

Handwritten notes at the top of the page, including the name "Walter Bird" and the number "102".



in the money to make her face to a central place in the study of law and general philosophy. C. F. C. HAWKES Walter Bird
pupils, friends or colleagues, at lectures, at meetings, reading what he wrote or talking to him, might suddenly find their view of the world transformed. Almost to the end he retained an unforgiving, though generous, enthusiasm for new experiments. He liked people and their failures.

Charles Francis Christopher Hawkes 1905–1992

CHRISTOPHER HAWKES was one of the foremost European prehistorians of his generation, dominating British Iron Age studies for nearly half a century. His career spanned the period in which prehistoric archaeology became a recognised university discipline, and virtually single-handedly he established the Oxford Institute of Archaeology as one of the leading centres for prehistoric and protohistoric archaeology in Europe. His training as a classical scholar, and his early years in the British Museum, determined his approach to archaeology, which was firmly grounded in a thorough knowledge of material culture and a familiarity with linguistic and historical sources. Above all, he was a committed European in his outlook and interests, attracting research students and visiting scholars to the Institute from all parts of Europe. The Festschrift presented to him in 1971 was appropriately entitled *The European Community in Later Prehistory*.

Charles Francis Christopher Hawkes was born on 5 June 1905, in Kensington, London, the only son of Charles Pascoe Hawkes, a barrister who had read history at Cambridge, and Eleanor, whose mother was Spanish and whose father had worked successively for Sandemans and Cockburns importing wine. Christopher was undoubtedly a gifted child, but his early school reports indicate that he was also erratic, and inclined to sacrifice accuracy for speed. During the First World War he attended Sandroyd school in Surrey, where he excelled in Latin, French and History, and began learning Greek, though he required extra tuition in Mathematics, the one weakness which threatened his pros-

© The British Academy 1994.

pects of a scholarship to Winchester. With the outbreak of war, his father had been called up in the Northumberland Fusiliers, and the family home moved to the north-east of England. During holidays they visited sites on Hadrian's Wall, and the monastic churches at Monkwearmouth and Jarrow. It was during a visit to Durham Cathedral at the age of eleven, as Christopher later recalled (1982a), that he encountered the formidable figure of Canon Greenwell, by then already in his mid-nineties, who proceeded to lecture him on Bede and the beginnings of English history.

Hawkes duly achieved his scholarship to Winchester, where he arrived in the autumn of 1918, a couple of months before the Armistice. The headmaster for most of his time was M. J. Rendall, who was succeeded in Christopher's final year by A. T. P. Williams; but the principal influence in his academic progress was his housemaster and classics tutor, Cyril Robinson, who remained a good friend until the latter's death in the early 1960s. He appears to have enjoyed the spartan but not repressive regime at Winchester, and with characteristic enthusiasm took up a variety of extra-curricular activities. He was not an outstanding sportsman, but played Winchester football, during which he sustained knee injuries on several occasions, which resulted in later life in a marked lameness. He joined the school choir, and indeed throughout his life had a great love of music. He particularly delighted in the theatre, and wrote and produced several plays in which he also took leading parts. He apparently gave a memorable performance in the title role of Marlowe's *Dr Faustus*, a production in which Dick Crossman, a lifelong friend, played Mephistopheles, and the Seven Deadly Sins included William Empson, John Sparrow, Robert Hamilton, C. E. ('Tom Brown') Stevens and Penderel Moon, with William Hayter, later Warden of New College, also in the cast. He also showed some talent as an artist (his father had been a skilled cartoonist), and was commissioned by Williams to produce a wall-painting in oils, depicting well-known school figures in the style of the Bayeux tapestry, which still survives in the Thule Chamber at Winchester. One of his earliest publications was a delightful description and appreciation of Winchester College (1933).

It was during his time at Winchester that Christopher Hawkes' latent interest in archaeology began to develop. The Iron Age hillfort at St. Catharine's Hill, with its Medieval chapel, was an immediate local landmark, but when, with the end of the war, his father had been posted to Larkhill on Salisbury Plain, and the family home moved to

Amesbury, he had the opportunity of exploring the many prehistoric monuments in that region. He began a correspondence with O. G. S. Crawford, recently appointed archaeology officer with the Ordnance Survey at Southampton, a contact which proved invaluable to him in his early fieldwork in Hampshire. With Crawford's encouragement, and armed with J. P. Williams-Freeman's *Field Archaeology as illustrated by Hampshire* (1915), he began a study of Hampshire trackways which was to lead to his first published paper in 1925.

Christopher Hawkes went up to Oxford in October 1924, where he was inducted as a Scholar of New College by Warden Spooner, who was shortly to be succeeded by the Rt Hon. H. A. L. Fisher. Fisher was a trustee of the British Museum, and it was he who subsequently advised Christopher to apply for the Assistant Keepership which became vacant in 1928. Among Christopher's circle of friends at Oxford was Nowell Myres, later Bodley's librarian, who had been two years ahead of him at Winchester, and who was to be one of his principal collaborators on the St. Catharine's Hill excavations. Myres was well-connected in Oxford (his father, later Sir John Myres was Wykeham Professor of Ancient History), and it was through his acquaintance with Miss M. V. Taylor, librarian of the Haverfield bequest, that they both went to dig with Mortimer Wheeler in the summer of 1925 at Brecon Gaer. The following year, Christopher gained further field experience with Donald Atkinson at Wroxeter, before undertaking excavations on his own account at Alcester, where he was visited by R. G. Collingwood, who was subsequently his tutor for Roman Britain as part of his Greats degree.

Christopher Hawkes' first major excavation, directed jointly with Nowell Myres and Charles (C. G.) Stevens over four seasons, 1924–8, was at St. Catharine's Hill, Winchester. The first two seasons were dedicated to the excavation of the Medieval chapel, but in 1927 a committee was formed by the Hampshire Field Club under Williams-Freeman to sponsor the excavation of the Iron Age hillfort. For Christopher, this was the beginning of a long association with the Hampshire Field Club, which saw him excavate a succession of hillforts (Buckland Rings, 1935, Quarley Hill, 1938, Bury Hill, 1939) and which culminated in his presidency of the club from 1960 to 1963.

