PLATE XXXIV

L. H. JEFFERY

Proceedings of the British Academy, LXXIII, 1987, 505–516

LILIAN HAMILTON JEFFERY

1915–1986

LILIAN HAMILTON JEFFERY (universally known as Anne) was born at Westcliff-on-Sea on 5 January 1915, the third and youngest daughter of Thomas Theophilus Jeffery and Lilian Mary Hamilton. Her mother, of mathematical bent but with a classical tradition in her family, was Irish from County Sligo. Her father was a full generation older, and a Londoner. He took a First in Classics at Peterhouse in 1877, and was a Fellow there from 1885 to 1891, a useful supplement to his position as Second Master of Mill Hill School from 1877 to 1891. After 1891, he took up a career as a free-lance lecturer and classical tutor, first in London, then in Cheltenham, dying as late as 1940. He gave Anne a firm classical grounding at home, and a taste for Victorian writers who had been his contemporaries stayed with her permanently.

In 1928, a shy and silent child, she at last went to school as a day girl at Cheltenham Ladies' College, with a scholarship. The classical staff was good, and not unenterprising; her performance as Antigone was still remembered by her English teacher many years later. In 1933 she won a Major Classical scholarship to Newnham. Here she came under Jocelyn Toynbee, then Classics Tutor, who will have given her an early insight into the possibilities of integrating archaeological evidence into a picture of the ancient world. A First in Part I of the Tripos was followed by a II.2 in Part II; some grain of obstinacy had determined that she did not care for the cruel and barbarous Romans. 'We decided to give the Romans a miss' was her account of her agreement with Miss Toynbee, and she more or less stuck to this position throughout life. An extra year on the Diploma in Classical Archaeology went better, under S. G. Campbell of Christ's, who had already introduced her to Greek epigraphy. Campbell, who died in 1956, is a curiously shadowy figure now, since he published very little; he was said to be revising the *Introduction to Greek Epigraphy* by E. S. Roberts. Some material was turned over to Anne at his death, which, to her distress, she found of little use.

Anne testified to the solidity of his learning, and always spoke of him with affection and gratitude. It was surely he who suggested that she should concentrate on archaic Greek inscriptions, with special reference to the *boustrophedon* style; this, no doubt, was thought of as a pendant to R. P. Austin's then recent Oxford dissertation on the *stoichedon* style.

With this in mind, she went out to the British School at Athens in November 1937, with its Walston Studentship and a Mary Ewart Travelling Scholarship. She remained devoted to the School throughout her life. It had given her, as to many others, not only opportunities for hard work and travel (also then hard work), but warm companionships. The circle of her friendships with foreign and Greek archaeologists was ultimately enormous. Her first year took her round a wide variety of sites and gave her her first taste of excavation under Edith Eccles on Chios. She won golden opinions, and was elected to a Jenner Research Fellowship at Newnham and the School's own School Studentship.

In January 1939 she went back to Athens with a more specific task. In her first year, she had already developed an interest in a topic off her main beat: the work of the Athenian sculptors Kritios and Nesiotes, which presented linked problems of sculptural and epigraphic scholarship in the transitional period from Archaic to Classical styles. Problems of that kind were peculiarly the province of Antony E. Raubitschek of the Austrian Archaeological Institute, who had already made a series of major discoveries by bringing together inscribed and sculptural fragments from the Athenian Acropolis. He was now planning a collection of the archaic dedications from the Acropolis, but political developments were intervening. Although he had been offered a research base at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, there were still substantial gaps in the museum work needed for a full publication. On his way to America, he discussed the matter with Anne. In her stay at Athens in 1939, while continuing her more general work on archaic inscriptions, she filled the gaps in his photographs and measurements, providing in particular all the material on the marble basins, which he had not previously worked on. In her version of events, she was a minor collaborator to the expert, but Raubitschek's preface to the completed *Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis* (1949) makes it clear that her suggestions had gone well beyond the factual material, and he firmly put her name on the title-page. As far as the long term was concerned, participation in such a coherent project developed her ability to fit minute detail into an overall feel for a society, in a way in which the investigation of scattered archaic inscriptions could not yet do.

