

way (s) in which knowledge of the past is constructed in the present. In order to further current archaeological practice it is essential that contributors relate their particular 'history' (ancient or modern) to new understandings of knowledge construction, theory or methodology within archaeology.

Venue: The Bateman Auditorium, Gonville & Caius College, Cambridge.

Date: Saturday, 26 June - Sunday, 27 June 2004 (Friday Night reception in Senior Parlour).

Payment: The cost, per person, incl. 2 nights accommodation, breakfast & one evening banquet is £150. Cheques to be made payable to the "University of Cambridge" (to arrive by Jan 1 2004).

Contact: Dr. Andrew Martin & Dr. David Mercer, Department of Archaeology & Anthropology, Downing Street, University of Cambridge. Cambridge CB2 3DZ, U.K.

Applications to give papers should include a proposal of not more than 300 words.

It is intended that collection of the papers will be published.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/bha.13111>

IX. Graduate dissertations in the history of archaeology

Historicism, biography, and the origins of prehistoric archaeology.

About a doctoral dissertation on "*L'univers du préhistorien. Science, foi et politique dans l'oeuvre et la vie d'Edouard Desor (1811-1882)*", Paris, Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales / University of Neuchatel, Switzerland. Members of the jury: Claude BLANCKAERT and Michel EGLOFF (directors), Pietro CORSI, Philippe MARGUERAT, Laurent TISSOT and Alain SCHNAPP.

With the same title, a slightly shorter version of this work is in press: Paris, L'Harmattan (collection Histoire des Sciences Humaines).

In concrete terms, this study is a biography of Edouard Desor, one of the main Central European instigators of prehistoric archaeology as a scientific discipline, in the 1860's and 1870's. However, my aim has been to exploit such a biographical approach in order to reconstruct the scientific, social, political, intellectual, cultural, and religious context in which prehistory emerged and asserted itself as a new subject of knowledge.

As a matter of fact, historians of science now agree on the fruitlessness of studies confined to the present disciplinary boundaries. Within science studies, many even affirm that there is no real dividing line between science and society, between "intrinsic" and "extrinsic" factors in the construction of knowledge. Such assertions appear firmly established in theory; but I thought it useful to look for a confirmation in concrete history.

That was the motive for the choice of a biographical approach. Understood as a kind of "microhistory" and thanks to the small scale it offers, biography actually allows to transversely encompass all the social, political, cultural, etc. factors mentioned before, to detail the changing relations which these factors share together, and to underscore the

dynamics which sustain such relations¹.

In this respect, the choice of the subject of the biography appears particularly profitable. Firstly, Edouard Desor left a huge archival documentation, which consists of a multitude of scientific drafts and manuscripts, a large personal library with his personal annotations, some 30,000 letters, and a personal diary he kept daily for almost forty years.

Beyond these documentary advantages, the scientist Desor secondly offers the interest of having equally been active in political, industrial, financial, and religious affairs — a characteristic of capital importance for the above-mentioned “multicontextualisation”. And in all these fields, his personal path has been both original and turbulent, offering clearly contrasting viewpoints to the historian.

An orphan of the lower middle class first reduced to social assistance, he ended his life as a prosperous millionaire. A young revolutionary German student, he had to move to France as a political refugee; settling later in the United States, where he campaigned for the abolition of slavery, he finally established himself in Switzerland, managing a long political career which he completed with his election to the presidency of the national House of representatives. Being a sociable-natured, French, German, Italian and English polyglot, keen on travels and experiences throughout the world, Desor also shared contacts in the whole of Europe and in America — contacts where scientific exchange was only one dimension of a broader reality. On the religious sphere, lastly, he turned away from atheism through the defense of a rationalist faith and a strong commitment to the separation of State and Church.

On the scientific level, one can note that being a self-taught man did not prevent him from reaching the heights of academic hierarchy. His work furthermore covers a very broad spectrum: being especially active in prehistoric archaeology, geology and palaeontology, Desor was a complete naturalist in the largest meaning of the word, dealing from human geography and anthropology to oceanography or to the study of the geography of plants. His scientific activity also took very diverse ways: beside his basic and applied researches, Desor actually operated as a publicist and a popularizer of science, who became deeply involved in the promotion and politics of science.