Meanwhile, in Oxford, Christopher's academic and extra-curricular career was flourishing. He gained a First in Classical Honour Moderations in 1926, and a First in Greats in 1928, between the two fitting in the role of the Earl of Kent in the OUDS production of King

Lear. In September 1928 he joined the staff of the British Museum's Department of British and Medieval Antiquities, and in due course his appointment was confirmed as Assistant Keeper (second class).

Hawkes' first duties in the museum were routine curatorial tasks in fields with which he had no previous familiarity — cataloguing a collection of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century medals and the Sturge collection of flints. The museum environment nonetheless provided opportunities for advancing his developing specialisation in British and Continental Iron Age archaeology, and within three years he had produced two seminal papers, on the Belgae of Gaul and Britain, with Gerald Dunning, for Wheeler's *Archaeological Journal* in 1930 and on Hillforts in *Antiquity* for 1931. The same year saw the publication of St. Catharine's Hill as a single volume of the Hampshire Field Club's *Transactions*. The Hillforts paper introduced the ABC division of the southern British Iron Age which was to remain in general use until the early 1960s, when, in spite of his own attempt to revise and elaborate the scheme in 1959/61, growing opposition to the 'invasion hypothesis' as an explanation of culture change undermined its basic premise, that the British Iron Age could be seen as an insular reflection of the Continental Hallstatt-La Tène sequence. The study of the Belgae was likewise subject to revision, more than thirty years later, by himself; indeed, he continued to contribute to the Belgic debate into his final years. Among other publications in this period was *Archaeology in England and Wales, 1914–31* (1932), written jointly with his museum colleague and close friend, Thomas Kendrick. The work had been commissioned by Gerhard Bersu as Director of the Römisch-Deutschen Kommission for its *Bericht*, but an English edition had been agreed with extra chapters to cover the Roman and post-Roman periods.

A further opportunity for consolidating and widening his circle of European contacts came when, together with Gordon Childe, by now established in the Abercromby Chair of Archaeology at Edinburgh, Christopher Hawkes was nominated as a permanent National Secretary to the newly-revived International Congress for Prehistoric and Protohistoric Sciences, which met in plenary session for the first time in London in 1932. For that occasion, Sir John Myres was Secretary-General and prime mover, with Sir Charles Peers, President of the Society of Antiquaries of London, as President. For Hawkes, this was the beginning of a long association with the International Union; he served as National Secretary until 1948, when he became a member

of the Permanent Council until 1971, thereafter being elected in his retirement to the Committee of Honour.

Throughout the 1930s, Hawkes gained an increasing reputation as a field archaeologist. When in 1929 plans for the Colchester bypass threatened the Iron Age and Roman settlement at Sheepen, he was invited with M. R. Hull of the Colchester museum to take charge of excavations under the nominal directorship of J. P. Bushe-Fox, then Inspector of Ancient Monuments for England. Hawkes directed operations from 1930 to 1932, with Hull continuing alone until 1939. The outcome of their joint research, *Camulodunum: Excavations at Colchester, 1930–39*, was published in 1947 as a Report of the Research Committee of the Society of Antiquaries. The extensive system of earthworks at Colchester was evidently the product of a complex and cumulative occupation in the immediately pre-Roman period, and for the Sheepen settlement, Hawkes distinguished six phases of occupation on the basis of a scrupulous study of the stratigraphic sequence. The site was rich in material remains, including quantities of Gallo-Belgic and Arretine pottery, brooches and coins, together with fragments of moulds for casting coin flans, indicating a local mint, on the basis of which Hawkes associated the site with Cunobelinus, whose capital at Camulodunum had been inferred from historical and numismatic evidence. Historical attributions in archaeology are less fashionable today, but more recent work in the Gosbecks area, the second major focus in the Colchester complex, has supported the possibility that these sites were part of a royal estate. The 1931 season of excavation at Colchester was marred by an unfortunate incident in which Hawkes and Bushe-Fox were buried when a trench which they were inspecting collapsed. Hawkes escaped unscathed — his later lameness was sometimes wrongly attributed to this episode — but Bushe-Fox never fully recovered from the accident.

It was during the Colchester excavations that Christopher met Jacquetta Hopkins, daughter of Sir Frederick Hopkins, the distinguished Cambridge biochemist, Nobel laureate and President of the Royal Society. They were married in October 1933, with a service held in the chapel of Sir Frederick's Cambridge college, Trinity. The following summer they excavated together with Olwen and Denis Brogan at Gergovia near Clermont-Ferrand, *oppidum* of the Arverni and traditional birthplace of Vercingetorix. Hawkes was responsible for a section through the main defences, in an attempt to reconcile Caesar's record of the site with the Gallo-Roman date of most of its surviving

remains. The vexed issue of the pre-Caesarian origins of the major Gaulish *oppida* continues to be a subject of intensive research.

On his return to the British Museum, relationships with Reginald Smith, Hawkes' Departmental Keeper, which had been strained for some time, deteriorated to the point that he offered his resignation, and took an extended period of sick leave. The dispute appears to have arisen through a perceived conflict of interests between the routine needs of the Department and the scholarly aspirations and successes of Smith's junior colleagues. Hawkes' biographer (Webster, 1991) quotes from a letter to Hawkes from Thomas Kendrick, reporting Smith's reaction to being rebuked by the Director, Sir George Hill. 'He then asked me if I wanted to give a lecture in the Albert Hall as he understood his staff had ambitions which he was opposing; asked Tonnochy if he called himself a genius, as he would like the geniuses in his department to be *plainly labelled* in case he failed to recognise them; and asked us if we wanted sofas to lie down on when tired!' — the last perhaps a reference to Hawkes' notorious difficulty in rising early, a characteristic which in later years led to his rather eccentric working life-style. The crisis blew over; by 1937 Kendrick had succeeded Smith as Keeper, and Hawkes was the following year promoted to Assistant Keeper (first class). His profound scholarship (and distinctive hand) left an unmistakable mark on the Accessions Register of the Department; his entries are a mine of information and acute observation to this day.

