
Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society

(incorporating the Cambs and Hunts Archaeological Society)

Volume XCIX
for 2010

1996
-2010



Recent Publications of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society

Proceedings XCVI, 2007: Price £12.50 for members, £14.50 for non-members

- Phil Weston, Andrew A.S. Newton and Kate Nicholson: *A Late Bronze Age enclosure at Lynton Way, Sawston, Cambridgeshire*
Christopher Taylor and Ashley Arbon: *The Chronicle Hills, Whittlesford, Cambridgeshire*
Christopher Evans, Mark Knight and Leo Webley: *Iron Age settlement and Romanisation on the Isle of Ely: the Hurst Lane Reservoir site*
Leo Webley: *Prehistoric, Roman and Saxon activity on the Fen hinterland at Parnwell, Peterborough*
Thomas Woolhouse: *Anglo-Saxon and medieval boundaries and burials at the former Oblic Engineering site, Church Street, Litlington*
Andrew A. S. Newton: *Mid-Saxon burials at Barnwell Road, Cambridge*
Paul Spoerry and Mark Hinman: *Early Saxon and medieval remains adjacent to the round moat, Fowlmere*
Mary Hesse: *The East Fields of Cambridge*
Craig Cessford with Alison Dickens: *Ely Cathedral and environs: recent investigations*
Michael Chisholm: *Re-assessing the navigation impact of draining the Fens in the seventeenth century*
Philomena Guillebaud: *West Cambridge 1870–1914: building the bicycle suburb*
Elizabeth Shepherd Popescu and Sarah Poppy: *Fieldwork in Cambridgeshire 2006*
Obituary: *David Wilson*; Malcolm Underwood, Paul Spoerry, Debby Banham: *Reviews*
Chris Jakes: *Recent Accessions to the Cambridgeshire Collection*

Proceedings XCVII, 2008: Price £12.50 for members, £14.50 for non-members

- Christopher Evans and Mark Knight: *Further Investigations at Arbury Camp, Cambridge: The Eastern Entrance—A Monumental Architecture*
David Ingham: *Iron Age settlement by the Dam Brook at Scotland Farm, Dry Drayton*
Daniel Stansbie: *Excavation of a Middle Iron Age enclosure at Bushmead Road, Eaton Socon, Cambridgeshire*
Steven Willis, Alice Lyons, Elizabeth Shepherd Popescu and Judith Roberts: *Late Iron Age/Early Roman Pottery Kilns at Blackhorse Lane, Swavesey, 1998–99*
Tom Phillips: *Iron Age Ditches and an Anglo-Saxon Building near the Mile Ditches, Bassingbourn, TL 3294 4335*
Nina Crummy and Tom Phillips: *A Zoomorphic Roman Handle from New Street, Godmanchester, TL 5246 2704*
Tom Lane, Elaine L Morris and Mark Peachey: *Excavations on a Roman Saltmaking Site at Cedar Close, March, Cambridgeshire*
Aileen Connor: *A Romano-Saxon Farmstead and possible 12th-century Dovecote or Windmill: Community excavations at Spring Close, Boxworth, TL 350 645*
Christopher Taylor: *New work on old sites: Somersham and Pampisford revisited*
Craig Cessford: *Excavation of the Civil War bastion ditch of Cambridge Castle*
Michael Chisholm: *The Old Plough: a neglected property of Ely Porta Manor*
Robert Liddiard: *Living on the Edge: Commons, Castles and Regional Settlement Patterns in Medieval East Anglia*
Philomena Guillebaud: *West Cambridge: the two World Wars and the inter-war lull*
Elizabeth Shepherd Popescu and Sarah Poppy: *Fieldwork in Cambridgeshire 2007*
Tim Malim and Sue Oosthuizen: *Reviews*
Chris Jakes: *Recent Accessions to the Cambridgeshire Collection*

Proceedings XCVIII, 2009: Price £12.50 for members, £14.50 for non-members

- John Pickles, Peter Gathercole, and Alison Taylor: *Mary Desborough Cra'ster, 1928–2008*
Leo Webley and Jonathan Hiller: *A fen island in the Neolithic and Bronze Age: excavations at North Fen, Sutton, Cambridgeshire*
Aileen Connor: *A fen island burial: excavation of an Early Bronze Age round barrow at North Fen, Sutton*
Hella Eckardt with Amanda Clarke, Sophie Hay, Stephen Macaulay, Pat Ryan, David Thornley and Jane Timby: *The Bartlow Hills in context*
Stephen Yeates: *Senuna, goddess of the river Rhee or Henney*
Scott Kenney: *A reappraisal of the evidence for the 'northern arm' of the Fleam Dyke at Fen Ditton*
Laura Piper and Andrew Norton: *An excavation at Station Quarry, Steeple Morden, Cambridgeshire*
Duncan Mackay: *Excavations at Scotland Road/Union Lane, Chesterton*
Aileen Connor: *A curious object from Firs Farm, Caxton*
Christopher Taylor: *A morphological analysis of Ickleton, Cambridgeshire: an admission of defeat*
Ken Sneath: *Funerals, the final consumer choice?*
N James: *The 'Age of the Windmill' in the Haddenham Level*
K S G Hinde: *Upware and Bottisham sluices*
Philomena Guillebaud: *Changes in the landscape of west Cambridge, Part V: 1945 to 2000*
John Pickles: *The CAS Collection of Cambridgeshire 'Sketches'*
Tom Lyons, Elizabeth Shepherd Popescu and Sarah Poppy: *Fieldwork in Cambridgeshire 2008*
Christopher Taylor, Christopher Brookes, Evelyn Lord and Sam Lucy: *Reviews*
Chris Jakes: *Recent Accessions to the Cambridgeshire Collection*

**Proceedings of the
Cambridge Antiquarian Society**

(incorporating the Cambs and Hunts Archaeological Society)

**Volume XCIX
for 2010**

Editors

David A Barrowclough
Mary Chester-Kadwell

Assistant Editor
Richard Halliday

Associate Editor (Archaeology) Professor Stephen Upex

Published by the Cambridge Antiquarian Society 2010

ISSN 0309-3606

Officers & Council, 2009–2010

President

Carenza Lewis MA, ScD, FSA

Vice-Presidents

Susan Oosthuizen MA, PhD, PGCE

Alison Taylor BA, MIFA, FSA

Professor A J Legge, MA

Disney Professor of Archaeology

Professor Graeme Barker MA, PhD, FBA, FSA, MIFA

Curator of the University Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology

Professor Nicholas Thomas BA, PhD, FAHA, FBA

Senior County Archaeological Officer

Quinton Carroll MA MIFA

Ordinary Members of Council

Alan Akeroyd BA, MAAd

(Hunts Loc Hist Soc)