In brief, thanks to the abundance of archival material, as well as to the richness and diversity of Desor’s activities and personal commitments, such a biography opens attractive viewpoints on numerous historical and epistemological issues. To mention but one example, Desor sheds new light on the presumed role of the raising, European nationalisms in the development of prehistoric archaeology, thanks to his action as a mediator between different national styles and traditions of research. It would lead me too far entering such issues — for it would first require an overview of Desor’s specific role in 19th century archaeological research, and especially in the first institutional establishment of prehistoric science². In actual fact, I think it appropriate to restrict myself here to more general and theoretical teachings of this biography, which concern the two above-mentioned “disciplinary” and “extrinsic/intrinsic” thematics.

¹ The methodological and theoretical principles which governed this biography are the subject of an article to be published in the *Revue d’Histoire des Sciences Humaines* 8 or 9 (2003).

² Cf. KAESER, M.-A., On the International Roots of Prehistory, *Antiquity* 76 (2002): 170-177.

1: Relations of prehistoric archaeology with other scientific researches

When one considers in detail the scientific research as it was actually practiced by Desor, there appears to be absolutely no solution of continuity between different themes of research or “disciplines”. At first sight, this does not surprise the historian: everybody acknowledges the strong connections extant between vertebrate palaeontology and the study of the “Reindeer age”, or between Quaternary geology and the stratigraphical analysis of prehistoric caves, for instance. Likewise, nobody will wonder at the fact that Desor’s palaeontological, geological, botanical and archaeological studies jointly contributed to the development of the same “progressionism”, which was to be strengthened by such a mutual backing-up.

That absence of compartmentalization proves much more interesting, when one realizes that it also applied between spheres and notions without obvious ontological or cognitive proximity. Desor for example had an original idea of “archaeological cultures”, which did not derive from ethnography or cultural anthropology, but was directly inspired from the geological “facies” — a notion which had been defined in the sedimentary rocks of the Jura mountains. Likewise, it is in botanics that he drew a theoretical pattern allowing for a conciliation between the synchronic diversity of archaeological cultures and the diachronic progress of human society, technology and morals. Now, these inspirations, analogies, and connections were never stated explicitly in his published works. Probably considered as compromising, conflicting with the necessities of a positive and reasoned scientific method, they are only perceptible in private writings, such as letters and the personal diary.

2: “Science” and “society” in the construction of knowledge

The same continuity applies between the so-called “intrinsic” and “extrinsic” factors in the construction of knowledge. Desor actually systematically took advantage of his political, commercial, financial, and theological competence and power in his scientific work. And, from the choice of his subjects of research up to their treatment, and his interpretation of the facts gathered, his practice of science was widely governed by promptings and questionings ensuing from other spheres. To take but one or two examples, his archaeological work in Northern Africa primarily suited a desire to solve a question regarding the hermeneutics of the Old Testament; conversely, Desor strengthened his understanding of the prehistoric technological and cultural evolution on the occasion of a sojourn in the Pontifical States, where theological criticism helped him to explain the contemporary economic and social underdevelopment of the Italian Peninsula.

After analysis, it therefore seems absolutely impossible to mark out an objective limit between realities which Desor ingenuously never considered as distinct in essence. This gets clearer, when one takes into account the meaning that Desor gave to his own scientific activity. To him, the mission of science applied all over: taken as a whole, scientific Truth was to be the basis of spiritual principles, political progress, social justice, and economic welfare. Now, since science was to exert its authority over all spheres, it sustained, and at the same time benefitted from all the other activities of the scientist. In Desor’s viewpoint, as in that of most of his 19th century contemporaries, the “social” thus *dissolved* into Science.

Yet, for us historians of archaeology, the details of such a biography rather testify to the noteworthy influence, within scientific research, of the personal path of the scientists, as well as of their commitments on other fronts, be they scientific, political, commercial or religious. One should nevertheless not interpret this as a kind of social determinism on the production and diffusion of science. For the “context” in question actually does in no way constitute a

rigid determinant: scrutinized at the scale of a singular life, it even turns out to be extraordinary flexible. In concrete terms, the context never constitutes a given, positive fact. For the scientist is constantly confronted with multiple influences, which interact in a dynamic way. The context therefore only exerts its influence through the subjective perception and the uncertain awareness of the historical actors. In brief, context does not steer science, and does not either impose insuperable constraints on science. On the contrary: through the multiplicity of its impulses and the almost infinite variety of their combinations, the influence of the “context” constitutes in fact an inexhaustible source of inspiration for the scientist — according to his nature, to his former experiences, and to his personal inclination.

