



KATHLEEN KENYON

Walter Stoneman

KATHLEEN MARY KENYON

1906-1978

IN 1952 Kathleen Kenyon initiated the excavations at Jericho, which were to change, dramatically, man's vision of his past. Childe's 'food producing revolution' was seen to have developed far more quickly than he had thought; the revolution itself assumed convincing human dimensions. Jacobsen's 'intellectual adventure of ancient man' began far earlier than anyone had conceived.

That great breakthrough in our knowledge was an archaeological triumph achieved and interpreted by a woman who had learned her craft under good teachers, had perfected the meticulous art of excavation so that few could doubt her reconstructions, and who had, at her disposal, the recently discovered method of dating by Carbon 14—a beneficent 'fall-out', thanks to the researches of Dr Libby, from the nuclear studies which had produced the atomic bomb.

The excavations at Jericho had other far-reaching results. Kathleen Kenyon (known to all as 'K') always believed that the basic field-work, on which all interpretations and conclusions depended, was that of a team. Of the scores of archaeological neophytes who worked with her at Jericho alone (not to mention a similar number at Jerusalem) one can compile a list of about sixty persons who gained their first field experience under her and carried the lessons they learned into their own professional careers, in excavation and/or teaching. Because her teams were of international scope, and most diverse in academic qualifications and interests, those lessons have been applied in geographical areas and in scholarly and art historical disciplines far removed from the Near East. When to these numbers are added the students of K's mentor, Sir Mortimer Wheeler, in India and Pakistan, and those working in archaeological research centres in nearly every part of the globe, one can perceive how the revolution in archaeological method which made Jericho possible has spread far abroad.

The regrettable tardiness of this memorial for Dame Kathleen has at least one compensation, especially for those who had the privilege of knowing and working with her in the field during both the Jericho and Jerusalem excavations but had only a vague

knowledge of her career and accomplishments before 1952. Obituaries have been written, but all, without exception, concentrate on the last twenty-five years of her life and pay scant attention to her earlier years. They have not, I believe, sufficiently appreciated the special circumstances of birth, temperament, training, and experience which produced the woman whose administrative skills and gifts of observation, analysis, and interpretation would make her name a household word and ensure recognition for the archaeological method she espoused. The opportunity which I have had, in part through reading but also through delightful talks with her sister, Nora, to learn how K's special gifts and character were brought to maturity has made me more conscious of the personality which so strongly informed and determined her life and work. Her contributions to archaeological theory and practice cannot be divorced from her desire to obtain more information about, and understand more fully, the past triumphs and defeats of the human race. To appreciate her, one must see her accomplishments in a much larger frame than Palestine. This memoir is an attempt to understand the great lady who accomplished the miracle of changing man's view of himself and gave him a new pride in his past.

Kathleen Mary Kenyon was born in London on 5 January 1906, the elder of the two daughters of Sir Frederic Kenyon of Pradoc, Shropshire. Her father had a long and distinguished career in the British Museum, first as Assistant Keeper in the Department of Manuscripts from 1898 and then as Director and Principal Librarian (he was the first person in the Museum's history to have achieved the Directorship without having been in charge of his own Department). She whose formative years were lived in the Director's quarters at the Museum could hardly be unaffected by the lure of antiquity and the scholarly habits of those who were studying there.

K's mother was Amy, daughter of Rowland Hunt, of New Boreatton, Shropshire, five miles from Pradoc. It is not surprising that K maintained close ties with that peaceful countryside throughout her life. It was in Shropshire, Herefordshire, and Leicestershire that she carried out some of her archaeological projects. It was in North Wales, very close to the Shropshire border, that she lived her last years, among gentle hills, surrounded by fields and woods, with the river Dee meandering along in the valley below. She was fond of sports and excelled at them; she rode well, and loved animals (particularly her ever-present dogs). She knew country life and farming problems, the

seasonal changes, the daily chores, tools, and equipment. She thus gained that close affinity with nature and rural life which would enrich her understanding and interpretation of the day-to-day activities of men and women of the past, whose memorials are often obscure and difficult to read in the scant remains of their dwellings, work-places, and tombs.

K was educated at St Paul's Girls' School where, not surprisingly (at least in retrospect), she became head girl. At Somerville College, Oxford, where she read for the Honours School of Modern History (which, for her, was mainly medieval history), her character had already assumed the form it would maintain until the end. Her history tutor was the illustrious Maude Clarke, a noted medievalist. Her comments at the time K left Oxford are illuminating: 'Miss Kenyon can be relied upon to carry out with intelligence and energy any duties that she may undertake. She is incapable of doing anything—games or work—in a slovenly or half-hearted way. The all-round ability, loyalty and unselfishness which have made her a most valuable member of the College should ensure her popularity as well as her success wherever she goes.'

She became one of the first women to be admitted as a member of the University's Archaeological Society and its first woman president. She obtained her blue in hockey, and team pictures of those days found place on her walls wherever she lived. It is quite clear that she was already one whose career would not be confined to the study and classroom of academe but who would venture forth into a world of physical activity controlled by a clearly defined purpose, to discover a past for which no written records or tradition could provide a clue.

That she would become an archaeologist, however, seems to have been largely a matter of accident. On graduation from Oxford she received and, no doubt, enthusiastically accepted (for the year was 1929) the opportunity presented by Dr Gertrude Caton Thompson's invitation to work with her at the famous ruins of Zimbabwe, in what was then Southern Rhodesia. Not only would she travel abroad but she could test her nascent interest in archaeology, and, perhaps, discover whether this still novel field of research would make an attractive career. The expedition was sponsored by the British Association for the Advancement of Science and financed, in part, by the Rhodes Trust. K's role was a broad one—to be photographer, driver of the ancient Dodge, and assistant to the director. It was a wonderful experience for a novice, for she was exposed, at very close quarters,

to the experience and standards of a pupil and associate of that archaeological genius, Sir William Flinders Petrie. Dr Caton Thompson, for her part, recognized K's abilities and, particularly, commented on her handiness with cameras and cars.