Sarah Bendall MA, PhD, FSA, MCLIP

Derek Booth BSc, PhD, CBiol, MSB

Michelle Bullivant, Dip Archae, PIFA

Alison Dickens BA, MIFA

Christopher Jakes, MCLIP

Stephen Macaulay, BA, MPhil, MIFA

Janet Morris BA

Shirley Wittering, M St

Secretary

Chris Michaelides BA, PGCE, MCLIP

86 Harvey Goodwin Court,

French's Road, Cambridge CB4 3JR

Tel: 07884 431012

email: secretary@camantsoc.org

Treasurer

Cyril Pritchett MA

66 Gough Way

Cambridge CB3 9LN

Registrar

Valory Hurst

43 South End, Bassingbourn

Royston, Hertfordshire SG8 5NL

email: registrar@camantsoc.org

Co-Editors

David Barrowclough MA PhD

Mary Chester-Kadwell MA PhD

Email: editor@camantsoc.org

Hon. Librarian

John Pickles MA, PhD, FSA

c/o Haddon Library

Faculty of Archaeology and Anthropology

Downing Street, Cambridge CB2 3DZ

Conference Secretary

Mark Hinman BA, MIFA

26 Newton Road, Whittlesford

Cambridgeshire CB2 4PF

email: conferences@camantsoc.org

Representative of the Cambridgeshire Association for Local History

Tom Doig PGCE

Hon. Auditor

R E Seaton CIPFA, IIA

Cambridge Antiquarian Society

Report for the Year 2009

Membership: there are now 382 members, 49 Affiliated Societies and 67 subscribing institutions.

Meetings: There were 4 Council meetings and 9 Ordinary meetings, at which the following lectures were given:

Gabriel Moshenska	<i>The School Air Raid Shelter: History, Archaeology and Memory</i>
Prof. Stephen Oakley	<i>How Latin Texts Survived from Antiquity to the Age of Printing</i> (In association with the Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies)
Richard Buckley	<i>A Tale of Two Towns: recent discoveries from Roman and Medieval Leicester</i>
Prof. Ronald Hutton	<i>The History of Prehistory: Megaliths and the Modern Imagination</i>
Dr Catherine Hills	<i>Skeletons in the Garden – Romans and Anglo Saxons at Newnham College</i>
Ben Robinson	<i>Revealing Peterborough – New Explorations in an Ancient Cathedral City</i>
Dr Stephen Alford	<i>Finding Nicholas Berden: the career of an Elizabethan spy</i>
Prof. Simon Keynes	<i>John Mitchell Kemble (1807–57): Apostle, Revolutionary, and Anglo-Saxonist</i>
Richard Mortimer & Alex Pickstone	<i>Further Excavations at the War Ditches, Cherry Hinton, Cambridge</i> (In association with the Prehistoric Society)

In addition the following two conferences were held:

21st November 2009 *Recent archaeological work in Cambridgeshire*

17th April 2010 *Past Relations: different approaches to the dead over time*

Excursions: The Programme for 2010 consisted of the following visits:

Chatham Historic Dockyard, Saturday 15 May:

One of the country's foremost naval dockyards for 300 years, Chatham has been in the care of the Historic Dockyard Trust since 1985. As well as three historic vessels – HMS Gannet (1878), HMS Cavalier (1944) and HM Submarine Ocelot (1962) – it has a spectacular Victorian Ropery and a galaxy of other permanent and temporary exhibitions and displays, including 'The Wooden Walls' (a recreation of the dockyard in 1758) and the RNLI Lifeboat Collection. It also has the largest single concentration of listed buildings (military, civil and religious) in the UK.

Cherry Hinton, Saturday 26 June.

A morning was spent exploring the historical and archaeological landscape of Cherry Hinton Hall and its surroundings, under the guidance of Ms Michelle Bullivant. Outwardly Victorian, the park nonetheless has many features that bear witness to former land uses and industrial activity. Also investigated was the Lime Kiln Hill area and the newly-open to the public East Pit.

Spalding, Lincolnshire, Wednesday 14 July.

The highlight of this excursion was a visit to the Spalding Gentlemen's Society, founded in 1710 and one of the oldest learned societies in the country. The Society has the UK's second oldest museum collection, containing many rare items of both local and national interest, and a fine library.

The medieval riverside at Ely, Wednesday 15 September.

The riverside was a centre of activity in the Middle Ages attracting trades dependent on the river, and those requiring water such as brewing. The area was developed after the diversion of the river to its present course, probably in the twelfth century, thereby incorporating Ely into the fenland river network.

This walk, led by Mrs Anne Holton-Krayenbuhl, explored the area between the river and Broad Street, bounded by Waterside to the north, looking at sites of former watercourses, hithes, and buildings. The tour also included two medieval houses in Broad Street.

Moggerhanger Park, Bedfordshire, Wednesday 6 October.

Relatively little-known, perhaps due to its long period of use as a local authority TB sanatorium and then orthopaedic hospital (from 1919 to 1987), Moggerhanger was designed by Sir John Soane for Sir Godfrey Thornton, a director of the Bank of England, and built between 1790 and 1816. Listed Grade 1, it is regarded as perhaps the best complete surviving example of Soane's work, and epitomises many of his architectural ideas. The grounds were laid out by Humphry Repton. Now in the care of a Trust, which stepped in to avert the threatened demolition of the house and construction of a housing estate on the site, this excursion enabled members to see the current state of an ongoing and ambitious programme of restoration.

Cambridge Antiquarian Society Accounts for the Year Ended 31/12/2009

Registered Charity 299211 • Founded 1840

PAYMENTS		2008	2009
	Lectures: Publishing Programme	332.53	310.00
	Expenses	255.44	401.07
	Vol XCVI Delivery	1418.33	
	Proceedings Vol XCVII Publication	6399.28	
	Proceedings Vol XCVII Delivery	911.14	(b)
	Proceedings Vol XCVIII Publication		7692.41
	Proceedings Vol XCVIII Delivery		1083.29
	Conduit	1050.36 (a)	1005.00 (a)
	Conference: March	944.69 (a)	898.35 (b, c)
	: November	437.67 (a)	300.00
	Excursions	2147.09 (a)	285.03 (b)
	Mailings: Delivery Charges	504.65	156.56 (b, c)
	Subscriptions (CBA, Rescue, CRSoc)	102.00	104.00
	Haddon Library: Conservation	100.00	100.00
	Office Expenses, Web Site, Misc	376.17	347.75
	Emolument: Registrar	250.00	250.00
	Publicity		532.65
	Insurance	221.60	241.05
	From capital: new web site	894.83 (b)	1121.25 (h)
	Small Grants Scheme	<u>500.00</u>	<u>100.00</u>
	Sub-Total	16895.78	14928.41
	Purchase of Investments	6000.00	
	Total Payments	<u>22895.78</u>	<u>14928.41</u>
RECEIPTS		2008	2009
	Subscriptions: Members & Societies	7110.00	6908.50
	Tax Reclaimed	720.71	779.65
	C.U. Archaeology Dept.	800.00	800.00
	Proceedings Vol XCVI: Grants	2369.00	
	VolXCVII: Grants	3370.00	
	VolXCVIII: Grants		2090.00
	Conduit	486.96	162.60
	Conference: March	1197.10	1813.00
	: November	386.00	505.00
	Excursions	1924.25	312.00
	Sales of Publications	173.48	135.90
	Royalties, Misc	416.00	208.05
	Investment Income (gross)	997.59	1174.05
	Interest: NSB (gross)	<u>812.02</u>	<u>67.41</u>
	Total Receipts	<u>20763.11</u>	<u>14956.16</u>
	less Payments (excluding Investment of capital adjusted below)	<u>22895.78</u>	<u>14928.41</u>
	Cash Surplus/Deficit (-)	-2132.67	27.75 (d)
	Fixed Interest Treasury Stock:		
	Capital investment	6000.00	
	less excess cost on purchase/re-investment over maturity values	-997.06	-571.32
	Surplus/Deficit (-) Income over Expenditure	<u>2870.27</u>	<u>-543.57</u>
STATEMENT OF ASSETS			
	Cash Funds: Current A/C	2611.26	2571.60
	: Deposit A/C	23265.03	23332.44 (e)
	Treasury Stock at maturity values	<u>18363.84</u>	<u>17792.52</u>
		<u>44240.13</u>	<u>43696.56 (g)</u>
	Accumulated Fund		
	At beginning of year	41369.86	44240.13
	Surplus/Deficit (-) Income over Expenditure for the Year	<u>2870.27</u>	<u>-543.57</u>
	At end of year	<u>44240.13</u>	<u>43696.56</u>
	Planned Future Expenditure		9840.00 (f)