The outbreak of war found her in Cambridge. Here she had her first experience of teaching as Temporary Assistant Lecturer to the evacuees of Bedford College, London. To a girl of twenty-five, this did not seem war-work comparable with what her male contemporaries were doing, and in 1940 she enrolled herself as a VAD at Cheltenham Military Hospital. In 1941 a more fruitful use of her talents became available. Volunteering for the WAAF in April, she was eventually summoned in November. There had been growing recognition of the importance of aerial photography and its interpretation. Ability to attend to detail and a keen visual memory were important; archaeological experience was thus thought particularly useful. Spells as a recruit and as an officer cadet at RAF Morecambe broadened her experience, even to the drilling of recruits, but she spent most of the rest of the war at the centre of air photography, Medmenham. A peculiarity of sight denied her the stereoscopic vision needed for work on the photographs, and her line was intelligence rather than direct interpretation. Medmenham was a place where many Oxford and Cambridge academics and archaeologists congregated, and she had a fairly interesting and congenial war, not stagnating and making lifelong friends. It is not clear how much use she made of the work-notes she took with her; either she or a similarly-placed colleague was put on a charge for 'keeping rubbish under the bed'. Life in the RAF left a permanent, though inoffensive, mark on her vocabulary. In her correspondence this combined with a Victorian penchant for underlining and abbreviation to produce a totally personal effect.

Demobilized as a Section Officer in January 1946, she still had a year of her Newnham Research Fellowship in hand. But Cambridge was now less congenial. The ethos of Newnham, under its new Principal, seemed more practical, less sympathetic to pure scholarship than it had been, and it was clear that Oxford, with a strong recent tradition of integrating archaeological and epigraphic work into the study of Greek civilization, was a more logical base for a large-scale epigraphic work. In 1961, Anne named five Oxford scholars, Tod, Beazley, Wade-Gery, Meiggs, and Dunbabin, as having, in their various ways, been particularly important for her work. The opportunity for a move was mediated by Dorothy Garrod, Fellow of Newnham and prominent in air photography, who had developed ties with

Lady Margaret Hall during the war. In the dour post-war years, LMH, particularly perhaps Lucy Sutherland as Principal, retained a respect for what was cheerfully described as 'totally useless scholarship', and Anne went there as Research Fellow in autumn 1946, remaining there, much loved, up till and beyond her retirement. In 1952, in order to maintain her link with the college after the expiry of her Research Fellowship, she was elected to a part-time Tutorship in Ancient History. It was recognized that she would not cover the whole 'Greats' field. The Romans were out of the question, and she successfully asserted her incompetence to deal with fourth-century Greece. On the other hand, she could offer Greek Sculpture, in which available teaching was always scarce, and, in order to make up the minimum four hours a week of teaching required of her, she also, from time to time, taught Classical set texts to first-year students in English or History. In 1953 she was elected to an Official Fellowship, and after 1959 she went on to a full tutorial load. The teaching was found congenial on both sides. She took infinite trouble to build her pupils' confidence in their own abilities and ideas, and her gentle firmness often inspired great devotion. Teaching for the Diploma in Classical Archaeology gave her the stray specialized pupil of high quality. With the exception of the editorship of the British School *Annual* (1955–61), she did not do much administration, not through unwillingness or incompetence; others had more of a taste for it. With this freedom and the fortunate specialism of her teaching range, she was able to control her own development.

The period of her Research Fellowship may look strange today. Enrolled as a student for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, she was in fact preparing a work on the largest scale. She was already known, at home and abroad, as the most gifted expert on archaic local scripts. Major new texts were being entrusted to her for publication, and her advice was frequently sought. From before and after the war, she had accumulated a large number of individual things that she wished to say, and a stream of articles, with unassuming titles, started to appear; on close inspection notes which looked narrowly technical often turned out to contain observations of central importance. A good example of this is a demonstration hidden in such an article in 1954 that the use of magical *defixiones* could be traced back well into the fifth century, contrary to Dodds's contention in *The Greeks and the Irrational* that their absence from the fifth century contributed to showing it as an age of enlightenment. She continued to travel in Greece and joined the British School's excavations at Old Smyrna in 1949. A sketch survives[1] showing her barefooted with her shoes tied round her neck, up to her ankles in the water-level of her trench, with a basket of newly found aryballoi before her; she was, of course, invaluable for the scanty epigraphic finds of the excavation.

In 1951, the major work, now called *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece*, eventually reached the stage of a successful dissertation. Its examiners, G. R. Driver and T. J. Dunbabin, were slightly shocked, in their different fields, by some low datings, but Driver reported: 'The dissertation is, I think, the best that I have seen and ought to be published; nothing like it has been done, to the best of my knowledge', and Dunbabin said, 'In saying that this work is fit for publication I mean this in no formal sense but in the conviction that it should be published and will be useful to Greek historians, archaeologists and epigraphists for a long time to come'. In fact, the book did not come out until 1961,[2] but, since the main difference between the dissertation and the book lies in the expansion of the catalogue material, it will be convenient to discuss it here.