A single season of excavation (following the pioneering work of Dr D. Randall MacIver twenty-five years earlier) dispelled the many wild theories about the origins of the great stone structures of Zimbabwe and demonstrated not only that it was to be dated to the Middle Ages but that it was built by Bantu-speaking native Africans. It was a discovery that justified a deep pride of tradition in a people who had no written past; it is not surprising that Zimbabwe would become the name of the new state some fifty years later. This was not to be a unique case, for archaeology was to prove its relevance even in the realm of contemporary politics, on many other occasions. For K, particularly, the Zimbabwe experience marks a first appearance in print as a contributor to the publication of the site written by the director.¹

The following year was an important one for the Kenyons, not least for K. It was the year of Sir Frederic's retirement from the British Museum and K helped in the move to their weekend cottage in Godstone, Surrey, recently enlarged, chiefly to house her father's collection of books. For the next five years she was actively engaged in field-work in both Britain and Palestine; this apparently unlikely turn of events was, it seems, in part due to her father's studies and interests. [I say this with some caution for, to my knowledge, K never acknowledged such an influence or any intervention, direct or indirect, by her father on her career.] Sir Frederic was, first and foremost, a classical scholar and a member of the various societies to be expected of a worker in this field. There is little doubt that he knew Dr (later Sir) R. E. M. Wheeler, for the latter was also a classicist and both were interested in archaeology. After 1926, in fact, both were Fellows of the Society of Antiquaries which was to sponsor the excavation of Verulamium (St Albans) directed by the Wheelers. It is possible, therefore, that Sir Frederic played some role in bringing K's experience at Zimbabwe to Wheeler's attention. She was, in any case, recruited by the Wheelers as a key member of the team which, from 1930 to 1933, was to establish both the pre-Roman

¹ For references to Kathleen Kenyon's writings see the bibliography (up to 1975) by N. J. H. Lord and A. C. Western in P. R. S. Moorey and P. J. Parr (eds.), *Archaeology in the Levant. Essays for Kathleen Kenyon* (Warminster, Wilts.: Aris & Phillips, 1978), pp. xi-xiv. Later works are, in our text, provided with place of publication and date.

Belgic presence at the site and to investigate and date some features of the defences and civic buildings of the Roman city.

K, during the four seasons, supervised most of the laborious excavation of 'The Fosse'—part of the defence works of the earliest Roman settlement; one writer (Moorey) has already noted the close similarities between K's methods and results at Verulamium and Samaria. For a final season, in 1934, K returned with the expedition architect, A. W. G. Lowther, to excavate and plan the theatre, still one of the most impressive (and visible) Roman buildings in Britain. This was her first experience in directing a large work force of experienced supervisors and students on an important site; it would stand her in good stead in the years ahead. Her speedy publication of the theatre in 1935 is an indication of how strongly she took to heart Wheeler's views on the need for prompt follow-up and presentation of the results to the public.

We should note here, however, that Tessa Wheeler probably had as great an influence on K as did Wheeler. Throughout the years at Verulamium, she was in charge of the Roman sites; it is not surprising that K, working closely with Tessa, should develop both friendship and admiration for her. Certainly it was Wheeler who was the overall archaeological strategist and administrator, roles which he performed with imagination and the natural authority which had, through the years of the First World War, been severely tried and not found wanting. Tessa, however, in her quiet and even self-abnegating way, had not only been his close associate and full partner in his earlier excavations, but had efficiently, without fanfare, performed the multifarious and demanding tasks of camp management and dig organization—so time-consuming and yet so necessary, especially with large staffs of experts and students. K's temperament was akin to Tessa's in many ways and it is probable that much of what later generations of students were to find so endearing in K—her modesty, helpfulness, good humour, kindness, and tolerance, were in part the result of K's own experience with Tessa. Overall, however, it is natural that K should see herself indebted primarily to the more dominant Wheeler 'to whom' as she wrote, 'I owe all my training in field archaeology and constant inspiration towards improved methods' (Foreword to *Beginning in Archaeology*, 1952). Immediately following this tribute, she voices her appreciation of 'Professor V. Gordon Childe, whose brilliant analysis and syntheses of archaeological subjects are such a stimulus to a broad view'. It was, perhaps, Childe, the famous prehistorian, who watched over

her shoulder as, later, she penetrated further and further into the human past at Jericho.

It was another side of her father's scholarly activity and interest which was, no doubt, of some effect in her involvement with excavation in Palestine. His papyrological studies had been, of necessity, somewhat in abeyance during his directorship at the Museum, but on retirement he accepted responsibility for publishing the large collection of new documents of the second to fourth centuries recently acquired by Mr Chester Beatty. Many of these were biblical and led Sir Frederic into the fields of both the 'lower' (textual) and 'higher' (literary) criticism of the sacred book; his publications, both scholarly and popular, in these fields brought him a new and world-wide reputation. He was one of the participants in the negotiations with the Russian government which led to the British Museum's purchase of the Codex Sinaiticus in 1933. It is little wonder that his biblical interests should have led to close association with the work of the Palestine Exploration Fund and that he should become the first Chairman of the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem after its founding in 1919 and remain so for many years. It is difficult to see how he could not be involved, in some way, with K's becoming attached to the BSAJ and a member of the Joint Expedition to Samaria of 1931-3, which combined the financial and intellectual forces of Harvard University (the sponsor of the earlier expedition of 1908-10), the Palestine Exploration Fund, the British Academy, the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem, and the Hebrew University. This expedition and the British Expedition of 1935 were both directed by Mr J. W. Crowfoot, director of the BSAJ.

K's annual alternation between Verulamium and Samaria provided the proof, if that were needed, that the new methods of excavation and the principles and standards of the new archaeology being developed by the Wheelers at Verulamium were not only applicable but essential for the elucidation of the far more complex site of Samaria. It is, in fact, on the bedrock of K's stratigraphical analysis of the successive periods of occupation at Samaria (which appeared as chap. 3 in *Samaria-Sebaste*, i, *The Buildings at Samaria*, published in 1942) that the history of the site could be untangled. Her study of the pottery in *Samaria-Sebaste*, iii, *The Objects from Samaria* (which appeared in 1957, only after and delayed by the Second World War) made it possible to associate the various periods with historical events whose literary documentation was to be found mainly in the Bible. It should be noted, however, that K did not herself equate the archaeological

evidence with the literary (biblical) record. She states, in fact, that the excavations 'revealed a series of buildings of the Israelite period, of which the relative chronology could be definitely established by stratification but of which the absolute dating is much less certain' (*Samaria-Sebaste*, i, 93). Later she remarks that the pottery in the associated deposits is in entire agreement 'with a date of approximately 880 BC' (*Samaria-Sebaste*, i, 97) for the earliest major construction phase but refuses to go further and equate this phase with the work of Omri and Ahab. She left this step to others, principally the Director, who would meld the strictly archaeological data with similar evidence from other sites and with the literary documentation to produce a historical synthesis.

Such an attitude on K's part—the assertion of the primacy of archaeological data as a source of knowledge about the past which should not be exploited to serve other ends—has often been a source of criticism. In a way, her refusal is surprising, because her mentor (Wheeler) rarely hesitated to draw historical conclusions from his archaeological evidence; for this he was criticized and some of his assertions considered facile or based on insufficient or ambiguous evidence. In Palestine it is commonplace that excavators or interpreters who claim that archaeological evidence proves the veracity (at least the historical accuracy) of the Bible are often roundly criticized.

