



GRAHAME CLARK

Alexander Csáky

John Grahame Douglas Clark 1907–1995

‘IF ANYONE WERE TO ASK ME why I have spent my life studying Prehistory, I would only say that I have remained under the spell of a subject which seeks to discover how we became human beings endowed with minds and souls before we had learned to write’. So begins Grahame Clark’s own account of his career.¹

He was born on 28 July 1907, the elder son of Charles Douglas Clark and Maude Ethel Grahame Clark (née Shaw). The family was based at Shortlands near Bromley in Kent. Grahame Clark last saw his father in 1914 as Lt Colonel Clark left for France, the Near East and then India. His father died of influenza in 1919 as his ship entered Plymouth Sound. Clark was brought up by his mother and his guardian uncle, Hugh Shaw, for whom he had real affection. As a small child, he was introduced to archaeology by an elderly neighbour, a Mr Bird, who had a collection of flints from Yorkshire. Clark’s own collection began soon afterwards, and his overwhelming interest was signalled to his mother when his pony arrived home riderless; he had spied some flints while out exercising the animal and had dismounted, gathered the artefacts, and forgotten about the beast.

Clark was sent to Marlborough, a school at the heart of prehistoric Wessex, with Avebury, Silbury Hill, and even Windmill Hill lying within the reach of an ambitious young boy. By this time, the family had moved to Seaford on the Sussex Downs where again there were great opportunities for observing ancient monuments and for collecting

© The British Academy 1997.

¹ ‘A Path to Prehistory’, unpublished manuscript, 1993.

stone tools. At school, Clark soon acquired the nickname of 'Stones and Bones', and he joined the Natural History Society. This brought him two advantages; he was excused games at least once a week in order to participate in Society activities, and he could engage in the pursuit of his two loves—the natural history of moths and butterflies, and flint collecting on the Downs. His first four publications, omitted from all the bibliographies usually consulted,² are reports on flint tools and weapons from the Marlborough and Seaford areas.³ His first paper describes collections of flints with distribution maps, technological information and functional interpretations. As the 'weapons of war' (axes, arrowheads and spear points) only made up three per cent of the assemblages, and domestic tools (scrapers, borers, knives, etc.) made up ninety-seven per cent, 'the community must have been essentially a peaceful one'. From 1923 to 1926, Clark was one of the Society's leading scholars, collecting, guiding and lecturing on archaeology, and still engaged in study of the natural history of the area. It would seem, from this distance, that even at this early age he had begun to develop that intense curiosity about the ancient world that would drive him for the rest of his life.

Partly due to the academic stimulus offered by his school teachers, Clark resolved to study prehistory at university. Cambridge was the only English university to offer instruction in prehistory to undergraduates, so he sat for a scholarship at Peterhouse. Unsuccessful in the examination, he was none the less offered a place as pensioner of the college and arrived in 1926. He first took the History Tripos then moved across to the newly-created Faculty of Archaeology and Anthropology; meantime, his uncle Hugh Shaw came across to enquire of the Disney Professor, Ellis Minns, about the prospects of future employment for an archaeologist. Receiving the same reply that one would expect today, Shaw none the less agreed to the new venture when he saw Clark's fierce determination to study prehistory. Clark was thus exposed to the excitement of the 'Arch and Anth' Tripos, studying social and physical anthropology along with archaeology, for two years. Prehistory was taught by Miles Burkitt, but equally valuable was the instruction indirectly provided by Cyril Fox's *Archaeology of the Cambridge Region*,⁴

² G. Clark, *Economic Prehistory. Papers on Archaeology by Grahame Clark* (Cambridge, 1989); the bibliography in this book is incomplete in other respects although the omissions are minor. To the books can now be added *Space, Time and Man. A Prehistorian's view* (Cambridge, 1992).

³ *Report of the Marlborough College Natural History Society* (1923), pp. 85–9; (1924), pp. 75–9; (1925), p. 114; (1926), pp. 73–5.

⁴ C. Fox, *The Archaeology of the Cambridge Region* (Cambridge, 1923).

by J. Clapham's economic history and geographical research,⁵ and by the Faculty's base in the University Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology. Clark was at once immersed in it all, walking daily by a huge totem pole from western Canada, past full-size casts of Mayan sculptures from central America, and proceeding underneath ethnographic hangings from the Torres Straits on his way to the lecture rooms. Across the court was the Botany School, and adjacent was the Sedgwick Museum of Geology. Among undergraduate books was Gordon Childe's *Dawn*,⁶ and the new journal *Antiquity* was influential; visiting lecturers included Leonard Woolley, Grafton Elliot Smith, Gertrude Caton Thompson and Dorothy Garrod. Woolley was in the midst of his work at Ur (1922–34), Elliot Smith's *The Evolution of Man* was newly published (1924), Caton Thompson had just completed her survey of the North Fayum (1924–6) and was working on the sites as Field Director (1927–8), and Garrod had completed her excavations at the Devil's Tower, Gibraltar (1925–6), and was engaged in her survey of Southern Kurdistan (1928). Louis Leakey was also present, with news of his East African Archaeological Research Expeditions (1926–9). These scholars had an international awareness in contrast to the parochial west European view of Burkitt; here was the first inkling of a world prehistory.

Another omission from the standard teaching was any introduction to the ways by which prehistorians came into possession of the evidence. Burkitt was no excavator although he travelled widely to visit others' work. Clark was well aware of this gap and upon graduation he resolved to find instruction. An ideal teacher was soon to emerge, in Eliot Curwen who worked as an amateur archaeologist on the Sussex Downs.⁷ In 1930 he and his son Cecil invited Clark to help in the excavation of a causewayed enclosure. This was good instruction in field techniques for Clark, although he had to learn to avoid certain subjects dear to his own interests; Curwen was a Creationist and would not tolerate hearing opinions that the world had a longer prehistory than 4004 BC. It was not the last time that Clark had to put up with people who had, to his mind, divergent and non-scientific views of the world.

Following success in the Archaeological and Anthropological Tripos (a First), Clark began research for a higher degree, and held a Hugo

⁵ Clapham became Professor of Economic History at Cambridge in 1928 but had variously been a Fellow of King's College since 1898; his *Study of Economic History* appeared in 1929.

⁶ V. G. Childe, *The Dawn of European Civilization* (London, 1925).

⁷ E. C. Curwen, *The Archaeology of Sussex* (London, 1937).

de Balsham Studentship at Peterhouse (1930–2). He worked primarily on the Mesolithic industries of Britain, and when he published his first book, *The Mesolithic Age in Britain*, his supervisor M. C. Burkitt wrote the preface which included the phrases ‘It is true that the cultures . . . were not so brilliant as those of Upper Palaeolithic date But at the same time though perhaps more miserable they are not at all despicable’.⁸ Words such as these may or may not have encouraged Clark during his research.

At one of the Sussex enclosures, the Trundle, Clark met two people who were to become lifelong friends and advisers. Charles Phillips was teaching history at Cambridge, and Stuart Piggott was already engaged in his study of Neolithic pottery. Of the two, Phillips was the more influential; he had an uncanny eye for the landscape and soon involved Clark in a project to identify the traces of early communities in the hitherto unexplored rural landscape of Lincolnshire.⁹ In Phillips’s Austin car, the two men could drive into the prime areas, collect artefacts and map the sites, and return to Cambridge within the day. By evening, the finds were soaking in water, and Phillips’s landlady was bringing macaroni cheese up the stairs to the team. Occasionally, Piggott would also be present, and Christopher Hawkes was there one day when extra supplies had to be summoned by a sharp tap on the floor. It was a good time for the men to debate how they hoped that British archaeology would develop. Clark was of the opinion that the archaeologists then controlling work were long on facts, miserably short on thought and narrow in perspective. No wonder Miles Burkitt put Clark up for election to the Society of Antiquaries of London in 1933, ‘before too many enemies were made’.¹⁰ Various Cambridge undergraduates were sometimes invited to sit in the back of Phillips’s car on the Lincolnshire forays, T. G. E. Powell and C. T. Shaw among them, and doubtless they absorbed not only the experience of fieldwork but also the outspoken comments about their teachers.

Clark later joined Phillips in the excavation of a Lincolnshire long barrow, and one of the team was a young archaeologist Gwladys Maud (Mollie) White. Grahame Clark and Mollie White had already met, appropriately enough, in the University Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology. She came into the main gallery with a question for Miles

⁸ J. G. D. Clark, *The Mesolithic Age in Britain* (Cambridge, 1932).

⁹ C. W. Phillips, *My Life in Archaeology* (Gloucester, 1987).

¹⁰ Clark served on Council in 1938 and again in 1946–7; he was Vice-President in 1959–62.