The original plan for a study of the *boustrophedon* system had now expanded into a systematic survey of all Greek alphabetic inscriptions and their scripts for the period, roughly speaking down to the end of the fifth century BC, before local scripts started to lose their distinctive identities. The topic had not been treated on any great scale for fifty years, and then largely on the basis of such drawings as had been available. By contrast, this was a work based as far as possible on autopsy; she had seen, drawn, photographed and studied a remarkable proportion of the 1158 texts which went, after some selection, into her catalogues. Given the new solidity of the foundations, she might well have made the book more explicitly a fresh start, with a brief survey of previous work. It remains a mildly irritating feature that the argument sometimes proceeds as a contribution to a continuing debate, requiring reference to works which are essentially being superseded. Even though the main differences between the local scripts had been distinguished by Kirchhoff in 1863, she was going far beyond him and her references to his terminology now tend to obscure understanding.

---

[1] H. Waterhouse, *The British School at Athens: the First Hundred Years* (1986), p. 93.

[2] A reprint, with additional matter by Dr A. W. Johnston, is in preparation.

The declared aim in the Preface is to establish a chronological framework for archaic Greek inscriptions, based on the twenty-five year period which had become current for sculpture and pottery. The approach was to be basically archaeological, with an over-modest disclaimer about the attention paid to philological and historical problems. Direct archaeological dating of inscribed pots and statuary came first, archaeological context next, followed by cautious use of what seemed to be historical arguments; speculation about the speed at which styles might have changed came a long way behind.[3] Some previous attempts at dating had been very slapdash, with cross-arguments between areas which were very different in their script and development. With more material available and stricter method, some dates were changed very drastically. She freely admitted that the evidence was sometimes inadequate for as much certainty about dates as about origins; 'Like a wine-taster, the epigraphist may go wrong over the year, but not over the district.' Nevertheless, her datings have in general stood up remarkably well, even against challenges on specific texts. If changes became necessary, she was ready to make them. In the last years of her life she moved late Spartan texts down a full generation;[4] characteristically, she did not accept the historical arguments until she found an art-historical argument to support them.

As far as the earliest stages of the chronology were concerned, her consolidation of the evidence fully substantiated the argument put forward by Rhys Carpenter in 1933.[5] Before proper archaeological datings for the eighth and seventh centuries had been worked out in the 1920s and 1930s, datings of the earliest Greek material had been vague, and most of the arguments about the origins of Greek writing had turned on comparisons with the Semitic scripts and attempts to determine when they had been closest to what became the Greek alphabet. Very high dates for the transmission of the alphabet had therefore been current. Anne came down for a transmission date slightly higher than Carpenter's, around 750 BC. The last thirty-five years have increased the evidence for the second half of the century without producing anything earlier. Semitists remain deeply unhappy, some preferring much earlier dates,[6] but the gap on the Greek side remains a problem for them.[7]

---

[3] She left a late reformulation of her method inside the cover of her own copy: 'The rough method of dating an inscription with nothing (internal) (or a find-spot) to help us must still be worked out (as in sculpture or vases) on each letter's stylistic development, till (hopefully) the whole structure can then be hooked onto the relevant period by one (or more) links which have independent dates—the identified war memorial, the known deceased/dedicator, the known event; if we can identify and collect the "oeuvre" of a stonemason/letterer, and date just one of the objects, that's an important aid.'

[4] *JHS*, ci (1981), 190–2, and an unpublished manuscript.

[5] Rhys Carpenter, *AJA*,xxxvii (1933), 8–29; ibid., xlii (1938), 58–69.

Anne made substantial contributions to the questions of where and how the transmission took place. She had, indeed, little patience with extreme earlier views by which a single brilliant Greek inventor had instantly realized that the Phoenician script would be more useful if it had vowels; one of the most attractive parts of her treatment is the substitution of a more realistic process of learning and adaptation which produced vowels. Nevertheless, she remained convinced that this had only happened in one place, supporting it with a technical argument about the unity of Greek misunderstanding of the names of Semitic sibilants. The differences which characterize individual Greek scripts as far back as we can trace them seemed less important to her.[8] In the book, she opted fairly firmly for Al Mina at the mouth of the Orontes as the place of transmission. She was more tolerant later about other candidates,[9] without explaining why her original arguments against Crete and Rhodes now seemed less convincing to her.

A section on 'Writing in Archaic Greece' contemplated the view that Greek had once only been written retrograde and disposed of it so firmly that it has never reappeared. It took in by the way the original investigation of *boustrophedon*, and passed to an enormously valuable discussion on the ways in which writing was in fact used in archaic Greece.