If we now leave the biographical path to consider this within the broad scope of the origins of prehistoric archaeology, it appears that the heuristic orientations which Desor and his contemporaries followed when they settled the epistemology disciplinary shape of prehistoric archaeology were of an extremely contingent nature. From that viewpoint, we ought to recognize that most of the analytical categories of present, modern prehistoric science widely proceed from forgotten and often invalidated debates, as well as from sociological, ideological, and interpersonal circumstances of the past history of research. In brief, the present discipline is moving within a framework which has been shaped for a very different use, in accordance with a very different context. All in all, prehistory is prisoner of an outdated intellectual legacy. Thanks to the underscoring of the forms, the characteristics, and the motives of this constraining legacy, history of archaeology nevertheless can help us to free our discipline from the weight of the past, from certain epistemological automatisms and from henceforth obsolete heuristic conventions.

Marc-Antoine KAESER

Swiss National Museum, Hardturmstr. 185, CH-8005 Zurich (Switzerland)

MarcAntoine.Kaeser@slm.admin.ch

Rethinking the Illinois Hopewell: a constructive comparison with approaches from British Archaeology and Bruno Latour’.

University of Cambridge 2002

In my dissertation I use Bruno Latour’s approach that concentrates on instances of contestation to understand the evolution and influences behind traditions of thought. Using this to understand the origins and development of ‘Processual’ archaeology (of the Hopewell) and ‘Post-Processual’ archaeology (of the British Neolithic) involved examining contacts, conflicts and critique on the one hand, and practice on the other. This identified the particular origins of theories, distinct discrepancies between practice and profession and general similarities between their methods of interpretation. The predominant method involved the imposition of a reified interpretation from archaeology or anthropology. Reification of a particular interpretation occurs through the removal of its context, its use by several people and later extension into other spheres of practice.

Having identified problems with this blanket approach of Hopewell and British Prehistoric interpretive methods, I addressed the archaeology of Hopewell burial mounds using historiographic methods. Latour argues that these enable a more empirical approach, “thus opening an unlimited field of study for anthropology” (Latour 1987: 204). By concentrating on contests over the ‘correct’ burial practice that sometimes existed between Lower Illinois Valley Hopewell communities of different traditions, new light was shed on Hopewell views

of the world, how they were used and how they evolved. These contests involved two contrasting mound types excavated into one another in quick succession, of usually three or four mounds duration.

By following the efforts of each community to make their claims distinct and more credible in these instances of contestation, many of the elements that were significant to each were clearly distinguished. Contests were also a source of gradual change. When three or four mounds of both traditions were built in sequence, this sequence of utterances showed that both sides negotiated local compromises possibly to diffuse conflict.

This approach allows a contextual analysis to be conducted but assumes that each separate controversy contains only one particular understanding of each tradition. Yet the construction of different interpretations of each tradition from each controversy does not preclude general understandings of these traditions or their developments. By linking controversies and their different interpretations, I set out to develop a historical chronicle for the Lower Illinois Valley. The realization that contests reveal the ideas behind burial practices (in ways that more abstract functional mounds do not) spurred the development of a new approach that allows understanding of both general similarities and particular differences.

Andrew Martin

University of Cambridge

andymartin54@hotmail.com

Changing perceptions of the Early Palaeolithic of Britain, c.1890-1960: abstract of a (nearly completed) doctoral thesis

The nature and meaning of the British Palaeolithic record has been debated for over a century and a half. This thesis, of which the following is a short abstract (any comments would be received with interest) explores the social and historical context of changing perceptions of the British Palaeolithic over the first half of the twentieth century. During this vibrant period of Palaeolithic research competing versions of the past were conceived, presented, and debated in a struggle to reach consensus amongst a number of related Quaternary disciplines, all involved in the ongoing practice of intellectual empire building. The perception and interpretation of the British Early Palaeolithic (*i.e.* our Lower and Middle Palaeolithic) changed enormously between c.1890 and 1960; the current picture and practice of British Palaeolithic research owes much to the debates of these decades.

