

SECTION II: PREHISTORY, MALTA

THE PREHISTORIC MALTESE ACHIEVEMENT AND ITS INTERPRETATION

Colin Renfrew

It is a privilege and honour to be speaking here at the University of Malta, and for us to be celebrating together one of the most important achievements of World Prehistory. It is, at the same time, I think, one of the least understood achievements of World Prehistory. The great temples of Malta and the art of prehistoric Malta are not yet perhaps as well known universally as they ought to be. They are famous among archaeologists but I think they deserve still greater celebrity! Certainly when I was looking again at those great temples at Mnajdra and Ħaġar Qim yesterday, and then going down the Hypogeum at Ħal Saflieni, I felt that if one were to draw up a list of the seven great monuments, the seven wonders of the prehistoric world, there is no doubt that one of these (perhaps one would choose Ħal Saflieni, perhaps it would be the Ġgantija), would be on the list. What I would like to do first is to set the scene, as it were, and to stress the point that we now know that the full development of these monuments, in the Ġgantija phase, took place somewhere around 3500 B.C. in calendar years. In the early phase in their development we are speaking therefore of a phenomenon which is comfortably earlier than the pyramids of Egypt. The apogee of development in the Tarxien period can be placed somewhere between 3000 and 2500 B.C. These remarkable and complex monuments, with their extremely sophisticated art, including wonderful spirals, are thus to be placed in the third millennium B.C. Among those extraordinary works of art, the most remarkable certainly must have been the monumental figure of a woman, probably a deity set in the temple at Tarxien. As you know only the legs remain, but she must rank as one of the earliest monumental sculptures in the world, the only competitors perhaps being the sculptures of Egypt in the Old Kingdom.

We can indeed celebrate these achievements, but how well can we interpret them? It is when we come to the religious interpretation, which is part of the focus of our Conference that matters become very much more obscure. I think they are obscured partly because we have inherited a series of myths, as it were, only some of which we have yet learnt to put aside. In this paper what I want to do, as well as speaking some cautionary words and I hope indicating where some hope of progress may lie, is to focus on some of those myths which we have already learnt to discard, which formerly obscured the way to further

progress, and to indicate one or two myths which I think we could with benefit also set on one side.

In the face of these great monuments, it is appropriate for us to remember one or two of those people who have contributed so much to our understanding of them. The first was Sir Themistocles Zammit with his early and pioneering excavations at these sites. We have all certainly learnt a very great deal from Professor John Evans whose standard work *The Prehistoric Antiquities of the Maltese Islands* (1971) will remain, probably for ever, one of the fundamental statements on these sites. Then we have profited much from Dr. David Trump and from his wife Bridget through their excavations at Skorba (Trump 1966) and subsequently. I would also like to acknowledge those Maltese colleagues who over the years have been very generous with their time and help — Mr. Francis Mallia, formerly Curator of Antiquities, and Mr. Tancred Gouder, who is at present, of course, Curator of Antiquities here in Malta. I would like to thank Dr. Anthony Bonanno also for bringing about this Conference.

Now for the myths! We can recognise very easily one or two which today we can see impeded earlier progress. The first was the myth of the Minoan connection. For certainly, it so happened that some of the early discoveries in Malta were being made at the very time that the important excavations of Sir Arthur Evans and his associates in Crete were bringing to light the Minoan civilisation. Perhaps for that reason, and because of the relative proximity of the two islands, it was natural that early Maltese scholars and early interpreters of the temples thought in terms of Minoan influence. Of course that remains an active hypothesis to this day. But it was assumed rather than demonstrated, and I think it became one of the impediments to further study of the monuments.

Secondly, there is the simple notion, which is no doubt quite reasonable in a sense, that the Maltese monuments are 'megalithic'; they are built of large stones. Nobody could dispute that simple truth. But this has led many to relate them directly to the megalithic monuments of western and north-western Europe, particularly coastal Europe, Atlantic Europe: a questionable point. Moreover to relate the deity or deities of the Maltese megalithic temples to whatever deities may have been associated with the various megalithic phenomena in western Europe makes a very dangerous assumption.