Notes

The presentation of the accounts conforms to guidance provided by the Charity Commission. Comment on some of the entries is given in the following notes:

- a. The cost of mailing details to members has been attributed to the event.
- b. A credit of £894.83 with Mailing Distributor arose in 2008 and was used in 2009.
- c. Adding the attributable postage credit makes the 2009 figures comparable to earlier years.
- d. This figure is influenced by a credit with the mailing distributor (b) and the exceptional expenditure on redesigning the Web site (h); excluding these amounts the surplus from the normal activities of the Society in the year 2009 is £254.17.
- e. In 2005 the Council reviewed the policy for the reserves held by the Society and concluded that the cash funds less liabilities (f) should be maintained in the range £10,000 to £20,000; on 31 December 2009 the reserves were £16,064
- f. Planned expenditure; PCAS Vol XCIX £8000, Ladd's Bequest (g) £840, Small Grants £500 and a grant of £500 to Cambridgeshire Archives towards the cost of purchasing the Fen Drainage Papers; total £9,840.
- g. Includes Ladd's bequest earmarked for events associated with Huntingdon; with interest the sum is now £840.
- h. Exceptional expenditure on the design of a new Web site.

Contents

Note on 'Mary Desborough Cra'ster, 1928–2008' published in <i>PCAS</i> XCVIII (2009), pp. 7-10	6
A Middle Bronze Age Cremation Cemetery on the Western Claylands at Papworth Everard Nicholas Gilmour, Natasha Dodwell and Elizabeth Popescu	7
Further excavation of a late Iron Age settlement at Scotland Farm, Dry Drayton David Ingham	25
Excavations at Castle Street Christopher Evans and Letty Ten Harkel	35
Early Bronze Age, Iron Age and Roman pit deposits at Bluntisham, Cambridgeshire Adrian Burrow and Andrew Mudd	61
Roman, Anglo-Saxon and medieval settlement at Stow Longa and Tilbrook (Huntingdonshire) Rob Atkins	75
Earthwork Survey at Huntingdon Mill Common Michael Fradley	89
Saxon and Medieval activity at Scotts Close, Hilton Thomas Woolhouse	97
A medieval clunch-working site at Fordham Road, Isleham, Cambridgeshire Andrew A. S. Newton	103
Small sites in Cambridgeshire Pip Stone for Archaeological Solutions	113
Medieval enclosures and trackways at Coles Lane, Oakington, Cambridgeshire Andrew B. Powell	121
The medieval network of navigable Fenland waterways I: Crowland Michael Chisholm	125
The Old Rectory Kingston: A Short Note on its Origins Susan Oosthuizen	139
Tea and Delicious Cakes: in conversation with Dr Pamela Jane Smith author of <i>A 'Splendid Idiosyncrasy': Prehistory at Cambridge 1915–50</i> David A. Barrowclough	145
The CAS Collection of Cambridgeshire 'Sketches': Part 2 John Pickles	155
Fieldwork in Cambridgeshire 2009 Sally Thompson, Hazel White, and Elizabeth Shepherd Popescu	161
<i>Index</i>	173
<i>Abbreviations</i>	180
Recent Accessions to the Cambridgeshire Collection Chris Jakes	181

**Tea and Delicious Cakes:
in conversation with Pamela Jane Smith author of
A 'Splendid Idiosyncrasy': Prehistory at Cambridge 1915–50**

David A. Barrowclough

In A *'Splendid Idiosyncrasy': Prehistory at Cambridge 1915-50* Pamela Jane Smith charts the development of prehistoric archaeology from an amateur 'haphazard' pastime (Smith 2009, 108) to a fully fledged academic discipline. Smith argues persuasively that the formalization of prehistory as a university subject emerged out of the daily round of informal exchanges centred around the tearoom of the Cambridge University Museum of Archaeology & Anthropology. The convivial atmosphere engendered by the exchange of tea and cakes established a close relationship of trust amongst the participants which necessarily prepared the way for academic exchanges.

Reflecting the centrality of food and drink in Smith's analysis of the birth of prehistory, the Editors broke with the recent tradition of book reviews in these *Proceedings* to talk to Pamela Jane Smith over a convivial lunch at Wolfson College. What follows is an annotated transcript of our conversation.



Pamela Jane Smith with Thurstan Shaw.

[DAB] It seemed fitting to conduct this interview over, if not tea, then a long lunch in College. You identify the sharing of food and drink as a key mechanism by which ideas were shared. When did you first recognise this? Was it something that emerged from the conversations you had, or had you already identified this as a central theme before the interviews?

[PJS] It emerged. The interviews revealed how deeply ingrained tea was in the culture of the Museum. It was taken for granted, everyone was aware that people met over tea, but no one had considered how this helped to define and construct identities. All ages and classes can partake in the drinking of tea; it is a great leveller. During the 1930s, there was a tea boy – Bernard Denston – who later became well known for his academic work.

In the beginning, there was no separate tea room. Later after the war there was a specific location away from the public but that tea room was rather Spartan. In the beginning, everyone would bring their own homemade cake, sometimes sandwiches. Tea would be taken from china cups and saucers.

Everyone would sit in the museum galleries in the afternoon and chat. Members of the public might wander in and they would be invited to join in.

What you might remember was that at this time the people were enmeshed in a web of relationships – people would at once be members of the Museum, Department and Cambridge Antiquarian Society, and it was through the daily round of tea drinking that these relationships were 'constructed'. ... Upon reflection, perhaps a better verb would be 'supported'. Constructed is a bit too active, but it is true that friendships were forged and arrangements cemented over tea So perhaps constructed works .

Life was much more informal in the 1920s. Even later in the 1960s, Mary Cra'ster would be there with her dogs. In the 1930s, Louis Clarke was both personally wealthy and flamboyant, and had a reputation for handing out money to vagrants who would come to the door to find him.