Since the mid-nineteenth century, interpretations of the British Palaeolithic had been closely linked to other areas of Quaternary research, particularly geology and palaeontology. During the first half of the twentieth century, representatives from a number of different Quaternary disciplines continued to tackle the complex question of how best to order, classify and interpret the Early Palaeolithic of Britain. Some were employed by institutions such as the Geological Survey of Great Britain or the British Museum; others devoted spare time to Palaeolithic research. Consensus was reached through a complex process of negotiation as diverse researchers introduced their discoveries, classifications, and interpretations into wider discussion through private correspondence, society meetings, and published works. The shifting interpretations and classifications of the pre-Palaeolithic industries of East Anglia and the Early Palaeolithic flake industries discovered in the Thames Valley and Clacton-on-Sea provide a focus for my research, and are used to explore the dominant preconceptions of the time and the social and disciplinary complexity of debate.

The first detailed case study of this thesis examines the last of the great Eolithic debates, which offers an enlightening perspective on the unspoken rules underpinning industrial classification and the social context of academic debate. From the 1910s onward, James Reid Moir and E. Ray Lankester promoted and defended their pre-Palaeolithic 'industries' from East Anglia by delivering carefully tailored arguments to selected arenas: societies, journals, and individuals. Lankester's letters to Moir illuminate the social calculation that lay behind such strategies, and widely held assumptions about the patterning of Palaeolithic industries. The thesis then turns to some contemporaries of Moir and Lankester, exploring the social and institutional restrictions of research, and then moving on to various attempts that were made to arrange the Early Palaeolithic industries within a reliable framework.

One good example of the restrictions that faced researchers in the early twentieth century comes from the famous collaboration between Reginald Smith, archaeologist at the British Museum, and Henry Dewey, Geologist of the Geological Survey, on several sites in the Thames Valley. The most celebrated of these sites was Barnfield Pit, Swanscombe, where Smith and Dewey worked between 1912 and 1914. However, differences in the respective agendas of individuals and institutions led to a breakdown in negotiation between Smith's superiors at the Museum and Dewey's employers at the Survey, and Dewey was removed from the case. A different set of restrictions dogged non-professionals, many of whom had to snatch time from unrelated employment to pursue their research. Some of the more fortunate were financially independent, such as Samuel Hazzledine Warren, a geologist from Loughton, Essex, who made some outstanding contributions to Palaeolithic research. Both Reginald Smith and Hazzledine Warren discovered industries that provoked some interesting responses from the varied ranks of Palaeolithic researchers. Their reactions to these flake-dominated industries, which drove many of the changes in the interpretation and classification of Early Palaeolithic industries between the 1910s and 1950s, provide a focus for the next section of this thesis.

In the nineteenth century, Gabriel de Mortillet had developed a popular and apparently widely-applicable industrial classification – a single progressive line of industries in which the crude hand-axes of the Chellean were succeeded by finer Acheulian hand-axes, which were then followed by the flake-dominated Mousterian. This scheme had been elaborated and partly reinforced by an industrial sequence developed by Victor Commont who was working in the Somme Valley in the years prior to the Great War. However, as growing numbers of Early Palaeolithic industries dominated by flakes and lacking a hand-axe element, but *pre-dating* the Mousterian were described, the difficulties of incorporating such variety within the old unilinear models inspired a number of competing solutions and a fresh perspective on the Palaeolithic.

Reginald Smith, stimulated by Commont's findings, developed an influential and apparently reliable British classification from his Thames Valley work with Henry Dewey. Amongst their sequence of industries was an Early Palaeolithic flake-dominated industry from Barnfield Pit (later recognised as Clactonian) that they interpreted as *pre-Chellean*. However, Hazzledine Warren, who was working on Early Palaeolithic flake-dominated assemblages around the same time, suspected that his industry from Clacton-on-Sea was neither pre-Chellean nor Mousterian. Warren eventually took a similar line to a number of continental researchers (such as Hugo Obermaier), and suggested that his industry was *pre-Mousterian* – loosely contemporary with the Acheulian, but on a separate cultural line from the hand-axe cultures. The concept of parallel industrial cultures inspired the construction of more complex industrial frameworks. Various attempts were made over the 1920s to explain and describe this industrial variety, but the most striking solution was not presented until the early 1930s.