There are other myths to doubt, and Dr. Bonanno has already referred to one, which has been very effectively questioned some time

ago by Dr. Peter Ucko and also by Mr. Andrew Fleming. That is the myth of a universal Great Earth Mother. The curious thing about many of these myths is that they came into our minds, into the scholarly world that is, in the very early days of scholarship, long before there was much evidence which might or might not justify them. So as archaeologists we started off with the assumption of a universal Earth Mother; you can read it in the writings of Schliemann and others even before the Minoan civilisation was discovered, although it was only after the discovery of the relevant material that this myth gained its greatest force. But the circumstance that the explanation was available before the evidence for it came to light underlines, I think, the very hypothetical and indeed dubious nature of that explanation. Now I do not doubt that we can with great profit discuss the possibility of a universal or at any rate a Mediterranean fertility cult in the early period. That would be an interesting hypothesis. I have rarely seen it presented as a hypothesis, but often offered instead as an accepted truth, (although not accepted by me, and I hope it is not accepted as an *a priori* truth by yourselves).

So my moral is that one must be ready to reject these old myths and to start anew with the Maltese antiquities. Of course, one must indeed be willing to study other religious manifestations and particularly religious manifestations whose iconography has some resemblances with that of early Malta. Let us indeed look at any cults which give us products in the religious iconography similar to those wonderful human figures of the Maltese temples. Let us then look at different structures in different classes of religion. No doubt there may be much to learn from discussion of Demeter and Persephone, from Phoenician deities and from the Near-Eastern precursors of those Phoenician deities. But what I would like to stress is that in the study of early religion we still lack, in my view, a coherent methodology for accurate comparison. For that reason it is all too easy to observe some figure in some other part of the world, whether nearby or distant, to recognise it as a 'fat lady', and since we have fat ladies in the Maltese temples, to conclude there must be some relationship. Well of course there is a resemblance! We live in a world which is partly inhabited by fat ladies after all, and so we must not be surprised sometimes to see them represented in the iconography. The same remark, can be made about spirals. We live in a world where, if one doodles with pen and paper, or with a stick on sand, it will be a miracle if one does not get some spirals very quickly. One of the great truths, (perhaps the only truth) of semiotics is that symbols have meanings which are often arbitrarily ascribed. That is to say that when one sees an object which

has some symbolic function, one may well be able to recognise that is a symbol but one cannot *a priori* know *of what* it is a symbol, because the meaning is likely to be arbitrarily ascribed. So that when we look at spirals we can think of the sky, or we can think of the sea, or we can think of eyes or breasts or even of genital organs. Our imagination can run riot. Perhaps it will run riot during the course of this Conference! But it is important for us to remember the underlying point that we do not know *a priori* the meaning of symbols. When in another part of the world we see two spirals we should not be quick to recognise the *oculus* motif, the eyes of the Great Mother looking at us. Nor should we identify two spirals as representing procreation in the form of the reproductive organs of the Great Mother. Nor again should we immediately see breasts or twin suns or whatever. These symbols have to be analysed within their own context.

The right way to proceed is to look at the religious iconography of a given region first of all, in its own terms. And while we may make these far-ranging comparisons to give ourselves ideas, we must be sober in trying to assess them within their own context. I would like to give you two examples where I think this has been accomplished so successfully — one is the work of Martin Nilsson, that great scholar, who wrote so effectively about the Minoan and Mycenaean religions and their iconography (Nilsson 1950). The other, happily here with us at this Conference, is Professor Marija Gimbutas, who has made such an intensive study of the iconography of the figurines of the neolithic period of south-east Europe (Gimbutas 1974).

FOUR KINDS OF CONTEXT

It is necessary to establish three or four contexts in any study of early religion. First of all we have to define very closely the temporal context: to define with great clarity what are the dates we are speaking of. Secondly we have to establish the spatial context. That is very much more difficult, for while of course we know where we are, where the finds have been made, the question is where we shall draw the borders of our study. In my own view we should in the first instance be willing to draw the borders quite narrowly. Then of course, we can look beyond them. If we are studying the Maltese prehistoric religion, the relevant borders are first of all those around the Maltese Islands. Then of course we can look beyond and examine other areas which may have had interaction with Malta. But we have to demonstrate what can be said about Maltese prehistoric religion first of all in that context.

The third context is the social context. It is imperative if we are going to speak about early religion that we have at least some general notion of the structure of society. It is a truism, yet perhaps one that has some validity, that when there are very hierarchical societies, for instance state societies, there are often very hierarchical pantheons as well. So that when one looks at the very hierarchical societies of the Near East or of Geometric and Archaic Greece, it is not surprising to find hierarchical pantheons too. Often there is a reflection of the social organisation in the religious organisations. Without wishing to exaggerate the significance of that notion, it is useful to look at the context in that way.

