

Museum is also being actively encouraged. From a purely academic point of view one of the most serious deprivations caused by sanctions is the lack of new books and recent journals, both in the university libraries and research departments. It is possible to post books to Baghdad, and volumes published since 1990 would be warmly welcomed by the State Board and the universities. It is much to be hoped that the situation will soon become more normal, and that British archaeologists will be able to join their European colleagues in enjoying the warm cooperation and support that we have always experienced in Iraq.

JOAN OATES

Philip Arthur Barker

1920–2000

At the peak of his archaeological career, Philip Barker wrote:

Most of us dig out of insatiable curiosity coupled with the, perhaps arrogant, conviction that by dissecting ancient sites we can understand them. The subtle flanks of an ancient earthwork, embedded in the landscape like a half-submerged Henry Moore, or the dark green contrapuntal tracery of a cropmark seen from the air, give us a powerful *frisson* of discovery and recognition and an overwhelming desire to know what it means.

Here, in *Techniques of archaeological excavation* (1977), Philip set out his passionate concern, not only with the past but also with the way in which the past was treated in the present. On every page his philosophy is intricately interleaved with his pedagogic attention to such details as plastic labels, churn brushes and the best sort of pink pencil. For in the late 1970s he and his colleagues were engaged in prolonged and bitter fights with the establishment about rescue archaeology, the need for long-term research and proper funding and the clear requirement for the establishment of field archaeology as a profession. It was this passionate concern which made him not only a great excavator but also a key figure in the archaeological politics of late 20th-century Britain.

Philip Barker died in the same week as Brian Hope-Taylor, another artist who became a superlative excavator. They shared a gift of visualizing buildings in their landscapes so that they could not envisage a post-hole without also envisaging the roof above it. The artist turned

archaeologist, who saw earthworks as sculptures, and air photographs as music, went on to paint some of our most memorable images of archaeological sites, particularly from the air. Art, music and archaeology were all of a piece and in another revealing statement in *Techniques* he wrote as “all art constantly aspires towards the condition of music” all excavation should aspire towards the condition of total excavation’.

He was born in 1920 to working-class parents in London and educated at Wembley Grammar School. He left school at 15 and grew up in the Second World War when he served as a bomber navigator in the RAF, winning a Distinguished Flying Cross. He remembered those days with affection and thought that ‘the best war-time air crew discipline’, where everyone knew their own job, should be a model for on-site discipline. When, at Wroxeter, we discovered a war-time gun emplacement among the Roman ruins, he insisted on saving every scrap of evidence, ostensibly because the whole sequence of events on the site were of equal importance, but partly, we felt, because it reminded him so vividly of his own past.

After the war he trained as an art teacher and taught at the Priory Boys School in Shrewsbury from 1949 until 1960. Like all the best teachers he had the gift of drawing his pupils into his own enthusiasms and as he became more and more interested in archaeology in the late 1950s his pupils became his trowel-fodder, ending up as teachers and archaeologists, kindled by ‘Pablo’s’ gift for communication and his profound interest in local archaeology. The West Midlands provided huge encouragement to amateur archaeologists through the Extra-Mural Department at Birmingham University and a network of amateur societies. Philip was drawn into this network and, despite his lack of formal qualifications, became a staff tutor in archaeology at Birmingham in 1960, taking a part-time MA at Leicester University in 1965 with a dissertation pioneering the study of medieval pottery in the West Midlands and Welsh border.

At that stage I attended his evening classes on medieval archaeology in Birmingham. Philip had just started to dig at Hen Domen, the earliest castle at Montgomery where he was employing open-area excavation to reveal a mass of ephemeral timber structures crowding the bai-