Generally, today, archaeological philosophy would side with K; that is, archaeology as a discipline should not be used to prove or disprove historical (or any other) theory or interpretation. On the other hand, K would probably have repudiated such support for the view of archaeology which she espoused. She was closer to Wheeler, the humanist, than to the technicians and sociologists of the modern school. Her tacit *caveat* against stretching archaeological evidence beyond its proper limit (as revealed in her Samaria reports) is, however, probably akin to her bald statement: 'Archaeology is nowadays an exact science . . .' (*PEQ* 1939, 29), made at about the same time. Both are probably best regarded as self-assured judgements of a young disciple of a new faith whose confidence in the self-evident truth is absolute and whose recognition of the errors inherent in straying from the revealed path makes any backsliding intolerable. Like Wheeler she had no scorn of the natural sciences and modern techniques when they knew their place: they were hand-maidens to archaeology, important aids to the elucidation of the environment and the mode of life of a community striving to mould its environment to human needs or

to accommodate human desires to the harsh facts of the natural world. Behavioural as well as natural and physical sciences must be considered as supportive of the main aim—the understanding of man and his societies in the past. Today, when archaeology has been so often politicized, K's refusal to translate an archaeological possibility (or even probability) into historical fact is a healthy reminder of the dangers of the opposite approach.

When K's responsibilities for the research and publication of Verulamium and Samaria were fulfilled, she turned once more to British archaeology. Samaria, like Zimbabwe, may have seemed like a detour—of interest, even of excitement and providing a sense of accomplishment—but not determinative of what her lifework would be. After all, archaeology in England still provided more opportunities for employment and, in addition, offered the unique challenge of applying new methods and the stimulus of working with other enthusiastic young scholars on the whole subject of Britain's past. All these came together in the Institute of Archaeology.

As early as 1926 Wheeler's recognition of the need for more trained archaeologists and a course of study which would provide both the professional and technical skills required by the new discipline led him to draw up a 'detailed scheme for a university Institute of Archaeology such as nowhere existed in this country'. It was not to come quickly or easily. In every possible way he preached the gospel of archaeology, specifically, it seems British archaeology, in contrast with classical archaeology and Egyptology. Both of these were acceptable as 'humanistic' studies at the University of London to which he was attached, whereas British archaeology (at least that of the pre-Roman period) and pre-history (a matter of 'stones and dirty boots') were suspect as 'scientific'. In these circumstances it was provident, if rather unexpected, that an agreement was reached between Wheeler and Petrie to collaborate in their efforts to create at the University a centre for archaeological training. Petrie badly needed some place to house his large collection of artefacts, mainly from excavations in Palestine. He had received the magnificent sum of £10,000 from an anonymous donor for this purpose and he now generously offered it to Wheeler for their common goal. For Wheeler this involved some change of emphasis, but he apparently welcomed it.

Finally, in 1934, the London University Institute of Archaeology came into legal existence, but without premises or full-time staff. A home was finally found in St John's Lodge, Regent's Park,

beautifully located but derelict after many years of disuse. Wheeler accepted the position of Honorary Director; in a letter written by him in 1935 to the chairman of the Managing Committee, he comments: 'I propose to suggest Kathleen Kenyon for the job [of secretary of the Managing Committee]. She is a level-headed person, with useful experience both in this country and in Palestine.' Her appointment was approved and, as Secretary, she assumed responsibility for solving the endless problems which beset the new foundation. The great task of getting the Institute suitably equipped for the teaching of field photography, for conservation, for soil analysis and other necessary skills, for storing the new teaching collections, for shelving of books, and for housing instructors was finally brought to a stage where the new Institute could be formally opened in April 1937.

K continued as Secretary, Wheeler as Honorary Director; they shared the teaching of prehistoric and Roman Britain. No doubt both had their doubts and worries, for the very existence of the fledgling institution was threatened by a severe shortage of funds. Further, the raising of professional eyebrows at the idea of granting academic respectability to a body which taught such vocational courses prevented the University from accepting it completely into the fold.

K's love of excavation and her teaching responsibilities involved her in more field-work, at which many of the students gained their first experience as dirt archaeologists. Two brief seasons (five weeks in 1936 and seven in 1937) at Roman Viroconium (today marked by the village of Wroxeter in Shropshire) demonstrated that it was founded as a legionary camp about AD 48 but dates, as a civil town, only from the Flavian period when the legionary headquarters were transferred north to Chester. It was K's conjecture that the local tribe of the Cornovii were forced to abandon their hill-fort on the Wrekin, near by, to make up the population of the new town. K planned two seasons of digging on the Wrekin, of which that in 1939 was to be preliminary. Unfortunately, the second season never took place and the conjecture could not be confirmed. In these same years, 1936 to 1939 inclusive, K led expeditions to the Jewry Wall site in Leicester. The wall itself, all that was standing of an earlier Roman building, was threatened by a general reconstruction of the area. Everywhere on the site were traces of occupation dating between AD 35 and 50 and attributed to the Belgic tribe of the Coritani. The inhabitants apparently surrendered to the forces of the Emperor Claudius in AD 43, and the succeeding levels

document 'the gradual evolution of the Roman-British country town' with its concomitant Romanization. The publication was delayed by the war but, with all its supporting chapters on local and imported pottery, on coins, small finds, and animal and human bones, it is a continuing source of information and dating for this period in the history of Britain.

The outbreak of war in 1939 forced a halt in excavation, but for K, at least, there was no relinquishing of archaeological duties. It was her voluntary and devoted service as Secretary and (from 1942-6) as Acting Director of the Institute of Archaeology which guaranteed that it would survive to see its acceptance as an official organ of the University and enjoy great success under the directorship of V. Gordon Childe. It even moved to Gordon Square in 1957, to a modern building in the heart of the University, but not without many regrets on the part of those who had come to cherish the relative peace, the austere charm, and the close fellowship of the old Lodge in Regent's Park. For K, the hostilities also brought wartime duties with the Red Cross, first as Divisional Commandant and Secretary of the Hammersmith Division in 1939 and from 1942 as Director of the Youth Department—which involved recruitment. These diverse responsibilities, without the compensation of purposive activity in the open air on an excavation, must have been very wearing and frustrating. There is little doubt, however, in the minds of people who have been associated with the Institute over the years, that its continued existence through these very difficult times was due to her sheer hard work and persistence.

The end of the war brought new problems, but also new opportunities. K was involved, particularly in Southwark, in the great clean-up and rescue operation in urban areas which followed years of neglect and serious damage by enemy action. With Childe's appointment as Director of the Institute, K became Lecturer in Palestinian Archaeology; the time was not ripe, however, for a resumption of field-work there. In the meantime, she could take up where she had left off in British archaeology. She did not resume her earlier work on the Wrekin but, instead, turned her energies to two other hill-forts (both large univallate sites)—Breedon-on-the-Hill, a stronghold of the Coritani in the north-west corner of Leicestershire (1946) and Sutton Walls, in Herefordshire, with its tribal war cemetery (1948-50).

It must have seemed to her friends and colleagues, at this juncture, that K was definitely set on the path of British archaeology. She had been digging, with the exception of the war years,

on a succession of British sites. She had helped bring the Institute of Archaeology into existence and had shared with Wheeler the teaching of British archaeology. During the war years, in Wheeler's absence, she was Acting Director and, presumably, continued to carry the same teaching load. Even after her appointment as Lecturer in Palestinian Archaeology, she carried on her field-work in Britain for another four years since the political situation in Palestine was so inimical to archaeological ventures. It could well have eventuated that K, with her high reputation and long experience in British archaeology, might finally have been persuaded to make it her lifework.