Burkitt about some Mesolithic object. Burkitt at once said 'you should ask Grahame Clark about that', and there he was, leaning over the balustrade of the upper gallery. Grahame Clark and Mollie White were married in 1936. Mollie gave up her job with the Welsh Commission and became an indispensable part of Clark's academic life as well as a source of immense happiness to him. Their honeymoon was spent in Norway and Sweden, visiting hunter-gatherer rock carvings recently studied by Gjessing;¹¹ they went on to Oslo to attend the Congress of Pre- and Protohistoric Sciences. Clark wrote an account of the carvings for *Antiquity* in 1937,¹² which helped him establish a long and good relationship with O. G. S. Crawford, founder and editor of the journal.

This period was crucial for Clark's future direction in prehistory. He was in regular contact with C. W. Phillips and the botanist Harry Godwin, both men later acknowledging Clark's influence on them as well, and Piggott was involved in even more serious discussions about the future of British prehistoric studies. It was agreed that Piggott would take on the Neolithic, Clark staying with the Mesolithic, and each had his own priorities for research, which were advanced through lectures and publications. Piggott modelled his later book on *The Neolithic Cultures of the British Isles* on Clark's concepts, especially in efforts to set the communities in an appropriate environmental frame. But Phillips was the prime source of inspiration for landscape archaeology, strengthened from a distance by Crawford. O. G. S. Crawford had already published his *Air Survey and Archaeology* (1924) and *Wessex from the Air* had appeared in 1928; these were influential books but Crawford's work as Archaeological Officer for the Ordnance Survey (1920–46) was more crucial for Clark's understanding of the potential of landscape archaeology. The writings of Cyril Fox were discussed as too theoretical and unyielding.

From this distance, it may be difficult to envisage the character of the archaeology of the period. Eager as Clark and Piggott were, to gain entry to the establishment they had to subscribe to the traditions of work and offer carefully-couched words of advice to their elders but not necessarily their betters. There were few significant excavations, and fewer still where methods were much beyond recovery of the most obvious structures and artefacts. At the stone circle of Avebury, all was well, as Piggott was employed as Assistant Director. The work was

¹¹ G. Gjessing, *Arktische Helleristninger: Nord-Norge* (Oslo, 1932).

¹² J. G. D. Clark, 'Scandinavian rock engravings', *Antiquity*, 11 (1937), 56–69.

directed and funded by Alexander Keiller,¹³ and Grahame and Mollie Clark were invited for a visit. The site was viewed with mutual satisfaction, but dinner at Keiller's residence required full evening dress which neither possessed. Clark's somewhat worn trousers were of course collected by a servant at bedtime for cleaning and pressing, with the contents of its pockets laid carefully and symmetrically on the elaborate dressing table—a piece of string and a broken penknife.

As a junior research student, Clark found the time and the encouragement to publish his thoughts on a group of flint tools that he had long ago identified from the chalklands of southern England. His first professional paper, on discoidal flint knives, appeared in the *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society of East Anglia* for 1928.¹⁴ The Society was by then exactly twenty years old, and rather fewer of its members were resident in East Anglia than had been at the beginning; in addition, the mania for flint collecting was in decline. Clark was an active member of the old Society, as were Stuart Piggott, Christopher Hawkes and Charles Phillips. By 1933, their opinions had hardened and an effort was made to widen the scope of the Society's interests by dropping the East Anglian designation. It was not until the Annual General Meeting of 1935 that the crucial vote was taken; the principal supporter of the *status quo*, Reid Moir, had intimated that he would be absent and a small party, led by Piggott, made the journey from Avebury to Norwich in a borrowed car. The result was an overwhelming endorsement of the proposed change of title.¹⁵ Clark was voted into the Editorship, Phillips became Secretary and the worn-out debates about the antiquity of man in East Anglia were at an end. It was ironic that Reid Moir gave a paper on 'worked flints' from beneath the Red Crag of Suffolk immediately after the Society had dropped its East Anglian title and just when the new generation were empowered to publicly dismiss the eoliths from further debate.¹⁶

¹³ I. F. Smith, *Windmill Hill and Avebury. Excavations by Alexander Keiller 1925–39* (Oxford, 1965).

¹⁴ J. G. D. Clark, 'Discoidal polished flint knives: their typology and distribution', *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society of East Anglia*, 6 (1928), 40–54.

¹⁵ G. Clark, 'The Prehistoric Society: from East Anglia to the world', *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, 51 (1985), 1–13. The brief report of the AGM in *Proceedings*, 1 (1935), 162 can be amplified by the notice sent out to members beforehand, and a notice sent out after the event. These survive in the Society's archive.

¹⁶ Burkitt was one of the few prehistorians who continued to give house room to eoliths, and in his *The Old Stone Age* (3rd edn., London, 1955) he was still arguing that 'the existence of Tertiary man seems incontestable'; in his University Museum collection he had labelled a flint flake from an impossibly ancient Crag 'this is a fine specimen', but of what we never were told.

The first meeting of the new Prehistoric Society was on 2 May 1935 at Burlington House, when nine members were present, and Clark was one of six speakers on recent archaeological research. In 1935, the Society had 353 members; by 1938, the total was already 668. The precarious nature of the finances, as evidenced in the accounts for the early years, never deterred the Council from its aim of publishing an annual *Proceedings*. In Clark's first year as editor of the new journal, 1,000 copies were printed even as the accounts showed an uneasy state, cash in hand £156. 4s. 7d., money owing £179. 2s. -. The confidence of Council in what it was doing must have been overwhelmingly strong.

Clark served as Editor of the *Proceedings* for thirty-five years, and worked to enhance its standing as a journal of international importance. Invited papers were secured from most of the rising stars of prehistoric studies (Piggott, W. F. Grimes, Glyn Daniel) as well as by the established leaders (Childe, Fox, Garrod, Curwen). Clark's aim was to promote prehistory as a subject and discipline in its own right, and to expose British readers to the European dimensions and, eventually, to the world. Although he had various Assistant Editors, among them Stuart Piggott and Kenneth Oakley, he never released his grip on the structure of the journal and rarely allowed a paper to pass to press without some alteration of style or content. Many papers went off barely legible, such was the rewriting between the typed lines.

In 1931, Clark was on the point of completing his book on the Mesolithic of Britain when he heard of a remarkable discovery made in the North Sea. From a depth of some twenty fathoms, a trawler had hauled up some moorlog containing a barbed antler point of Maglemosian type. This find, from the Leman and Ower bank, confirmed Clark's theory that the south-east of Britain had been colonised from lands across the present North Sea, at a time when there had existed a wide and welcoming plain between the higher lands of what were to become southern England and the north-west of continental Europe. Harry Godwin and his wife Margaret applied the new science of pollen analysis to the moorlog and dated it to the Boreal phase, just the period of the Maglemosian in Denmark.¹⁷ Subsequent redating of the point to an earlier time is immaterial; the object stimulated great interest in and enthusiasm for Fenland research.

In the summer of 1932, Clark had seen enough Fenland landscapes,

¹⁷ H. Godwin, *Fenland: Its Ancient Past and Uncertain Future* (Cambridge, 1978); original report, H. and M. E Godwin, 'British Maglemose harpoon sites', *Antiquity*, 7 (1933), 36–48.

and had sufficient knowledge of the limitations of the existing archaeological evidence, to take the lead in an act that has had a profound influence on modern archaeology. He summoned a gathering of scientists, historians and archaeologists to a meeting in Peterhouse, and, with Charles Phillips and Harry Godwin, the Fenland Research Committee was formed.¹⁸ The Committee brought the subjects of botany, geology, geography, biology, history and prehistory together—almost certainly for the first time—in a combined approach to a diminishing resource, that of the Fenland of East Anglia. The Committee met three times a year, at different Cambridge colleges, and under the influence of competitive dinners the members could debate the programme of work, and resolve to undertake the necessary tasks. One of the first sites to be selected for work was Shippea Hill, a prehistoric site not far east of Cambridge. Clark led the excavation, with Godwin in regular attendance; the work was designed to explore the context of Mesolithic and Bronze Age flints eroding out of a sand ridge mostly submerged by peat. An enormously deep trench was excavated by labourers accustomed to working through damp peat, and the hole was stepped back; even so, the photo of Clark at the bottom, with the peaty sides entirely lacking shoring planks, is unnerving.¹⁹ At a depth of 15 feet, Neolithic material was found, and at 17 feet was the Mesolithic. The Bronze Age occupation lay near the top of the sequence and Godwin was able to examine both pollen and the sand-peat-clay sequences he had predicted. From here, the Research Committee moved on to other sites, publishing their results mostly in the *Antiquaries Journal*,²⁰ and in the short space of a decade managed to imprint the idea that an ecological approach to archaeological evidence was not only desirable at all times but essential wherever and whenever conditions allowed the full panoply of disciplines to be applied. In terms of British archaeology, the Fenland work

¹⁸ C. W. Phillips, 'The Fenland Research Committee, its past achievements and future prospects', in W. F. Grimes (ed.), *Aspects of Archaeology in Britain and Beyond* (London, 1957), pp. 258–73.