ley of a Norman castle. Open-area excavation was new in Britain. Philip spoke glowingly of Van Giffen, of Hatt at Norre Fjand and Steensburg at Storr Valby. His contemporaries and colleagues were also trying these new techniques — Hope-Taylor at Yeavinger, Rahtz at Cheddar, Hurst and Golson at Wharram Percy and Biddle at Winchester. It seems self-evident now that this is the easiest way to capture the plan of multi-period sites, but in the mid 1960s ‘the answer still lay in the section’. What Philip Barker did was to combine open-area excavation with an artist’s eye for the smallest variation in colour and texture and a conviction that every change could carry some crucial clue as to meaning. At Hen Domen, on a long-drawn-out campaign of excavations, in a field he made his own, he demonstrated the value of his minute, painstaking approach to such sites. Hen Domen was particularly important to him. Wroxeter, where he was to show that Roman life went on long after the formal end of the Roman province, was larger and in some ways more demanding, but Wroxeter had been dug before and by many people. Hen Domen was a pristine site: it was here that his family camped every year, with his wife Eve organizing the cooking and their three sons helping with the digging. Moreover, at Hen Domen the whole town of Montgomery took a personal interest in the dig and Philip developed further his strong sense that the archaeologist had a duty and a responsibility to bring his findings before the public.

At Hen Domen he had been recovering medieval wooden buildings. When he used the same techniques at Wroxeter he revolutionized Romano-British archaeology. Wroxeter, a 220-acre Roman city, four miles south of Shrewsbury, is on the Welsh border and, unlike most other Roman-British cities, was abandoned under green fields. Earlier excavators had trenched its central *insulae*, carving great holes into the rubble mass which covered, apparently at random, the former public buildings. Using the same meticulous dissection methods Philip was able to demonstrate that in the city centre the rubble was re-used as the foundations for large, classically proportioned timber buildings inhabited into the 6th century AD. A series of disbelieving visitors had to be convinced by demonstration — Philip was at his pedagogic best with Christopher Hawkes, Leo Rivet, A.H.A.

Hogg and that formidable former Wroxeter trench-digger, Kathleen Kenyon. From 1969 to 1990 every August the Wroxeter campaign went on and on with a ‘continuous modification of techniques’, many pioneered at Wroxeter, including photogrammetry, the use of sieving and the early use of computing for data handling. Roman finds bored him — there were so many of them and they required so much labour. What he liked was to walk the site alone in the very early morning noting each fresh change and during the day to ‘walk the floor’ endlessly, scrabbling furiously with a trowel at some new interesting area, abandoning a heap of spoil for a hapless troweller to clear. Each week brought more visitors and the introduction of public Open Days, but increasingly from 1971 onwards, he was engaged as well in the setting up first of RESCUE and then the Institute of Field Archaeology. After dinner he would retire upstairs in the dig house to listen to music or to read before heading out for a pint. Down would come Philip, exalted by music or depressed by self-inflicted reading — the season he was reading Eliot’s *The Wasteland* being notably gloomy.

At the pub there would be endless discussion. He wrote ‘it is a great advantage to have supervisors or assistants on the site who are capable of taking and expressing a constructively critical view of every stage of the work’ and his site supervisors were given large responsibilities. They imported new ideas and theories to which he listened carefully, sometimes half-convinced by their view that true objectivity was possible. Yet he was a man who worked intuitively. His curiosity about the past was too strong for him not to bring all his experience to bear on interpretation, and his sense of human relationships too close to allow him the distance that true objectivity requires. Those of us who worked with him throughout the years knew that, despite the demanding precision and the clinical cleanliness of the techniques he insisted upon, he needed to give names and functions to the ‘events’ so painstakingly recorded and his mind was constantly engaged with the story of what he was excavating.

In the late 1960s British archaeologists became increasingly anxious about the widespread destruction of archaeology in post-war redevelopment. A powerful lobby gathered to galvanize public support for better protection of Britain’s heritage, resulting in RESCUE, the Trust

for British Archaeology, of which Philip became the first secretary in 1971. RESCUE's work led eventually to the legislation which now protects archaeology on development sites and Philip's role in this was fundamental. His steadfast concern fuelled the debates with MPs and opinion-makers and, with the same tenacity of purpose, he helped from 1979 to found the Institute of Field Archaeologists, bringing a much-needed professionalism to the discipline.