Once again, however (as with Zimbabwe and Samaria), another exotic site carried her away—Sabratha. This was one of the Roman/Byzantine cities in Tripolitania (part of today's Libya), which had been the site of major excavation and conservation work by the Italian Antiquities Service between the wars. Major Ward-Perkins, early in 1943, was seconded from military duties on the recommendation of his superior officer, Colonel Wheeler, to reconstitute the Antiquities administration for Cyrenaica and Tripolitania. After the war Ward-Perkins became Director of the British School in Rome and one of his early acts was to invite K to collaborate with him in excavation at Sabratha. One major season (in 1948) and two smaller expeditions (in 1949 and 1951) were carried out. Apart from some recording of the results of the Italian excavations, the significant new undertaking was a substantial sounding into the pre-Roman Phoenician levels.

Ward-Perkins produced, in 1949, an interim report on the 1948 season, and K a very brief statement on the whole project in the *Illustrated London News* of 29 March 1952, but a complete report was not ready when she died. Ward-Perkins took up the task on behalf of the Society for Libyan Studies. His death in 1981 led to the assumption by Philip M. Kenrick, now of Reading University, of responsibility for the final publication. He remarks (in *Libyan Studies*, xiii (1982), 51–60): 'The documentation which [Miss Kenyon] left was certainly in an advanced stage of preparation. Much of the excavation is, in fact, written up and it seems that most of the text was completed in the early fifties. Publication has clearly been delayed by the immense task of studying the pottery and providing the dating evidence required to correlate the stratigraphic sequences which had been established. This task was vastly greater in 1950 than it would have been now, in view of the advances in our knowledge of the relevant pottery in the intervening years.' Some idea of what was involved

is given by K's comment that 'from the first season at Sabratha even the selected pottery brought back to England amounted to seven tons'. I have vivid memories of K's indefatigable work schedule as I witnessed it in 1955: work on the Sabratha finds at the Institute during the week after her heavy teaching and counselling schedule, the Jericho materials at her cottage in High Wycombe at the week-ends. (She bought this cottage in November 1952, after her father's death.) It was a tough programme but not unexpected; at Jericho she seemed to require no more than four hours' sleep a night and she maintained almost unbelievable work habits to the very end.

We have seen K's contributions to the archaeology of Britain, particularly Roman Britain, and her unexpected forays into East Africa, Palestine, and North Africa. We must now turn to those years of her commitment to the archaeology of Palestine. Although she had become Lecturer in Palestinian Archaeology at the Institute in 1948, there was little prospect of excavating there. Yet, a year after completion of the work at Sabratha, K was actively planning excavations at Jericho.

That the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem should be the sponsor is even more surprising. The BSAJ had been created in 1919 under the joint sponsorship of the British Academy and the Palestine Exploration Fund, largely as a result of the efforts of Sir Robert Mond, backed by his generous financial support and guarantees. The old established Schools in Athens and Rome were its models but it had not acquired the resources or the reputation they enjoyed. Sir Frederic Kenyon became its first Chairman of the Board, and the University of Liverpool provided the services of Professor John Garstang as its first Director. The Mandatory power took advantage of this development to make Garstang also the Director of the new Department of Antiquities, to share the premises acquired for the School's use on Cœur de Lion Street (near the later Mandelbaum Gate) and to make use of the School's staff for its infant inspectorate. Garstang did much to build up the School's library, a project which, once more, received generous support from Mond. However, when the Rockefeller Museum was built (it was founded in 1927), the Department of Antiquities finally established its headquarters there, leaving the School to its own resources and its own plans. The BSAJ was a full partner in the Joint Expedition to Samaria and was also engaged in the British Expedition which followed, both under the direction of the Crowfoots, as we have already seen. John Garstang, at about the same time, was excavating Jericho. A new

archaeological survey of Palestine was begun but was abandoned when war broke out in 1939. After the war, in the years 1945–8, political disturbances and civil war finally led to the creation of the state of Israel.

By this time, also, the BSAJ had lost its premises, and its library was stored in a room at the American School. The prospects were so dismal that the British Treasury even considered abandoning altogether the idea of a British institute in Jerusalem. It was Wheeler, as Honorary Secretary of the British Academy, who saved the day. In 1951 K became Honorary Director of the re-constituted BSAJ and went to Jerusalem to negotiate with the American School of Oriental Research a collaborative effort for further work at Jericho.

It must not be thought that any major operation at the site was contemplated at this stage; funds were simply not available. Rather, K thought that a field expedition would provide the high profile activity which would put the School once more 'on the map' and win the public support needed. A School building, as headquarters and hostel, and a permanent staff could come later.

Her reasons for choosing Jericho as the target were simple enough. The large-scale excavations carried out at the site by Garstang between 1930 and 1936 had provided clear evidence for a destruction of the city by earthquake and fire. The date assigned to this event, the second half of the second millennium BC., made it possible to associate it with the capture of the city by the Israelites under Joshua, but it was generally felt that evidence for a more precise dating was desirable. In a deep sounding, also, Garstang had distinguished a thick deposit with microliths, above which were eight levels containing houses built of mud brick, with stone and flint tools of a Neolithic type but no pottery or metal. Many scholars thought the terminology Garstang applied to these deposits—'Pre-Pottery Neolithic'—was self-contradictory or at least ambivalent. Obviously, further efforts should be made to discover more about these lower levels. Finally, K thought, correctly, that such a dig would train students in Near Eastern archaeology without whom the BSAJ could not survive. The project was designed for a one-season, at most a two-season, effort.

That we miscalculated is, as everyone knows, an understatement. I can remember vividly the early days of that first season in January 1952 when the truth dawned. As Annual Professor of the American School of Oriental Research that year, I was honoured with the title of Assistant Director of the dig, but I was a very inexperienced archaeologist and knew nothing of what has come

to be called the 'Wheeler-Kenyon' method. In fact, the first edition of K's *Beginning in Archaeology* appeared only in that year and none of us had seen it. Nevertheless, K asked me to sit with her on the edge of Garstang's great east-west trench in the northern part of the tell, our legs dangling in the air, to look at the stratification clearly visible on the opposite wall of the trench. We discussed it and tried to understand it; we agreed that it bore little resemblance to the published section which, at best, must be considered schematic. At the same time, there was no doubt that, at the bottom of the trench, were the outlines of house walls and that these were associated with flint and stone artefacts but no pottery. It was then, also, I believe, that she told me of her puzzlement about the 'Joshua' wall in the western trench. That the wall showed clear evidence of destruction by fire, and possibly, earthquake was not in doubt; the foundation trench of the wall, however, contained pottery datable no later than the Early Bronze Age, nearly a millennium before Joshua.