The final section of this thesis examines the aims and assumptions of Early Palaeolithic schemes of the 1930s and 1940s, the reasons for differences in their reception, and their impact on the direction of research.

By the early 1930s a variety of solutions had been advanced in the attempt to incorporate these diverse Early Palaeolithic flake industries within a general industrial classification. For various reasons, the version proposed by Henri Breuil became extremely popular in Britain. Breuil, who was probably inspired by Obermaier, integrated his views of contemporary hand-axe and non-hand-axe industries within a rigid classification outlined in a series of articles co-authored with Koslowski. Their scheme was based largely on the Somme Valley succession and incorporated a hydra of minutely subdivided industries on a number of parallel lines, each industry rigidly locked into position within a complex industrial framework through associations with other industries. These were positioned within a relative chronology supplied by the Alpine glacial succession of Penck and Brückner. By plucking the flake industries from the old hand-axe dominated line, and relocating them on a parallel stream, industrial variety could be assimilated without abandoning assumptions of industrial progression. However, Breuil's version of parallel hand-axe-and-flake and flake-making populations was not a novel one. The welcome received by Breuil's scheme cannot be explained solely in terms of archaeological aptness, but must also be considered in the context of broader Quaternary frameworks.

Influential practitioners of other Quaternary disciplines had long used the sequence of Palaeolithic industries as zone-fossils to assist their chronology-building activities and support competing patterns of the past. Quaternary disciplines each harboured their own peculiar debates and agendas, and researchers working on river-terraces, glacial deposits, fauna, molluscs and hominids contributed to the creation of a recognisable Palaeolithic record. This contribution was often made through their efforts to develop and promote favoured versions of a relative Quaternary chronology by borrowing selectively from the array of competing conclusions offered by cousin researchers. However, by the late 1920s such activities suffered a setback – as outlined above, it now seemed that more than one industrial zone fossil might exist at the same point in time. Now that Early Palaeolithic flake industries, such as the Clactonian or Levalloisian, were suspected to overlap with more traditional industries, such as the Acheulian, the value of industries as zone-fossils or time-markers depreciated accordingly. Breuil's industrial scheme, arriving in the early 1930s, therefore provided a timely offer of fine-grained chronological resolution for Quaternary correlation, and its adoption by a number of Quaternary researchers initially contributed to its popularity. Their efforts to tune old relative chronologies to the longer and more detailed chronology of Breuil's scheme caused some disruption between Palaeolithic and cousin Quaternary disciplines. Nonetheless, widespread use of Breuil's scheme by influential researchers such as Kenneth Oakley, Percy Boswell and Frederick Zeuner also integrated the assumptions that were incorporated within Breuil's model more firmly into mainstream Palaeolithic research.

However, growing awareness of greater regional and global industrial variety had, by the late 1940s, inspired a reaction against Breuil's two-tier scheme of detailed industrial subdivisions and generalised parallel cultures. Certain British researchers had become concerned that Breuil and Koslowski's meticulous Somme-based industrial subdivisions were more limited in scope than had previously been appreciated, and could not account for anomalous industrial variation at British sites such as Baker's Hole. Once again various Quaternary researchers, whose relative chronologies were partly founded upon these supposedly time-specific Palaeolithic industries, were led to question the accuracy of the established industrial

framework. Their doubts contributed to the downfall of Breuil's scheme, and many of the old industrial subdivisions fell into disuse. In the renewed uncertainty over industrial classification, statistical and assemblage-based industrial analyses became increasingly popular. Meanwhile, at the other end of the interpretative scale, Breuil's distinction between hand-axe and non-hand-axe (flake) lines had become exaggerated into a caricatured distinction between flake and core cultures, and early objections to this scheme (such as Warren's defence of core-tools within his definition of the flake-rich Clactonian) were gaining ground. Hallam Movius Jr., John Goodwin, Gertrude Caton-Thompson and others argued that the core-flake dichotomy now appeared to be of limited application outside Western Europe. This encouraged more ecological and anthropological interpretations that prepared the ground in Britain for the later reception of processual interpretations.