[DAB] When I first got hold of a copy of your book I quickly flicked through the pages, as one does, and I was struck by the photographic images. They seemed to represent a long-lost world and did not reflect my own experiences of Cambridge in the 21st century. The world of which you write was very much that of the English Upper Middle Classes, often caricatured as a world of 'mad dogs and Englishmen' reflected in the notion that 'everything stops for tea'. I wonder how you would interpret the role of the English class system in the development of archaeology at this time? It does not seem to figure overtly in your text, and yet lies beneath. Was it a deliberate decision to down play this aspect?

[PJS] Hmm, that is a good question. No, I did not approach the study from the perspective of class. Of course one could do; yes, I could have done. But that would be a quite different study. To do that properly one would have to immerse oneself in the literature of social changes that took place during the period, and to do so would have moved the focus of my study. As I engaged with the interviews and documentary material the centrality of the tea room took over, and I found that this was an intellectually novel and stimulating avenue to follow.

So no, I didn't look at class as a primary concern. But as you ask me I can see that it would be an interesting question. My feeling is that tea was in fact a great leveller; it brought together the staff who were from a range of backgrounds. There was Louis Clarke at one end of the spectrum, an extremely wealthy man, and at the other there was Bernard Denston the tea boy. Bernard told me that he did not sit with the others at teatime, but that he took his tea back to his area to drink because he felt 'shy around the toffs'. At first there had been no tea boy and they had all made their own tea.

[DAB] There was a class distinction then, in the mind of Bernard Denston?

[PJS] But Bernard Denston was eventually awarded an MA and Louis Clarke championed Maureen O'Reilly. It was therefore possible to move through the system.

[DAB] But this was a system of patronage? There was a clear class based hierarchy?

[PJS] There were avenues to mobility, cracks in the system.

But I think that to study class would have been a red herring, without going into great detail. I would have had to look at the role of the grammar schools; my feeling is that a lot of grammar school girls came in.

Haddon was not rich but Middle Class, and a radical a great champion of women's rights. He was a champion of outsiders – but in Cambridge outsiders had a habit of becoming insiders. And the reverse could happen, Louis Clarke became an outsider, because he was too rich, he didn't fit with the changing political climate.

[DAB] Talking of class, and the exclusion from the professionalization of archaeology, of all but the most privileged, brings me to the exclusion of another group – women. No discussion of archaeology at Cambridge would be complete without a discussion of Dorothy Garrod. What is your impression of her as an archaeologist, academic and woman? Although we are rightly proud of her role as a pioneer, I wonder if her success masks a more general exclusion of women at Cambridge – what did male colleagues feel about her? Did they encourage other women, or were they opposed to women students and lecturers generally?

[PJS] Women, women are the tea room, they are the museum.

Garrod as a woman, she was shy and elegant. Most of all she was very hurt by her brothers.

[DAB] You are referring to their deaths in World War I?

[PJS] Yes. She lost most of her family in the war and I believe she was grieving all of her life.

[DAB] And she lost her fiancé too?

[PJS] Yes. I believe that is so. Jane Callander spoke to Loveley-Smith and she confirmed that Garrod had been engaged.

[DAB] What about Garrod as a field archaeologist?

[PJS] Gender was not important in the field. She worked overseas and as far as locals were concerned she was 'British'. It was her Britishness that defined her in their eyes not her gender. They made no distinction between her and a man. You have to remember that she was working when half the world was painted pink on the map; the Empire was at its geographic height. As a British person she had the power wherever she travelled in the Empire. This gave her a great deal of flexibility, autonomy, to act.

[DAB] How did she treat the local populations where she worked?

[PJS] She had excellent relations with both the Kurds and the Palestinians. She was enthralled by them, and they respected her. There was even love for her I would say, especially in Palestine. They would tell her their oral histories and she would write it all down in her diaries. She always referred to it as Palestine, never Israel. When the Palestinian villages were destroyed, and the villagers were moved, she felt the loss personally, she was concerned. Garrod was not openly emotional, and so she may not have wished that people knew her feelings, but my impression was that she was harmed by the Palestinian Diaspora which she witnessed. Many of the people that she knew and had worked with lost their homes, they were moved into camps and Garrod lost touch with them. Now I have put some of the photographs on the web, and been contacted by relatives of those people, I know they lost all their personal photographs and all that survives of their villages are Dorothy's photographs. It is very moving.



Dorothy Garrod with Yusra, who found *Tabun 1*, an adult Neanderthal skeleton.

[DAB] And how about life in Cambridge?

[PJS] Back in Cambridge Garrod found it much tougher. She was unable to come to terms with what was needed to function successfully within the University. The University was not accustomed to women, for the purposes of the bureaucracy she was a man, an honorary man. In order to deal with her the University had to treat her as if she were a man. For her it was very difficult. After the freedom she had enjoyed working overseas to return to Cambridge was stifling. She was used to working in the field and was not prepared for the politicking of Cambridge. She couldn't play the game. Remember that she had never been to school; she had been educated at home, and she was completely unprepared for the male-dominated public school educated men that she encountered in the administration. The faculty men were accepting and supportive! It was still a chilly climate within the university.

Garrod didn't frequent the tearoom in the 1940s perhaps because there was too much 'shop talk'. She would have been more at home there earlier in the 1930s when the talk was less structured.

[DAB] Can you explain what you mean by 'shop talk'?

[PJS] 'shop talk' ... When someone discusses the nuance of isotope analyses with colleagues, that would be 'shop talk'. When someone arranges the dull details of an academic committee agreement, that would be shop talk. It is business as usual. Practical language; deal making language; committee language.

But then Mary Cras'ter still described witnessing gentlemanly discussions over tea when she arrived later. So I could be wrong about the shop talk analysis; that was my sense however. People describe tea time as, whatever generation, as lively with loads of ideas kicking about. .. What historians describe as a 'knowledge making space'. There is this quote from my book:

The straight academic road into science is clearly more likely travelled by men. This statement is also true of Garrod's entrance into the academic world, which differed greatly from Clark's, who advanced from undergraduate to Bye-Fellow, Faculty Assistant Lecturer, University Lecturer and finally to Professor, all within the same university system. Women post-graduates in Sonnert and Holton's study had more difficulty establishing collegiate networks of important contacts once within the university; earlier lack of appropriate institutional education could have adversely affected them. Most women interviewed found that the university environment was not supportive and was sometimes frightening. They tended to feel excluded from informal social events such as going for drinks and feel out-of-place in predominantly male groups.

These findings may suggest the reason why Garrod never participated in Faculty gatherings. According to Bruce Howe, she did not frequent the tea-room. 'The Museum coffee and teas were very stimulating shop-talk occasions. Daniel, Bushnell, Phillips, Lethbridge, Clark were the regulars; Garrod not at all ... O'Reilly saw the pot was brewing, contributed cakes, cookies without fail.' Garrod might have felt reluctant as a professor to behave as a woman must, contributing tea and cake; there may have been a sense of informal exclusion. In addition, since so many Faculty and research plans were informally concocted over tea, Garrod might have had difficulty remaining up-to-date on the definition of Faculty issues and the formulation of subsequent decisions.