Such discoveries put a completely different complexion on the project. The rest, as one must say, is history. This is not the place to describe in detail the surprises which awaited us over the next years; K, herself, in the annual reports in the *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* and in *Digging Up Jericho*, conveys, if one reads between the lines, the excitement with which each new day was greeted by the Jericho team, from Director downwards. Excavation at Jericho was high adventure, for we were digging into the unknown and anything was possible. It might be the city wall of the earliest Pre-Pottery Neolithic town, still standing over 7.5 m high, and a magnificent stone tower, solid, except for a passageway and staircase in its interior, leading to the top. Until this discovery, the oldest stone architecture was that of the Egyptian Early Dynastic and Old Kingdom in the early third millennium BC; the Jericho tower is of the eighth millennium BC—about twice as old! It might be plastered and painted skulls, surely early portrait busts, from the seventh millennium BC. It might be tombs of about 1600 BC, containing the remains of well-constructed wooden furniture, of textiles, jewellery, carved bone inlay, wigs, of food and drink and, of course, quantities of pottery objects. What did not appear was firm evidence of a town which had fallen to Joshua.

Year by year, the team changed, except for a few registrars, conservators, surveyors, artists, and other such trained personnel who usually stayed for more than one season and provided some continuity. Another group of perennials were the Jerichoan

workers from the refugee camps who came to us, often as very young boys but, after seven years, had become knowledgeable and interested professional excavators. In fact, when the Jericho excavation came to an end, they were much in demand on other digs; many of them were later employed on the Jerusalem excavations. 'Jerichoans', in fact, became the equivalent of the 'Shergatis' of the Mesopotamian excavations and the 'Guftis' of Egypt.

It is almost impossible to exaggerate the importance of the Jericho excavations, not only for Palestinian archaeology but for the Old World generally. Whole new vistas of mankind's early history were opened up. 'By the remorseless application of strict excavational method, and by sheer courage and force of personality in the face of difficulties that would have daunted anybody less single-minded, she pushed the history of settled, urban life back at least a couple of thousand years beyond its previously accepted limits. The traditionalists fought a determined rearguard action, but they were out-gunned . . . Many of the accepted orthodoxies of archaeological thinking had been irretrievably shattered; and, even more important, a door had been flung open, letting in the fresh air of new and vastly improved excavational techniques, all of this on a site which attracted the maximum public attention and in an excavation which had drawn volunteers from the five continents. Near Eastern archaeology could never be the same again.' In these ringing words, delivered on 25 October 1978 at the Memorial Service for K held in St James's, Piccadilly, John Ward-Perkins hailed K and her accomplishments at Jericho.

Even today, although thirty years of extensive (and intensive) archaeological investigation has taken place in Palestine, Jericho remains a type site for the early periods, from perhaps the 10th to the 5th millennium BC. Research in Israel, in Syria, and Lebanon, in Turkey, Iraq, and Iran, have supplemented, modified and (frequently) complicated the picture presented by Jericho.

This would be the logical place to explain how and why Jericho has played such an important role. This memoir cannot be an archaeological treatise, yet one must give a basic minimum of information, if only to explain why the excavation itself had such a gripping hold on all those who worked there. The earliest occupation at Jericho, on bedrock, seems to have been a sanctuary (dedicated perhaps to the powerful spirit of the perennial spring), established by wandering hunters who frequented the area in the 10th millennium BC. Evidence for a more permanent (but still

partly nomadic) settlement, termed Proto-Neolithic, is provided by about 4.0 m of deposit containing a series of floors which must have belonged to round huts constructed of perishable materials.

The transition to a sedentary population was finally accomplished in a fully urban settlement termed Pre-Pottery Neolithic A. Its round houses (possibly domed), its defensive walls and great stone tower, its domestication and raising of grains, the assumed irrigation works, the implications of an (ancestor?) cult of skulls, all bespeak the evolution of community organization, social controls and of specialization of function within the society. Parallels to this stage of cultural development have been found at a few other sites but Jericho remains, until now, unique in its achievement of urbanism. Its date—roughly the eighth millennium BC.

PPNA was succeeded by another urban culture named, at Jericho, Pre-Pottery Neolithic B. It differed in many ways from its predecessor: the houses were rectangular, there were definite evidences not only of a plastered-skull cult, but also of a household shrine and, possibly, a community sanctuary. Agriculture was actively pursued and there was now, in addition, a beginning of the domestication of animals. There are far more parallels to this culture of the seventh millennium BC in Jordan, Israel, and in the north (Syria and Lebanon), from which it came into Palestine. In Anatolia, too, we have at this time comparable developments but the cultures are different. Yet, at the time of the 1952–8 excavations, Jericho was *sui generis*.

What follows at Jericho and at other sites in Palestine, must come as something of a shock to the 'ever-upward-and-onward' evolutionist (if any still exist). There is a complete break in occupation for an unknown period, but perhaps between a thousand and fifteen hundred years. Where the population went, how they lived, what caused this sudden cultural decline is a mystery. When occupation appears once more on the tell of Jericho it is by people living in pit-dwellings, practising agriculture and for the first time using pottery (crude and primitive, to be sure), which is distinctive enough in form and decoration to permit comparison with other sites and to demonstrate that this retrogression was widespread. While the excavation was in progress, the full significance of this sudden cultural break was not recognized, but the evidence for it can now be seen as, perhaps, a salutary warning to those who see in PPNA and PPNB grounds for unconditional optimism about the human condition.

One can follow man's cultural history onward through another

3,000 years of occupation on the tell of Jericho and in the tombs of its inhabitants. One can only admire the meticulous techniques of excavation, the keen observation, and the discerning interpretation which are evident throughout K's writing on this site. It was the wonder of the Jericho excavations under K's direction that so many people, the general public as well as the professional historian, recognized that here was archaeological talent at its best, reconstructing a human past which was far more sophisticated and understandable at a far earlier period than had hitherto been imagined. The BBC sent out a large crew to Jericho in 1955, with Wheeler as the star attraction, to produce a programme for its series on 'Buried Treasure'. All could identify with these distant ancestors and see them as flesh and blood human beings and not merely as dim precursors to be recognized and distinguished only by habits of chipping flint, manufacturing pottery, or building houses peculiar to them.

It is a great pity that K did not live to publish Jericho completely, for there is little doubt that this project was the high point of her career. Her factual reports, year by year in the *PEQ*, her popular, but certainly informative book, *Digging Up Jericho*, her two volumes on the tombs and the completed or largely researched material left to Dr Tom Holland, her doctoral student and assistant, bear witness to the devotion and labour she applied to the task over many years. Holland's completion of the work is a rich testimony to the importance of the site, to K's ability to cope with its complexities, and to his own appreciation of both causes.