The debates of these decades may have been forgotten, but they are far from irrelevant today, and similar essential confusions, preconceptions and styles of intellectual negotiation can be glimpsed in current research. The flake-core dichotomy, inspired by Breuil's scheme of the 1930s, continues to muddy the Clactonian debate, where argument has circled around the presence or absence of 'bifaces' (as distinct from hand-axes) that, for Warren, posed no problem. Competing industrial frameworks continue to be created to match current perceptions of industrial patterns, supported by selective use of other Quaternary chronologies, each offering a better fit than the last. Grand schemes are still created on a global scale despite the amount of uncertainty over regional correlations. The socially and historically specific minutiae of academic arguments continue to restrict and direct interpretations of the Palaeolithic sequence.

Archives consulted in the course of research

Ashmolean Museum, Oxford:	John Evans
British Library:	E. Ray Lankester, John Lubbock
British Museum:	F. Haward, Reginald Smith, W. Allen Sturge, Swanscombe Committee, S.H. Warren
British Museum (Natural History):	Lewis Abbott, Martin A.C. Hinton, Kenneth Oakley, S.H. Warren, A. Smith Woodward
Bodleian Library:	Christopher Hawkes, John Linton Myres
Buxton Museum:	W. Boyd Dawkins, J.W. Jackson
Cambridge University Library:	Louis Agassiz, Miles Burkitt, Osmond Fisher
Clare College, Cambridge:	Harry Godwin
Edinburgh University Library:	James Croll, Archibald Geikie, James Geikie, Charles Lyell, A.C. Ramsay
Falconer Museum, Forres:	Hugh Falconer
Geological Society of London Library:	Archibald Geikie, R. Murchison, Joseph Prestwich, Searles V. Wood Jr.
Geological Survey Library, Keyworth:	James Croll, William Boyd Dawkins, Henry Dewey, James Geikie, F. Harmer, A.S. Kennard, Joseph Prestwich, A.C. Ramsay, Clement Reid, William Sollas, H.B. Woodward, F. Zeuner
Leeds University Library:	Percy Fry Kendall
National Library of Wales:	A.C. Ramsay
Oxford University Museum of Natural History:	William Sollas
Pitt-Rivers Museum, Oxford:	S.H. Warren

Sedgwick Museum of Geology,
Cambridge:
University College London,
Department of Manuscripts:

T.G. Bonney, T. McKenny Hughes

T.G. Bonney, A. Smith Woodward, F. Zeuner

Anne O'Connor

Department of Archaeology, University of Durham DH1 3LE

anne.o'connor@durham.ac.uk

God, Empire and Pre-history at Cambridge

“We may look forward to our school and Museum being the real centre of your branch of research in the Empire” Ethnologist A.C.Haddon to Miles Burkitt, 18 December 1920. (Courtesy of the Cambridge University Archives; University Library: Add 7959, letter found in Box III).

The oldest ‘school’ of prehistoric archaeology in Britain is at Cambridge University. During much of the twentieth century, the Cambridge Faculty was the only one producing a flow of graduates. In 1915, at the invitation of the Reader in Ethnology, A.C. Haddon, shy, young Miles Burkitt, “essentially unconventional, he flaunted incongruously an Old Etonian tie”(Eileen Fox, 2000: 44) became the first in Britain to offer lectures on prehistoric archaeology as part of a degree course to undergraduates. During the 1920s and ‘30s, the archaeological side of the Cambridge Tripos attracted increasing numbers of competent students who eventually defined the scope and intent of a new ‘profession’.

Many graduates from these decades successfully pursued full time archaeological careers. These included A.J.H. Goodwin (Professor at the University of Cape Town, first ‘professional’ South African prehistorian, starting in 1923 as Assistant in Ethnology to A.R. Brown), Mary Kitson Clark (member of Dorothy Garrod’s famed 1929 all female team at el Wad, Mt Carmel, Palestine), Jacquetta Hawkes (internationally published author), Glyn Daniel (Cambridge Disney Professor of Archaeology, Editor of *Antiquity*), Thurstan Shaw (‘father of British West African Archaeology’ and Professor of Archaeology at the University of Ibadan, Nigeria), J. Desmond Clark (Professor of Anthropology at Berkeley, USA), Bernard Fagg (Head of the Nigerian Antiquities Service) and Charles McBurney (Cambridge Professor of Quaternary Prehistory). By 1932, Cyril Fox’s work on the Cambridge region, L.S.B. Leakey’s work on the stone age cultures of Kenya, H. O’Neil Hencken’s work on the archaeology of Cornwall and Scilly and Grahame Clark’s work on the Mesolithic had all begun as dissertations of the newly instituted PhD degree in the recently established Board of Archaeological and Anthropological Studies.