Throughout the 1930s, Hawkes continued to strengthen his European connections. He visited a number of sites and museums in France, meeting Espérandieu at Nîmes, Reinach at Saint-Germain and the Abbé Favret at Epernay. In 1933 he toured the Netherlands and Germany at the instigation of Gerhard Bersu, meeting van Giffen and Sprockhoff, and in 1936, with the prospect of war already looming, he attended the second International Congress in Oslo, returning via Sweden, Germany and the Netherlands. Bersu had been relieved by Hitler from his position as Director of the Römisch-Germanischen Kommission, but in 1938 came to Britain at the invitation of the Prehistoric Society to undertake excavations of the Iron Age settlement at Little Woodbury in Wiltshire, thereafter spending the duration of the war in Britain, much of it as an internee in the Isle of Man. These were active years in southern England for Iron Age studies. Wheeler had been at Maiden Castle, 1934–7 (where Hawkes had accompanied

Bersu on a visit), and Hawkes himself had directed further hillfort excavations in Hampshire.

In August 1940, Hawkes was transferred to the Ministry of Aircraft Production, just three months after the publication of his major work of synthesis, *Prehistoric Foundations of Europe to the Mycenaean Age*. In its scholarship and originality of interpretation it was matched only by Childe's *Dawn of European Civilisation*, the second edition of which appeared while *Foundations* was in press. After more than half a century, Hawkes' basic perception of European civilisation seems remarkably fresh. For him, Europe's

foundations were formed of a balance of cultures, in which Mediterranean and Western, Alpine and Danubian, Nordic and East European elements of Stone Age inheritance were poised against the civilizing influence of the Orient, in an equilibrium dominated by peoples of Aryan speech [now a dated term, of course] and warrior tradition, who from the years before and after 2000 B.C. onwards have given so much to the moving pattern of European achievement. The movement of the pattern, the instability of the balance, seem throughout characteristics of historic process in Europe, as against the 'changeless East', which invented civilisation only to stagnate in it. . . . The instability of Europe's equilibrium has been not its weakness but its strength.

One issue on which Hawkes took a characteristically bold stance, and one which is still a source of debate, was the origins of Celtic language and culture. Childe had implied that the Bronze Age antecedents of the central European Hallstatt and La Tène cultures must have been Celtic, but Hawkes explicitly argued that the Beaker and Early Bronze Age cultures of Europe, including Britain and Ireland, should be regarded as Celtic or at least proto-Celtic. This was a theme to which Hawkes returned in later papers, introducing the concept of 'cumulative Celticity' which still commands widespread support among archaeologists, if not among historical linguists.

As the war came to an end, leading British archaeologists began to review the state of the discipline and to consider post-war planning. A series of conferences was organised in Oxford, Cambridge and London, beginning as early as August 1943, to which Hawkes contributed papers on the future prospects for British and European archaeology. Among these, he co-edited and contributed to *A Survey and Policy of Field Research in the Archaeology of Great Britain*, published under the auspices of the recently-formed Council for British Archaeology in

1948. With the peace came opportunities to revive his Continental connections, at the Brussels Anthropological Congress and elsewhere.

In 1946, Christopher Hawkes was appointed to the newly-established Chair of European Archaeology at Oxford, and to a Professorial Fellowship of Keble College, posts which he occupied until his retirement in 1972. In fact, as an external examiner in prehistory for the Department of Anthropology in 1939 he had been party to a formal recommendation that such a post be created, and had suggested the title 'European' rather than simply 'Prehistoric', since at that time Oxford had no post in Roman or early Medieval archaeology. In the event, the remit of the chair reflected this broad chronological spectrum, covering the period from the origins of agriculture to the death of Charlemagne. It is doubtful nowadays whether any one person could master such a broad field, at least in terms of active research. Many more professional posts and a proliferation of publications have necessarily induced greater specialisation, perhaps not wholly to the benefit of the discipline. But for Hawkes, breadth was a strength, one area of specialisation informing another. He would have a Bronze Age phase, an Iron Age phase and an Anglo-Saxon phase, then return to one of the others with fresh insights. He was a prodigious reader, and was frequently to be found in his study, with anglepoise illuminating a volume balanced on a cushion on his knees, absorbing the latest research in fields well beyond the span of his own specialisations.

In 1946, Oxford was one of only four British universities — the others being Cambridge, Edinburgh and London — to have chairs of archaeology, and most senior practitioners had been trained initially in related and more traditional disciplines such as history or classics. Hawkes, therefore, would hardly have been unique in believing that 'archaeology is not . . . a subject in its own right, as are History, Philosophy, or . . . the Biological Sciences' (1948, p. 4). Notwithstanding developments in the professional status of archaeology, which he actively supported, not least as a founder member of the Council for British Archaeology, he retained a firm belief, which he expressed explicitly in his Inaugural Lecture, *Archaeology and the History of Europe* (1948), that academically archaeology belonged within the broader disciplinary framework of history. Twenty-five years later he re-stated this fundamental view in the foreword to his and Sonia Hawkes' edited volume *Greeks, Celts and Romans* (1973), the first of their intended series entitled *Archaeology into History*. He saw no conflict in the objectives of prehistoric and text-aided archaeology,

though each might demand particular analytical skills. He was also concerned with the interface between archaeology and linguistics, particularly in the context of Celtic studies, and more than once regretted the lack of active collaboration between the two disciplines.

Christopher Hawkes' career not only covered the period in which archaeology became an established university discipline, it also saw the handmaid of history become increasingly dependent upon a close liaison with the environmental and natural sciences. Hawkes recognised the need to foster these links, and readily took up a proposal of Lord Cherwell's for a physics laboratory to promote science-based research in archaeology. Years later, he recalled the occasion of his meeting Cherwell (formerly Professor Lindemann, and universally revered as 'The Prof') at dinner in Christ Church. 'He put his idea for this Lab to me almost at once — certainly with the fish, perhaps already with the soup; and answered my question, who would run it, by introducing to me the young Teddy Hall, having sat him, as his guest, on my other side' (1986a). The proposal did not fall on stony ground, for, ever since he came to know Hopkins as his father-in-law, Christopher had been profoundly convinced of the potential value of the sciences to developing archaeology. Indeed, when the Chair of Archaeology in Belfast had fallen vacant a couple of years earlier, he had been instrumental in recommending the appointment of a scientist. In spite of some scepticism that the necessary funding could be raised, Hawkes obtained a grant from the Wenner-Gren Foundation of New York, negotiated while he was a Visiting Lecturer at Harvard in 1953–4, and the Research Laboratory for Archaeology and History of Art was duly established, with Hall as first Director, in 1955. Hawkes served as Secretary to its management committee for seventeen years, and among many contributions to the activities of the Laboratory devised the title of its international journal *Archaeometry* (he is credited with the invention of the term in the *OED*), which was launched in 1958.

