Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group

Antiquity Imagined: Cultural Values in Archaeological Folklore

JEROME A. VOSS

IN his first letter to Sherlock Holmes in *The Hound of the Baskervilles,* Dr. Watson describes his impressions of the prehistoric ruins on the moor around Baskerville Hall:

> On all sides of you as you walk are the houses of these forgotten folk, with their graves and the huge monoliths which are supposed to have marked their temples. As you look at their grey stone huts against the scarred hill-sides you leave your own age behind you, and if you were to see a skin-clad, hairy man crawl out from the low door, fitting a flint-tipped arrow on to the string of his bow, you would feel that his presence there was more natural than your own.[1]

Like many others in diverse places and times, Dr. Watson is trying to extend meaning into an unknown past, to understand and interpret the cultural remains of people about whom he knows virtually nothing.

Dr. Watson's mental exercise has been so frequently repeated because the prehistoric past is evident in landscapes all over the world. The fragmentary remains of stone tools, broken pottery, and bone signal innumerable hunting camps and farming villages. More imposing are earth and stone structures built during many post-Paleolithic cultural periods. Megalithic tombs, hill forts, and barrows dot the European countryside. Massive stone buildings and monuments stand in Africa and Asia. In North America, burial mounds, platform mounds, and pueblos remain as visible links to the past. These remains beg analysis and interpretation. Although professional archaeologists have excavated and studied many such monuments during the past century, there is a much longer history of folk interpretation.

This essay focuses on the folklore of prehistoric sites in Great Britain and the rest of Europe and in North America, where monuments which were surely significant for their builders have remained important down to the present day, and not simply in an archaeological sense. For example, large prehistoric stone and earthen structures are often focal points within communities. Grinsell notes that 'quite a number of prehistoric . . . sites have served as meeting places for a variety of purposes ranging from inauguration of kings or tribal chiefs to the holding of witches' sabbats.'[2] Similarly, Michell discusses the numerous churches built on or near prehistoric monuments in Great Britain.[3] No less significant is the modern Easter sunrise service held annually at the western Alabama site of Moundville, a large group of platform and burial mounds dating to approximately A.D. 1300. I have also seen what appeared to be a regularly visited hunting camp adjacent to two burial mounds in southern Mississippi and a Dutch megalithic tomb used as a road rally checkpoint.

The concern of this essay is not with modern uses as much as with the countless tales which have been told concerning the construction and original purposes of prehistoric monuments. Although these tales, which have been well-documented, have roots in the distant past, traditional folk themes remain quite popular in the present, in spite of the professional archaeological study which has substantially expanded the

scientific understanding of prehistoric sites. Indeed, the uses and interpretations of the monuments have placed a significance upon them which usually differs greatly from their original functions. The folklore of prehistoric sites is a form of folk history, or, more properly, metaphorical history. The monuments are often clearly visible and yet most people know little, if anything, about who made the monuments, how they were made, or why they were made. Such characteristics create historic ambiguity, providing the opportunity for the expression, through folklore, of cultural sentiments about the nature of a society's history and about human history and society in general. In the Euro-American context the folklore of prehistoric monuments permits multidimensional expressions of cultural antiquity, modern cultural and social concerns, the cultural superiority of the present, and ethnocentrism.

A central theme of the European and American folklore of prehistoric monuments involves the association of these sites with unusual, supernatural, or mysterious forces. This theme has at times been expressed in formal religious terms, but more frequently in the linkage of monuments with monsters, giants, unusual powers, or strange prehistorical cultural practices.