By the late 1940s, prehistoric archaeology had become one of the most successful and widely exported subjects produced by Cambridge; the Tripos became the ‘gatekeeper’ for post-graduate research and archaeological careers within Britain and its Empire. “The Cambridge intellectual imperium endures across prehistoric landscapes . . . every continent is liberally sprinkled with the Cambridge mark” wrote John Mulvaney (1990: 115) in his review of Clark’s 1989 *Prehistory at Cambridge and Beyond*. Mulvaney, considered to be the ‘founding father’ of Australian archaeology, graduated in 1953.

Miles Crawford Burkitt, born in 1890, was son of F. C. Burkitt (1864-1935), one of Cambridge’s most distinguished Divinity Professors. Celebrated as the first layman elected to a Cambridge

Theological Chair, F.C. Burkitt was a renowned, vigorous, and prolific scholar, accomplished in the textual criticism of the New, Hebrew and Old Testaments. Archaeology was an equal fascination and as a member of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society, Burkitt published archaeological studies in their journal.

Professor F.C. Burkitt belonged to the London Society for the Study of Religion which had been founded in 1904 by Friedrich von Hugel, Baron of the Holy Roman Empire. Baron von Hugel's young brother, Anatole, had been appointed in 1883 as the first Curator of the Cambridge Museum General and Local Archaeology and of Ethnology. Members of the London Society became ardent supporters of Anatole von Hugel's Colonial collections. The fate of the Museum and the future Faculty was inseparable. Abundant evidence exists of intertwining historical purpose.

Destined to become a powerful marriage of interests, the relationship between Anthropology and the Curator von Hugel began to take more formal shape in the early 1900s. In May 1903, A.C. Haddon, the Disney Professor of Archaeology W. Ridgeway and the Cambridge Antiquarian Committee, which governed the affairs of the Museum, defended von Hugel's desire for adequate facilities and appropriate space. When von Hugel's request was challenged in the Senate, Ridgeway, a powerfully built man and persuasive orator, silenced the opposition with "into our hands [have come] valuable collections which, if lost to the University, would take more than 500 years to replace" (Cambridge University Reporter, June 2, 1903: 893).

The following October, von Hugel and F.C. Burkitt defended and signed the first Memorial on the study of anthropology at Cambridge. "We the undersigned members of the Senate wish respectfully to lay before you . . . The study of all branches of Anthropology — Archaeology, Ethnology, Physical and Mental Anthropology — has within the last decade made extraordinary advances . . . The materials for the teaching of Pre-historic Archaeology and Ethnology have been rapidly accumulating in the Museum . . . We therefore ask you to take steps . . . to establish a Board of Anthropological Studies". During two years previously, A.C.Haddon had delivered several presentations in the Museum's lecture theatre. It had been formally announced that "Explorers" and "Military Officers, Civil Servants, Missionaries and other who may desire to undertake scientific work when stationed abroad" (CUR January 13, 1903: 337) could call on Haddon at the Museum to arrange instruction.

When the Senate approved that a Board of Anthropological Studies be established in May 1904, composed of the Disney Professor of Archaeology Ridgeway, Lecturer in Ethnology Haddon and the revered University Lecturer in Physiological and Experimental Psychology, W.H.R. Rivers, Von Hugel was invited to serve. In letters to von Hugel throughout the 1910s, Ridgeway clearly stated that the fate of the Museum was the fate of Anthropology, which included the study of Pre-historic Archaeology. When the Museum profited in 1910 from benevolent donations from members of the Society for the Study of Religion, he wrote to von Hugel "My heartiest congratulations. Fortune indeed smiles on us . . . we are now beginning to convince the public that Anthropology has great importance . . . for science and for practical life"(letter dated, 7 January 1910, 1910 Box, Cambridge Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology Archives).