Contemporaries and pupils of Christopher Hawkes would recall him pre-eminently as a scholar, a teacher and an ardent advocate of European archaeology. The world of academic politics one might not have regarded as his natural habitat. Yet one of his foremost achievements in Oxford was the creation of the Institute of Archaeology, which was formally established as an independent unit in 1961 in the elegant Regency terrace in Beaumont Street which it still occupies. In fact, the premises had been available since 1957, when Oriental Studies began moving to its newly-built Institute in Pusey Lane, but it had

taken several years of trenchant argument before the University conceded administrative autonomy. By this time Hawkes had been joined by Ian Richmond, newly-appointed to the Chair of Archaeology of the Roman Empire, and on the ground floor of 35 Beaumont Street by Professor Edgar Wind in the newly-created Chair of the History of Art. Hawkes' vision of the Oxford Institute was essentially as a centre of excellence in research, and the 1960s saw a succession of visiting scholars or research students working with him or under his supervision, many of whom now hold senior posts in archaeology in Britain or abroad and in whose appointment or advancement he took great personal pleasure. With Richmond's untimely death in 1965, Sheppard Frere was appointed to the Roman Chair, and the next few years saw a considerable increase in the number of research students working in the field of Roman archaeology. The 1960s and 70s were times of major change in archaeology, both academically and professionally. In his Inaugural Lecture, Hawkes had asserted quite explicitly: 'I cannot imagine Oxford setting up an Honour School of Archaeology or offering a Doctorate in Archaeology'. In practice, he evidently recognised the need for postgraduate qualifications within the professional framework of post-war archaeology. Indeed, one of his first priorities had been the establishment of a postgraduate Diploma in European Archaeology, which had been approved in 1958. His modestly expressed requirement, that 'some capacity for reading Continental literature in the original is expected; in particular, a reading knowledge of archaeological German, which is really not difficult to acquire' (1958, p. 125) might evince a wry smile today. With regard to an undergraduate degree at Oxford, however, which finally came many years after his retirement, I doubt whether he was ever really convinced of its desirability.

Apart from the time-consuming efforts which these developments entailed, and in spite of the break-up of his marriage in 1953, Hawkes maintained his research output throughout the 1950s, in no small measure through the support of his research assistant, Margaret Smith, with whom he published a major paper on buckets and cauldrons in 1957 (and who on her own account contributed significantly to the reassessment of the Deverel-Rimbury culture and the British Middle and Late Bronze Age). In 1954, he had assumed editorial responsibility for the British series of *Inventaria Archaeologica*, again initially with the assistance of Miss Smith. He travelled extensively in Europe in 1955–6 (notably in Italy) as Leverhulme Research Fellow, and again

in 1958 on the occasion of the fifth International Congress in Hamburg. In the same year he met Sonia Chadwick, then curator of Scunthorpe Museum, and later lecturer in Anglo-Saxon archaeology at Oxford. They married early in 1959, and formed a close partnership until his death thirty-three years later.

In December 1958, at a conference organised by the Council for British Archaeology in London, Hawkes presented a revised and much elaborated version of his ABC system of classification for the British Iron Age, which triggered over the next few years a fundamental reappraisal of the 'invasion' model as a catalyst of culture change, not just for the Iron Age, but in British prehistory in general. Less controversial, though of equal if not greater significance, was his 1960 'Scheme for the British Bronze Age', also presented at a CBA Conference in London, never formally published though widely circulated, and still cited as a landmark in the literature.

Both these schemes were produced at a time of crucial change in British Bronze Age and Iron Age studies. Updating of 'Ornament Horizon' metalwork and related Deverel-Rimbury assemblages had left an apparent hiatus in the settlement record of the Late Bronze Age, which over the next decade was to be filled with the realisation that sites hitherto regarded as earliest Iron Age, including some hillforts, could have their origins in the preceding phase. Radiocarbon dating too was progressively to have the effect of raising the date for the beginnings of copper and bronze technology, though not so dramatically as its impact on Neolithic chronology. Hawkes' scheme for the Bronze Age was a simple three-fold division, Early, Middle and Late, each sub-divided numerically on the basis of distinctive assemblages of ceramic or metalwork types. Subsequent studies adopted key type-sites or hoards to denote successive industrial phases in preference to the Hawkes nomenclature, with greater flexibility to reflect differences in regional development.

The scheme for the Southern British Iron Age expressly embodied regional variations, with five Provinces — Southern, South-Western, Western, Eastern, and Pennine — sub-divided into thirty Regions, principally on a physiographical basis, though not without reference to the perceived integrity of cultural groupings. The three-fold ABC division of 1930 was retained, but sub-divided by ordinal numbers into First, Second or Third as deemed appropriate. Within each Province, absolute dates for these cultural groups could vary, hence Southern Second A or Western Third B could be adjusted against an absolute

chronological scale, for which Periods and Phases denoted by cardinal numbers were proposed. In structure, the scheme was logical and flexible (provided the basic assumption of its ABC division was accepted), and indeed it prompted Stuart Piggott in 1961 to publish an extension of the Hawkes scheme for northern Britain. But its basic premise, that the British ABC sequence was the insular outcome of successive episodes of colonisation or invasion from Continental Europe, was soon challenged, notably by Roy Hodson, who argued that instead of basing a system of classification on a series of perceived historical events, 'a first principle for an objective material classification of this sort would be that cultures should be defined by distinctive type-fossils. Further sub-divisions of these cultures would be made not by arbitrary geographical divisions but by recognizing series of more specialized type-fossils that would divide up the material into progressively smaller groups' (Hodson, 1962, p. 153). The criticism was not without force; indeed it characterises closely the process whereby the complex sequence of Continental Late Bronze Age and Iron Age regional groups (among others) have been defined. The problem arises from the fact that, whereas the latter can be based upon cemetery inventories of associated artefacts including types recognised as diagnostic, for Britain the material inventory is drawn for the most part from settlement contexts, and is by comparison poor in range of types and largely undiagnostic, as Hodson's own subsequent attempt to define an early and late 'Woodbury culture' demonstrated. The one medium in which regional variations can be detected, however subjectively, is pottery (as in Cunliffe's more recent 'style zones'), and it is these that intuitively underpinned Hawkes' geographical divisions. With the wider availability of radiocarbon dates for the Iron Age, notwithstanding particular problems of calibration for this period, the need for a system of classification of the ABC kind has declined. But in terms of pottery studies, Hawkes' relative sequence remains substantially valid.