In Europe the association of Christian beliefs and practices with prehistoric monuments has a long history. After an early prohibition against worship at ancient sites, the church ultimately incorporated many prehistoric monuments into the system of formal religious practice. Churches were built with stones from megalithic structures or on the sites of barrows or tombs. Worshippers carved crosses on standing stones and placed other Christian symbols in or near monuments. This pattern of Christianization began in some places by the seventh century.[4] It is not surprising, therefore, that a religious folklore developed early concerning prehistoric sites. Some tales attribute monuments to important figures in religious doctrine, frequently saints or the devil.[5] Other folktales focus on specific religious beliefs and practices. Concerning megalithic monuments, one theme dating back hundreds of years involves the petrification of people who had violated religious expectations. Stories of the Merry Maidens and the Nine Maidens in Cornwall tell of women who were turned to stone for dancing on the Sabbath. The Hurlers in Cornwall, legend says, is a group of men petrified for sporting on Sunday, while Stanton Drew in Somerset is supposedly a wedding party which continued its celebrations a little too long. Very similar stories have been collected elsewhere in Europe.[6]

Formal religious beliefs have also affected the folklore of North American monuments. Nineteenth century stories attribute prehistoric mounds to the lost tribes of Israel.[7] Similarly, the Mormon church has used ancient monuments as evidence for pre-Columbian civilizations.[8]

Many folktales relating to prehistoric monuments involve beings and powers which are not part of an organized religious belief system. Stories link sites with giants, Druids, monsters, and other mythological and mysterious figures. The attribution of megalithic structures to giants is not entirely unreasonable, given the size of some of the boulders used in construction. In fact, such speculation entered into early scientific considerations of archaeological sites. Sixteenth and seventeenth-century Dutch texts, with imaginative illustrations, discussed the possibility that giants built the megalithic tombs in Drente.[9] In Great Britain folklore linking giants with megalithic structures has been quite common. Early writings mentioned skeletons of gigantic stature being found in stone tombs. Other stories portray giants throwing large boulders at each other. One tale

involves both a religious figure and a giant: St. Patrick awakened a giant buried in an Irish tomb. Smaller prehistoric monuments, such as cairns and barrows, have been associated in folklore with smaller figures, such as gnomes and elves.[10]

Akin to such stories are the tales of magic and mysterious prehistoric groups. From the time of Geoffrey of Monmouth, Stonehenge has been known as the Giants' Dance, a monument which, according to Arthurian lore, was built by Merlin.[11] Michell and Piggott have both discussed the early versions of the Druid tales in Great Britain and the important roles played by Aubrey and Stukely in the popularization of the Druid link with prehistoric monuments.[12] Of course, the most famous association is that of the Druids with Stonehenge. Michell notes that, although there has been considerable archaeological study of Stonehenge and a professional anthropological conclusion that no links exist between the Druids and the building of Stonehenge,

> . . . the public mind, having been conditioned by generations of authorities to see Stonehenge as a temple of the Druids, could hardly be blamed if it were somewhat less agile than that of the professors in turning against the Druid image.[13]

Even to their contemporaries the Romans, as Piggott pointed out, the Druids were cloaked in mystery and ambiguity, which increased in later centuries:

> The knowledge of the Druids acquired by the classical world moved over the years from reality to unreality, as encounter was diluted into report, and report faded into rumour . . . Even from the first the Druids were inevitably the victims of the interests and ideologies of those who observed them . . . Druids sometimes walked in the enchanted landscape; grave philosophers among Noble Savages . . . In another mood Druids could figure as characters of terror performing gory and obscene sacrifices.[14]

Although the romanticized Druids have been the subject of considerable written study and speculation, this group clearly belongs to that folk category of characters and societies with unusual powers and practices. Not all of these groups are named, like the Druids, but most have been endowed, through folklore, with unusual and extraordinary characteristics.

In the New World, popular writings have linked the Native Americans and their cultures not only to the lost tribes of Israel, but also to the marvellous and mythical continents of Atlantis and the recently invented Mu. The Atlanteans of Plato have at times been as vigorously associated with New World monuments as the Druids have with British megaliths.[15]

Associated with stories of mysterious and powerful people are tales of the magical powers of prehistoric monuments. The stones of many British stone circles are considered to be uncountable.[16] Other tales attribute healing and fertility powers to megaliths. An intriguing and relatively modern example of such themes involves the attempt to find lines of orientation linking ancient monuments. The ley-line hunters have plotted what they perceive as straight lines across the English countryside, joining monuments which were often constructed during different cultural periods. These lines are interpreted as networks of energy and supernatural force.[17]