It has always been a little mystifying to other archaeologists and a source of criticism that K should have taken on the excavation of Jerusalem in 1961, only three years after the end of the Jericho excavation. To many it was foolhardy, perhaps even quixotic. Some may have thought that she was over-confident in her own abilities. Her reasons were, however, simple enough. The archaeological investigation of Jerusalem had been, for nearly a century, a prime concern of British archaeologists, but the task had by no means been accomplished. The rapid growth in Jerusalem's population was leading to the building of houses on the top and slopes of the south-east hill, outside the present walls, where the earliest city lay and from which David ruled the newly created kingdom of Israel. If excavation did not begin soon, using the new techniques proven so successful at Jericho, there might not be another chance. It is quite possible that the very difficulties experienced by her predecessors posed a challenge she could not resist. Jerusalem was, moreover, the only city in Palestine which

would *not* be an anti-climax after Jericho. Its historical and religious importance could not fail to make the elucidation of its history by archaeological means of great public interest. Finally, K was enough of a sentimentalist to believe that the centennial of Britain's involvement in Jerusalem, to be celebrated in 1965, could most worthily be marked by a new, definitive expedition which would solve many of the problems still remaining.

Whether or not she was justified in her analysis of the immediacy of the need, she sought and obtained the collaboration of the École Biblique under its renowned archaeologist, Père Roland de Vaux, and of the Royal Ontario Museum under the writer.

Once more, given the topography of Jerusalem and the fact that few unoccupied areas suitable for excavation were available in the busy, living city, the basic stratification of the defence systems on the eastern slope of the ancient city of David was investigated by the trench method so successful at Jericho. The main trench, descending at an angle of nearly 45° , was extended as needed to follow walls or to investigate other features over a broader area. Elsewhere, single squares, sometimes enlarged to cover greater areas, had to suffice where adjacent buildings impinged too closely. Parenthetically, we should note here that a grid system of squares was rarely used. This may seem strange, for it is one of the characteristics of the Wheeler-Kenyon system. At Jericho, a restricted grid system was used in site II above the spring. At Jerusalem, where level areas suitable for a grid were seldom available, only site S (adjacent to the corner of the city wall east of the Dung Gate) and site L (in the Armenian Garden) were treated in this way.

Perhaps this is the place to pause and consider criticisms which have been levelled at this, by now, almost universal method of digging. The Wheeler-Kenyon stratigraphical system is predicated on the necessity of recognizing, excavating, and recording on graph paper, to a predetermined scale, the different layers of soil, distinguished as they are excavated by colour or texture. Only thus can one discern the sequence in which they have been laid down; this sequence in turn determines the relative order of walls, floors, pits, ovens, and other man-made features encountered. It is the only method by which the sequence of walls and floors can be proven and demonstrated. Such excavating, however, must be meticulous if the interpretation is to be accurate, and meticulousness means experience and time.

Excavation by simple trench, however, can provide sections only in the two sides of the trench. If the trench consists of a series

of separate squares, the cross-baulks will tie the two sides together and provide position by horizontal length, horizontal width, and vertical height dimensions. On level ground, a whole grid of squares may be laid out. If, within the individual squares, additional baulks are needed, they can always be created and connected to a main section line, so providing the three-dimensional reference required.

The criticisms levelled against this method are two: the very meticulousness of the method demands extremely well-trained crews and is tedious; very rarely will a whole building, or complex of buildings, be excavated, and our knowledge of the architecture will be, by that measure, left incomplete. The other criticism is similar: the preservation of baulks prevents one from grasping the whole plan. To take the second criticism first: the method does not require that baulks be left in place; once drawn they may be removed and replaced by new ones as excavation proceeds downwards. As for the concern that meticulousness is self-defeating, it seems strange that an archaeologist or any researcher for that matter should indict precision in procedures or experiments. There is no easy answer to this incompatibility of means and ends. As a matter of fact, K encountered the problem at Jericho. In spite of several squares and trenches which descended into Pre-Pottery Neolithic B, nowhere was a complete house-plan excavated; we cannot say how large the houses were, whether they were built around courtyards, or what their relationship was to other houses and streets. In such circumstances the director will have to decide, on an *ad hoc* basis, whether the desideratum is a larger excavated area (with the concomitant risk of being unable to date a building exactly or to date the various modifications carried out on it) or whether the dating is the more important factor.

At Jericho, where the original aim of the project was to solve two specific problems, it seemed easier to proceed downwards in Garstang's trenches or dig new trenches parallel to his, in which the stratification could still be seen. When it was desirable to learn the extent of the walls to north and south, new trenches were dug. At Jerusalem there seemed to be no more effective way of distinguishing and dating, relatively and, subsequently, absolutely, the system of city defences which must have run along the brow or on the slopes of the original city of David. These trenches could be, and were, widened or extended to explore areas which might supplement the information already gained.

K, although she could be very dogmatic in her statements,

based on her long experience with her own method and on her observation of the unfortunate results of other methods, was more flexible in practice. Such flexibility did not extend to the abandonment of baulks or the recording of stratigraphy, but she did recognize practical problems. She had experience of the collapse of baulks through sheer weight and instability or from the effect of winter rains, but there were usually ways of precluding such misadventure or overcoming the misfortune once it had occurred.

No excavation could have been so demanding on physical stamina and mental alertness as Jerusalem. When K was working on smaller sites (even in Britain at the Verulamium Roman theatre), she had the energy of youth and few duties other than the job in hand. At Samaria, she had a strictly defined stratigraphic and pottery responsibility on which she could concentrate. At Sabratha, her task was, in part, the interpretation of structures and city plans already excavated by the Italians and new soundings to explore the older, pre-Roman levels. Also, she shared overall responsibility with Ward-Perkins. Jericho greatly increased the weight on her shoulders for she was sole director of a very large and complex operation. She also had heavy duties in England: teaching and administration at the Institute of Archaeology, her honorary directorship of the British School in Jerusalem, raising funds through scores of lectures, heavy writing schedules and obligations arising out of her membership of a number of learned societies. While publication of Sabratha had become the first heavy charge on her time and energy, she now had to do the research required to prepare annual reports on Jericho in *PEQ*. She was still, however, quite capable of running efficiently a major field project. Her strong physique, her long hours of work, her determination, and, perhaps, the relative isolation of the site assured this.

Jerusalem, however, was not Jericho. It was a stone-built site and the threatened avalanche of collapsing stone and earth (even when supported by skilfully built retaining walls) posed problems not experienced at brick-built Jericho. Jerusalem was also a large, living city, from whose intrusions and impositions one could not insulate oneself. K's indomitable determination to see and oversee all aspects of the work, day after day, involved climbing up and down the steep streets and slopes of Jerusalem in summer's heat, descending treacherous stairs into deep excavations, and struggling up again, working over and annotating great piles of pottery, drawing sections, and, in addition, carrying on diplomatic negotiations with officials of all kinds, civilian,

military, and ecclesiastical, on an endless variety of subjects, from supplies of drinking water to permission to dig an additional two metres here or there, from importunate tourists to labour disputes. In spite of the efficient help provided by housekeepers, registrars, conservators, photographers, draughtsmen, surveyors, the weight of ultimate responsibility was hers and she accepted it. That she did so with good grace, humour, and forbearance is one of the memorable experiences of working with her.