The point has already been made that until only 15 or 20 years ago the spirals of the Mycenaean shaft graves, dating from around 1600 B.C. (found by Schliemann at Mycenae, a century ago), and their comparison with the spirals from the temples at Tarxien, offered the principal dating evidence for the Maltese temples. Even John Evans put some emphasis on the similarities here which led him to give a date of around 2000 B.C. for the developed phase of the Tarxien temples. And he put great emphasis also on the spirals on the ceiling at the Hal Saflieni hypogeum.

Today largely through the work of Evans in establishing a reliable stratigraphic sequence, and then that of Dr. Trump in refining that sequence, and providing radiocarbon samples to be dated, there is a sound radiocarbon chronology. With the calibration of radiocarbon dating it was possible to see that chronology in a new light (Renfrew 1972). It is clear that this was one of the myths, and that one would be wrong today to relate these spirals directly with those of Crete.

The next myth, as we saw, was the relationship between the Maltese temples and the megaliths of north western Europe. In the 1930s and 1940s this notion of a movement of people and ideas from Crete was widespread. So the megalithic tombs of Italy and Sicily, and the Maltese temples were considered as part of the same movement, which continued to Spain and to the megaliths of Europe in general. That idea again has now been discarded so that when we look at one of the great monuments, for instance in the Orkney Islands, in North Scotland, we can recognise something whose architecture we can admire and study but which has no relationship to the Maltese architecture other than in being very sophisticated, and very old and pre-urban. We are still in a sense suffering from that sense of surprise which to start with we all feel when we perceive that these great achievements in Malta, or in this case Scotland, were indeed achieved

by a pre-urban society. One cannot strictly speak here of a 'civilisation' since in the English language we relate civilisation and *civitas* whereas in French 'civilisation' is used in a wider cultural sense.

More recent work has suggested that there was independent development in different parts of Europe for the megalithic tombs and undoubtedly also independent development in Malta for the Maltese temples. The calibrated dates for the Maltese sequence, which it was possible to establish a decade or more ago, indicated the important periods here; the Mġarr period of the early temples, the Ġgantija period about 3000 B.C., which is the period of the major development of the great temples, and then the Tarxien period which is the climax when most of the art was produced. It must have ended around 2500 B.C. That gives us a chronological context.

As concerns the spatial context, it is clear that mistakes were made in relating Malta to the Aegean. I am not suggesting that we should not be free to make these comparisons, but I think recent experience makes us cautious of accepting them too readily. I am also cautious about possible comparisons with Sardinia. Recent developments in Sardinian archaeology have shown us the great wealth to be seen there and we know also that these are roughly contemporary with developments in Malta. We do have some ways of monitoring the extent of contact between Malta and other areas — for instance the obsidian trade, which shows that obsidian from Pantelleria and Lipari was reaching Malta already in the earliest Għar Dalam period. There are indications of contact and movement, but no suggestion that the contact becomes more intense at the period of the temples; indeed it may have become less so.

In considering social context and comparing the achievements, for instance the great buildings, in pre-state societies, sometimes it is useful to use the concept of the chiefdom. That is a very general concept and may have weaknesses in that respect, but it allows us to think at the same time of Polynesia — or of some of the great monuments of the British Isles like the henge monuments, and it allows us to consider what the society was like. Without a very highly stratified society, without a very hierarchical society in Malta, what was the society like which produced these great temples? The answer surely has to be that there must have been some centralised organisation to bring about these great achievements, albeit without the strict hierarchy of a state society, for we find no evidence in the artifacts for individuals of great personal wealth. It is perhaps legitimate to use as a first approximation this concept of the chiefdom.

The spatial distribution of the monuments perhaps supports that. Some years ago I produced a map (Renfrew 1973: 154), (later improved by Dr. Trump 1983: 72), to suggest that it may be possible to think of the Maltese Islands as a number of territories, each territory with a small group of temples, typically two temples, sometimes more, which will have served as a focal point of the territory. In the early phase of Maltese temples, in the Ġgantija phase, it is perhaps appropriate to think of some territorial distribution in this way. Here one can also use the idea of competition. It is quite useful to compare the Maltese parishes, where the churches vie with one another (and that firework display last Saturday night was a fine example of conspicuous consumption of wealth!) Above all one is impressed by the construction of the churches, these enormous churches — I think it is quite legitimate to use our insights into these achievements of modern construction, and indeed of modern faith. We could of course misinterpret them, I have no doubt, but I suggest that in the competitive territoriality of some of the more pious and energetic of the Maltese parishes today we may see something of the same phenomenon which we note in these remarkable and gargantuan constructions of prehistoric Malta. That sets the scene, as it were, in terms of the social context insofar as we are able to do.