¹⁹ J. G. D. Clark, H. and M. E. Godwin, and M. H. Clifford, 'Report on recent excavations at Peacock's Farm, Shippea Hill, Cambridgeshire', *Antiquaries Journal*, 15 (1935), 284–319.

²⁰ J. G. D. Clark, 'Report on an Early Bronze Age site in the south-eastern Fens', *Antiquaries Journal*, 13 (1933), 266–96; H. and M. E. Godwin, J. G. D. Clark, and M. H. Clifford, 'A Bronze Age spearhead found in Methwold Fen, Norfolk', *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society of East Anglia*, 7 (1934), 395–8; J. G. D. Clark, H. and M. E. Godwin, and M. H. Clifford, 'Peacock's Farm, (1935) see above, n.19; J. G. D. Clark, 'Report on a Late Bronze Age site in Mildenhall Fen, West Suffolk', *Antiquaries Journal*, 16 (1936), 29–50; J. G. D. Clark and H. Godwin, 'A Late Bronze Age find near Stuntney, Isle of Ely', *Antiquaries Journal*, 20 (1940), 52–71.

did not make the permanent impression that Clark wanted; this was not due to an inadequacy of the approach, but was due in great measure to the general impression that the Fenland was a freak, unmatched elsewhere, both in its original and its current status, and thus ill-serving as a model. Time has shown how wrong that impression was, and how the opportunities were missed; Clark became well aware of this after the War.

The Mesolithic Age in Britain was published in 1932, and Clark obtained his Ph.D. the following year. His dissertation was not the same as his book, as in the former he covered the flint industries of the Mesolithic, Neolithic and early Metal Age. His collaboration with Piggott in publications began with a paper on the flint mines,²¹ and continued soon after with a report on work on the Essex coastline.²² Clark's interest in flint industries, so often ignored in considerations of his other, organic, archaeology, was always prominent in his many visits to museums and to sites throughout the world. His papers on microlithic industries in Britain and in western Europe served as landmarks for many years.²³

By 1935 Clark had almost thirty papers in print. All were on British sites and subjects. He was elected to a Bye-Fellowship at Peterhouse in 1932 and one of his early tasks as a junior Fellow was to introduce the Abbé Breuil to High Table in College; this passed off well enough, perhaps in part because both Breuil, surprisingly enough, and Clark were of the same mind in asserting that in the Stone Age, Europe was no more than a small northern projection of the greater land masses of Africa and Asia. To this view not everyone agreed, especially most of the French prehistorians.

Clark set off in 1933, and again in 1934, on his first major study tours to northern Europe. His aim was to collect material relating to early human settlement and ecological change in the northern lands, and

²¹ J. G. D. Clark and S. Piggott, 'The Age of the British flint mines', *Antiquity*, 7 (1933), 166–83.

²² S. Hazzledine Warren, S. Piggott, J. G. D. Clark, M. C. Burkitt and H. and M. E. Godwin, 'Archaeology of the submerged land surface of the Essex coast', *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, 2 (1936), 178–210.

²³ J. G. D. Clark, 'The classification of a microlithic culture: the Tardenoisian of Horsham', *Archaeological Journal*, 90 (1933), 52–77; 'Derivative forms of the *petit tranchet* in Britain', *Archaeological Journal*, 91 (1934), 32–58; 'A microlithic industry from the Cambridgeshire Fenland and other industries of Sauveterrian affinities from Britain', *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, 21 (1955), 3–20; 'Blade and trapeze industries of the European Stone Age', *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, 24 (1958), 24–42.

he visited Holland, Denmark and Germany, meeting three men in particular who influenced his work very significantly. Therkel Mathiasen was in mid-campaign on Mesolithic sites, J. Troels-Smith was engaged in refinements of pollen analysis, and Gudmun Hatt was studying primitive cultivation; most of their work was published three or four years later, but Clark was able to observe their individual environmental and ecological approaches in the field.²⁴

But there were others at work too, and the sites visited included some from which inorganics were wholly absent. The fishing stations in particular, some in current use, and older examples then being investigated,²⁵ must have encouraged Clark in his quest to secure material for a major book. In 1936, *The Mesolithic Settlement of Northern Europe* appeared.²⁶ In this, he set out his aim—to put archaeology in the context of a totality of an ecosystem. He applied a battery of newly-developed and well-established techniques to the dating of the various industrial complexes so far identified over the vast territory of northern Europe, and he did not lose sight of the fact that environmental change in such a severe climate could have profound impacts on communities. Yet equally important to future work was his realisation that while he was dabbling with the lithic industries of the British Mesolithic, in Denmark his contemporaries were studying not only flints but also the wood, fibre, bone and antler artefacts surviving in the bogs. His chance to make the case for wetland sites to a wider public was made in his 1939 book *Archaeology and Society*, a wide-ranging essay on modern archaeology, its strengths and its weaknesses.²⁷ By this time, of course, the wave of nationalistic exaggeration was about to break upon Europe and the world. The book touched upon the threat, but concentrated on ancient economies, technology, housing, exchange of goods, and intellectual life.

²⁴ T. Mathiasen, 'Gudenaakulturen. En Mesolithisk Inlands bebyggelse i Jylland', *Aarbøger* (1937), 1–186; J. Troels-Smith, 'Stammebade fra Aamosen'. *Fra Nationalmuseets Arbejdsmark* (1946); G. Hatt 1937, *Landbrug i Danmarks Oldtid* (Copenhagen, 1937).

²⁵ e.g. I. Arwidsson, 'Några fasta fisken i Södra Bullaren från äldre tider', *Göteborgs och Bohusläns Fornminnesförenings Tidsskrift*, (1936), 92–122. Arwidsson's work here was only one of the family's contributions to Clark's development; Greta Arwidsson's later work at Valsgårde and Birka played a part in Clark's increasing interest in symbols of prestige - a far cry from the wooden stakes on the Bullaren Lake.

²⁶ J. G. D. Clark, *The Mesolithic Settlement of Northern Europe: A Study of the Food Gathering Peoples of Northern Europe During the Early Post-glacial Period* (Cambridge, 1936).

²⁷ Grahame Clark, *Archaeology and Society* (London, 1939).

Clark was appointed as University Assistant Lecturer in Archaeology at Cambridge in 1935, at an annual salary of £150. He worked under the Departmental Head, Ellis Minns, who had encouraged him throughout his undergraduate and graduate days. Minns gave Clark an offprint of his paper on 'The Art of the Northern Nomads' in 1942, inscribing it 'To Grahame Clark my most surpassing pupil'. In the Department, Clark could indulge himself by teaching the Mesolithic, by forays into the fields of Cambridgeshire and beyond, by serious involvement with the *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* and by a close acquaintance with the ethnographic collections of the University Museum. Here it was that he began to plan for major field projects, into the Fens with his Research Committee, and elsewhere for sites that would yield the sort of evidence he needed for his aim—societies in their true ecological setting. In 1937–8 he made a bad decision to excavate a Mesolithic site in Surrey, which yielded thousands of flints but little or nothing in the way of structures, and organic survival was poor.²⁸ He admitted later that he should have gone farther afield to the Somerset Levels where Godwin was already achieving much, and well-preserved sites were appearing.²⁹

Several of the most successful of the students he taught soon ventured into archaeologically-uncharted lands. Thurstan Shaw, who graduated in 1936, became Curator of the Anthropological Museum of the Gold Coast (1937–45), and Desmond Clark became Director of the Rhodes-Livingstone Museum of Northern Rhodesia (1938–61). These men provided inspiration for Clark's eventual adoption of the world as his prehistoric theme. In 1939 he was able to anticipate the future with the unexpected (to readers) publication in the *Proceedings* of Donald Thompson's paper on the seasonal activities of the people of Cape York in Australia;³⁰ this paper had a profound effect on the editor and, had the war not intervened, he would have instigated a campaign in the Fens to try out his theory on the Mesolithic and Neolithic communities. By the time he could do this, the opportunity in the Fens had passed. He made a plea for the survival of the ancient heritage, in all its forms, in his 1939 book *Archaeology and Society*.

²⁸ J. G. D. Clark and W. F. Rankine, 'Excavations at Farnham, Surrey (1937–38): the Horsham culture and the question of Mesolithic dwellings', *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, 5 (1939), 61–118.

²⁹ H. Godwin, *The Archives of the Peat Bogs* (Cambridge, 1981).

³⁰ D. Thompson, 'The seasonal factor in human culture', *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, 5 (1939), 209–21.