The folklore of the mysterious prehistoric monuments continues to thrive in modern contexts.[18] Pseudo-scientific literature, drawing to some extent on traditional themes, has had a substantial impact on the public imagination. Probably the best-known example is Von Däniken's suggestion that many early human cultural accomplishments must be attributed to visitors from elsewhere in the universe. Concerning the Great Pyramid, he poses numerous questions:

With what power, with what 'machines', with what technical resources was the rocky terrain levelled at all? How did the master builders drive the tunnels downwards? And how did they illuminate them? . . . How and with what were the stone blocks cut out of the quarries? . . . How were they transported and joined to the thousandth of an inch? . . . The Great Pyramid is (and remains?) visible testimony of a technique that has never been understood. Today, in the twentieth century, no architect could build a copy of the pyramid of Cheops, even if the technical resources of every continent were at his disposal.[19]

Von Däniken's answer is that visitors from space are responsible for the Great Pyramid and other archaeological wonders of the world. Although Egyptologists have the answers to many of the questions posed by von Däniken and few, if any, archaeologists subscribe to his theory, his books have gone through multiple printings all over the world, stimulating other books, movies, and television programmes.

Less outlandish, but in a similar vein, are writings in what would usually be considered as more serious scholarly texts. Burl states that 'stone circles hint at mysteries beyond our understanding.'[20] He emphasizes the sacrifices and religious mysteries which he feels must have characterized activity at monuments, describing a dramatic scene:

Now they too are dead and it is we, descended from them, who visit the rings, seeking our own ancestors. We shall never see them, the painted bodies in the sunlight, darker figures against the moon, the dancers, the images of death. Yet the symbols and the dreads are constant through the centuries. The knowledge is the same. Youth is short and life must end. Death is always there.[21]

Michell states that:

Throughout the rises, falls and resurgences of all the various academic theories of Stonehenge, artists have been notably consistent in their comments on it; and after hearing the rival assertions and pseudo-certainties of the scholars, it is well to be reminded by them that the only certainty about Stonehenge is that the ancient secret it conceals is a formidable one.[22]

Professional archaeologists have also been affected to some extent by traditional ideas concerning monuments, frequently attributing considerable sociopolitical complexity, a special characteristic, to prehistoric societies which built imposing structures. Although the ethnographic record indicates that egalitarian groups, such as the Assamese tribes, erected massive standing stones,[23] there has been a clear tendency in archaeology towards an assumed correlation between monument construction and the level of sociopolitical complexity. The building of large earth or stone structures is certainly one indication of organized productive activity beyond the household level, but it is not necessarily sufficient proof of social and political complexity; a pattern of mutually-reinforcing evidence is needed.[24]

Although not folklore *per se*, these recent writings, both professional archaeological and otherwise, represent a continuation of folk themes which extend back centuries. These themes focus on the monuments as mysterious, magical, and/or associated with unusual peoples. The recent literature, whether flamboyant or restrained and academic, serves to reinforce the mystery of the monuments.

The large prehistoric monuments in Europe and North America have clearly remained important in the lives of the people who followed the builders, evoking images of giants, lost tribes, sacrifices, saints, and travellers from space. The interpretation of this folklore and its importance remains a matter for discussion.

Several authors have argued that legends and uses of prehistoric monuments are continuations of significant traditions of rituals dating back beyond recent times, perhaps back to the time of monument construction.[25] Glyn Daniel, an archaeologist and an authority on European megalithic structures, interprets the association of organized religion with prehistoric sites as a survival of the sacredness of locations:

I find it difficult to envisage why there should be a Christian occupation of some megalithic sites, unless a real tradition of their importance as special and sacred sites was carried through the period of the Bronze Age and early Iron Age of barbarian Europe and into historic times.[26]

Michell echoes this argument:

With the physical evidence of the purpose of stone circles giving rise to so many totally diverse theories, the one source of information that remains constant and coherent is the folklore record.[27]

Similarly, while effectively discounting some of the more imaginative stories concerning British stone circles, Burl states that stories of dancing and ritual curing at monuments may have interpretative relevance:

Such stories provide insights into otherwise forgotten meanings of the rings, and, used carefully, can be a useful means of learning more about our ancestors who left no written record of their beliefs. Folklore, however imperfect, preserves something of their world.[28]