Integral to criticism of the ABC scheme was that it was founded on the premise that British Iron Age cultures were the product, at any rate in part, of recognisable episodes of immigration from Continental Europe. Diffusionism as a model of culture change was being widely challenged in the 1960s, and in particular the equation of pottery styles and distributions with cultural or even ethnic groups ('pots equal people'), which had been implicit in the definition of archaeological cultures from Gordon Childe onwards, was rightly regarded as too

simplistic. Grahame Clark (1966) diagnosed archaeologists of the first half of the twentieth century as suffering from 'invasion neurosis', concluding his analysis with the observation that 'the first wave of migrations into southern England since that associated with the introduction of Beaker pottery, metallurgy and single-grave burial, unreservedly accepted by the younger school of British archaeologists, is that associated with the Belgae' (1966, p. 186). Ironically, even Beaker invasions have fallen casualty to more recent interpretations, while the Belgae have fared little better, at any rate in their equation with the Aylesford-Swarling culture of south-eastern England. Three times in his paper Clark had represented the views of the 'younger school' of British archaeologists. Hawkes, in reply (1968), invoking the question of Celtic language and how its introduction into Britain might be accounted for by indigenous evolution, could not resist caricaturing his critic as 'a lifelong member of "the younger school"' and remained an unreconstructed advocate of immigrants. The debate was, of course, not advanced by the polarisation of definitions. Clark was prepared to acknowledge the possibility of 'local intrusions'; Hawkes wondered how many local intrusions were needed to produce an aggregate invasion. The point which opponents of the invasion hypothesis were right in principle to make was that invasions should be demonstrated, not assumed. Equally, however, alternative explanations of culture change in principle should be subject to similar demonstration, and not simply endorsed by generational fashion. The gulf between principle and reality is the dilemma of prehistory, and the notion that archaeological hypotheses can be tested on the analogy of experimental sciences is in these cases a fallacy.

A compromise view which was put forward by Christopher Hawkes in 1971 at the Congress of Celtic Studies in Rennes (his 1973), and which has been widely adopted (and extended, cf. Renfrew, 1987) is the concept of 'cumulative Celticity'. Addressing primarily the question of late La Tène introductions into south-eastern England, and Caesar's reported immigrants *ex Belgio*, he examined a range of means whereby a new regime might be imposed on the native population, through political alliances, by marriage, through clientship, all short of raids and acts of war. Such processes he believed could have been cumulative over a prolonged period of time, with minimal impact upon the archaeological record at any given point. He was thus not abandoning the possibility of invasions in prehistory — for historical periods these are amply documented — but he accepted that the processes involved

were more complex and subtle than the single-episode model of cultural diffusion had allowed. With the model of cumulative Celticity, the invasion controversy thus becomes effectively redundant.

Following formal retirement in 1972, Christopher Hawkes embarked on an ambitious programme of travel, lecturing and publication. He gave the Oliver Davies lecture in Belfast in 1974, and the following year addressed the Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei on the Celts in Britain (1978a), gave the Sir John Myres Memorial Lecture in Oxford on Pytheas (1977), and in London the Mortimer Wheeler Lecture on Britain and Caesar (1978b). He travelled Europe as Leverhulme Emeritus Fellow in 1972–3, was Visiting Professor in the University of Munich in the summer of 1974, and in 1976 attended the ninth International Congress in Nice. He jointly organised, with Paul-Marie Duval, an international symposium on Celtic art in Oxford in 1972, which led to their *Celtic Art in Ancient Europe* (1975). It is worth recalling that, in earlier years in Oxford, Hawkes had particularly valued his intellectual association with the pre-eminent classical-cum-Celtic art-historian Paul Jacobsthal, whose magisterial study *Early Celtic Art* (1944) he had been allowed eight pages to review in the *Journal of Roman Studies*. He took an active part, with great relish, in discussions at the most recent Celtic Congress in Oxford, in the heat-wave of July 1983, welcoming a glimmering rapport between students of language and archaeology (Jope and Hawkes, 1984). Hawkes continued to publish papers and reviews annually into the early 1980s. His last major work was the product of a long-standing research project with M. R. Hull, their *Corpus of Ancient Brooches in Britain* (1987), which is a monument to the value of his detailed knowledge of the British Museum and many other collections, public and private. It does, however, exhibit the way in which his approach could at times be over-dominated by taxonomy.

In an active career spanning sixty years, Christopher Hawkes was accorded many academic honours. He was elected a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries of London in 1932, nominated by R. G. Collingwood, and in 1981 was Gold Medallist of the Society. In 1948, he was elected Fellow of the British Academy. He was a member of the German Archaeological Institute and a Corresponding Member of the Royal Irish Academy. Many of his major papers appeared in European publications, in France, Germany, Spain, Italy, Ireland and elsewhere; his academic reputation perhaps stood higher outwith Britain than at home. I know that he valued most highly his doctorates from

Dublin, where he was honoured by the National University of Ireland in 1972 at a ceremony presided over by President de Valera (indeed he had a deeply romantic feeling for most things Irish) and from the University of Haute-Bretagne at Rennes the previous year. I was present on the latter occasion, and recall the evident pride with which he responded in French to the award of the degree, and his reaction at being upstaged by the Czech academician, Jan Filip, who followed with his acceptance in Latin, a language in which Christopher could have displayed equal facility.