While waiting to be called up for military service, he took lessons in Russian from Ellis Minns and apparently found this much less formidable than expected; deflation set in when presented with the poems of Pushkin, but his limited knowledge was put to good use later in life. In the RAF Volunteer Reserves he was first sent to Medmenham to the aerial photograph interpretation unit, and here he met again Stuart Piggott, Glyn Daniel, Charles McBurney and Dorothy Garrod (the new Disney Professor of Archaeology). Most of them were sent overseas, but Clark remained in Britain because of a health problem. In 1944 he transferred to the Air Historical branch in London; this allowed him to re-establish a home in Cambridge from where he commuted to work each day, writing on the train and editing papers for the *Proceedings*. He also found time for visits to art galleries in London, arousing an interest in modern art in which he could indulge later on. In great part stimulated by his pre-war travels, he also began to assemble material and thoughts on a new approach, that of an economic prehistory, one not based on typologies, and inorganics, but one more securely founded on seasonalities and organic survivals. Papers on bees, water, seals, whales, forests, sheep, fishing, and fowling flowed from his pen in the years 1942–8;³¹ these short papers were revelatory to almost all archaeologists except those then working in the water-saturated sites of Denmark and north Germany. From here, the different work and emphases of Johannes Iversen and Albrecht Rust made Clark ever more determined in his ecological approach.³² There had to be comparable opportunities in Britain, and all the necessary multi-disciplinary studies were ready to be mobilised.

At the war's end, Clark was made a full University Lecturer and helped Dorothy Garrod develop a new Part II in Archaeology for the

³¹ 'Bees in antiquity', *Antiquity*, 16 (1942), 208–15; 'Water in antiquity', *Antiquity*, 18 (1944), 1–15; 'Seal-hunting in the Stone Age of north-western Europe: a study in economic prehistory', *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, 12 (1946), 12–48; 'Forest clearance and prehistoric farming', *Economic History Review*, 17 (1947), 45–51; 'Sheep and swine in the husbandry of prehistoric Europe', *Antiquity*, 21 (1947), 122–36; 'Whales as an economic factor in prehistoric Europe', *Antiquity*, 21 (1947), 84–104; 'The development of fishing in prehistoric Europe', *Antiquaries Journal*, 28 (1948), 45–85; 'Fowling in prehistoric Europe', *Antiquity*, 22 (1948), 116–30.

These papers were reprinted in *Economic Prehistory* (1989).

³² J. Iversen, 'Land occupation in Denmark's Stone Age. A pollen-analytical study of the influence of farming culture on the vegetational development' *Danmarks Geologiske Undersøgelse II R 66* (Copenhagen, 1941). A. Rust, *Die alt- und mittelsteinzeitlichen funde von Stellmoor* (Neumünster, 1943); *Das altsteinzeitliche rentierjägerlager Meiendorf* (Neumünster, 1937).

Triplos. Soon he was able to make another extended tour of northern Europe, this time to the far north with a Leverhulme Scholarship. He travelled up the west coast of Norway in a small boat which called at fishing villages in every fjord to deliver mail and stores. Clark could go ashore for daily supplies of milk and other food, and could observe how much the communities depended on the sea, their only means of travel, on fishing, and on preserving the catches for the long winters. From Norway and Sweden he travelled to Finland where his Helsinki hotel sheets were made of paper, and his coffee was brewed from parched grain, such were the reparation demands. This tour of 1947, and a later Australian visit in 1964, were probably the most influential on Clark's own evolution as a prehistorian. The Scandinavian visit allowed him to experience in part the wide landscapes, the environmental harshness yet also its richness, and to observe the seemingly primitive yet highly developed economic practices of the people both inland and coastal. He could hardly avoid noticing the wide use of organic substances for tools, nor the richness of folk culture; on a northern train he was rudely disturbed by a bunch of drunken travellers, which presumably added something to his appreciation of folk behaviour. He wrote a short account of the more archaeologically satisfying aspects of folk culture and prehistory in 1951.³³

In 1950 Clark was offered a Fellowship at Peterhouse, which he held for forty-five years. Here in College he encountered a wide range of disciplines, among them the economic history of Michael Postan. Postan was Lecturer, then Professor, of Economic History at the University, and a Fellow of Peterhouse since 1935. His *Historical Methods in Social Sciences* had appeared in 1939, but it was his work towards *The Medieval Economy and Society* and *Essays on Medieval Agriculture and the Medieval Economy* (1973) that were the stimulus. Postan awakened Clark's interest in prehistoric agriculture that had remained dormant for some years, although Godwin had pursued the evidence from pollen analysis for some time for the Fenland Research Committee. The emerging Neolithic was important, but it did not alter Clark's own opinion of those who devoted themselves solely to the developed Neolithic, and especially those inclined to visit megaliths; these people were 'secondary archaeologists'. There may have been a deliberate attempt here to distance himself from certain of his colleagues, but

³³ J. G. D. Clark, 'Folk-culture and the study of European prehistory', in Grimes (ed.), *Aspects of Archaeology* (1951), pp. 49–65.

he said the same of the research students who went the way of the big stones.

As a University Lecturer, Clark was not always appreciated by his students. His lectures were generally considered to be rather poorly constructed, and he often wandered from the subject in hand. More than once he gave a detailed Part II lecture by mistake to a bunch of first-year students who may have felt happy to be considered able to take it, but who mostly could not understand what was going on. For those legitimately taking his courses on the Mesolithic or the beginnings of agriculture, the *post mortem* of the lectures would take place in a nearby coffee house, either 'The Bun Shop' or 'Hawkins' (both alas no more); here the delivery of the information was criticised, but no one would think of missing the lectures, and sometimes there was excitement when Clark would launch into an off-the-cuff description of a recent discovery that might even be relevant to the course of instruction. He never much ventured, throughout his many years as a prominent archaeologist, to get absorbed into popular archaeology. Glyn Daniel was very successful both in television and in writing for the public, and Clark must have felt unable to compete at this level. He mostly kept quiet about the public face of archaeology, with the occasional swipe at 'what might charitably be termed post-T.V. books'.³⁴

In 1948, Clark was told about the discovery of some microliths at Seamer Carr in Yorkshire. He was already aware of a number of antler barbed points from Holderness, and hastened to the site. Here he found pieces of antler and bone sticking out from the side of a ditch. Godwin was appraised of the potential and he and Clark mounted an ambitious campaign in 1949–51.³⁵ The site, Star Carr, was explored with great care, and the organic material, for so long sought after by Clark, emerged in great quantities. The British Museum (Natural History) undertook the faunal analyses and introduced a vacuum chamber to ensure the continued preservation of the bone and antler. The story of Star Carr has been told so often, and the reinterpretations so frequent, that little needs to be said here. Inorganic flintwork could be seen in a proper subsidiary, yet still important, relationship to the bark, wood, bone and antler artefacts made and used by the occupants of a wooden

³⁴ J. G. D. Clark, 'Prehistory since Childe', *Bulletin of the Institute of Archaeology*, 13 (1976), 1–21.

³⁵ J. G. D. Clark, 'A preliminary report on excavations at Star Carr, Seamer, Scarborough, Yorkshire, 1949', *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, 15 (1949), 52–65.

platform built out into the pool. Godwin's environmental analyses were crucial to the interpretation of the site, and Clark could assert with some justification that here was a British site to rival, indeed surpass, almost all of the Danish sites. The inventor of the radiocarbon dating method, Willard Libby, undertook to process a sample of the wooden platform and produced a date of 9488 ± 350 years before present; the site was on all counts the contemporary of Klosterlund in Denmark, where only flint and stone objects had survived. In the monograph of the site, published in 1954,³⁶ Clark produced a classic diagram showing how the Mesolithic group had exploited the animal, vegetable and mineral resources, for food, clothing, fire, tools and weapons, and adornment. He also made the point, again, that Quaternary Research was vital in any serious prehistoric research project, particularly those dealing with the Stone Age. Godwin had only recently assumed charge of the newly-formed Sub-Department of Quaternary Research in the Botany School and Star Carr was the best possible example of the great future that that institution was to have. For Clark, the successful use of the rich faunal remains in his interpretation, and the inspiring and entirely satisfactory radiocarbon date, were to remain with him as guides to future research projects.

Meanwhile, his more theoretical studies of subsistence practices and the exploitation of natural resources continued and an opportunity arose to bring his various papers together. Gordon Childe had retired as Abercromby Professor in Edinburgh and Clark was a candidate for the chair. Piggott was chosen and at once invited his friend and colleague to deliver the 1949 Munro Lectures in Scotland. Clark accepted, and the lectures appeared in printed form as *Prehistoric Europe: The Economic Basis*, in 1952.³⁷ To many, this is Clark's major triumph. The book went into various languages, including Russian; Minns would be pleased. In the same year, Dorothy Garrod made way and Clark was elected to the Disney Professorship in Cambridge. In the next year he took the Sc.D. degree at Cambridge on the basis of his published work. He was unsure about the degree, whether it should have been the Litt.D. or the Sc.D., but in part was persuaded towards science by the offer of a free scarlet gown of a deceased geologist; for a prehistorian, it was a fitting choice.