THE STUDY OF EARLY RELIGIONS

I now want to make one or two remarks about the study of early religions, because as I said at the beginning we have very little in the way of a framework. I want to say something first of all about analogy, because in this Conference we are deliberately looking at other religions, and therefore are making analogical comparisons. When we see a similarity between one fat lady and another, if we are talking about a fertility cult we should be able to realise there are at least four possible underlying causes for such an analogy.

One is common ancestry. When we see a fat lady sculpture in Malta and a fat lady in prehistoric Greece, then it may well be that they are similar because they have a similar ancestry. In other words there could be a common cultural background.

Secondly and quite separately is the question of what one might call structural homology. That may be a rather pompous term, but it simply means resemblance of form coming about without a direct common cause. In this case, one might expect to find a fat lady in the iconography of Greece and a fat lady in Malta because in real life you may equally find a fat lady in each place. One has nothing to do with the other; there is no relationship between the two.

Thirdly, it may be a question of analagous process. In other words there may be sequences of development in the religion in each area, quite independent developments, which lead to an emphasis on certain properties of similarity.

And fourthly it may be a question of convergent evolution, to borrow a term from the biologists, where the similarities become progressively more evident.

So I think we have to try and bear in mind these possibilities and each time we are offered an analogy we have to consider the relative merits. I would like to stress that there is absolutely no presumption in favour of the first, in favour of common ancestry. One has to *demonstrate* the common ancestry if we are going to use that as a conclusion. There is therefore no presumption in favour of an Early Neolithic Great Mother. The Early Neolithic of the West Mediterranean is in any case not particularly abundant in those female figurines which we do see at Çatal Hüyük, and indeed in south east Europe. The absence of such a widespread abundance of such figurines predisposes me not to accept too readily the notion of a universal Great Earth Mother. So I am not in the least chastened by the discoveries at Çatal Hüyük, to which Dr. Bonanno referred in his opening remarks.

TRANSFORMATIONS

Religious like social organisation undergoes transformations and these transformations have their own internal dynamic. That may not seem a very remarkable statement. But there is the tendency among archaeologists, when changes take place, to try to derive from outside the reasons, the underlying causes for these transformations. Usually we should look instead inside within the developing trajectory of the society for the underlying dynamic of the transformation. If we use the notion of internally produced transformations then we can perhaps begin to see how in the very early beginnings in the Żebbuġ phase we come to developments which grow in the Mgarr phase. We don't always have to be drawing from outside for our inspiration.

This may be illustrated with reference to the religions of the Aegean. My reason for making this comparison is not to liken the Aegean finds with those of Malta, but on the contrary to emphasise how in the Aegean we have an autonomous series of transformations, which again have sometimes been explained through external agencies, but I think needlessly so. We may begin with the Greek fat ladies — for instance from the isle of Crete, in the neolithic period. In

the early bronze age there were indeed these remarkable marble figures which have sometimes been called fertility figures, but they are very rarely fat. On the contrary they are extremely thin, and if you prefer thin ladies it is to the Cyclades that you should turn! When we come to Early Minoan Crete we do indeed see some splendid representations of women in the form of pottery vessels. Some of them may relate to fertility, and some of them also relate to liquids — milk, water, wine perhaps. Then in the Middle Minoan period, the early period of Cretan palaces, we do indeed have development of some sort of pantheon. There may be a whole range of deities. The most remarkable figure comes from the Temple Repositories at Knossos in the Middle Minoan III period. But interestingly the Minoan palaces themselves do not seem to have been temples, and the main religious centres seem to have been outside in the hills, the peak sanctuaries. And then we come to the Late Bronze I period around 1500 B.C. in Crete, and the apogee of the palace civilisation. The wonderful stone vase from one of the Cretan palaces at Zakro may actually give a representation of a peak sanctuary. It represents a mountainside with mountain goats at the top. Contemporary with it are the gold double axes from the sacred caves at Arkalochori. When you look across to Mycenae on mainland Greece, you find influences from Minoan Crete well represented in the great gold finger rings found there, but Mycenae developed its own different traditions so that by the Late Helladic IIIA and IIIB periods around 1400 B.C. and a little later, one finds the remarkable terracotta figures from the temple at Mycenae. This represents a further development and the gesture with the upraised arms is significant. This is picked up in Crete after the collapse of the Cretan palaces when the great religion of the Cretan palaces must have suffered a setback. It must have lost its priests, and have become a popular religion. One then finds a whole series of little shrines, with the Minoan Goddess with upraised arms. Now I indicate this sequence of forms simply to illustrate how the iconography changed with the centuries. Things of one period are not the same as those in another. This is a series of transformations. And late in the Minoan period in Crete there appear Mycenaean figurines during the Late Helladic IIIC period around 1100 B.C. Now it is worth noting that until recently most of the deities known in the Mycenaean world in the form of figures or figurines were female. It is not until the Geometric period in Greece that we see male deities clearly represented. But my own recent excavations in Melos have shown us that the transformations there began earlier. On the island of Melos, at the site of Phylakopi, we found a Sanctuary which began its life sometime in the 14th century B.C. and continued right on into the 11th century. It takes us right through the late Mycenaean