In 1913, Haddon introduced Miles Burkitt to the eminent French prehistorian, Monsieur l'Abbe Henri Breuil during lunch following a University of London Conference on prehistoric art. The irrepressible Breuil made an immediate and indelible impression on young Burkitt. Within weeks they were roaming France and Spain together in search of prehistoric

adventures. Burkitt enthusiastically joined Breuil, Pere Teilhard de Chardin and the German priest, Hugo Obermaier, at Obermaier's acclaimed excavation at the Cave of Castillo. Letters home reveal Burkitt's delight and wonder at Spain's Palaeolithic industries and France's Magdalenian art. When war broke out, Burkitt joined Breuil in the French Red Cross; later he helped his father and Haddon set up YMCA 'huts' in Rouen, France. These huts served as clubs where soldiers could rest, play cards and listen to entertaining talks. Haddon spoke on "Strange Subjects of the British Empire" (Cambridge University Archives; Haddon Papers; letter found in envelope II). Miles Burkitt learned to overcome his shyness by lecturing on prehistoric art (in conversation with author, Miles Burkitt Jr, 1999).

Sometime during WWI, Burkitt began to believe that humans "moved Godward in spite of or maybe partly owing to struggles against overwhelming odds" and that, as a result of these struggles, our "soul" developed in our body during the Upper Palaeolithic (quotes from unpublished notes loaned by the Burkitt family). Burkitt clearly articulated these beliefs in later sermons as well as in a published Lenten address at Cambridge's All Saints Church in 1929. "A knowledge of the ancient past and the part played in it by our forerunners . . . becomes important in the great study of Man, next to the study of God, the chief object of all intellectual effort . . . The study of humanity's past is in large part a study of God and His purpose as it is being worked out through each succeeding age" (Burkitt 1930: 265-6). Again, in undated and unpublished notes, he states "the story of early man and his reactions to conflict with the world around him . . . we see as a culmination, the result of struggle and failure, the generation of the soul"(quoted courtesy of the Burkitt family).

This belief seems to be Burkitt's central motivation to teach prehistory to undergraduates and Colonial Probationers at Cambridge. Interrupted by the War, Burkitt returned in 1919 to spread a new philosophy. He argued that through the study of the past, we gain knowledge of ourselves. He hoped that Cambridge men, educated in prehistory, would be public spirited, just, intelligent leaders and fair peaceful colonial administrators. The study of the past might make us wiser. Armed with a prehistoric perspective on the struggles of humanity, gentler undergraduates might avoid another war and might administer justice with understanding and humility (summarised from unpublished notes courtesy of the family).

Burkitt is criticised by some (Daniel 1986) for his apparent lack of professional ambition and for his rumoured refusal to accept the new Abercromby Professorship of Prehistoric Archaeology at Edinburgh before V.G. Childe. Yet, he is remembered with great affection by former students from the 1920s, '30s and early '40s. In interviews, Thurstan Shaw clearly describes a "generous man of good will"; the late Desmond Clark stated that Burkitt was "an inspiring teacher", a dedicated and gifted lecturer obviously happiest while teaching Cambridge introductory courses on the Palaeolithic.

'God, Empire and Pre-history' proved a powerfully effective trinity. Cambridge indeed became a real centre of prehistoric research. However, Burkitt's hope for the resulting Peace still eludes us.

Bibliography

- Burkitt, Miles 1930 Christ and Pre-history. *The Modern Churchman* 19: 265-72.
Cambridge University Reporter, 1903. Cambridge: CUP.
Daniel, Glyn 1986 *Some Small Harvest: the Memoirs of Glyn Daniel*. London: Thames and Hudson.
Fox, Aileen 2000 *Aileen - A Pioneering Archaeologist*. Herefordshire: Gracewing.
Mulvaney, John 1990 Review: Prehistory at Cambridge and Beyond by Grahame Clark. *Thinking European: a Journal of University Life and Thought* 3 (no.2310): 115-9.

I thank the Burkitt family, the late Desmond Clark, Thurstan Shaw, the University of Cambridge University Library Archives and the Cambridge University Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology Archives.

Pamela Jane Smith
Cambridge University
Cambridge, UK, CB3 0BU
pjs1011@cam.ac.uk