³⁶ J. G. D. Clark, *Excavations at Star Carr: An Early Mesolithic Site at Seamer, near Scarborough, Yorkshire* (Cambridge, 1954).

³⁷ J. G. D. Clark, *Prehistoric Europe: The Economic Basis* (London, 1952).

His 1953 Albert Reckitt Archaeological Lecture to the British Academy gave Clark an opportunity to express his economic prehistory in other ways, and foreshadowed the path he wanted to follow in his later writings. He used this lecture as one of the bases for his final manuscripts: ‘. . . economic progress, in the sense of a growing capacity to utilise natural resources such as we can trace in prehistory, marks stages in the liberation of the human spirit by making possible more varied responses and so accelerates the processes of change and diversification over the whole realm of culture’.³⁸

In 1952 Clark broke out of Europe to attend the inaugural meeting of the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Prehistoric Research in New York. This brought opportunities for archaeological fieldwork in many areas of the world, and Clark was soon to benefit his students and others by Wenner-Gren activities. However, he set himself the task first of carrying out more local excavations, partly to test his observations on sites where skilful work had revealed surprisingly detailed information about settlements in particular. In Norfolk, first, he tested an Iron Age site but conditions were very poor.³⁹ Then in 1957–8 he undertook a major piece of excavation at Hurst Fen near Cambridge where, according to expectations, he might have found Neolithic house plans and settlement organisation along the lines of the sand-based Neolithic structures just across the North Sea. Although the site yielded vast amounts of flint implements and pottery, severe erosion of the Fen soils had removed all trace of structures. This was a great disappointment and the report on the site, as prompt as ever, was Clark’s last excavation paper.⁴⁰

Henceforth he was in analytical mode, and increasingly involved with committees both inside and outside the University. He served on the Ancient Monuments Board, on the Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England, on various management committees and councils, and continued to edit the *Proceedings*. He never took kindly to University politics or the machinations needed then, and now,

³⁸ J. G. D. Clark, ‘The economic approach to prehistory: Albert Reckitt Archaeological Lecture, 1953’, *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 39 (1953), 215–38. This quotation varies only in some slight degree from the published lecture, and is Clark’s own annotated version which he aimed to present in his *A Path to Prehistory* (see above, n. 1), or in his *Man the Spiritual Primate* of which only one chapter, and various notes, exist in manuscript.

³⁹ J. G. D. Clark and C. I. Fell, ‘The early Iron Age site at Mickle Moor-Hill, West Harling, Norfolk, and its pottery’, *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, 19 (1953), 1–39.

⁴⁰ J. G. D. Clark, E. S. Higgs, and I. H. Longworth, ‘Excavations at the Neolithic site Hurst Fen, Mildenhall, Suffolk (1954, 1957 and 1958)’, *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, 26 (1960), 202–45.

to ensure progress both structural (plant) and academic (staff); his time as Disney Professor and as occasional Chairman of the Faculty was propitious for augmenting his staff but he never bothered to work the system and press for new developments. Yet he was assiduous in encouraging every member of his existing staff to conduct research of almost whatever kind, and wherever in the world, and to help in its publication. One aspect of his Headship was widely appreciated; he never felt it necessary to have a formal Departmental meeting. Decisions for Faculty were made 'on the hoof' and communicated as and when necessary, or not at all. He was Chairman of the Faculty for three years and would race through the Agenda, overriding other Departmental Heads whenever discussion and decision seemed to be developing into debate. His aims for his Department were always clear—make time for study and research, and for graduate students, and for undergraduate teaching, in that descending order.

He had a succession of research students for whom he acted as supervisor or in other capacities, and he was immensely proud of their achievements. Some reflect wryly on the lack of real supervision of their subjects; Clark would often launch into a discourse on a totally unrelated topic, interesting perhaps but not much practical use for a student aiming to complete a dissertation on a specific subject, generally one suggested by Clark in the first place. His own graduate students went on to create new concepts in archaeological research or to direct major institutions in various parts of the world. More than one he sent off to new jobs in Africa or Australia, the recruit sometimes never having heard of the particular region or the precise subject which was to be the focus of research. Most survived the encounters, and were anxious to reciprocate when Clark, later on, began to travel the world⁴¹ He suffered two terrible blows in his later years, with the deaths of David Clarke and Glyn Isaac, both Peterhouse men and world leaders in their fields. He took comfort in their accomplishments and those of the others, and while still Disney Professor he was assiduous in monitoring and encouraging the progress of all the graduates of his Department who participated in the expansion of world archaeology in the late 1960s and 1970s. Clark's famous map of the world, with its many coloured pins showing where the graduates had landed to establish outposts of the Cambridge school, was never prominently displayed,

⁴¹ Clark wrote, often movingly, about his many students and their achievements in his book *Prehistory at Cambridge and Beyond* (Cambridge, 1989).

but he kept a mental image of the world with its Cambridge diaspora, and he could identify every region with its current 'holder', the work underway, and the latest publications emanating from the colonies. Of course he knew it was an exaggeration of the prominence of his school, but that was no hindrance to encouragement. Although his book *Pre-history at Cambridge and Beyond* appeared only in 1989, it reflected upon the flow of talent that had passed into and through Cambridge, with only a few remaining at home. Much autobiographical material appears in this book, and it shows Clark in a rightfully expansionist mode, and the pride which he had for the accomplishments of his students.

As Head of a prestigious Department and therefore on the receiving end of a succession of visitors to Cambridge, Clark used his College Fellowship to the full, and many a foreign archaeologist recalls dining at High Table where the talk could veer wildly from the quality of the food to University politics and inevitably to archaeology, without any noticeable break in the flow either of words or of food. Another divertissement for newcomers was a tour with Clark to visit local sites, or to travel together by car to meetings outside Cambridge. His abilities as the operator of a motor vehicle are legendary, and some of the stories told by former passengers are certainly true. Colleagues, visiting scholars and students all had variously unnerving experiences with Clark at the wheel of his Mercedes or other powerful car. Sudden braking, as a monument was sighted in the distance, created as much alarm to passengers as it did to the drivers of following vehicles; it was one way of picking up local terms of abuse. Clark's sense of direction was not often wrong but in any event there was little opportunity for anyone, especially a student, to suggest a change of course as the flow of words continued without respite. Many visitors recall with delight their times in the Fens with Clark; a few still shudder. Clark was wholly unconcerned with such matters, as one specific example may indicate. In the early 1960s, *en route* from Cambridge to Birmingham on the hitherto untried M1 motorway, and in driving rain, Clark placed his Mercedes firmly in the outside lane and rushed northwards at over 100 m.p.h, growling only as a very occasional Jaguar passed by on the inside lane. On approaching the Bull Ring, an innovative and terrifying ring road recently constructed, Clark handed over his only map to his newly-appointed Assistant Lecturer, suggesting that this would help us find our way into the city centre. The map was in an AA book of 1935 when, presumably, horse and cart were the order of the day. Cars, like bicycles

and typewriters (but not his staff), were there to be used without respite until they were deemed unfit for the task; a new machine was then purchased.

Like most field archaeologists of the day, Clark was obliged to make most of his own maps, plans and drawings. He was surprisingly patient and talented at this, not so well able to create attractive artwork as Stuart Piggott could, but none the less entirely competent. His maps were invariably models of clarity. For the Star Carr report, he was able to take time to delineate over 100 barbed antler points and various pieces of bone and wood, in part because his literary activities were curtailed by a broken arm. The fact that Clark of all people was doing this kind of work amazed a small group of visiting Dutch archaeologists who were accustomed to assigning such tasks to draughtsmen; yet there was no better way to become acquainted with the artefacts. Photography was a craft never fully mastered and not often employed as a serious expression of the evidence. Site photography was a haphazard affair; at Hurst Fen he decided that a high elevation photograph was called for, but after trying to mount a contraption made of chairs and planks, he abandoned the attempt with the words, 'No, the loss to science would be too great'. Whether this referred to the potential damage to site or to archaeologist is unclear.