period. I haven't time to describe the buildings in detail to you. The main shrine is quite a small and modest room, but the Sanctuary had a large number of items of iconography (Renfrew 1985), including a small gold head, perhaps from some cult figure and a whole series of splendid bovid figures, which are amongst the finest from the Mycenaean world. We had the great good fortune to find one beautiful figure about 40 cm high, the 'lady of Phylakopi' (*ibid.* pl 31). She is a remarkable work of art. But she too illustrates the difficulty of making gender distinctions. If you looked at the head alone you might think it was bearded. But some other convention is being followed there: I don't believe it is bearded and most scholars agree that this is a female deity. In addition we have a series of male figures which are really without close comparison in the Mycenaean world. This is why I am taking your time to indicate these things: it is to illustrate this idea which I want to emphasise of internal transformation within a religion. The conventional view of the Greek religion has sometimes been that there was a Mycenaean religion and then a collapse, and a Dark Age and then a new religion, namely the Greek religion. Sometimes this change is associated, quite erroneously I think, with ideas about the Indo-European languages. Now we see that the development of the Greek religion should be seen instead as a whole series of transformations and that one of the major transformations was occurring already during Mycenaean times. We should expect, when we are looking at the development of Maltese religion to see in the same way a series of transformations, and we shouldn't necessarily be looking for external causes for these transformations. Interestingly, we had at Phylakopi two male figurines in bronze of this period which are imports from the Near East, so I am not trying to argue the case for complete isolation. Certainly there were contacts and sometimes significant interactions between different areas. But I think these should be seen in perspective.

THE MALTESE CASE

Now let us turn to Malta again and use the background of the notion of spatial context, temporal context and the social and the cognitive contexts, and the idea of transformation, to look again briefly at the Malta temples and their associated cults.

It is very important to start with Dr. Trump's find at Skorba of female iconography. These female figurines are amongst the earliest representation from Malta of the human form. The Skorba phase is a millennium or so before the great temples, and we do perhaps have some indication of the early religious observances. It is difficult of

course to correlate the small figurines found in any area with any coherent religious observance because we don't have a very good context for them. But it is a fair assumption perhaps to make that they have such a significance.

And then in the Żebbuġ phase, the time when the rock-cut tombs make their appearance, there is the important find of the menhir from Żebbuġ. John Evans was amongst those who suggested that the rock-cut tombs could be a starting point for the development of the Maltese temples and it is significant that we have this early iconography. It may well be female iconography, but that is not easy to establish from the head alone. It may be relevant to the later development of the temples. Then you will remember that from among the earlier temples, namely the temple at Mgarr, there came the delightful little temple model (Evans 1971: pl. 33, 11-12), which also helps us to realise how the temples may have been roofed. From the Tarxien period comes an exciting fragment of a temple, a model which has been reconstructed by Professor Stuart Piggott (*ibid.* pl 47, 7-9; Trump 1983: 68, fig. 5). It is a wonderful thing that we have these graphic representations from the Neolithic period of what these temples looked like. I think it is essential to remember one of the reasons for the technical accomplishment of the Maltese temples; that the rock was such as to allow easy construction. This no doubt is true for some of the great modern achievements of Maltese architecture also. So it was in Orkney in Scotland, which I referred to earlier. If you have a wonderful stone which is easy to work, then it is not surprising that you may find remarkable architectural achievements. This of course must be one of the contributory reasons for the accomplishments of Maltese civilisation. But when we come to the spirals, I have no easy explanations to offer for their great sophistication. For me these are really the high point of Maltese art, in the great sophistication of these abstract motifs which I enthused about earlier and in the very great variety in their forms.