At his memorial service in Worcester Cathedral, where he had been consultant archaeologist, a colleague praised him as 'a good man'. Philip's integrity was unshakeable and he cared far more about the success of his ideas than any public recognition. His university knew his worth, awarding him an Honorary M.Litt. in 1998. His national contribution went publicly unmarked. His achievements in the field, coupled with his immense influence on public archaeology, deserved more. He leaves us his books and his paintings and above all our memories of a man whose personal tenet, 'hold fast that which is good' was an example to everyone who knew him.

KATE PRETTY

James J. Fanto Deetz

8 February 1930–25 November 2000

James Deetz's intellectual contributions focused on culture change and on the ways in which changes affected the lives and minds of ordinary people. He will be long remembered as a man whose scholarship and teaching galvanized many, but who set an example that few can follow. He was both a scholar and a family man, and accomplished what academics seldom achieve: a private life as rich and rewarding as his professional career. He married first Eleanore Kelley Deetz; they had six sons and four daughters. Deetz's second wife and widow is Patricia Scott Deetz, a social historian who collaborated with Jim in his most recent research efforts.

After receiving his BA (1957), MA (1959) and Ph.D (1960) from Harvard University, Deetz taught at the University of California at Santa Barbara from 1960–1978, at Harvard University (1965–1966), at Brown University (1967–1978), at the College of William and Mary (1977–1978) and at the University of California, Berkeley (1978–1993); most recently he was the David A. Harrison Professor of New World Studies at the University of Virginia. Deetz was

acclaimed as a masterful teacher who entertained and inspired students who flocked to his ever-popular courses.

Author of over 60 articles and books influential in both historical and prehistoric archaeology, Deetz was admired for his clear and accessible writing. His Ph.D dissertation, *The dynamics of stylistic change in Arikara ceramics*, published in monograph form in 1965, was heralded for its innovative statistical analyses of artefact variation as a means of delineating shifts in social organization and patterns of kinship among the Arikara before and after European contact. His first book, *Invitation to archaeology* (1967), was used extensively as a text for introductory classes in archaeology, and his popular introduction to historical archaeology, *In small things forgotten* (1977), remains in wide distribution and has had multiple printings. Deetz's 1993 book, *Flowerdew Hundred*, received the 1994 James Mooney Award from the Southern Anthropological Society and the 1995 Distinguished Book Award of the Society of Colonial Wars, New York.

From 1967–1978, Deetz served as Assistant Director of Plimoth Plantation, conducting excavations at a number of historical sites in and around Plymouth (MA), including 17th-century Pilgrim settlements. During this time he also published what many consider his most influential and provocative contributions to historical archaeology — a series of innovative studies of New England gravestones, co-authored with colleague and friend Edwin Dethlefsen. Deetz & Dethlefsen offered a compelling demonstration of the efficacy of seriation studies in archaeology, and in his own later work Deetz related gravestone carving to broader changes in the lifestyles and world view of colonial New Englanders.

From 1982, he was Director of Research and a member of the Board of Directors of Flowerdew Hundred Foundation, Hopewell (VA), where he directed field schools and Summer Institutes in American Historical Archaeology, sponsored by the National Endowment for the Humanities, at 17th-, 18th- and 19th-century sites at Flowerdew Hundred Plantation. Deetz since 1984 held the post of Honorary Visiting Professor of Historical Archaeology at the University of Cape Town, South Africa, and from 1983 conducted research on the British colonial frontier of the Eastern Cape as part of his broader investigation of the comparative archaeology of English colonialism.

Most recently, he teamed with his second wife, Patricia Scott Deetz, to write *The times of their lives: life, love and death in Plymouth Colony*. The book appeared only shortly before Jim's death, bringing his professional life full circle by returning to and reconsidering his first ventures into historical archaeology at the home sites of the religious separatists later known as Pilgrims who founded New England's first permanent settlement.

In 1997, the Society for Historical Archaeology recognized Deetz's contributions to the field by awarding him its lifetime achievement award, the J.C. Harrington Medal in Historical Archaeology. For his pioneering work at Plimoth Plantation, where he not only brought archaeological investigations into the foreground of the museum's research into 17th-century life but also initiated the first-person approach to 'living history' involving costumed interpreters 'in character' that continues to expose Plantation visitors to unexpected encounters with 17th-

century customs and beliefs — Deetz always stressed that people needed to be made aware that if they were somehow transported back in time they would experience severe culture shock — in 1999 Deetz was awarded the Harry H. Hornblower Award.