The non-archaeological demands on her time had also increased and were to burgeon. Miss Rachel Trickett, her successor at St Hugh's College, has generously provided the following brief commentary on her accomplishments there. 'Dame Kathleen Kenyon was elected Principal of St Hugh's College in 1962, and immediately involved herself in a strenuous appeal for building funds for the College which was so successful that one of the two new buildings which were erected as a result of it is named after her. She took a full part in University politics as a member of Hebdomadal Council, and she was a firm and generous administrator of the College. Her interest in and affection for undergraduates was responded to by them with great warmth and appreciation. She was a much loved Principal whose extraordinary energies enabled her to carry out this exacting position at the same time as she pursued her archaeological work.'

As a Trustee of the British and Ashmolean Museums, of the National Trust, and the Council for British Archaeology, as a member or officer of many learned societies, and as a counsellor, friend, and supporter of many local archaeological groups, she attended meetings, lectured, carried on a heavy correspondence, and raised funds. All these burdens, as well as her dogged attempts to conserve time for research and publication, must have kept her close to exhaustion much of the time.

Nevertheless, her difficulty in delegating or sharing authority constituted a serious flaw in what otherwise was an excellent archaeological method. Today, the Wheeler-Kenyon approach to excavation has been modified to recognize the limitations of even the most devoted and energetic director. First of all, mega-projects such as Jericho and Jerusalem have been abandoned, not only because of the vast administrative and publishing responsibilities entailed, but also because of the greatly increased costs. Also, the direction of a project has become a collaborative effort: a director and a team of experts with well-defined and delegated responsibilities share the burden of managing the project in the

field, season after season, and finally, the research and writing of the report.

Both changes reflect conditions far different from those which K faced. Today's greater cost is in part the result of changes in emphasis or of purpose in excavation: a field project has a clear and limited aim and the exact forces required to accomplish it are recruited. While the focus is sharper, the kinds of information sought have been broadened in order that the environment in which the target culture existed may be defined closely. Many of the new scientific disciplines taken for granted by today's archaeologists were not even known, or the need for such barely recognized, at the time of Jericho. Nor were they considered of great importance at Jerusalem, whose relatively late foundation as a walled city (about 1800 BC) encouraged us to think that the environment had changed little, if at all. The combination, in today's field-work, of fewer but more highly qualified (and expensive) assistants, working on smaller but more specialized projects is a far cry from what was considered a normal approach in the 1950s and 1960s.

Further, the ideal of a team of specialists sharing responsibility under an overall director assumes the availability of a body of professionals, trained and experienced in archaeology or one of the sciences. Such experts were very scarce when Jericho and Jerusalem were excavated. Year after year these sites were training grounds, and there were very few to whom K could have delegated responsibility even if she had been inclined to do so.

This is not to mitigate what, at least in hindsight, may well seem to be K's rashness in undertaking such a monumental task as Jerusalem. Her reasons for doing so, both logical and sentimental, are hard to fault. What she did not adequately assess was the cumulative burden of her responsibility for publication when added to the increasing demands made by her academic and administrative duties.

There is no doubt, however, that the Jerusalem project produced significant results. The limits of the city, and the lines of its defensive walls at various periods were, in general, established and, most important, dated. The mystery of access to its water supply, the spring Gihon, was solved. The extension of the limits of David's city to the north, under Solomon, to include the Temple hill was documented. Work in and on the flanks of the Central valley threw light on the Iron Age defences and the Herodian city plan. Excavations south of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre produced evidence that the traditional site of the tomb of Christ

could be authentic. Further west, above the Hinnom valley, the earliest line of defence was identified and dated. The so-called 'Third Wall' was shown to be no earlier than the sixth decade of the first century AD and is best interpreted as a barrier wall thrown up hurriedly when Titus's forces were approaching the city. To be sure, extensive excavation by Israeli archaeologists since 1967 has supplemented and in some respects modified the conclusions of the 1961-7 excavations, but generally they still stand.

Several postscripts to this brief description and assessment of the Jerusalem excavation must be added. Jericho and Jerusalem put the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem in the forefront of archaeological institutions after years of eclipse, and set a standard of technique which is respected and has been copied in many parts of the world. There is now a School building and hostel in which students can work and carry on their own researches. When the time came to establish a British institution in Jordan, K was able, in part, no doubt, because of her success in putting the Jerusalem School on a firm foundation, but also by her own energetic and influential efforts, to raise some thousands of pounds to keep the Amman office open until it was officially accepted into the family of British schools abroad by a Treasury grant in the spring of 1978. She also participated in the first meeting of the steering committee set up by the British Academy to launch the project. Her death, only a few months later, did not end her commitment; her library was sent to augment the small collection of the new British Institute at Amman for Archaeology and History. Included was the bound presentation volume of *Archaeology in the Levant*, edited by P. R. S. Moorey and P. J. Parr, and presented to her a few months before her death to replace the mere list of contributed essays which she had received at the party held at Oxford in January 1976, to mark her seventieth birthday.

Over the years which saw K so involved in field-work, she still found time to write. *Digging up Jericho* and *Digging up Jerusalem* were not pot-boilers. They are full of information and well written. They did much to publicize her work. She also wrote papers on subjects related to her excavations but of more limited import. These, to some extent, were attempts to re-interpret the conclusions of earlier excavators at other sites, the discoveries of Petrie at 'Ajjul, for instance, or those of the excavators of Megiddo and Hazor. To a different category belongs her *Archaeology in the Holy Land*, which, in an expanded and definitive fourth edition, appeared only after her death. Here too we should include her

contributions to the revised *Cambridge Ancient History*. These last two were basically attempts to produce a synthesis of all that was known, from archaeological and documentary sources, about the history of Palestine or, more broadly, about Palestinian history within the larger framework of Near Eastern and, finally, world history. Her publications have, inevitably, been compared with those of Professor Albright and Père de Vaux and, from some viewpoints, found wanting. Without in any way underestimating the work of these fine scholars, for whom K had very high regard, one wonders whether the comparisons (or, better, the strictures) are apt.

In her Preface to the first edition (1960) of *Archaeology in the Holy Land*, K states quite clearly her purpose: 'The emphasis in this book is on the first word in its title, archaeology. It does not claim to be a complete history, for in the historical period literary evidence can give a much more detailed political, religious and economic picture than has here been attempted. But nevertheless, a story of Palestine is the framework of the book, with the emphasis upon the contribution that archaeology can make.' K begins her 'history' with the Mesolithic and stops with the advent of Hellenism, but includes brief, up-to-date, summaries of the excavations at forty-three sites in Palestine. Albright's *The Archaeology of Palestine* includes more of the Palaeolithic and carries the historical record down through the Graeco-Roman period. He also adds five chapters on more general topics such as languages and literature, daily life, archaeology and the Old and New Testaments, and the role of Palestine in world history. Obviously, Albright's intention was far broader than K's. The reasons for this are not far to seek.