In his discussion of the Rollright Stones, Burl continues:

The water, the healing powers, fertility, midwinter, midsummer, all these combine in legends and folk-memories that perhaps more than any excavation tell us 'for what memorial or significance' this isolated ring, far away from any other stone circle, was put up so many centuries ago alongside the trackway from Wessex northwards to the Peak District.[29]

Such writings ascribe particularly long-lasting and specific significance to the stone and earthen monuments. Daniel, for example, suggests that the sacred nature of these sites lasted in many cases for over 3,000 years, which in Great Britain would have been through the cultural and political transitions of the Iron Age, the Roman occupation, the Anglo-Saxon period, and the Norman conquest.

It is highly unlikely that anything specific about the sacredness and magic of these sites lured later populations to use the monuments and tell stories about them. Indeed, a very specific purpose and meaning attached to a site would actually tend to hinder subsequent utilization. Instead, the monuments have general, not specific, importance; a vague, ambiguous mystery which can be reappraised from time to time. Lowenthal has argued that the cultural transitions of the present require an ambiguity in the past. The past is interpreted in accordance with present habits and preferences; the mystery and imprecision of the past are important because such characteristics allow alternative and flexible explanations relevant to present viewpoints and concerns.[30] Prehistoric monuments provide an ideal focus for such folk history because such structures are clearly from the past but are not well-understood by most people. Such monuments are enduring places in a geographic sense:

Certain objects, both natural and man-made, persist as places through eons of time, outliving the patronage

of particular cultures. Perhaps any large feature in the landscape creates its own world, which may expand or contract with the passing concerns of the people, but which does not completely lose its identity . . . How is it possible for a monument to transcend the values of a particular culture? An answer might be: a large monument like Stonehenge carries both general and specific import. The specific import changes in time whereas the general remains . . . Enduring places, of which there are very few in the world, speak to humanity.[31]

An alternative approach to understanding the folklore of ancient monuments focuses upon the cultural context of the storytellers rather than upon the culture of the monument builders. Dundes notes that folklore may serve to express folk ideas which are the underpinnings of world view. These folk ideas are basic notions concerning human nature, the world, and the place of humankind in nature.[32] Similarly, in his consideration of folklore and history, Wilson notes that folklore 'teaches us what the people believe their history to have been and thus helps us better understand the motivations which govern their lives in the present.'[33] In these terms the enduring quality and ambiguity of the prehistoric monuments provide the opportunity for the members of a society to express diverse statements about their history and culture.

One rather common interpretation of the latent expressions in the Euro-American folklore of prehistoric sites centres on the need to establish a cultural identity in the present. The durability of ancient structures creates a feeling of continuity and roots in the past:

We also require more conscious and particular evidence of the past — features and structures we believe to be old, precious, or durable. The intimate continuity of the past with present is a source of general comfort . . . Buffeted by change, we retain traces of our past to be sure of our enduring identity.[34]

Nations and ethnic groups often consciously attempt to lengthen their historical traditions, ostensibly for the validation of a cultural identity, by finding new evidence of an extended historical heritage. The linkage of the Druids with stone monuments in Great Britain performs such a function, as does a whole series of continuing arguments which attempt to fill the pre-Columbian period in North America with early civilizations.[35] Attempts to establish cultural and historical ties with the past through the folk interpretation of prehistoric sites are certainly not limited to Euro-American societies. For example, the origin myths of the Choctaw in Mississippi revolve around the site of Nanih Waiya, a group of mounds which almost certainly predated Choctaw establishment in their homeland.[36] Emphasis upon the past in any form may be a method of establishing identity and reflects the notion that the corporate nature of society is the result of historical process. Ancient monuments are effective in promoting an identity, even if the ethnic associations with the monuments are fictive, because they are visible connections with the past. Just as complex societies build imposing monuments to symbolize the present social form, so the previous monuments may be incorporated into a system as a foundation of heritage, a cultural birth certificate in stone.