[DAB] So she was most at home when digging?

[PJS] Yes, digging was where she was at ease. But having said that, when she became Disney Professor she ate separately from the others in the field. Becoming Disney professor changed her – I think she felt she had to engender 'respect'.

[DAB] Do you think that things have changed?

[PJS] The next Disney Professor will be a woman!

[DAB] You seem very sure?

[PJS] 80% of the archaeology students are women, women are in the majority. After all these years it is time we had a woman.

[DAB] I can see your point, but when I look at the people in archaeology who hold professorships I still see relatively few women.

[PJS] Yes, 'where are the women'? When I organised the first personal history lectures one of the comments I got afterwards was, 'where are the women?'. It still seems difficult; it's as if women haven't yet realised they are in the majority.

[DAB] In a sense your book is a three act play: Burkitt, Clark and Garrod. What were the similarities between the three and what the biggest differences? How did these shape the development of archaeology?

[PJS] *Laughs* Well it didn't start out that way. I knew Bruce Trigger in Canada (he was in McGill and I was in Victoria) and it was he who suggested I study Clark. No one had studied Clark yet at then in the early 1990s and the time was ripe. Bruce found himself sitting next to Paul Mellars at dinner and he mentioned me. Paul subsequently introduced himself to me and asked if I were serious about studying Clark, which I was as I had already written an MA about him. So I arrived in Cambridge ready to study Clark, and in the process I came across Garrod. Then I thought that I really couldn't leave out Burkitt. So that's how I got my three main protagonists. At that point Paul Mellars jumped in and told me to stop and cement what I had.

[DAB] What was Burkitt's primary success/contribution? What was his weakness?

[PJS] *refers to her book* Surviving students from the 1920s and 1930s recalled how much they appreciated Burkitt's personal approach to prehistory in the 'small and intimate' Archaeology and Anthropology Faculty. 'Miles' great ability was to make prehistory exciting with his memories of sites and prehistorians' his lectures were 'enlivened and enriched by his great store of amusing anecdotes . . . I was much attached to Miles,' said Desmond Clark, who was perhaps one of Burkitt's most famous students.

Burkitt was proud to communicate the knowledge he had learned as the sole young pupil of the Abbé Breuil. He prepared to teach prehistory while lying in the mud at Gargas and digging by the light of an acetylene lamp with honoured intellectual guardians. His mentors were gentlemen. Cartailhac was consistently charming and cultured, and according to Burkitt, Teilhard de Chardin was courteous and 'well-bred . . . a Christian mystic and gentleman combined' (Burkitt as quoted by Cuénot 1965: 20). 'One's first emotion was affection' (Burkitt 1922a: 43) for the prehistorians he met in Spain and France. In an uncritical way, when Burkitt began to teach, one of his firm desires was to communicate his feeling of excitement and to demonstrate his devotion to Obermaier and Breuil's ideas. He never aspired to be the charismatic researcher described by Morrell and Geison. Before formalised controls over recruitment, institutionalised avenues of entry and established qualifying standards, 'spirit' was made 'flesh' through personal attachment and companionship. Knowledge was gained over the nightly camp fires, at which Burkitt 'had much conversation' or on the back of a horse while travelling through acres of waterlily lagoons in Spain. Archaeological knowledge was packaged within an individual, trade-like apprenticeship based on loyalty.

If Burkitt were applying for his post today, with

the current stress on original research, he would likely not be short-listed. He may not have even qualified for Cambridge if the Previous were mandatory before coming up from Eton. In an era before a standardised qualifying entry examination, before self-conscious attempts at 'meritocracy' and before paid positions, Burkitt's comparative wealth and place as a male child of the University allowed him to contribute freely on his own terms. As recorded in the Faculty Minutes, the Board felt fortunate to have him. He was precisely the right man, a fine historical fit. Without Burkitt, prehistoric archaeology may never have been taught to undergraduates. The subject may not have been introduced in Cambridge. 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 in the late 1920s. Yet he is remembered with great affection. Thurstan Shaw clearly described a 'generous man of good will' and Desmond Clark stated that Burkitt was 'a dedicated lecturer' obviously happiest while teaching Cambridge introductory courses on the Palaeolithic. Burkitt remained as a non-professional lecturer in the Faculty until 1958 when he retired in order to commit himself more fully to local government. Over the years, he was particularly well thought of as the Chairman of the Education Committee of the County Council for Cambridgeshire where he fought for the inclusion of archaeology in secondary school curricula. However, his dream of a united world run by judicious, historically-informed men, resulting in peace among nations, has eluded us.

[DAB] What was Clark's primary success/contribution? What his weakness?

[PJS] *referring to her book again* In order to understand Clark we need to begin with Miles Burkitt, an independently wealthy man who shared his private library, lithics collections and wide knowledge with students in an atmosphere of generosity and good will. He was motivated by the belief that archaeology, as part of a liberal education, would produce Godly men of value and sound judgement who would justly administer an Empire. Archaeology was not to be seen as a career. It was a humane study to better mankind not individual desires. Men of 'ambition' were suspect; they could easily be corrupted by the seduction of power, money and fame. Those who put their own academic ambitions before the common good were 'rude'. Research was not the prime goal of Burkitt's academic life; the Ph.D was still, in the 1920s, a questionable, even at times disreputable, degree. Such a degree was too narrow and could be viewed as self-serving. 'No one took a Ph.D because that was considered vulgar,' observed Mary Cra'ster. Research for its own sake was still an 'ungentlemanly, boorish, and even foolish German idea' (Morrell 1993: 122).

In contrast, Burkitt's most famous Ph.D student, Grahame Clark, was a self-proclaimed man of Science. Matriculating in 1926, he achieved First Class Honours in the Archaeology and Anthropology Tripos, concen-

trating on north-western European prehistory, a specialisation specifically set up at his request.

Motivated by his love of science, Clark became one of the first research students in archaeology in the new Faculty of Archaeology and Anthropology. Upon hearing of his decision to pursue a Ph.D in prehistoric archaeology, Clark's guardian approached his supervisor, Miles Burkitt, and Disney Professor Ellis Minns to enquire about employment possibilities. He was promptly told that Clark had no employment future. Although Clark came from a very respectable middle class background, he did not have a private income. He was, nevertheless, very determined to become a 'professional archaeologist'.

Clark's wish to be a 'professional' would have been an impossible dream when Burkitt dug with Obermaier in 1913. However, during Clark's undergraduate years, Cyril Fox had already become a successful professional role model. With Louis Clarke's support, Fox had secured the post of Keeper of Archaeology at the National Museum of Wales in 1924. On completion of his Ph.D, Clark began to achieve his dream of being a professional archaeologist, beginning his long and distinguished career with the tenure of a Bye-Fellowship at Peterhouse. Following this, he was successively: Faculty Assistant Lecturer (1935–46), University Lecturer (1946–52), Disney Professor of Archaeology (1952–74), Head of the Department of Archaeology and Anthropology (1956–61 and 1968–71), and Master of Peterhouse (1973–80).