For all his erudition, Christopher Hawkes was not an ivory-tower academic, and more than most he was accessible to local fieldworkers and amateur archaeologists, who came to him regularly, from his British Museum days and still when he occupied the Oxford chair, for encouragement and for his verdict on their latest discoveries. He was an active participant in national and regional archaeological affairs. He was Honorary Secretary of the Royal Archaeological Institute for five years from 1930, and assumed the Editorship of its *Archaeological Journal*, 1944–50. He was a member of the Ancient Monuments Board for England, 1954–69, and a Visitor of the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford, 1961–7. He served terms as President of national bodies like the Prehistoric Society, 1950–4, and the Council for British Archaeology, 1961–6; but he also accepted the Presidency of the Hampshire Field Club, 1960–3, which in the 1930s had sponsored his early hillfort excavations.

In attempting to evaluate Christopher Hawkes' contribution to European archaeology, it must be acknowledged that, in a career of publication spanning sixty years, much will have been superseded or revised, and indeed he was not infrequently the first to recognise the need for revision, and to carry it into effect. His work has not endured without criticism, any more than has that of Gordon Childe. Those who make the greatest impact of their generation are obviously the most susceptible to reappraisal in the next. But as with Childe, much subsequent work could not have happened had it not been for Christopher Hawkes' own outstanding contribution to his field. His legacy to British Iron Age studies alone is witnessed by the fact that the latest edition of the standard textbook on the subject (Cunliffe, 1992) still lists no less than twenty-six of his publications in its bibliography.

Because of his reputation as a scholar of formidable intellect, it is easy in retrospect to underestimate Christopher Hawkes' contribution as an excavator and field-archaeologist. Compared to many excavations at the time, Hawkes' hillfort excavations in the 1930s were carried out

with strict regard for stratigraphic principles, and he was adept at sorting out complex structural sequences. He was also an astute interpreter of older field research, as his widely-acclaimed review of Pitt Rivers' excavations on Cranborne Chase demonstrated (1947). At Quarley Hill in Hampshire he was concerned with the relationship between the hillfort and the surrounding network of ranch boundaries and other field monuments, an exercise in landscape archaeology which modestly anticipated the more recent success on a larger scale of the Danebury project. In fact, Hawkes himself had targeted Danebury for excavation in 1939, but chose nearby Bury Hill instead because of the considerable logistical problems which the former presented, and more immediately because permission to excavate was not at that time forthcoming. But in later years, he was instrumental in reviving interest in Danebury as a candidate for large-scale excavation. One aspect of historical interest revealed by Hawkes' excavation reports is his use of representational shading for section drawings, rather than the diagrammatic system of positively demarcating layers used by Wheeler. The prime example of this style is, of course, Bersu's Little Woodbury Report, and there seems little doubt that Hawkes was influenced by Bersu in adopting this technique. Post-war British archaeologists tended to favour the Wheeler-Kenyon model, but students who have experienced the difficulties of determining on a prehistoric site in Britain where exactly one layer ends and another begins may yet have some sympathy with the attempted objectivity of the Bersu-Hawkes method. The same skills which he had developed in his pre-war hillfort excavations Hawkes applied in 1958–9 with equal effect in his programme of fieldwork and excavation centred on the Portuguese *castros* of Sabrosa and Cutero, and the *cividade* at Ancora. With remarkable economy of effort and resources he clarified the structural sequence at Sabrosa in a manner which commands respect among the present generation of Portuguese fieldworkers. A recent memorial exhibition, organised by the Sociedade Martins Sarmiento of Guimaraes, acknowledged the technical advances in stratigraphic excavation which he had introduced. Even after he gave up excavation (his final field season was 1960, on Sonia's excavation at Longbridge Deverill Cow Down in Wiltshire, during which they took time to visit my excavation at Pimperne in Dorset, where we first met), he continued to support and encourage his students' hillfort excavations, including Michael Avery's at Rainsborough Camp and mine at Blewburton Hill. Together we visited other work in progress, Stanford's at Croft Ambrey, Dyer's and

Moss-Eckardt's at Ravensburgh Castle, and Cotton's and Frere's at Ivinghoe Beacon. It was Ivinghoe, 1963–5, with its evidence of Late Bronze Age metalwork, that raised again the possibility that hillforts might have origins older than the Iron Age, where, since Hawkes' paper of 1931 they had been firmly assigned. As we left the site, I recall him reflecting that either we could believe that there was a Late Bronze Age episode, represented by the bronzes but no pottery, followed by an Iron Age phase represented by pottery but no metalwork, or we should grasp the nettle and consider the possibility that hillforts began already in Britain, as in Continental Europe, in the Late Bronze Age. Within a few years, radiocarbon dating from sites throughout Britain had endorsed that probability, and triggered a further review of the Late Bronze Age-Iron Age transition in which he was an active participant.

For someone who was prolific in publication, Hawkes devoted relatively few papers to expressly theoretical issues. He was not careless nor ignorant of theory, though a more recent generation might imagine that it invented theoretical archaeology, but he certainly had little patience for those who seem to believe that profound thinking equates with utterly opaque writing. In his paper on *Archaeological Theory and Method* (1954), resulting from a seminar given at Harvard the previous year, he outlined four levels of archaeological inference, more recently referred to as 'Hawkes' hierarchy' (Trigger, 1989). To infer *techniques* from archaeological material he took as relatively simple; to infer *subsistence-economics* was likewise fairly straightforward; to infer *social/political institutions* was considerably more difficult; and to infer *religious institutions and spiritual life* was most contentious of all. The implication of Hawkes' argument was not that archaeologists should give priority to technology and economy (*pace* Renfrew and Bahn, 1991, p.150), but that the study of text-aided societies might better inform an understanding of text-free prehistory. Nor was Hawkes' analysis necessarily at odds with Binford's approach to the function of artefacts, technomic, sociotechnic and ideotechnic, within the total cultural system. Less happy, because more studiously contrived, was Hawkes' system of sub-division of prehistory, using the Greek prefixes ante-, tele-, para-, pene- and proto-historic (1951), which, with the exception of the last, already established in European usage, was never generally adopted. He nonetheless retained a positive interest in archaeological theory into later life, as his reviews (1983c,d,e) indicate.