But it is the local surveys and catalogues which form the greater part of the book. Detailed discussion would be profitless. There are rare occasions where the argument could be faulted, but they have remained, despite their inevitable ageing, a rich collection of evidence and discussion, ignored at peril by anyone concerned with archaic Greece.

The thesis completed, she went off to the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, with an office in a hastily cleared basement storeroom. This was a relatively relaxed period which she used to broaden her interests again. She found time to attend Harold Cherniss's famous Pindar class, but, from next door, I do not remember getting much help with my early struggles with classical Attic lettering, and she disappeared quite frequently to renew American friendships from Athens and the war.

---

[6] Naveh, *AJA*, lxxvii (1973), 1–8.

[7] Cf. Anne's respectful note on Naveh in *CAH*², III.1, 823, n. 8.

[8] For a variant view see Cook and Woodhead, *AJA*, lxiii (1959), 175–8, agreeing however that the vowel system arose in one place.

[9] *Archaic Greece*, pp. 26, 194; *CAH*², III.1, 822–3.

Back in Oxford and starting as a tutor, she had a long period of activity on which she thrived. Changing the thesis into a book demanded detailed attention, quite apart from the problems of financing and producing it. Articles continued to appear, some epigraphic, some pretty purely historical. She felt the need to give attention to some pretty arid fields, such as what the Greeks themselves had thought about the origin of writing. One paper given to the Oxford Philological Society, on the scholiasts to Dionysius Thrax, is memorable, not so much for its content, but for its being almost drowned in one corner of the room by the noise of a visitor (from an institution notorious for its attitude to women) saying, over and over again: 'Gee, what a pity! Such a pretty girl! What a pity!'

Chronological order now becomes unrealistic. It will be convenient to defer one major specialized project of these years, and to concentrate on her general historical thinking. Although *Archaic Greece* did not appear until 1976, it had its roots in her tutorial work and, still more, in the lectures with which she fulfilled the greater part of her university teaching requirement. For many years these ran in parallel with a very different course which aimed to steer beginners in Greek History through the confusion of the earliest period by playing down difficulties and drawing firm lines. This was not Anne's way. She tended more to work out into the chaos from points of relative certainty, and it was a nice problem for a tutor to determine which course would suit a pupil best. It would require the collation of lecture-notes from several generations to determine how far her mind changed, and I do not attempt the task.

Archaic Greece is presented as a contribution to understanding the variety of the cultures of the period as opposed to their unity, a natural result, she thought, of having paid so much attention to local dialects and scripts and of having a preference for local, rather than Panhellenic, Greek art. After an introduction on background, sources, the form of the city-state, and colonization, it is therefore organized topographically, which involves some awkward cross-referencing. In an awesome feat of compression, virtually every available piece of factual evidence finds its place, is given what she considered its most probable interpretation, illuminated with a feel for the geography, and illustrated with a totally individual selection of plates. Since she seldom felt tempted to press her own ideas, attentive reading is needed to discover the wide range of her personal contributions. The sharpness of her observation and the economy of her writing are more apparent, unified, for example, in two golden pages on Spartan art.

Though the European Dark Ages are raided for comparisons, it is essentially a modernist work, in which Greeks behave for currently recognizable motives. Passages on social organization and behaviour are largely descriptive. Cult only gets much of a show when political considerations are involved. There is a great deal about trade which might now not be thought subtle enough; pottery dominates, because it has survived. That might stand as symbolic for the book as a whole. The best possible guide to the surviving evidence, it has little space to give to what might have been lost.

I turn now to her work on Athens, which restarted after the thesis. After the strains of spreading herself over the whole Greek world, it was natural that she should seek a more concentrated topic. There was one for which she was already prepared by her work with Raubitschek. Although Gisela Richter was greatly solidifying knowledge of the sculpture of archaic Attic grave-monuments, she was hardly, even with help from Margharita Guarducci, doing much to integrate her study with the relevant epigraphic material. In 1954, Anne spent the long vacation in Greece collecting material and trying to consider the monuments as a whole. The long article which eventually came out of this [10] was not so much a contribution to Athenian attitudes on death and burial, invaluable though the material later was for those pursuing that line, as a typology of the development of grave-monuments and the broad lines of a division of the material by workshops. There had been the beginnings of a similar approach by Raubitschek on the dedications, which he had not really carried through. Here, for the first time, individual archaic Athenian letter-cutters, not necessarily correlating with the sculptors, began to emerge.

Some overlap was already visible with the finds from the Acropolis. She was therefore reasonably prepared when, in 1962, a small cabal persuaded Professor Klaffenbach of the Berlin Academy that I was the person to organize a new edition of

---

[10] *BSA*, lvii (1962), 115–53.