Numerous writers have commented on the value of prehistoric monuments and attendant folklore in promoting social identity. However, this aspect of the folklore is actually part of a broader statement of world view. The Euro-American folklore of prehistoric sites does not simply proclaim a cultural heritage, but promotes the idea of the superiority of the present over the past. Such expressions of ethnocentrism are both latent and manifest in the folklore.

The folklore concerning the past often expresses the dominant cultural values and concerns of the present. The folklore relationship between formal religious institutions and ancient monuments signalled the importance of religion in the relatively recent society rather than the sacredness of a location in the distant past. The petrification stories reflected themes of divine judgement in religious doctrine. In modern times the scientific studies which have argued that many prehistoric monuments were calendars, computers, or astronomical observatories[37] reflect modern concerns with time, space, and calculation. Although anticipated by nineteenth-century scholars, the archaeo-astronomical studies of the alignments and calendrical functions of stone circles and other sites began in earnest during the 1960s.[38] That decade also witnessed the initial boom in the importance of computers. Although some scientists have found astronomical alignments or prehistoric calculators everywhere they have looked, it appears that many alignments plotted for standing stones and other monuments are accurate. Most of these alignments would not have been difficult to arrange, particularly for societies which depended upon the seasons as did the prehistoric agricultural societies responsible for most of the monument construction. The recent emphasis upon calendrical and astronomical functions as being *the* functions reflects modern Western values and concerns, just as the stories of petrification were significant in earlier periods. Some of the more popular writings demonstrate the ethnocentrism inherent in the archaeo-astronomical arguments, as authors comment on discovering the intelligence of prehistoric peoples. Thus, James Cornell writes:

> In fact, archaeo-astronomy has, in part, helped revolutionize our assessment of ancient man's intellectual and cultural development . . . Once thought to be no more than loutish nomads who lived off the land as hunters and gatherers, the native Americans are now being reconstructed as complex, intelligent people who developed stable and intricate societies relatively advanced within the limits imposed by their environment. Part of this new image is due to research in archaeo-astronomy.[39]

Cornell manifestly attempts to place all of humanity into what is basically a Western psychological and cultural mould, by stating that archaeo-astronomy:

> . . . is a science concerned with the struggle of men and women against hostile environments. It is a science that chronicles both the intellectual development of all human civilizations . . . and the psychic fulfillment of individuals. And it is a science that explores the deepest human emotions, for it seeks to understand the relationship between humans and nature. Oddly, that relationship has not changed much over thousands of years. We are closer to our ancestors than we imagined.[40]

Similar expressions of modern concerns are found in various utopian visions of prehistoric societies. While such accounts frequently place prehistoric people on an intellectual and social pedestal,[41] the foundation of that pedestal is a perceived harmony between past and present concerns. For example, Janet Bord and Colin Bord interpret the ley lines as marking extraordinarily beneficial energy currents flowing through the earth:

> It would seem as if the hidden current which flows through the land can be tapped at certain points, much as an electric socket on the skirting board of our sitting room enables us to 'plug in' to the current and put it to use. These outlets are thought to exist at ancient sites and particularly in the huge blocks of stone which were erected as circles or single standing stones by the ancient race who must originally have gathered, channelled, and used the earth currents.[42]

Arguing from 'the evidence of the few primitive races which still exist in isolated areas upon the earth,' the Bords claim that the earliest societies instinctively recognized and visited sacred centres, and 'in these circumstances man functioned in perfect harmony with nature.'[43] Unfortunately, the attempt to increase the benefits of the earth power by manipulating currents led, the Bords argue, to the exhaustion of the power and the disintegration of the societies employing it:

> It was discovered that by the alignment of standing stones, circles of stones, and earth mounds the flow of energy could be increased and accelerated, and thereby greater *immediate* benefit could be obtained, regardless of the long-term consequences . . . From the moment that this procedure was adopted, the eventual distintegration and downfall of the whole system was inevitable. The earth's vitality was overly-abundantly drawn upon, the fertilising influences flowed across the land, and all prospered for a period, until a time was reached when the demand began to exhaust the supply.[44]