Albright, and also de Vaux, were trained in biblical studies, in textual and literary criticism, and had a firm control of the ancient languages; because they recognized the necessity of knowing the past of those countries which bordered on Palestine (the 'lands of the Bible' in the broadest sense), they followed closely the results of excavations and research in all other countries which might impinge on the biblical record. They were both, in a very real sense, biblical archaeologists. Their concern was to interpret the Bible in the light of modern research and to defend its essential historicity. K had none of their skills in languages, literary criticism, or historical research. What is more, her archaeological work in Palestine was largely restricted to the preliterate (and prehistoric) period. The historic relevance of her studies at Samaria, as we have seen, was drawn by the Director,

Professor Crowfoot. The greatest discoveries made at Jericho pertained to the prehistoric period of Palestinian history. For the historic period, it provided little information, even archaeological. Jerusalem has always belonged in the historical period; the archaeological record, as refined by the 1961–7 excavations, has provided a prehistory, as it were, to the biblical record and can help flesh out our knowledge of the historical topography of the city and, at least potentially, expand our knowledge of its social, economic, and political history.

K's field experience, therefore, when added to her professional and educational background, did not equip her to do what de Vaux and Albright attempted to do. There is little doubt that she recognized this fact and therefore confined her writing generally to archaeological matters. In other words, she did what her Preface to *Archaeology in the Holy Land* (referred to above) said she intended to do. And in this field she was authoritative.

To the extent that K and de Vaux were both dealing with the prehistory of Palestine in their *Cambridge Ancient History* essays, their approach is, perforce, similar. In K's essay on 'Palestine in the Time of the Eighteenth Dynasty' (vol. ii, chap. 11), however, she notes that the availability of records of Egyptian campaigns in Palestine and Syria raises the possibility of 'interpreting events suggested by the archaeological evidence in the light of the written evidence, and in this way providing a historical framework'. She then proceeds to set the various excavated strata and tombs of Palestinian sites of this period into a chronological framework based primarily on a pottery sequence and then links these with events known from the Egyptian sources of the fifteenth to fourteenth centuries BC.

Finally, in three books, *Amorites and Canaanites* (the Schweich Lectures of 1963), *The Bible and Recent Archaeology* (basically the Haskell Lectures of 1976; London, British Museum, 1978), and in the fourth edition of her *Archaeology in the Holy Land*, K has freely and fairly used biblical sources as documentary evidence and accorded them the same respect which she assigns to archaeological evidence. She admits discrepancies between the two, and acknowledges uncertainties, internal contradictions, and lack of comprehensibility in both types of evidence. She is not dogmatic nor scornful of literary sources, of whatever kind, but modestly sets forth what she feels to be the most likely historical course of events.

K's retirement from St Hugh's in 1973 and her move to the lovely house, Rose Hill, at Erbistock, near Wrexham—a gift of her father—brought her back to the country of her family's roots.

There she carried on a heavy schedule of research and writing, broken by hard physical labour which included everything from fruit and vegetable picking to hedge-pruning, from tree-planting to road-building. She was not, however, cut off from the world of academe and archaeology. Books for review constantly came her way; learned societies still called for her attention; she carried on a very heavy correspondence. She was also working at full speed, with the help of Dr Holland and Lady Wheeler, preparing chapters on the tell of Jericho for publication.

K continued to receive honours. In 1954, already, she had been created CBE; in 1973 this honour from Her Majesty the Queen was advanced to DBE. She had also been decorated by His Majesty King Hussein of Jordan, for her contributions to his country, for it must be remembered that Jericho and Jerusalem (except for the last season, 1967), were in Jordan at the time of her excavations. From Oxford she had received her BA, MA and D.Litt., but honorary degrees came also from London and Exeter. An LHD (Doctor of Humane Letters) was bestowed by Kenyon College in Ohio in May 1959. The last degree she received, I believe, was the Th.D. *honoris causa* conferred by the Evangelisch-theologische Fakultät der Eberhard-Karls-Universität on the evening before the opening of an International Symposium to mark the centenary of the Deutscher Verein zur Erforschung Palästinas held in Tübingen 22–5 November 1977. Many of her students and former colleagues were present, and I cannot say that I ever saw her in higher spirits, more proud of her accomplishments and more confident of her ability to finish her writing commitments on Sabratha, Jericho, and Jerusalem. There were happy meals together, long talks, and some chaffing about the propriety of her, the excavator of Jericho, accepting a Doctor of Theology degree. We were all appreciative of the hospitality of our hosts in providing the occasion for such a reunion within the framework of an important historic and academic occasion. It was the last time I saw her, and the memory of those days is a very warm one.

To all these other honours must be added K's membership of many scholarly societies. She was an FBA and an FSA, an honorary Fellow of Somerville and St Hugh's. She was probably a full or honorary member of many other bodies of which I have no knowledge; she could hardly have avoided such honours for she would have recognized that all of them called for her assistance in some way, if only moral support; she was always prepared to go beyond that.

Dame Kathleen died on 24 August 1978 of a massive stroke. The shock of her sudden passing was felt by countless men and women who had come under her spell as student, associate, or friend. Most would have recognized under the gruff exterior a soft heart, a sensitivity, and a vulnerability which she sought to hide. Many would remember her understanding and faith in them when they were young, as pupils or neophyte archaeologists. Many would have appreciated her tolerance and patience, her good humour and love of life. Her simplicity and devotion to the task at hand entailed greater demands on herself than on others. Although she required (and got) the best her students and teams could give, she engendered respect and affection. In spite of her conservatism and, perhaps, old-fashioned ways, she was not prudish or censorious. She did not pry and her teams enjoyed a great amount of freedom; if one was up, ready for a solid day's work at the time set, the rest of the day was one's own. Because she entered whole-heartedly into the social life of her dig crews, she enjoyed their trust and loyalty. Her standards of work on the dig were extremely high but, if there were mistakes, she rarely displayed exasperation; she patiently showed the errant worker his or her fault and helped to correct it. Her relationships with other scholars were sometimes not as close because she had little patience with those who could not see (and agree with) her point of view, or lacked her dedication. Yet, she did not hold grudges and attempted, even when she disagreed quite forcefully, to listen attentively and to act in a proper manner. Her book reviews often reveal a 'sweet reasonableness', even when her views of the methods used or the conclusions reached are often quite pointed.

K was a devoted, but quiet, Christian and a regular worshipper whenever that was possible. After her retirement, she attended the small parish church of St Hilary, Erbistock. At the funeral her Rector told of her services to the world but emphasized her contribution to her own parish. 'Are we not most proud', he said, 'that one so erudite and distinguished lived amongst us so humbly in Christian fellowship?' Her grave is in a quiet churchyard, on a hill overlooking the river Dee in accordance with her express wish.

Her young team-mates often called K the 'Sitt'—the Lady. The workmen called her the 'Great Sitt'. These were terms of ultimate respect carried so far, in the case of the workers, that they would often blame their inability to understand her ungrammatical Arabic on their own lack of comprehension of what they considered to be her 'classical' Arabic. We who knew and worked with her can only confess, truly, that a Great Lady has departed

from our midst. Our appreciation of all that she taught us, and our gratitude for the opportunity to know her personally, can best be demonstrated by our determination to complete the work she so ably inaugurated.

A. D. TUSHINGHAM