Clark was elected to the British Academy in 1951 and was Chairman of Section 10 (Archaeology) from 1974 to 1978. He was an active member of the Section but it was not until the late 1960s that he seized the opportunities to involve the Section and the Academy in major projects. Before that time, he embarked on a series of journeys to various parts of the world, rarely on holiday (apart from a Scandinavian visit in 1955) and often as a visiting lecturer or professor. He was the Grant MacCurdy Lecturer at Harvard in 1957, W. Evans Professor at Otago and Commonwealth Visiting Fellow in Australia in 1964, between which times he attended the Congress of Pre- and Protohistoric Sciences at Hamburg and Rome. A notable excursion to the Netherlands with the Prehistoric Society in 1960 allowed a group of recent graduates to observe the leading British prehistorians, Clark, Piggott *et al.*, in earnest and sometimes amicably heated discourse with W. van Giffen and his formidable graduates and associates P. Modderman, W. Glasbergen and H. Waterbolk. Clark was always held in very considerable respect by his contemporaries and it was not surprising to see even Piggott and his colleague R. J. C. Atkinson anxious to make a favourable impression on one of Clark's visits to their site at Wayland's

Smithy. Lounging in their directorial hut one day, drinking gin with a visitor, they were roused to frantic action when told that Professor Clark was walking up to the excavation. Clark did nothing to cultivate this superior position, but probably did little to undermine it. He was by far the most respected British prehistorian on the continent of Europe where his reputation was regularly enhanced by his visits and the encouragement given to young research workers in particular.

In 1961 Clark published the first edition of *World Prehistory: An Outline*, basing his syntheses in part on his own travels and visits, on the work of his own students, and to a considerable extent on his contacts in various parts of the world.⁴² One of the basic elements of the book, and indeed essential for comparative studies, was the ever-wider presentation of absolute dates from all parts of the world. This was the master key that unlocked the doors of the world for Clark. It gave him the framework for the patterns of behaviour that he could deduce from the material culture observed, and it allowed him to speculate on contacts, influences and indigenous development. He pursued this in more detailed ways soon after his *World Prehistory* appeared. The first edition was flawed by omissions and some errors, as he well knew. But he also knew that some senior archaeologists could not find it in themselves to accept a theory of world prehistory, arguing that it was only possible to comprehend more specific, solid, site or landscape-based archaeology. Clark ignored such criticism because he knew the time had come to move outwards to the widest concepts of space and time. Almost at once, he began to reassemble the evidence and to augment it by his own research. A pleasant interruption to this was his installation as Commander, Order of the Dannebrog, in 1961; as someone who had always looked to Denmark for both evidence and inspiration, this award was particularly gratifying.

In 1968 he was in Japan, Taiwan, the Philippines and New Zealand. In Taipei *en route* to some meeting or other, his host stepped into a bookshop and brought out a pirated copy of Clark's *Archaeology and Society*. This was not the only such unauthorised version of his books. But in this case, redress, if not financial then emotional, was secured in the Philippines. Clark was able to see the fabulous Locsin collection of

⁴² G. Clark, *World Prehistory: An Outline* (Cambridge, 1961). It was about this time that he began to publish consistently under the name Grahame Clark rather than J. G. D. Clark. This was in part because J. D. Clark (Desmond Clark) was also actively publishing and some confusion could, and did, arise. In 1990 the laudation of the Erasmus Foundation cited the book *The Prehistory of Africa* as one of Grahame's major publications; it was Desmond's.

Chinese porcelain of the Sung, Yuan and early Ming periods, and was then invited to the Locsin estate where the excavation of a cemetery was in progress. The grave goods already found included Chinese porcelain of the Yuan dynasty (AD 1279–1368), and Clark was asked to continue the excavation of a grave where the labourers had dug down to the level of the burial. Lo and behold, he soon exposed some fine porcelain. Lunch was then taken under the palm trees, with white-coated waiters serving suckling pig on fine china. Upon departure, Clark was presented with a box containing ‘his’ excavated porcelain. A perfect day.

From 1964 to 1969 he travelled widely, not only to the east but also to Canada and America, and to parts of the Near East and central Europe. In Australia in 1964 on a Commonwealth Visiting Scholarship he had a particularly satisfying time, with a field trip into Central Australia with Norman Tindale. Here he could observe the aboriginal people’s use of space in their hunting and gathering economies, and he could try to comprehend their complex cultural patterns; this visit was profoundly important for Clark’s vision of prehistory. He generally made assiduous records of all his observations, but on this journey his notebook vanished into some crevice in the great outback; this loss may account for a slip of the pen in one of Clark’s later publications where the Wombah midden appears as Wombat.⁴³ More importantly, Clark’s observations of work at the stone quarries and long-distance distributions led him to an appraisal of traffic in stone axe and adze blades which appeared in 1965.⁴⁴ In New Zealand, as W. Evans Professor at Otago, Clark was intensely interested in the contrasting ways of life of the Maoris of the North Island and those of the South Island, due in good measure to the cultivation of introduced food plants in the North, and the implications therefrom for exchanges in materials and commodities. The impressions gained in Australia and New Zealand were to direct Clark in his future writings, not only in the *World Prehistory: A New Outline* of 1969,⁴⁵ but also in his later thoughts on symbols and interactions which appeared as lengthy essays in the 1980s.

⁴³ John Mulvaney has the last photograph of the book, and the reference is G. Clark, *World Prehistory: A New Outline* (Cambridge, 1969), p. 260.

⁴⁴ G. Clark, ‘Traffic in stone axe and adze blades’, *Economic History Review*, 2nd ser., 18 (1965), 1–28. He had already touched on this subject in his 1948 paper on South Scandinavian flint in the far north, *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, 14 (1948), 221–32.

⁴⁵ G. Clark, *World Prehistory: A New Outline* (Cambridge, 1969).

In 1967 he received the Hodgkins Medal of the Smithsonian Institution, and in 1971 the Viking Fund Medal of the Wenner-Gren Foundation. These were followed by the Lucy Wharton Gold Medal from the University of Pennsylvania in 1974, the Gold Medal of the Society of Antiquaries of London in 1978 and the Chandra Medal of the Asiatic Society in 1979. He was a Corresponding or Foreign Member of a large number of European and American Academies.⁴⁶

In 1969 he was Hitchcock Professor at Berkeley in California where his close friend J. Desmond Clark was based, and in his lectures he returned to the importance of basic archaeological evidence. Artefacts were the signposts of the course of prehistory, as everyone should know, but they were also the mechanism that distinguished humans from other animals. They signified the human capacity to identify and assign importance both to the everyday elements of prehistoric life and to the symbols of the thought processes that reflected forces beyond the grasp of humans. This statement served notice that Clark was not about to fall into the abyss of writing prehistory without evidence to back it up, but it was also a comment on those close at hand, both in America and in Europe, who were content to pick at the cherries and ignore the branches and trunk without which the fruit would not exist. The powerful theme pursued here, and in his Albert Reckitt Archaeological Lecture as long ago as 1953, was simple: economic progress empowered the human spirit. It was a theme that Clark continued to develop throughout his later years.

Clark did not devote as much research time to the Americas as he did to other parts of the world, but he made an impassioned plea to North American archaeologists when he made a tour across much of Canada in 1976. He commented upon the tendency of some current archaeologists to treat their subject as a science, and almost a pure science at that.⁴⁷ Clark stated that this view was misguided and 'it is also pathetic'. Natural science was a mere artefact of man, elaborate and expensive, and yet nothing more than a means by which man could comprehend and manipulate his environment; he might have included

⁴⁶ Royal Society of Northern Antiquaries (Copenhagen); Swiss Prehistoric Society; German Archaeological Institute; Archaeological Institute of America; Finnish Archaeological Society; American Academy of Arts and Sciences; Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters; Royal Netherlands Academy of Sciences; Royal Society of Sciences, Uppsala; National Academy of Sciences, America; Royal Society of Humane Letters, Lund.

⁴⁷ G. Clark, 'New perspectives in Canadian archaeology: a summation', in A. G. McKay (ed.), *New Perspectives in Canadian Archaeology* (Ottawa, 1976), pp. 237–48.

culture in his argument. In this, he signalled his intention to devote time and writing to the development of his thoughts on the uniqueness of the human condition, and on the particular elements in the archaeological record that could most easily identify that state.

In the late 1960s, while writing two slighter books on *Prehistoric Societies* (with Stuart Piggott) and *The Stone Age Hunters*,⁴⁸ Clark took up a theme that was to develop into a major research project. By using the newly-available radiocarbon dates for the earliest agriculturally based communities throughout Europe and the Near East, he could produce a map that conclusively showed the spread of farming from the Near East into south-eastern Europe and across to the north and west.⁴⁹ This map, however refined and with a multiplicity of new spots, has never been seriously disputed although Clark was doubtless happy to accept minor adjustments and local innovations. But having secured the academic background and demonstrated the dynamics of economic change, he took steps to implement active research into the subject of early European agriculture. With the encouragement of the Sub-Department of Quaternary Research, Robert Rodden was despatched to Greece to begin a major excavation on the early Neolithic site of Nea Nikomedeia.⁵⁰ Eric Higgs, already attached to the Department of Archaeology and with practical experience of animal husbandry, went the same way and began investigations into earlier sites in the Aegean region.⁵¹ Clark visited Greece and was inspired by what he saw. He worked with others in the British Academy to establish a Major Research Project on the Early History of Agriculture. A small committee was assembled in 1966, meeting in the same parlour in Peterhouse as had been used over thirty years before, when the Fenland Research Committee was established. Indeed, a majority of the new committee had been there at the earlier meeting. This initiated a major project that took much of Clark's time and energy, although Higgs was made director. The work

⁴⁸ G. Clark, *The Stone Age Hunters* (London, 1967).