While this story of the decline of a prehistoric paradise parallels the tale of the Temptation and Fall, it also clearly expresses a series of interrelated social issues of recent years, including the renewed interest in utopian experimentation during the 1960s, environmentalism, the energy crisis of the 1970s, and concerns about the abuse of modern technology. In fact, the Bords draw an explicit parallel with worries about the expanding use of nuclear energy which, in spite of its immediate benefits, may have long-term negative consequences.[45] The prehistoric monuments, which once provided an opportunity for the expression of religious prohibitions, today permit the statement of concern about the violation of 'natural' laws.[46]

More patently ethnocentric is the folk theme centering on extraordinary creatures or powers as responsible for the construction of monuments: giants throwing boulders, Merlin building Stonehenge, God petrifying people, or space visitors building the Pyramids. Part of the mystery surrounding the monuments has always been an uncertainty as to how the people in the past could possibly have built these monuments without modern technology. One of the first questions asked by introductory archaeology students when shown pictures of Stonehenge is: how did they build it? The association of the monuments with incredible powers reflects a belief in the superiority of the present; in other words it is assumed that ordinary people in the past could not have built these structures without the tools and knowledge of the present, so some superhuman agency must take the credit. In a sense, the professional archaeological correlation of monument construction with social complexity is a restrained statement of the same theme: people could not or did not build monuments without an appropriately complex organization. The von Däniken argument represents a synthesis of traditional and modern themes in this respect: a theory concerned with alignments and computation, but attributing the ability to build precise structures to non-humans.

To some extent, this aspect of the folklore of prehistoric sites appears to contradict that aspect which places ancient peoples in natural utopias or which gives prehistoric people the ability to build stone alignments with astronomical significance. Such contradiction is common in folklore (one need only consider contradictory proverbs), but both aspects, in effect, serve the same purpose. The current theme concerning astronomical alignments and computing reinforces the importance of the Euro-American emphasis upon time-keeping and record-keeping technology, just as previous stories with a religious theme reinforced the social and political importance of the church. On the other hand, the association of the monuments with the unusual, which is akin to stating that prehistoric peoples were not capable of such engineering feats, is a statement of

cultural superiority. Michell discusses both aspects of the folklore, noting that there have been what he calls High and Low analyses and theories of the past.[47] What Michell considers as the High interpretations provide justification for modern cultural emphases and concerns by basing them in the past, while the Low interpretations separate modern cultures from the past.

These Low interpretations are amplified by the scenarios which depict prehistoric monuments as the scenes of human sacrifice and strange religious rituals, often associated with fertility. These visions of the past are clearly ethnocentric and resemble stories told about 'savage' ethnic groups. Popular nineteenth and twentieth century travelogues often described strange rituals, warfare, and cannibalism among indigenous societies in Africa, Oceania, South America, and North America.[48] In one rather typical account, Mary Hastings Bradley, after discussing missionary and Belgian administrative reports of cannibalism in central Africa,[49] states:

> We simply knew that these people had been open cannibals until the Belgians had begun administrative work with the presence of these posts north and to the south.[50]

Bradley also describes a ritual dance in terms not unlike Burl's statement quoted previously (p. 83): 'stark savagery in its forest, dancing that devil dance of ageless fear.'[51] Arens has argued that the attribution of cannibalism to other groups is a powerful method of proving one's own superiority.[52] Such attribution would be particularly valuable in situations of the economic and political conquest of one society by another. The issue here is not the fact or fiction of cannibalism in the past or present, but rather the intent of the writer or storyteller. The similarity of some of the folklore of prehistoric sites to the modern characterizations of 'savage' societies suggests that prehistoric cultures may also be scapegoats and targets for ethnocentric evaluation.

It is interesting that such ethnocentric statements concerning the past are current not only in popular folklore but also in many anthropological writings about the past: Upper Paleolithic 'Venus' figurines become fertility symbols and broken skulls demonstrate prehistoric cannibalism. In his discussion of the skulls recovered from the Chinese cave at Zhoukoudian, Birdsell writes:

> One of the most interesting discoveries made at this site was recognizing that the bones of all 40 individuals clearly had been cannibalized . . . Since this cannibalism must have gone on for many thousands of years, the rate does not imply self-destruction among these people. But this grade of our ancestors did have some very bad habits.[53]

As is the case with much of folklore, the tales of prehistoric monuments are expressions of multiple themes and purposes. The folklore may provide an explanation, often entertaining, for the cultural features in the landscape. Beyond providing an explanation, however, the stories are the basis for the expression of folk ideas concerning history, culture, and society. The folklore may variously serve to establish a cultural heritage, reinforce values and norms, and distinguish a way of life from others.