As a teacher Christopher Hawkes commanded the respect and affection of his students, not only for his immense erudition, but for his irrepressible enthusiasm for the subject. A typical late-night supervision often left his research students in a state of mental exhaustion, but stimulated by the wealth of new ideas which he had prompted. I can certainly recall beginning sessions in the conviction that I had nothing original to offer, and leaving with a sense of excitement and impatience to explore the host of new avenues he had opened up. He did not just impart his ideas — though he did so generously — but had the ability to educate in the true sense of drawing out their own partially-developed ideas from his students. With written text he was a rigorous editor, and was capable of filling all available margins with red or green ink in his distinctive handwriting. His more cryptic marginal comments could equally concentrate the mind: I remember once using the phrase ‘with the increasing impact of something or other’, which prompted the note ‘pangere or premere?’ At that moment, I was reminded of Jacquetta’s prefatory observation in their *Prehistoric Britain* (1944), in which she acknowledged Christopher’s contribution: ‘his exacting scholar’s eye scanned my text, and allowed nothing dubious or inaccurate to pass. For this the reader will be more grateful than I was’. His own written style could be complex, always absolutely accurate grammatically, though sometimes appearing to owe more to Latin or German syntax than to English. He used a range of constructions beyond the normal repertory, but equally could condense his ideas with an economy that bordered on the cryptic (a point which had been observed already by Gordon Childe in 1941 in his otherwise effusive review of *Prehistoric Foundations*). As a lecturer, Christopher Hawkes could be expansive — he was given to lengthy parentheses, perhaps to explain the antecedents of a particular regional culture, which might leave a less than wholly attentive student in uncertainty as to which millennium was under discussion — and in the process, as one former pupil has recalled, might seem oblivious to the smouldering disaster in the map of central Europe as the antique projector began to overheat. In tutorials, too, he might digress to bring home a point, our discussion getting as far as China on one occasion before he detected from my expression that I had lost the thread of relevance, whereupon in an exercise of intellectual gymnastics he worked the argument progressively back to the British Iron Age, with a triumphant sparkle in his eyes when he finally reached his objective. He was a source of constant stimulation, and his profound knowledge of Euro-

pean archaeology and archaeologists was an immeasurable asset to his research students. An introduction from Christopher Hawkes was a passport into all the major archaeological institutions of Europe north and south of the Alps.

For many of his former students, the early years of the Oxford Institute represent the summer of Christopher Hawkes' career and achievement. Those who worked there in the early 1960s recall with affection the friendly interaction of staff and students, notably at tea in the 'genteel shabbiness', as one described it, of the Regency drawing room, furnished on a shoestring by Sonia from astute visits to the salerooms. The two resident professors, Hawkes and Richmond (the latter affectionately known to students and staff as 'Uncle Ian', though not in his hearing), could not have been more different in personalities, the one effervescent and demonstrative, the other sedate and considered in every pronouncement. Their coinciding at tea invariably sparked some esoteric debate, and sometimes quite provocative exchanges, not infrequently laced with Latin tags, as each tried to outwit the other. One of the highlights of that time was the Institute fancy-dress party of 1963, at which a number of distinguished academics contrived to make antique spectacles of themselves. Christopher came in a black shirt, padded out to simulate a Durotrigian bead-rim pot, with enamel mugs under his armpits to represent countersunk handles. But the point of his humour was that he had pinned a piece of white tape down his shirt, for this was meant to be a *cracked* pot. He wore a mask over his eyes to show that his head was not part of the sketch, which did not help his navigation round the crowded rooms. Around his waist was a cummerbund, with the supposed museum label: 'Fictile antiquity, age uncertain, donated anonymously 1946' — the year, of course, of his appointment to the Chair. Richmond came more grandly as a Roman emperor with purple toga and laurel wreath around his distinctively high forehead. Christopher thought the portrayal suggested Vitellius, but Richmond doubtless had some more illustrious figure in mind. I have a recollection that the ensemble lacked his usual scrupulous attention to detail, in that he was wearing black dress shoes, having apparently walked thus clad from dinner at All Souls. Also present was the Revd Professor John Barnes, of Egyptology, dressed in something appropriate to his field, and, as ever, complaining of gout in terms not normally associated with a man of the cloth. Christopher enjoyed it all immensely, and awarded the prize to his long-

suffering secretary, Jennifer Nicholson, for her resourceful impersonation of Bush Barrow.

For many of us, former pupils, colleagues or friends, it will be the personal memories of Christopher Hawkes that we shall cherish, his warmth and generosity of spirit, his loyalty to friends and institutions with which he was associated, his disarming smile and charm, his enjoyment of female company, his wit and mimicry in relating anecdotes about the great names of his youth, the mischievous sense of humour with which he could deflate intellectual pretentiousness, and not least his capacity to smile at himself. At times he seemed almost to cultivate an air of academic eccentricity: he was a natural extrovert, with a touch of the showman. Yet in many respects he remained a very private person. Throughout his life he had a profound appreciation and abiding love of music. One senior colleague and long-standing friend recalled his reflections upon listening to Bach's fifth French Suite for keyboard: 'what a wonderful work the strange little loure is, so full of wayward mystery.' His response to music seemed to say so much about both the intellectual and emotional range of his thinking. His legacy to those who were privileged to be his students will be the memory of a man whose scholarship, intellectual excitement and passion for archaeology fired another generation to share his aspirations.

D. W. HARDING

University of Edinburgh

Note. For details of Christopher Hawkes' early life, the writer acknowledges his debt to Diana Webster's recent biography (1991). He would also like to express his warmest thanks to Mrs Sonia Hawkes and to Professor Martyn Jope for information and personal recollections which have been incorporated into this appreciation.

Bibliography

A full bibliography of the publications of Christopher Hawkes up to 1971 appeared in Boardman *et al.* (eds), 1971. The list was further updated to 1982 by Hawkes in his 'Retrospect' (1982a). Publications since that date are included below. Major publications in which he was collaborating at the time of his death include the definitive report on the Colchester Dyke (Philip Crummy), the report of his

Portuguese excavations (Dr Francisco Queiroga), and the excavations at Longbridge Deverill Cow Down, Wiltshire (Mrs Sonia Hawkes).