⁴⁹ G. Clark, 'Radiocarbon dating and the expansion of farming culture from the Near East over Europe', *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, 31 (1965), 58–73.

⁵⁰ R. J. Rodden, 'Excavations at the Early Neolithic site at Nea Nikomedeia, Greek Macedonia (1961 Season)', *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, 28 (1962), 267–88.

⁵¹ S. I. Dakaris, E. S. Higgs, and R. W. Hey, 'The climate, environment and industries of Stone Age Greece: Part 1', *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 30 (1964), 194–214; E. S. Higgs and C. Vita-Finzi, 'The climate, environment and industries of Stone Age Greece: Part 2', *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, 32 (1966), 1–29; E. S. Higgs, C. Vita-Finzi, D. R. Harris and A. E. Fagg, 'The climate, environment and industries of Stone Age Greece: Part 3', *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, 33 (1967), 1–29.

done in Greece and elsewhere by the team was designed to explore the economic aspects of prehistory set within an ever-increasingly detailed palaeoenvironmental frame. Clark pressed for rapid publication of results, in a monograph series,⁵² and provided much-needed encouragement and control at times of stress when the original aims of the project were threatened by the sheer speed of the work being done.

At the same time as he was demonstrating the spread of farming across Europe, and initiating the project, Clark took some of his British colleagues to task in a classic paper on the invasion hypothesis in British archaeology.⁵³ He could not accept that every innovation that appeared in the record had to be the result of new arrivals from the continent. That was too easy and, as he reiterated in the first Gordon Childe Memorial Lecture, 'it has tended in the past to inhibit research into alternative causes'.⁵⁴ His 1966 paper was not universally welcomed but it had the desired effect on the bulk of British prehistorians, who now looked more carefully before they leaped across the channel seeking originators for developments in these islands.

The Early History of Agriculture project absorbed much of Clark's emotions in the active years of its work. He was more content to see from a distance the work of his colleague Charles McBurney. McBurney's great excavations in North Africa and on Jersey absorbed much space and energy within the confines of the Department, and Clark had the greatest respect for the work of post-excavation analyses and the painstaking way by which McBurney put together the monograph of the Haua Fteah.⁵⁵ It was a happier relationship between the two than existed between Clark and the other senior figure, Glyn Daniel, but a working pattern was established with all and there can be little doubt that the Department offered an exciting spectrum of approaches to graduate students in particular. Undergraduates had their turn too, but only those who went the way of one camp or another had much hope of success in the Tripos; the rest left somewhat bemused by it all, with

⁵² E. S. Higgs (ed.), *Papers in Economic Prehistory* (Cambridge, 1972); E. S. Higgs (ed.), *Palaeoeconomy* (Cambridge, 1975); E. S. Higgs, M. R. Jarman, G. N. Bailey, and H. N. Jarman, *Early European Agriculture* (Cambridge, 1982).

⁵³ J. G. D. Clark, 'The invasion hypothesis in British archaeology', *Antiquity*, 40 (1966), 172–89.

⁵⁴ J. G. D. Clark, 'Prehistory since Childe', see above, n. 34.

⁵⁵ C. B. M. McBurney, *The Haua Fteah (Cyrenaica)* (Cambridge, 1967). The Jersey excavations had to be published after McBurney's death: P. Callow and J. M. Cornford (eds.), *La Cotte de St Brelade 1961–1978* (Norwich, 1986).

Second Class degrees. Clark did better; he became Commander, Order of the British Empire, in 1971.

Although much absorbed with his travels and new experiences, and assembling vast quantities of new information in the late 1960s and early 1970s, Clark was always aware of his original base of research in Northern Europe, and of his environmental and economic approaches, and in his debt to the site of Star Carr. He was anxious that the evidence from Star Carr should be capable of reworking and although his excavation records were not stratigraphically detailed enough for intricate work patterns to be deduced, none the less the bulk of the material and its excellent condition permitted new appraisals over the years. Clark made an effort himself to expose new thoughts in a widely-quoted paper of 1972, subtitled *A Case Study in Bioarchaeology*.⁵⁶ This long paper, essentially a small book, was a very substantial reworking and rethinking of the data from Star Carr. The 1954 monograph had appeared soon after the field seasons ended, and Clark felt that he wanted to expose the evidence to new and more fully-considered thoughts. A major section of the paper, titled 'Bioarchaeological interpretation', allowed him to deal with environment, social context, seasonality, site territory and food supply. It remains a model of his own archaeological evolution up to the early 1970s.

In 1972, Clark was a Visiting Professor at the University of Uppsala, and he became once more absorbed into the study of the earliest traces of human occupation in northern Europe. He received a Filosofie Doktor (*honoris causa*) from Uppsala University in 1976, an award that gave him much pleasure in the recognition by a Scandinavian university of his contributions to prehistory. Equally satisfying was a Doctor of Letters awarded by the National University of Ireland in the same year.

In 1975, *The Earlier Stone Age Settlement of Scandinavia* appeared, in which Clark tried to bring together the evidence newly-acquired since his pioneering book of 1936.⁵⁷ Many new discoveries had been made, and new techniques applied to their elucidation, but the new book was not as warmly received as had been the first, and it was obvious to Clark that the task of identifying the significant developments in a land with which he was familiar, but in which he was not resident, was

⁵⁶ G. Clark, 'Star Carr: A Case Study in Bioarchaeology' in *Addison-Wesley Modular Publication* (Reading, Mass., 1972).

⁵⁷ G. Clark, *The Earlier Stone Age Settlement of Scandinavia* (Cambridge, 1975).

beyond him; the pace of discovery was too great, and more importantly the new approaches made by a generation of Scandinavian scholars included concepts that Clark could not fully accept and therefore did not recognise in his book. He had planned a second book, *The Later Stone Age Settlement*, but did not pursue this as he would have been on less familiar chronological territory.

The multiplicity of scientific interests brought to bear on the Early History of Agriculture Project led easily enough to thoughts about the expansion of science-based archaeology, and Clark was instrumental in calling a meeting in 1972 between representatives of the British Academy, the Natural Environment Research Council, and the Royal Society. Archaeology and the natural sciences were debated in terms of equality of opportunity, but it was clear that the former would be the greater beneficiary of any union of resources. By 1974, Science-based Archaeology was on the agenda of the Science Research Council and in 1975 the Academy pressed for a solution to the problem of funding archaeological science from a wholly inadequate and inappropriate resource. In 1976, Clark assumed the Chair at the first Science-based Archaeology Committee, which consisted of a formidable array of scientists sympathetic to archaeology in one way or another. In 1980 he relinquished the Chair but by then major advances had been made, including the establishment of the Radiocarbon Accelerator Unit at Oxford. In that year, Clark gave the J. C. Jacobsen Memorial Lecture to the Danish Academy of Science, and he could point with some satisfaction to the results of the dating programme, on a world basis, and to the advances in an understanding of global environmental change.⁵⁸ These tools were essential in the efforts by archaeologists to comprehend the character and the pace of change within and between prehistoric communities.

Another abiding interest was in collecting porcelain. Clark had always been intrigued by Jomon pottery, not least by its early dating, and from 1968 when he had attended a Congress in Tokyo he became an avid collector of Far Eastern porcelain, some of it rare and extremely fragile. He probably took some amusement from the terrified looks on the faces of his students when they, invited to tea, were handed a piece, told its age (but not its price) and asked to admire it.

⁵⁸ In 1980, Clark was able to publish some of his thoughts about the relationships in 'World prehistory and natural science', the J. C. Jacobsen Memorial Lecture, *Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser*, 50 (1980), 1–40.

At Peterhouse, where he was Master 1973–80, he and his wife entertained scholars from all parts of the world, and without exception the visitors speak of their joy at being received so warmly in such dignified surroundings. Clark felt passionate about the College, and firmly believed that anyone fortunate enough to become attached to a place of learning and Fellowship should accept an obligation to work towards the general good rather than holing up in a room for personal study alone. He has been described as ‘an absolutely perfect Master of Peterhouse’. The College had such a hold on him that sometimes even prehistory had to wait; visitors who came during the Bumps were promptly bundled off with the Master to support Peterhouse. Clark would say: ‘these things are important, we can’t spend all of our time thinking about archaeology’. The College elected him to an Honorary Fellowship in 1980 and he continued to participate in College matters whenever possible. Welcome breaks from University and College politics were taken at Aldeburgh in Suffolk where he could sail his small boat in peace; rumour has it that he sailed as he drove. This time was a particularly happy one for him and Mollie. Gardening at his home in Cambridge was another interest and their Wilberforce Road garden had always been proudly displayed to a constant flow of visitors.

