tuesday, 28 November, 1944, at 1.30, preceded by a buffet lunch at 12.30.

The lecture examined the effect on man’s control over external nature of the adoption of copper or bronze and then iron as a material for tools since this has been used as the basis of archaeological classification for over a century. In practice, the earliest metal, copper or bronze, was employed in three different modes. Firstly, as in Egypt before 3000 B.C. and in barbarian Europe before 1500, metal was used almost exclusively for armaments and ornaments. Secondly, in Egypt after 3000 B.C. and all round the Mediterranean after 2000, metal was employed for the manufacture of fine tools for craftsmen like carpenters, jewellers, and metal-workers. Thirdly, only after 1500 B.C. in Egypt and Greece and after 1200 in barbarian Europe but as early as 2500 in Mesopotamia was metal used also in agriculture and some rough work. The first mode means no material advance in productivity over the Stone Stage, but the second increased both the output and the quality of craftsmanship and became the condition for the invention of the wheel and the windlass if not also of the plough and the sailing boat—very significant steps in technological progress.

Yet at no time in the Bronze Stage did the builders of the Pyramids or of Stonehenge nor any other society command such a commonplace but ‘indispensable devices as shears, hinged togs, the crane, and block-and-tackle, or shoe the plough with a metal share, while in Asia Minor and barbarian Europe bronze never ousted even the stone axe; it was too expensive. Metal first became cheap in the Iron Stage so that it could be used freely in agriculture and for heavy work. Subsequently among the vastly augmented army of workers now accustomed to use metal some were intelligent enough to invent new species of tools beginning with tongs and...