WILEY

118. The Use of Diagrams.

Author(s): Arthur Thomson

Source: *Man*, Vol. 2 (1902), p. 170

Published by: Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2839537>

Accessed: 26-06-2016 20:20 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Wiley, Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Man*

I hope these notes will suffice to show that Professor Thomson's objections do not concern the case of research diagrams (which was the object of my paper), but are details which I did not point out as they were so geometrically obvious. It would be a great mistake to burden research diagrams by enforcing that equality of scale in all cases which it is supposed that I had overlooked.

W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE.

Method.

Thomson.

The Use of Diagrams. *A Rejoinder to MAN*, 1902. 117. By Arthur Thomson, M.A., Professor of Human Anatomy in the University of Oxford. **118**

I have little to add to what I have already stated. I may, however, point out that in his original article (61) Professor Petrie defined the research diagram as one in which the main object "is to present as many variables as possible in one view, with such clearness that the eye can grasp any two at once without being distracted by others." Furthermore, he subsequently stated (p. 82) that the results obtained by his system of triangles were sufficient for "all comparative purposes." Professor Petrie in his present note now says that in research diagrams "general correlations are sought for and exactitude is not wanted," a statement which is certainly not a repetition of his former views as expressed in his previous article (61). The Professor further adds that by "comparative purposes" he meant "when *mere comparison* is needed, and not absolutely accurate relations," an interpretation of his meaning which is certainly not conveyed by the words employed in his original paper. The object of my criticism of his method was to render this clear and so warn others against falling into the possible error of supposing that the results obtained were sufficient for "all comparative purposes." This, and this alone, must be my justification for the use of the expression "misleading nature" employed in my previous communication (95).

If the exaggeration of variations be the object of Professor Petrie's method, then there is much to be said in its favour. At the same time it should be borne in mind that correlations which are based on a system in which exactitude is sacrificed are themselves liable to be inexact.

ARTHUR THOMSON.

Crete.

Bosanquet.

A Mycenæan Town and Cemeteries at Palaikastro. By R. C. Bosanquet, M.A., Director of the British School of Archaeology at Athens. **119**

During April and May 1902 the British School at Athens undertook preliminary excavations at Palaikastro. I was accompanied by the architect of the School, Mr. Heaton Comyn. The plain of Palaikastro, the largest plain on the east coast of Crete, measures three miles from east to west and two from north to south. It lies north of Zakro, and north-east of Praesos, the sites explored last year by Mr. Hogarth and the British School respectively. (MAN, 1901. 147-148.)

There seems to have been no large settlement here from Mycenæan times until the middle of the nineteenth century; but in that early age it was one of the principal centres, perhaps the capital, of Eastern Crete. The excavations were rewarded by the discovery of a Mycenæan town extending over an area of at least five hundred by three hundred yards, and of cemeteries which throw new light on the burial customs of the earliest inhabitants.

The most conspicuous feature of the plain is a steep table-topped headland called Kástri, which juts out into the sea midway along the low, and in parts marshy, beach. In spite of its acropolis-like form it does not seem to have been fortified. The scanty remains on its summit are those of a very late Mycenæan village. Beneath them we found a few fragments of much earlier pottery, including some Kamárais ware. At the foot of Kástri, and sheltered by it from the north, lies a sandy crescent-shaped bay, the natural harbour of the plain. A small promontory forms the southern horn of the