These social and cultural expressions are perhaps related to the statements of future orientation which Dundes considers to be a prominent feature of American world view as expressed in folklore,[54] although such an analysis would be at variance with many descriptions of European and American society as tradition-bound and focused on the past. In either case, the expression of both major cultural themes and ethnocentrism

is related ultimately to a basic function of folklore, the reinforcement of dominant values and practices. Prehistoric monuments are especially suitable focal points for such statements precisely because they are visible and ambiguous at the same time, and may be interpreted as desired by a people. Although the monuments provide a link to the past, this past may be constructed in culturally appropriate terms.

Department of Sociology and Anthropology,
University of Southern Mississippi.

NOTES

1. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, *The Hound of the Baskervilles* (1902; reprinted New York, 1968), pp. 90-91.
2. Leslie V. Grinsell, *Folklore of Prehistoric Sites in Britain* (Newton Abbot, 1976), p. 50.
3. John Michell, *Megalithomania* (Ithaca, New York, 1982), pp. 153-154.
4. Dorothy Carrington and Leslie Grinsell, 'The Folklore of Some Archaeological Sites in Corsica,' *Folklore* 93 (1982), p. 61; Glyn Daniel, *Megaliths in History* (London, 1972), pp. 20-37; Grinsell, *op. cit.*, pp. 16-18; Michell, *op. cit.*, pp. 153-154.
5. Wendy Boase, *The Folklore of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight* (Totowa, New Jersey, 1976), pp. 96-97; Carrington and Grinsell, *op. cit.*, p. 62; Grinsell, *op. cit.*, p. 18.
6. Aubrey Burl, *Rings of Stone* (New Haven and New York, 1979), pp. 250, 266; Carrington and Grinsell, *op. cit.*, pp. 64-65; S. P. Menefee, 'The "Merry Maidens" and the 'Noce de Pierre",' *Folklore* 85 (1974), 23-42.
7. Jesse D. Jennings, *Prehistory of North America* (New York, 1974), pp. 37-39, 53.
8. Robert Wauchope, *Lost Tribes and Sunken Continents: Myth and Method in the Study of American Indians* (Chicago, 1962).
9. Jan Albert Bakker, *The TRB West Group* (Amsterdam, 1979), pp. 17-18; Michell, *op. cit.*, pp. 43-44.
10. Boase, *op. cit.*, pp. 94-97; Carrington and Grinsell, *op. cit.*, pp. 62-63; Daniel, *op cit.*, pp. 16-18; Grinsell, *op cit.*, pp. 27-35.
11. Leslie V. Grinsell, 'The Legendary History and Folklore of Stonehenge,' *Folklore* 87 (1976), 5-20.
12. Michell, *opp. cit.*, pp. 10-15; Stuart Piggott, *The Druids* (London, 1968), pp. 137-165.
13. Michell *op. cit.*, p. 24
14. Piggott, *op. cit.*, pp. 189, 191.
15. The best discussion of this topic remains Wauchope, *op. cit.*
16. S. P. Menefee, 'The "Countless Stones": A Final Reckoning,' *Folklore* 86 (1975), 146-166.
17. Burl, *op. cit.*, pp. 80-82; Michell, *op. cit.*, pp. 100-101. See Tom Williamson and Liz Bellamy, *Ley Lines in Question* (Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey, 1983) for a critical review and history of ley line hunting.
18. See Michell, *op cit.*, pp. 153-157.
19. Erich von Däniken, *Chariots of the Gods?*, translated by Michael Heron (New York, 1971), pp. 77-78.
20. Burl, *op. cit.*, p. 78.
21. *Ibid.*, pp. 84-85.
22. Michell, *op. cit.*, p. 31.
23. See T. C. Hodson, *The Naga Tribes of Manipur* (London, 1911), p. 187; J. H. Hutton, 'The Meaning and Method of the Erection of Monoliths by the Naga Tribes,' *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 52 (1922), 242-249.
24. C. S. Peebles and S. M. Kus, 'Some Archaeological Correlates of Ranked Societies,' *American Antiquity* 42 (1977), 421-448.
25. This theme is developed in Walter Johnson, *Folk Memory or the Continuity of British Archaeology* (1908, reprinted New York, 1971).
26. Daniel, *op. cit.*, p. 59.
27. Michell, *op. cit.*, p. 102.
28. Burl, *op. cit.*, p. 78.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 255.
30. David Lowenthal, 'Past Time, Present Place: Landscape and Memory.' *Geographical Review* 65 (1975), 1-36.
31. Yi-Fu Tuan, *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience* (Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1977), pp. 162-164.
32. Alan Dundes, 'Folk Ideas as Units of World View,' in *Toward New Perspectives in Folklore,* edited by A. Paredes and R. Bauman (American Folklore Society Bibliographical and Special Series 23, 1972), pp. 93-103.