Inscriptiones Graecae, I, the volume containing Attic inscriptions to 403 BC. I needed collaborators and was in particular certain that I could not move a step without Anne. Somewhat to her relief, there were fewer offers of help for the private inscriptions than for the public, and we started off, rather slowly for my part, on the basis that the bulk of the private texts would fall to her. The main attraction for her was the possibility of extending her operations on the workshops to the dedications. Raubitschek had arranged his catalogue by types of monument; she would order the texts chronologically and by workshops. At this stage, we had not really faced another major problem about private texts, how to tell whether a private gravestone was earlier than 403; that was a serious mistake, since she never felt really happy with this later material.

Anne's museum work for the task, supported by a Leverhulme grant, took nearly a year in 1967–8. Doing many other things at the same time and grumbling vigorously about the need to write in Latin, she had more or less completed her first draft by 1973; a spell as Catharine McBride Guest Lecturer at Bryn Mawr ('this blissful abode') in 1971 helped greatly here. The work remains unpublished, which cries for explanation. No clear agreement about format had been arrived at with Klaffenbach, and it turned out that, by his successor's standards, by no means always unreasonable, our presentation was often seriously inadequate. Fighting the public inscriptions through to publication as a first fascicule in 1981 was not easy, and meanwhile Anne lost impetus for tidying and improving her contribution. If bilingual word-processing had been available ten years earlier, it would have helped; some texts were typed three or four times.

What would have been sensible, as we later saw, would have been for Anne to write an article, in the middle 1970s, to show how she was extending her workshops from the gravestones into the dedications, but this was never done. Her conclusions come out fairly clearly from her arrangement and her cross-referencing, and some clarification is still perhaps possible from her notes. When the volume is finally published, the feat of organization and acute observation it involved will gradually become clear.

This is the major achievement involved in this unpublished work. Other aspects were less satisfactory. She started by being too easily satisfied with Raubitschek's treatment of verse inscriptions; the work of her pupil Peter Hansen has made a great difference here. There is a problem about dating texts before and after the Persian sack of the Acropolis in 480 BC; she had thought she had found a way of getting a more refined solution than Raubitschek's, but, with only a few months to live, she had to agree that it would not work. Tidying for publication, after she turned the material over to me, has therefore taken longer than I would have hoped.

In 1980, she gave up her Tutorship and her LMH flat in Fyfield Road two years early, to give herself more time for work, and transferred herself to a flat in Belsyre Court, ten minutes' walk from college. Here she continued to distribute tea, sherry, advice and commiseration to a stream of visitors; the main difference was that the series of cats who had distinguished her college rooms came to an end. In fact, not much systematic work emerged from this last phase, and, for reasons which never became fully clear, lapses in her memory for domestic matters started to bother her. But her memory for her work never deserted her, and she was by no means stagnating. A last visit to Athens for the Epigraphic Congress of October 1982 produced a tantalizing paper on the continuity of heroic burial, which may yet point in profitable directions.

LMH made her an Honorary Fellow; she had become a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries in 1956 and of this Academy in 1965. A last, very grand, invitation to America in 1983 she turned down, with considerable reluctance. The reality behind the honours was that virtually no scholar anywhere dreamt of publishing a new archaic Greek text without showing it to her first, and their reasons were not narrowly textual and epigraphic. From the smallest ring to a Cyclopean block, she could define, as far as possible, the archaeological considerations relevant for interpretation.

Early in 1984, disquieting symptoms revealed cancer of the lymphatic system. In her long decline, she showed exemplary calm and fortitude. For a time, she stayed in the flat between periods of treatment, even taking one last pupil in Greek Sculpture (and making a fuss when his college tried to pay her). She might well have stayed longer, but thought she would be less of a nuisance to her friends if she transferred herself to a nursing home. There, the room might have been thought somewhat bleak, but she got good care. Armed with an enormous diary to record visitors and their conversation, she ranged from reminiscence to expert advice on new photographs and squeezes; problems about Kritios and Nesiotes reappeared to close the circle. Occasional forays to the flat to save her family trouble in tidying up after her had to be watched; perhaps remembering her experience with Campbell's notes, she was showing signs of throwing away too much. On 29 September 1986 she died, leaving her family, friends and colleagues with memories of a matchless serenity.

D. M. Lewis

I am greatly indebted to Anne's sister, Mrs J. Neufville Taylor, to Dr E. A. O. Whiteman, to Dr A. W. Johnston, and, above all, to Mr P. M. Fraser, on whose Memorial Address in LMH on 29 November 1986 I have drawn freely.