- Boardman, J., Brown, M. A. and Powell, T. G. E. (eds), 1971. *The European Community in Later Prehistory, Studies in honour of C. F. C. Hawkes*, London.
- Clark, J. G. D., 1966. 'The Invasion Hypothesis in British Archaeology', *Antiquity*, LX, 172–89.
- Cunliffe, B. W., 1992. *Iron Age Communities in Britain*, 3rd ed., London.
- Hawkes, C. F. C., 1947. 'Britons, Romans and Saxons round Salisbury and in Cranborne Chase: reviewing the excavations of General Pitt-Rivers, 1881–1889', *Arch. Journ.*, CIV, 27–81.
- Hawkes, C. F. C., 1948. *Archaeology and the History of Europe*, Oxford.
- Hawkes, C. F. C., 1951. 'British Prehistory half-way through the century', *Proc. Prehist. Soc.*, XVII, 1–15.
- Hawkes, C. F. C., 1954. 'Archaeological Theory and Method: some suggestions from the Old World', *Amer. Anthropologist*, 56, 155–68.
- Hawkes, C. F. C., 1958. 'Archaeology in Oxford University: Two Recent Developments', *Antiquity*, XXXII, 123–6.
- Hawkes, C. F. C., 1968. 'British Prehistory: The Invasion Hypothesis', *Antiquity*, LXII, 297–8.
- Hawkes, C. F. C., 1973. '“Cumulative Celticity” in pre-Roman Britain', *Etudes Celtiques*, XIII, 607–28.
- Hawkes, C. F. C., 1977. *Pytheas: Europe and the Greek Explorers*, Oxford.
- Hawkes, C. F. C., 1978a. 'The Celts in British Prehistory', in *I Celti e la loro cultura nell'epoca pre-romana e romana nella Britannia*, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Quaderno 237, Rome.
- Hawkes, C. F. C., 1978b. 'Britain and Julius Caesar', *Proc. Brit. Acad.*, LXIII, 125–92.
- Hawkes, C. F. C., 1980. Review of I. M. Stead, *The Arras Culture*, 1979, *Antiquity*, LIV, 148–9.
- Hawkes, C. F. C., 1982a. 'Archaeological Retrospect 3', *Antiquity*, LVI, 93–101.
- Hawkes, C. F. C., 1982b. 'Colchester Before the Romans or Who Were Our Belgae?', *Essex Arch. and Hist.*, 14, 3–14.
- Hawkes, C. F. C., 1982c. Review of B. Cunliffe (ed), *Coinage and Society in Britain and Gaul: some current problems*, 1981, *Antiq. Journ.*, LXII, 151–2.
- Hawkes, C. F. C., 1982d. Review of C. Partridge, *Skeleton Green. A Late Iron Age and Romano-British Site*, 1981, *Antiq. Journ.*, LXII, 411–12.
- Hawkes, C. F. C., 1983a. 'Belgium and Britain in the Urnfield and Hallstatt periods', *Bull. Mus. Roy. d'Art et d'Histoire*, 54.1, 25–35.
- Hawkes, C. F. C., 1983b. 'The Rillaton Gold Cup', *Antiquity*, LVII, 124–6.
- Hawkes, C. F. C., 1983c. Review of C. Renfrew, *Towards an Archaeology of Mind*, 1982, *Antiquity*, LVII, 147–8.
- Hawkes, C. F. C., 1983d. Review of W. J. van Dussen, *History as Science: the Philosophy of R. G. Collingwood*, 1981, *Antiquity*, LVII, 150–51.
- Hawkes, C. F. C., 1983e. Review of Grahame Clark, *The Identity of Man*, 1983, *Antiquity*, LVII, 232–3.

- Hawkes, C. F. C., 1984a. 'Ictis Disentangled, and the British Tin Trade', *Oxford Journ. Arch.*, 3, 2, 211–33.
- Hawkes, C. F. C., 1984b. Review of S. J. de Laet, *La Belgique d'avant les Romains*, 1982, *Antiq. Journ.*, LXIV, 434–5.
- Hawkes, C. F. C., 1985. Review of S. Macready and F. H. Thompson (eds), *Cross-Channel Trade between Gaul and Britain in the Pre-Roman Iron Age*, 1984, *Antiquity*, LIX, 73–4.
- Hawkes, C. F. C., 1986a. 'The Research Laboratory: Its Beginning', *Archaeometry*, 28, 2, 131–2.
- Hawkes, C. F. C., 1986b. 'Archaeology in Britain since 1945', *Antiquity*, LX, 175–8.
- Hawkes, C. F. C., 1986c. 'Foreword' to Morris, M., 'An Iron Age and Romano-British site at Choseley Farm, Odiham: the excavations of Dorothy Liddell, 1937', *Proc. Hampshire Field Club*, 42, 89–90.
- Hawkes, C. F. C., 1986d. Review of C. Thomas, *Exploration of a drowned landscape*, 1985, *Antiquity*, LX, 61–2.
- Hawkes, C. F. C., 1987. 'Archaeologists and Indo-Europeanists: Can they mate? Hindrances and Hopes', in *Proto-Indo-European: the Archaeology of a Linguistic Problem. Studies in Honor of Marija Gimbutas*, S. N. Skomal and E. C. Polome (eds), 203–15.
- Hawkes, C. F. C., 1989. Review of R. and V. Megaw, *Celtic Art from its beginnings to the Book of Kells*, 1989, *Antiquity*, 63, 646–7.
- Hodson, F. R., 1962. 'Some pottery from Eastbourne, the "Marnians" and the Pre-Roman Iron Age in Southern England', *Proc. Prehist. Soc.*, XXVIII, 140–55.
- Hull, M. R. and Hawkes, C. F. C., 1987. *Corpus of Ancient Brooches in Britain*, Brit. Arch. Rep., 168.
- Jope, E. M. and Hawkes, C. F. C., 1984. 'Celtic Studies, Oxford, July, 1983', *Antiquity*, LVIII, 90–94.
- Renfrew, A. C., 1987. *Archaeology and Language*.
- Renfrew, C. and Bahn, P., 1991. *Archaeology: Theories, Methods and Practice*.
- Selkirk, A. and Hawkes, S. C. (eds), 1986. *Oxford University Institute of Archaeology: Silver Jubilee Reflections*.
- Trigger, B. G., 1989. *A History of Archaeological Thought*, Cambridge.
- Webster, D. B., 1991. *Hawkeseye: The Early Life of Christopher Hawkes*, Stroud.