The societies advised that trilithon 6, 7, with lintel—which had slewed round—and trilithon 56, which was leaning at a dangerous angle, should be examined with a view to replacement with as little excavation as possible; that the monolith and lintel 22 be replaced, and its companion sarsen (21) secured; and that trili­thon 57, 58, should be re-erected in its place, which was exactly known. Steps were taken to place the matter in the hands of engineering experts. On the 19th of September 1901 trilithon 56 was successfully raised to a perpendicular position. It then presented an imposing appearance, standing 21 ft. above ground: its total length was found to be 29 ft. 6 in., and its weight about 30 tons. The excavations were carried to a depth of 8 ft. 3 in. below the datum line, and many objects were found, including chippings and lumps of the stones, stone tools, bones, and (in the upper strata) coins and fragments of pottery. Nearly 100 stone implements were excavated—axes, hammer axes, stone hammers and mauls—which, according to Dr Gowland, who superintended the work, had been used not only for breaking the rude blocks into regular forms, but also for working down their faces to a level or curved surface. No light was thrown, however, **on** the transport of the blocks.

Notwithstanding the many attempts, both by excavations and speculative writings, to elucidate the history of this unique monument, the archaeological data available are insufficient to decide definitely between the conflicting opinions held with regard to the date of its construction and the purpose for which it was originally intended. The finding of chips of “ sarsens ” and " blue stones ” together “ down to the bed of the rock ” would seem to disprove the theory that the inner circle and inner horseshoe were built earlier than the rest of the monument. Dr Gowland at a meeting of the Society of Antiquaries (Dec. 19, 1901), read a paper on his recent excavations on the site of Stonehenge, in which he came to the conclusion that the struc­ture was a temple dedicated to the worship of the sun, and he assigns its erection to the end of the Neolithic period (2000 to 1800 b.c.), on the ground that no bronze implements or relics were found during his explorations. It does not follow, however, from the fact that only stone tools were found at the bottom of the trenches that the monument was constructed when metal tools were unknown, because none of the Stonehenge tools have the characteristic forms of Neolithic implements, so that they might have been specially improvised for the purpose of roughly hewing these huge stones, for which, indeed, they were really better adapted, and more easily procured, than the early and very costly metal tools of the Bronze Age. On the other hand, the recorded discovery of iron armour, Roman and British pottery and coins, together with the bones and horns of deer and other animals, is of little evidential value without a precise record of the circumstances in which they were found. Only one object, viz. an incense burner, seems to the present writer to have any chronological value, as it is an undoubted sepulchral relic of the Bronze Age.

That the sun on midsummer day rises nearly, but not quite, in line with the “ avenue ” and over the Friar’s Heel, has long been advanced as the chief argument in support of the theory that Stonehenge was a temple for sun-worship. On the sup­position that this stone was raised to mark exactly the line of sunrise on midsummer’s day when the structure was erected, it would naturally follow, owing to well-known astronomical causes, that in the course of time the direction of this line would slowly undergo a change, and that, at any subsequent date since, the amount of deviation would be commensurate with the lapse of time, thus supplying chronological data to astronomers for determining the age of the building. The solution of this problem has recently been attempted by Sir Norman Lockyer *(Stonehenge and other British Stone Monuments)*, who calculates that on midsummer day, 1680 b.c., the sun would rise exactly over the Friar’s Heel, and in a direct line with the axis of the temple and "avenue.” The above date he therefore considers to be the date of the erection of this great national monument, within a margin of possible error, on either side, of 200 years.

Looking at Stonehenge from the architectural standpoint. there can be no hesitancy in regarding it as an advanced re­presentative of the ordinary stone circles, some two hundred of which, great and small, are known within the British Isles. It is, however, differentiated from them all by having hewn stones, capstones, tenons and sockets. That its analogues were chiefly used as sepulchres has been fully established, and this is presumptive evidence that the sepulchral element was, at least, one of the objects for which Stonehenge was constructed: and it was probably for this reason that it was erected on Salis­bury Plain, where there already existed an extensive necropolis of the Bronze Age. Nor would this by any means militate against its use as a temple for consecrating the dead, or for sun-worship, or any other religious purpose.

Authorities.—Among numerous writings on Stonehenge may be mentioned *Stonehenge and Abury,* by Dr William Stukely (1740; reprinted in 1840); Davies, *Celtic Researches* (1801), and *Mythology of the Druids* (1809) ; Hoare, *Ancient Wiltshire* (1812), vol. i. ; Browne, *An Illustration of Stonehenge and Abury* (1823); Fergusson, *Rude Stone Monuments* (1872); Long, *Stonehenge and its Barrows* (1876); Gidley, *Stonehenge viewed in the Light of Ancient History and Modern Observation* (1877); W. Μ. Flinders Petrie, *Stonehenge: Plans, Descriptions and Theories* (1880); E. T. Stevens, *Jottings on Stone­henge* (1882) ; Edgar Barclay, *Stonehenge and its Earth* *Works* (1895) ; Lockyer, *Stonehenge and other British Stone Monuments, Astro­nomically Considered* (1906). See also *The Times* (April 9, 1901). For a complete bibliography of Stonehenge see *The Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine* (Dec. 1901), by W. Jerome Harrison. (R. Mu.)

**STONEMAN, GEORGE** (1822-1894), American soldier, was born at Busti, in Chautauqua county, New York, on the 8th of August 1822. He graduated at West Point in 1846, served as second lieutenant with the Mormon battalion in California during the Mexican War, and became a captain in 1855. In February 1861, while in command of Fort Brown, Texas, he disregarded the orders of his superior officer, Major-General D. E. Twiggs, to surrender to the Confederate forces, and escaped with the garrison. He served on McClellan’s staff during the West Virginia campaign, and was commissioned brigadier­general of volunteers and appointed chief of cavalry of the Army of the Potomac in August 1861, in which capacity he took part in the Peninsula campaign and the Seven Days’ Battle. He commanded the III. corps in the Fredericksburg campaign; and was promoted, in November 1862, to be major-general of volunteers. During the Chancellorsville campaign he made an unsuccessful cavalry raid toward Richmond. In the early months of 1864 he commanded the XXIII. corps, and then, as commander of the cavalry of the department of the Ohio, took part in the Atlanta campaign. While attempting to seize the Confederate prison at Andersonville (July 31, 1864), he was captured at Clinton, Georgia. After his release in October he commanded cavalry in East Tennessee, making successful raids into Virginia and North Carolina, and on the 12th of April 1865 defeated a Confederate force near Salisbury, North Carolina, and captured a large number of prisoners. After­ward he held commands in Tennessee and Virginia until 1868. He was mustered out of the volunteer service in September 1866, but served in the regular army as colonel and brevet­major-general till 1871. He then removed to California, was elected governor by the Democrats, and served from 1883 to 1887. In February 1891 he was made a colonel on the retired list, U.S. Army, and on the 5th of September 1894 died at Buffalo, New York.

**STONE MONUMENTS, PRIMITIVE**—The raising of com­memorative monuments of such enduring material as stone is a practice that may be traced in all countries to the remotest times. The highly sculptured statues, obelisks and other monumental erections of modern civilization are but the lineal representatives of the unhewn monoliths, dolmens, cromlechs, &c., of prehistoric times. Judging from the large number of the Iatter that have still survived the destructive agencies (notably those of man himself) to which they have been exposed during so many ages, it would seem that the motives which led to their erection had as great a hold on humanity in its earlier stages of development as at the present time. In giving some