As for his primary contribution Trigger (1989: 269) states that, by the 1940s and 1950s, Clark had begun to pioneer an ecologically oriented, functionalist approach to prehistory, the first scholar to apply A.G. Tansley's (1935) concept of an ecosystem to archaeological evidence. Willey (1990: 371) agrees that Clark developed the ecosystem concept, introducing to English archaeology a view of culture which attempted 'to say something about the interrelationship of environment, technology, social forms, and idea systems'. It is generally thought that Clark's stress upon an interdisciplinary approach led to the development in England of the subdisciplines of bio- and zooarchaeology as well as palaeoeconomy and palaeoethnobotany.

Looking at his contribution critically I think we can say that during the 1930s, Clark was a successful intellectual entrepreneur who, more than any other individual in Cambridge archaeology, personified the new generation of prehistorians who believed that archaeology was a profession. Whereas Burkitt felt that archaeology was an amateur avocation which must serve the Empire and promote world peace, Clark felt that archaeology was a professional endeavour which must become academically institutionalised. Without doubt, he was responsible for gaining increased status for prehistory as a specialisation at Cambridge.

Thinking now about his 'weaknesses'. According to many I interviewed, Clark was the embodiment of the 'Young Man in a Hurry' from F.M. Cornford's well-known 1908 satire of Cambridge University politics, *Microcosmographia Academica: Being a Guide for the*

Young Academic Politician.

Clark also appears to have been one of Cornford's *Adullamites* who inhabited 'a series of caves near Downing Street'. *Adullamites* were dangerous because they knew what they wanted; 'and that is, [where] all the money is going'.

By 1914, Downing Street had become the building site for the new science Tripos courses, laboratories and museums. Among these were the famous Cavendish Laboratory as well as Chemistry, Engineering, Zoology, Mineralogy, Geology, Botany and the new University Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology. In keeping with the location, the Faculty of Archaeology and Anthropology had consistently fought to be classified on the Science rather than the Arts side of the General Board of the Faculties. *Adullamites* were indeed men of Science who 'It will be seen ... are not refined, like Classical men' (all quotations, Cornford 1908: 3).

Clark was a self-focused, very ambitious, determined young man. Apparently aloof, cold and driven, and stories describing his inscrutable, difficult-to-know nature abound. Undergraduate Warwick Bray, 'Thinking about my days, I have come to the conclusion that Clark *as a person* was irrelevant. What he had to say was up-to-date, exciting, clearly and well argued. The books were fabulous; I used to read them for pure pleasure. It didn't matter that the man himself was cold as a crocodile'.

Personal magnetism, or lack thereof, was not an issue. Instead of personality, Clark's innovative intellectual approach and how it evolved are crucial to understanding Cambridge prehistory in the 1930s. During this period, Clark changed his definitions, goals, methods, research questions and subjects studied. In order to examine the cause and effect of Clark's changing intellectual agenda, it is best to start with his conception and approach to archaeology prior to the establishment of the Fenland Research Committee.

To sum up, Clark was brilliant. Students realised that and followed his intellectual lead despite his distant personality.

[DAB] What was Garrod's primary success/contribution? What was her weakness?

[PJS] *referring to her book* Garrod's own words describe her character. At the end of her life, an acquaintance suggested to Garrod that she had been lucky. '*Pas la chance,*' Garrod replied, '*c'est courage et perseverance.*'

Where Clark had been a successful, professionalizing, intellectual entrepreneur who rapidly changed archaeological theory and method during the 1930s, and consequently dramatically altered the Faculty's archaeological curriculum; Garrod, a female outsider, a woman professor in a university that still barred her from full membership, was well-known for her non-university based archaeological research in England, Gibraltar, Palestine, Kurdistan and Bulgaria. She suffered personally when elected to the oldest and most prestigious university chair of archaeology in Great Britain. Her experiences reveal the gendered

operation of academic careers.

Dorothy Garrod's difficulty in being Professor was that she found distasteful exactly the type of behaviour that had resulted in her election. She was untrained in the types of political manoeuvres that F.M. Cornford's famous satire of 1908 on Cambridge University politics, *Microcosmographia Academica* so accurately describes. The 'political activity' of casually negotiating deals while strolling King's Parade was alien to her. 'Remember this:' Cornford (1908: 42) warns, 'the men who get things done are the men who walk up and down the King's Parade, from 2 to 4, every day of their lives.'

In addition, Garrod's lack of full membership in the University before 1948 and also the fact that she was a woman barred her from some behind-the-scenes interactions and also from social settings where deals might have been struck. Women were not allowed, for example, to dine at the men's colleges where issues were broached and resolved during conversations at High Table. She would not have been present at important informal discussions where bureaucratic manoeuvres might have been agreed upon.

Negotiating scimmages with powerful bureaucratic officers or committees was difficult partly because some members of the General Board of the Faculties were particularly hard to deal with. She was unaccustomed to the often sharp style of Cambridge institutional interactions and was uncomfortable with the verbal sparring and sarcastic retorts which were an acceptable part of the negotiating process.

Garrod had no experience in hierarchical, institutional settings, where she would have been under a General Board, yet over undergraduates. She had never gone to a public school such as Marlborough, as had her brothers, or entered Cambridge and stayed there to build her career, as had Grahame Clark. She was accustomed to leading small, egalitarian research teams where she had control of funding and final decisions, or to supervising one or two students over tea; Garrod was ill-prepared for the University's ranked system.

Throughout, Garrod seems to have been operating on the more co-operative, reasoned, and even dignified mode of behaviour she had enjoyed in the practice of research. This behaviour was maladaptive within Cambridge's arcane institutional, hierarchical arena where control and manipulation of scarce resources were critical and where bureaucratic effectiveness required a tacit knowledge of how to act.

Garrod adequately fulfilled the formal requirements of her office. Her diligent service on the Faculty was well-appreciated. She conscientiously worked on Faculty committees and with Burkitt, Clark and Daniel to formulate regulations and to establish a curriculum for the new Tripos course. According to Daniel (1986), Garrod insisted, while serving on the committee to revise and expand the course, that students be required to gain experience excavating abroad and that the new curriculum stress world prehistory. Daniel considered this to be Garrod's most valuable contribution, commemorated today by the

Department's Garrod Fund established specifically to pay students' travel expenses. Garrod thus wished to encourage non-Eurocentric perspectives, hoping that with experience abroad and knowledge of the prehistory of other nations, students could consider the place of prehistoric England within a broader context.

However, Garrod never seemed to have tried to institutionalise her own research agenda. In comparison to Clark, who immediately taught his own material, pushed an ecological approach to archaeological analysis and who also fought to institutionalise what was to become known world-wide as environmental and palaeoeconomic archaeology, Garrod did not suggest that her many outstanding discoveries or her views on the evolution of *Homo sapiens* should become part of the required curriculum. Papers on the prehistory of the Near East and on the Levantine corridor were conspicuously absent from the newly established Part II. Although she made it clear that she wanted world prehistory to be taught at Cambridge, Garrod seemed completely incapable of 'blowing her own trumpet' or championing her own material.