By the early 1970s, he was now wholly immersed in a world prehistory which he alone it seemed could grasp. His first two editions of the *World Prehistory* book had exposed the gaps in information, some real and some of his own, and he set to in ‘the sanctuary of the Master’s lodge at Peterhouse’ to work up the material flowing into Cambridge through visiting scholars, and also the information he had accumulated on his world travels. He had a formidable card index system that allowed him to build up a body of evidence which he could search at will for the latest references, discoveries, personalities and above all concepts. Quotations were liberally sprinkled throughout the cards, and he was always generous in acknowledging help of any kind in the lengthy dedications and lists in his publications. Writing drafts of his papers and books was an ever-absorbing task and pleasure, and when one report went off to the press, another was promptly initiated at his desk in the Master’s lodge or in the comfortable home he and Mollie acquired after 1980.

Clark was invited to India in 1978 by B. K. Thapar, Director-General of the Archaeological Survey. Thapar had spent some time in Cambridge and had provided Clark with material for his revision of *World Prehistory*. In India, Clark gave the first Wheeler Memorial

Lectures, on the contribution of Sir Mortimer to Indian archaeology. The two lectures, published soon after,⁵⁹ allowed Clark to expound on Wheeler's disciplined approach to field-work and to ponder on his legacy to Indian archaeology. Clark was generous in his praise of the first subject, but less so of the second; he felt that Indian archaeologists should now break out of the shackles that a too-rigid approach to fieldwork *à la* Wheeler might create. The chronologies had now been established, and it was time to ask more searching questions of the evidence. Of course, it was phrased well, as it had to be in the circumstances.

In 1977 Clark published the third and final edition of his book, *World Prehistory in New Perspective*.⁶⁰ This was a total rewrite of his previous efforts, was far longer and better constructed. It bore all the signs of a greater awareness of the prehistoric world in all its variety, and of the need to refine the information by more, and more-refined, research. Radiocarbon dating was extensively used to correlate events, if not on a world-wide basis, then at least on a continental frame. This book, like the other two editions, went into translations in various languages, but only the 1969 version appeared in Serbo-Croat. World prehistory is now beyond the capabilities of any one person, and although it may be said that any synthesis that tries to cover the world will, like a British Rail timetable, inevitably have gaps and missed connections, it is the chronology of Clark's work that is important. He it was who tried, and succeeded in part, to present the prehistoric world in such a way that the themes of humanity, of invention and innovation, of contact and stress, of a community of necessities, and of demonstrable variations in behaviour, were always before us. Understated in places, exaggerated in others, the humanity of the race was always implicit in his text. The place of the natural sciences, the cornerstone of much of Clark's own work, was there, of course, but it was the human condition that interested him.

There followed, in a way as anticlimax, other books, of essay proportions and thematic approaches. *Mesolithic Prelude* (1980), *The Identity of Man* (1983), *Symbols of Excellence* (1986) and *Space, Time and Man* (1992) were books designed for more general readership and helped to advance the archaeological and prehistoric causes that Clark

⁵⁹ G. Clark, *Sir Mortimer and Indian Archaeology* (New Delhi, 1979).

⁶⁰ G. Clark, *World Prehistory in New Perspective* (Cambridge, 1977). This book had 554 pages, in contrast to the earlier editions of about 300 pages.

still wanted to pursue.⁶¹ *Space, Time and Man* drew heavily upon Clark's own *World Prehistory* but extended the enquiry into relatively modern societies. His premise was that once humans and other animals had exploited the spatial dimensions of their environments, and had successfully occupied their territories over time, a parting of the ways occurred. Only humans could perceive the dimensionality of space and time, by consciously and at times illogically expanding their spatial horizons, and by deliberately setting out to document the passage of time.

The Identity of Man as Seen by an Archaeologist was another essay directing attention to the features that distinguished humans from other primates, namely culture and cultural behaviour. The awareness of other times, of times long ago, of ancestors, and the quest for immortality, each necessitating attempts to try to grasp some conception of the cosmos, could be traced in prehistory, and delineated in ethno-historical societies. This book had a logical but less well-argued successor in *Symbols of Excellence*, subtitled *Precious Materials as Expressions of Status*, in which Clark's admiration for the artistic expressions of the Stone Age could be followed through time into the realms of modern societies in which extraordinary combinations of precious substances came to signify position and power. In the conclusion, he deemed it a privilege to be able to study objects that oozed status, and to thereby acknowledge the power that they conveyed to mere citizens of the state. Here, as much as anywhere else, Clark exhibited his own political proclivities, and why not? His great and good friend Gordon Childe had done the same from the opposite end and that had not disturbed their close relationship and mutual admiration. Both men subscribed to the view that it was essential for all people of whatever political hue to co-operate, or else to perish, and Clark's writings through the years carried that stark message—facing up to our predicament as self-conscious human beings was how he expressed it.⁶² In 1976 Clark had been able to publish his view of Gordon Childe in a wide assessment of developments in prehistoric studies since Childe's death.⁶³

⁶¹ G. Clark, *Mesolithic Prelude: The Palaeolithic-Neolithic Transition in Old World Prehistory* (Edinburgh, 1980) should logically have been written decades before its appearance; *The Identity of Man as Seen by an Archaeologist* (London, 1983); *Symbols of Excellence: Precious Materials as Expressions of Status* (Cambridge, 1986); *Space, Time and Man: A Prehistorian's View* (Cambridge, 1992). Several of these appeared in translation and, in all, about a dozen of his books appeared in one or more of thirteen languages.

⁶² e.g., in his Inaugural Lecture, *The Study of Prehistory* (Cambridge, 1954).

⁶³ J. G. D. Clark, 'Prehistory since Childe', see above, n. 34. In this essay, Clark gave no real indication of his friendship with Childe; their surviving correspondence speaks of a familiarity and warmth that does not come through in his publications.

In 1990, the Praemium Erasmianum Foundation of The Netherlands awarded its Erasmus Prize to Grahame Clark, and the citation referred to his interdisciplinary work, his interest in prehistoric economics, his definitions and descriptions of ancient societies, and his contribution to the Cambridge school of archaeology. In accepting the award, Clark at once identified the uses to which it would be put. The Prehistoric Society would administer a Europa Fund to provide an annual award to a Europa Lecturer who was judged to have made significant contributions to European prehistoric studies. And the British Academy would administer an endowment for a medal which would recognise achievements in prehistoric research. The first recipient of the medal was Clark's former colleague and collaborator Stuart Piggott, whose delight at the award was a reminder to those present of the long friendship of the two men. There followed, in 1992, a knighthood for Grahame Clark on the grounds of his lifetime of research and his leadership in the study of the prehistory of the world. In 1994, the emergence of the Macdonald Institute for Archaeological Research at Cambridge was witnessed by Sir Grahame and Lady Clark, and the Grahame Clark Laboratory for Archaeology was dedicated. At the time of his death on 12 September 1995 he was planning another book, to be called *Man the Spiritual Primate*, and sections exist for future research into arguably the greatest prehistorian of the twentieth century.

At the end of the day, how best to sum up the career and contributions of Grahame Clark? Much has been written, and more will appear, about his pioneering work in prehistoric economics, in the ecological approach, in the study of organic artefacts, in his initiation of science-based archaeology, in his Academy projects, and in his world view of prehistory. But perhaps above all else was the encouragement given to his own graduates and to all those he met in Cambridge or abroad, to pursue an archaeology that could bind the world together both in the prehistoric past and in the future, through the identification of a commonality of aspiration and endeavour.

On 10 July 1926, the young Grahame Clark delivered a paper to the Natural History Society of Marlborough College; the paper was called 'Progress in Prehistoric Times' and the Secretary of the Society reported: 'He knew his subject very well'.

JOHN COLES

Fellow of the Academy

Note. I am grateful to many people who have helped in the compilation of this Memoir. I am particularly grateful to Lady Clark who has provided many papers for me to read, and who has given me insights into Grahame Clark's life. Information and comments have been sent to me by many colleagues, and I am happy to acknowledge the assistance of the following: C. J. Becker FBA; J. D. Clark FBA; B. J. Coles; B. W. Cunliffe FBA; J. D. Evans FBA; P. Gathercole; B. Gräslund; N. D. C. Hammond; C. F. C. Higham; M. S. F. Hood FBA; R. R. Inskip; I. H. Longworth; M. P. Malmer FBA; A. McBurney; C. McVean; P. A. Mellars FBA; P. J. R. Modderman; D. J. Mulvaney FBA; the late S. Piggott FBA; Lord Renfrew FBA; D. A. Roe; P. Rowley-Conwy; C. T. Shaw FBA; G. R. Willey FBA; and Sir David Wilson FBA.