33. William A. Wilson, 'Folklore and History: Fact Amid the Legends,' in *Readings in American Folklore,* edited by J. H. Brunvand (New York, 1979), p. 466.
34. Lowenthal, *op. cit.,* pp. 8-9.
35. See Lowenthal, *op. cit.;* Piggott, *op. cit.;* Michell, *op. cit;* Wauchope, *op. cit.*
36. John R. Swanton, *Source Material for the Social and Ceremonial Life of the Choctaw Indians* (Smithsonian Institution Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 103, 1931).
37. For example, Gerald S. Hawkins, *Stonehenge Decoded* (New York, 1965); Fred Hoyle, *On Stonehenge* (San Francisco, 1977).
38. Michell, *op. cit.,* pp. 97-104; see also Alexander Thom, *Megalithic Sites in Britain* (Oxford, 1967) and Alexander Thom, *Megalithic Lunar Observations* (Oxford, 1971).
39. James Cornell, *The First Stargazers: An Introduction to the Origins of Astronomy* (New York, 1981), pp. 4, 10.
40. *Ibid.,* p. 246.
41. See, for example, Janet Bord and Colin Bord, *Mysterious Britain* (London, 1974), p. ix, in which they emphasize that the prehistoric residents of Britain were not savages.
42. Janet Bord and Colin Bord, *The Secret Country: An Interpretation of the Folklore of Ancient Sites in Britain* (New York, 1976), p. 37.
43. *Ibid.,* p. 213.
44. *Ibid.,* p. 214.
45. *Ibid.,* p. 214.
46. See also Williamson and Bellamy, *op. cit.,* pp. 25-26, 177-184.
47. Michell, *op. cit.*
48. Some titles found in five minutes of browsing in a university library include: Mary Hastings Bradley, *Caravans and Cannibals* (New York, 1926); Martin Johnson, *Cannibal-Land: Adventure with a Camera in the New Hebrides* (Boston and New York, 1929); Caroline Mytinger, *Headhunting in the Solomon Islands* (New York, 1942); Gordon Sinclair, *Cannibal Quest* (New York, 1934); Herbert Ward, *Five Years with the Congo Cannibals* (New York, 1890).
49. Bradley, *op. cit.,* pp. 186-191.
50. *Ibid.,* p. 191.
51. *Ibid.,* p. 61.
52. W. Arens, *The Man-Eating Myth* (Oxford, 1979); the issue of the actual extent of cannibalism is explored in *The Ethnography of Cannibalism,* edited by Paula Brown and Donald Tuzin (Washington, D.C., 1983).
53. J. B. Birdsell, *Human Evolution: An Introduction to the New Physical Anthropology* (Boston, 1981), pp. 266-267.
54. Alan Dundes, 'Thinking Ahead: A Folkloristic Reflection of the Future Orientation in American World View,' *Anthropological Quarterly* 42 (1969), 53-72.