

## ANTIQUITY

ENGLAND IN TUDOR TIMES. By L. E. SALZMAN, M.A., F.S.A. London : B. T. Batsford, Ltd. 1926. 8vo, pp. 143 and 67 plates. 7s. 6d.

This interesting account of the social life and industries of Tudor England will be found very useful by students of that period—the numerous extracts from contemporary writers adding to its value. The five chapters deal with the spirit of the Tudor age, life in the country, life in the town, life in the home, the Church, and adventures on land and sea. The author's style is good and makes easy reading, while the printer has reason to be pleased with his work.

R. C. C. CLAY.

A GUIDE TO THE ROMAN WALL. By R. G. COLLINGWOOD, M.A., F.S.A. Andrew Reid and Co., Ltd., Akenside Hill, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. 1926. 6d.

For the modest sum of sixpence may be obtained a handbook of about twelve thousand words, three plans of forts and a small sketch-map of the north of England in Roman times—all from the hand of a first-rate authority. The information supplied is practical and lucidly expressed. It will certainly be found to “give the visitor all he need know in a shape that will not burden anyone's pocket or knapsack”; and we commend it to all such as being indispensable.

THE TWILIGHT OF HISTORY. By D. G. HOGARTH [The 8th Earl Grey Memorial Lecture, delivered 17 February 1926]. Oxford University Press. 1926. 1s.

Dr Hogarth enunciates an important principle. “The history of humanity from first to last shows the index of civilization not to be art. The acme of art production has always been attained during political stages of autocracy or of limited aristocracy, which precede the acme of general well-being . . . Art declines in quality when it ceases to be the main concern of a dominant class, but civilization will still broaden and grow, because society enfranchised on a wider basis substitutes for art-interest a concern for the conquest of mechanical force.” We must not, for example, make the mistake that Ruskin made, when he confused art and ethics. Neither bad painting nor ugly pottery imply social decadence; indeed inference from one to the other is most hazardous. Dr Hogarth attributes the decay of Cretan art to the overthrow, soon after 1400 B.C., of the old Cnossian Dynasty by Minos, the probable founder of the late Minoan Dynasty, which was Achaean.

But surely he overstates his case against ‘pre-history’ when he says that “it is no more than subjective guessing at the causes of surviving products of human activities . . .”? That there is a surfeit of guessing we know, and deplore; but so sweeping a condemnation is stultified by Dr Hogarth's own work, including this brilliant little essay.

THE GREEKS IN SPAIN. By RHYS CARPENTER, Professor of Classical Archaeology in Bryn Mawr College, Pennsylvania. [Bryn Mawr Notes and Monographs, no. 6. Bryn Mawr College, and Longmans, Green and Co., 1925].

This little book is a model which might be copied with advantage in Europe. The author combines scholarship with archaeology and he has the sure touch of the art critic. His style is irreproachable, and it is a pleasure to read his lucid account of an abstruse subject. The book consists of 116 pages of narrative and 64 of appendices, including

## REVIEWS

references, a short but excellent classical bibliography, and a chronological table. There are two useful maps and 25 photographs, some of them indifferently reproduced.

Although, like all students of Spanish archaeology, Professor Carpenter is indebted to the researches of Schulten and Bosch Gimpera, and says so, he claims to have produced a connected account of Greek activities in Spain. There was need of such. (His bibliography contains a bare half dozen articles dealing with the same subject, and they are rather inaccessible). To have done so is in itself an achievement for which he deserves the thanks of all. His other claims entitle him to rank as an original investigator, and prove that it is possible for the right sort of specialist to produce good and valuable work without becoming unintelligible.

### ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF INDIA, 1923-4.

Edited by SIR JOHN MARSHALL, Director-General of Archaeology in India. [European agent—the Office of the High Commissioner for India, 42 Grosvenor Gardens, London, S.W. 1]. 1926.

By far the most interesting part of this Report is that which deals with the excavation of the Indo-Sumerian sites of Mohenjo-Daro and Harappa. Sir John Marshall is justifiably proud of these epoch-making discoveries which, as he says, at a single bound take us back to a period some 3000 years earlier than any that was previously known to exist in India. They establish the fact that, at least as long as 5000 years ago, "the peoples of the Punjab and Sind were living in well-built cities and were in possession of a relatively mature culture with a high standard of art and craftsmanship and a developed system of pictographic writing."

Harappa is in the Montgomery District of the Punjab on the river Ravi, 150 miles south-west of Amritsar. Mohenjo-Daro is in the Larkana District of Sind, about 150 miles north of Hyderabad and about 200 miles north-west of Karachi. Both sites lie in the plains of the Indus, though they are as far apart as London and Aberdeen. It would be morally certain that others like them existed, were we not informed otherwise by the same authority that they abound, especially "along the banks of the dried-up beds of the main stream and its estuaries, not only in Sind but in Bahawalpur State and the Punjab." It is therefore more regrettable to read throughout the Report of the financial stringency which has hitherto impeded excavation. The discoveries rank with those of Rawlinson, Schliemann and Evans; and the whole world is impatiently waiting for news of a kind which only the spade can release.

Though the sites are to be classed as recent discoveries the characteristic seals bearing the effigy of a bull and with inscriptions in an unknown pictographic script had long been known. "More than half a century ago some specimens of these seals were obtained by Sir Alexander Cunningham and published in his Report for 1875 (vol. v, p. 108, and plate xxxiii, fig. 1). Other specimens were subsequently acquired by the British Museum and published by Dr J. F. Fleet in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1912. They should, therefore, have been well-known to orientalists, and must have been constantly seen by Mesopotamian experts in the British Museum." Not one single individual, however, appreciated their significance. It is hardly surprising therefore that, when more finds came to light, Sir John Marshall should have turned, not to recognized seats of learning, but to the *Illustrated London News*, "in the hope that, through the medium of that widely read journal I might succeed in getting some light thrown on their age and character by archaeologists in other countries. This