In addition, she simply did not appear to understand the importance of attracting students in order to further her own research agenda.

Garrod never became acculturated to the type of informal behaviour needed to be a 'Cambridge man'. All indications are that she was uncomfortable in her Professorial role and left as soon as her sense of duty allowed. She did a competent job but longed to return to her field research.

Clare Fell, who was Assistant Curator of the Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology from 1948–53, remembered 'how shocked and saddened everyone was when she resigned. Dorothy was one of the few women professors and the female academics thought it terrible she should resign. But she was right, as she wanted to finish her research and not get bogged down in administration.'

Although she did not function happily within the University hierarchy and certainly was not an intellectual careerist or entrepreneur as was Clark, Garrod was very well-liked by her Archaeology and Anthropology staff colleagues. 'Oh, we loved her. She was quite awe-inspiring' remembered Mary Thatcher.

According to Daniel (1986: 211), in personal situations, 'Dorothy Garrod had been easy to get on with; she was a generous, lovable, outgoing person.' Upon retirement, thirty-four members of the Faculty Board presented her with an ornate scroll, inscribed in Latin, which reveals their sadness and respect, which can be translated as:

To Dorothy Annie Elizabeth Garrod most illustrious teacher and indefatigable explorer of antiquity, who for thirteen years professed the science of archaeology in Cambridge with such great learning, such great splendour, such great friendliness and humanity, her colleagues, acquaintances, friends, whose names are written beneath, joyfully giving thanks for so many things well done, earnestly mourning her sad and premature departure, following her in all excellent things, moved not only by love but

also by regret, to one who has deserved it, who tomorrow will emigrate to Gaul, yet will quite often return to Britain, give with pleasure this clock as a gift.

'caelum non animus mutant, qui trans [mare] currunt'
[Horace. Epistles, Book I, 11, line 27] 'those who hasten across [the sea] change their horizon, not their soul'.

[DAB] Of the three, which would you most like to take tea with? Whom the least?

[PJS] Garrod!!! Without doubt. I would be have been so honoured. She was one of the greatest prehistorian of the twentieth century and without her I would not be here. All women at Cambridge are in her debt.

[DAB] You chose three case studies, but could there have been more – is there anyone else from the period that you would like to research?

[PJS] Oh yes. Louis Clarke for starters.

[DAB] How did you find your way to Cambridge? What inspired you to undertake this study? Was it suggested to you – by whom? Or how else did the topic arise? Why Prehistory? Why did you not include Anglo-Saxon archaeology? Why Cambridge rather than Edinburgh, or UCL, or the British Schools?

[PJS] I was born near New York City so am an American citizen but lived in Canada for 35 years and am also a Canadian, and I have lived in Europe for years. I came here at the suggestion of Bruce Trigger to study Clark. Cambridge has always been associated with science and with archaeology, more than say Oxford, so it was the place to study. And why prehistory, well my background is as a prehistorian, so that is where my knowledge and interest lies. I don't know about, say, Anglo-Saxon in the same way.

[DAB] A criticism that I have heard levelled against this kind of study is that it is in effect navel

gazing – a sort of self indulgent introspection? How do you respond to that critique? What is the long term value of such studies?

[PJS] First of all, I was not an insider when I began the study. I came from Canada and so had an outsiders perspective. Originally my study was to focus on Clark, but widened once I engaged with the material. My approach has been that of an ethnographer visiting Cambridge to study the 'natives'.

The centrality of Cambridge in the intellectual life of the world makes it a rich source of material. Practically every historian of science studies comes to Cambridge in order to understand science; it is the centre. One could have started at the periphery, but as I was then living in Cambridge it seemed fair to study Cambridge.

Yes, I understand the criticism of introspection. For me the approach is to follow small changes that lead to large ones, that's how history works. It is also essential for me to be emotionally committed; I don't claim to be objective. In fact it is impossible to be truly objective for me. I revel in the subjectivity; understanding emotions are a way through the history.

[DAB] Can you explain a little more about what you mean?

[PJS] Affectation moves history. Let me illustrate how this works. Look at the photograph on the front cover of my book. Here are all the staff dressed in museum artefacts – the people relate through the artefacts to each other. Audrey Richards is dressed as Margaret Mead on the right of the photo. Mead was married during the 1930s to Reo Fortune who is on the left of the photo. Reo Fortune, at that point, was apparently in love with Mina Lethbridge who was devoted to Tom (Tom is standing behind Reo and wears a conquistors helmet. Mina stands near him. She was very beautiful). After Tom died, Mina took care of Reo and eventually lived in 'Reo's cottage' in Girton. In the front Maureen O'Reilly sits next Prof John Hutton, the



Audrey Richards, Reo Fortune, Mina Lethbridge, Tom Lethbridge, Maureen O'Reilly, Prof John Hutton. Picture taken by Mina Lethbridge.

William Wyse professor of social anthropology. They eventually marry happily. There is an emotional commitment amongst the group, messy but deep. They were a family. Notice also how the support staff are sitting in the background, and are not in fancy dress. They are present, but also separate.

Referring to her book PJS continued The historian Paul Thompson (1998) mentions that oral history results can be unpredictable and may force a shift of research focus. One of the first interviews I conducted was with a now deceased personality. My question about the 'rural' nature of Cambridge versus Oxford was misheard as 'moral' at which time he happily launched into a personal discussion of past loves. Much to my embarrassment, this happened again three months later. The interviewee heard 'moral' rather than 'rural'. On a later occasion, I brought up the topic of 'rurality' with Thurstan Shaw. 'Oh,' he responded, 'we all knew who the womanisers were.' I realised then that I was asking the wrong question. Human relations were more important than rurality. Perhaps one of the strengths of the Faculty was its smallness and its endogamy. There was a history of long-committed couples who worked together for the advancement of the subject, as well as a commitment to the tea-room as a sanctuary.

In the end, people wanted to be remembered for whom and what they loved, not for what they had accomplished. Their uniform passion unites prehistory at Cambridge. From Burkitt, who believed that the soul was illuminated by a knowledge of the past, to Clark, who believed that prehistory could be the great leveler and therefore must be professionalised, to Garrod, who named the Neanderthal child, Abel, and came to prehistoric archaeology as if converted to a religion, the common thread is a certain belief that this subject will enlighten our lives and strengthen the world.

It is clear that this deep emotional and philosophical commitment was one of the major reasons for the success of prehistoric archaeology.

[DAB] I felt you were at your best when painting a picture of Cambridge characters, where your prose was very readable. Less successful for me was the 'theory' and methodology. I understand that this was a necessary component of the PhD thesis which requires a certain amount of 'jumping through hoops', but wonder whether this would have been better left out of the book. Why did you decide to leave it in?

[PJS] You're not the first person to say that. People enjoy the stories. They say why can't you just publish the stories. Of course for the purpose of the PhD thesis one needs to include the theory. Then I wanted to get my work out into the public domain. It had been a long time in gestation and there was a need to publish. So many people had been asking me about the work that it was necessary to go to press. Maybe what is needed next is a second book on the stories, but at the moment I don't have the time to commit to it, but maybe in the future I will, it is an option.