One factor then, if we are looking at the internal development in the architecture and the art, is the ease of carving the stone. Another is the very feature of insularity. When we analyse the position of Malta, it is ready-made for strong interaction. But of course that has been one of the principal themes of Maltese history. If we look at the Knights of Malta or the great days of Malta as a naval centre, Malta's very existence was as a focal point, as a centre of interaction. But in periods when transport is less easy, islands are also obviously a locus for insularity, and insularity is in some ways almost the opposite of such

interaction. It is a remarkable feature in prehistory that in many different cases we find insularity allowing a sort of exaggeration, a sort of hothouse effect as if the reverberations of the culture can't get out and don't spread themselves more widely, but are reinforced by the insular status. That is of course what we find so clearly in Polynesia. So that when we look at Easter Island, we see great monuments which arose partly because of the remarkable insularity of Easter Island, partly through local social developments towards a chiefdom society. Clearly there were very competitive tribes and chiefdoms. I am not presuming here to give an explanation of the achievements of Easter Island or of Malta but I am emphasising relevant features. In Malta we have remarkable developments in art: in Easter Island you have the development of the rongorongo writing and indeed the remarkable local artistic developments.

My last point is to stress that I think we can recognise deities in Malta. If I had more time I would give a more coherent background to this observation, but I think there is certainly one, perhaps more than one, female deity in the Maltese temples. There are two arguments that would lead me to this conclusion. One is the great scale of the major statue at Tarxien. It is rare to make monumental, larger than life-size statues unless you are referring either to a great ruler (and I don't think in a non-state society that is appropriate), or to a deity figure. The other argument is one of relationship in scale. There are two very important sculptures in the Museum of Valletta. The first piece is unfortunately much damaged and shows the feet of a seated fat lady and on the back or the side there are remarkable little figures of standing ladies who are subordinate to the great figure (Evans 1971: pl. 48, 1-3). I think that when there are artistic representations of *subordination* then the depiction either represents a great human leader with little human people, (which one often finds in a state-society), or it represents a divine figure with little human people. The same observation occurs in another place in the Museum in Valetta, again incomplete (*ibid.* pl. 48, 4-5). Here one sees the legs and skirt of one of these great ladies and with her there is a little seated figure of an acolyte. If we are looking for concrete arguments for the divine status of this figure, then I find this conjunction, really quite a significant one.

In conclusion I would like to mention that if one is analysing the early Maltese religion one should certainly note the presence of the various phallic representation, although curiously in the developed phase, the Tarxien phase, one sees groups of two if not three phalli represented rather than a single one. One should not, however, get

carried away, if I might say so, by these phallic representations. There is clearly something of religious significance here, but religion can have many sides, many aspects, and it is not appropriate to try and unite everything into one central simplifying idea of "fertility".

One should offer a further cautionary word about the famous sculpture sometimes identified as a priest (*ibid.* pl. 49, 11-13). First of all it could easily be female because the torso, is restored. Secondly there is absolutely nothing that teaches us that this is not a divine figure rather than an acolyte.

My final thought is that far from understanding the Maltese religion well, we do not in fact know a great deal about the contextual background, as I have tried to show. It may well be that we are on the threshold of making the necessary significant observations, and in order to make them properly I think we have to cast aside the older interpretations of a universal Great Mother, and the automatic belief in the existence of a fertility cult. It is not clear to me precisely what the notion of a fertility cult entails and I shall be interested to see if anybody else at this Conference really knows what they mean by the concept of "fertility cult". That is something that I hope we shall learn in the days to follow!

Bibliography

EVANS, J.D.

1971 — *Prehistoric Antiquities of the Maltese Islands*, London (Athlone Press).

GIMBUTAS, M.

1974 — *The Gods and Goddesses of Old Europe*, London (Thames and Hudson).

NILSSON, M.P.

1950 — *The Minoan-Mycenaean Religion and its Survival in Greek Religion*, 2nd ed., Lund.

RENFREW, C.

1972 — Malta and the calibrated radiocarbon chronology, *Antiquity*, 46, 141-4.

1973 — *Before Civilisation*, London (Jonathan Cape).

1985 — *The Archaeology of Cult: The Sanctuary at Phylakopi*, London (Thames and Hudson).

TRUMP, D.H.

1966 — *Skorba* (Reports of the Research Committee of the Society of Antiquaries of London XXII), Oxford.

1983 — Megalithic architecture in Malta, in C. Renfrew (ed.), *The Megalithic Monuments of Western Europe*, London (Thames and Hudson).