[DAB] What next? You have been running the 'oral histories' can you tell us about these? Are they going to result in a future publication?

[PJS] Not as a book. I am not sure how I could do that, there is so much material. But we are going to stream them all on the internet so that they will be available. They are also available on DVD at the moment, and I am always surprised how many enquiries I get. They come from all over the world.

[DAB] Are there lessons to be learnt from your study? One can't help but notice that the practice of taking tea has largely died out at Cambridge – we have two tea rooms – the Department and the McDonald, reflecting the division between undergrads and others. The McDonald tea room is dominated by graduate students and post-docs, with relatively few lecturers making a regular visit. This is probably due to the pressures of modern life – the leisure of taking tea is something we have lost. Is this significant? It stands in stark contrast to my experience in Manchester. When working at Manchester Museum for a week I was taken to the weekly tea and biscuits session by John Prag, who take time to introduce me to all the staff. It seemed that they were deliberately attempting to create the collegiate atmosphere and scholarly exchanges that you describe so well in Cambridge.

[PJS] The McDonald tea room seems to work well for some especially the research fellows and the museum staff but I think there is a problem with the layout of the McDonald tea room; round tables might be needed so that people can circulate and talk. It's about telling each other stories. The McDonald area acts as a barrier to this. With the layout of the chairs it is difficult for people to circulate and be inclusive. And yes, there is the second, Departmental tea room – but who uses that? It seems to be used less and less and always seems empty these days.

[DAB] I noticed a change, once access to the McDonald was opened up to the whole of the Graduate student population the Department tea room was much less busy.

[PJS] Yes, but I don't see the MPhils in the McDonald. Where do they go these days?

[DAB] But neither do you see that many senior staff, there are a few regulars, but many of the lecturers only drop in occasionally.

[PJS] Yes, that is also right. People are too busy to sit and talk, and of course there is an issue of status, concerning who mixes with whom that didn't exist before.

But tea is important and that's why I insisted that tea was served with the Personal Histories lectures. Everyone gets chance to take tea once a year, that is my contribution. It is really important that we get all the undergraduates to participate that way the collective memory of the department can remain tradition through tea.

[DAB] Your study traces the advent of professional archaeology – the sense that without a degree one could not really assert archaeological authority.

[PJS] For Clark the degree, the Cambridge degree, was the mark of the professional. Nothing else would do. And for him to be a professional was key. Of course for much of the time Cambridge was the only place to go if one wanted to study archaeology, there were no alternative courses. Then by the time there were, Cambridge had firmly established itself. As many of my interviewees said 'where else would I go?'

A common factor amongst many of the people I interviewed that motivated them to study archaeology were strong personal experiences. I can think of Norman Hammond, Paul Mellars, Peter Rowley-Conwy, Grahame Clark, Thurstan Shaw – they had all gained early experiences of archaeology, usually when at school. Clark had been at Marlborough where he had dug. The perception was that Cambridge was the only place to go to study.

[DAB] Before I came up to Cambridge I considered the alternatives, and it seemed to me that the Archaeology and Anthropology degree was the gold standard.

[PJS] Yes, that was the perception then. I think it is true.

[DAB] In recent years the division has widened, with the advent of the commercial archaeological units, we now have a tripartite divide between amateur, commercial and academic archaeologists. Some of us feel that this has been a mixed blessing. New tensions have developed between academics and commercial archaeologists, whilst existing ones between amateur and professional have deepened. Having given this much thought for your thesis I wonder what your reflections are on the amateur, professional and academic divide that has emerged?

[PJS] I think Cambridge is better at bridging the gap than other places. The Cambridge Archaeological Unit has clear links to the Department and the McDonald. This bridges the gap, but there are divisions, I think with the Cambridge Antiquarian Society. I am not quite sure why. There are Carenza Lewis and John Pickles, Sue Oosthuizen and Nick James and yourself, but otherwise you don't see Cambridge Antiquarian Society people in the McDonald at lectures or drinking coffee.

[DAB] What more could be said of the relationship of the Department, Museum and Cambridge Antiquarian Society?

[PJS] Perhaps it is necessary as the Faculty has grown that fragmentation has become the dominant reality. But in my study, the Museum, Faculty and Cambridge Antiquarian Society were still merged. The same people were involved in all three organisations. The Museum and Faculty were still one. Students loved it. It worked. As Joan Lillico (class of 1935) said in an interview 'Small really was beautiful!'

As the interview came to an end and Pamela departed I [DAB] was left to reflect on the appropriateness of a comment reported to have been made by I.M.R. Summers, 'The Anthropology and Archaeology Department was far more interesting than any primitive tribe' (Smith 2009, 109).

The interview with Pamela Jane Smith was conducted on the 5th May 2010, at Wolfson College, Cambridge. Her book is published by Archaeopress of Oxford under the following reference:

A 'Splendid Idiosyncrasy': Prehistory at Cambridge 1915-50.

Smith, P. J. 2009.

Oxford: BAR British Series 485. ISBN 978 1 4073 0430 4

Proceedings Volume XCIX, 2010

Price £12.50 for members, £14.50 for non-members

Contents

Note on 'Mary Desborough Cra'ster, 1928–2008' published in <i>PCAS</i> XCVIII (2009)	6
A Middle Bronze Age Cremation Cemetery on the Western Claylands at Papworth Everard Nicholas Gilmour, Natasha Dodwell and Elizabeth Popescu	7
Further excavation of a late Iron Age settlement at Scotland Farm, Dry Drayton David Ingham	25
Excavations at Castle Street Christopher Evans and Letty Ten Harkel	35
Early Bronze Age, Iron Age and Roman pit deposits at Bluntisham, Cambridgeshire Adrian Burrow and Andrew Mudd	61
Roman, Anglo-Saxon and medieval settlement at Stow Longa and Tilbrook (Huntingdonshire) Rob Atkins	75
Earthwork Survey at Huntingdon Mill Common Michael Fradley	89
Saxon and Medieval activity at Scotts Close, Hilton Thomas Woolhouse	97
A medieval clunch-working site at Fordham Road, Isleham, Cambridgeshire Andrew A. S. Newton	103
Small sites in Cambridgeshire Pip Stone for Archaeological Solutions	113
Medieval enclosures and trackways at Coles Lane, Oakington, Cambridgeshire Andrew B. Powell	121
The medieval network of navigable Fenland waterways I: Crowland Michael Chisholm	125
The Old Rectory Kingston: A Short Note on its Origins Susan Oosthuizen	139
Tea and Delicious Cakes: in conversation with Dr Pamela Jane Smith author of <i>A 'Splendid Idiosyncrasy': Prehistory at Cambridge 1915–50</i> David A. Barrowclough	145
The CAS Collection of Cambridgeshire 'Sketches': Part 2 John Pickles	155
Fieldwork in Cambridgeshire 2009 Sally Thompson, Hazel White, and Elizabeth Shepherd Popescu	161
<i>Index</i>	173
<i>Abbreviations</i>	180
Recent Accessions to the Cambridgeshire Collection Chris Jakes	181