Grounded in structuralism, Deetz's approach was synthetic, working from data outwards, emphasizing qualitative as well as quantitative evaluations, incorporating multiple and complementary lines of evidence, allying historical documents closely with excavated evidence. His interest was in the details of everyday lives among early settlers, indigenous peoples, colonists and African Americans, and his method consisted of probing diverse categories of material culture — houses, gravestones, ceramics, musical instruments, clay pipes — examining the productions of individuals to bring to light underlying cultural rules that generate patterns of thought that are manifested in social behaviour and material culture.

MARY BEAUDRY

Bibliography of major works

- DEETZ, J. 1963. Archaeological investigations at La Purisma Mission, *UCLA Archaeological Survey Annual Report 1962-1963*: 165-241. Los Angeles (CA): Department of Anthropology-Sociology, University of California.
1965. *The dynamics of stylistic change in Arikara ceramics*. Urbana (IL): University of Illinois Press. Illinois Studies in Anthropology 4.
1967. *Invitation to archaeology*. Garden City (NY): Natural History Press. Translated into Japanese. 1988 (Tokyo: Tuttle-Mori Agency Inc.).
1968. Late man in North America: archaeology of European Americans, in B.J. Meggers (ed.), *Anthropological archaeology in the Americas*: 121-30. Washington (DC): Anthropological Society of Washington. Reprinted in Deetz (1971): 208-18.
1968. The inference of residence and descent from archaeological data, in L.R. & S.R. Binford (ed.), *New perspectives in archaeology*: 41-8. Chicago (IL): Aldine Press.
1970. Archaeology as a social science, *Bulletin of the American Anthropological Association* 3(2): 115-25. (Reprinted in M.P. Leone (ed.), *Contemporary archaeology: a guide to theory and contributions*: 108-17. Carbondale (IL): Southern Illinois University Press.)
- (Ed.) 1971. *Man's imprint from the past: readings in the methods of archaeology*. Boston (MA): Little, Brown.
1973. Ceramics from Plymouth, 1620-1835: the archaeological evidence, in I.M.G. Quimby (ed.), *Ceramics in America*: 15-40. Charlottesville (VA): University Press of Virginia.
1977. *In small things forgotten: an archaeology of early American life*. Garden City (NY): Anchor Books.
1982. Households: a structural key to archaeological explanation, *American Behavioral Scientist* 25(6): 717-24.
1983. Scientific humanism and humanistic science: a plea for paradigmatic pluralism in historical archaeology, *Geoscience and Man* 23: 27-34.
1988. American historical archaeology: methods and results, *Science* 239 (22 January 1988): 362-7.
1988. History and archaeological theory: Walter Taylor revisited, *American Antiquity* 53(1): 13-22.
1988. Material culture and worldview in colonial Anglo-America, in M.P. Leone & P.B. Potter, Jr (ed.), *The recovery of meaning: historical archaeology in the eastern United States*: 219-35. Washington (DC): Smithsonian Institution Press.
1993. *Flowerdew Hundred: the archaeology of a Virginia plantation, 1619-1864*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.
1989. Archaeography, archaeology, or archeology? *American Journal of Archaeology* 93: 429-35.
- DEETZ, J.F. & P. SCOTT DEETZ. 2000. *The times of their lives: live, love, and death in Plymouth Colony*. New York (NY): W.H. Freeman.
- DEETZ, J.F., & E.S. DETHLEFSEN. 1964. Death's heads, cherubs and willow trees: experimental archaeology in colonial cemeteries, *American Antiquity* 31(4): 502-10.
1971. Some social aspects of New England colonial mortuary art, in J.A. Brown (ed.), *Approaches to the social dimensions of mortuary practices*, 30-38. Society for American Archaeology Memoir 25 [issued as *American Antiquity* 36(3, pt. 2)].
- A intellectual history of Deetz's early work appears in: YENTSCH, A.E. 1992. Man and vision in historical archaeology, in A.E. Yentsch & M.C. Beaudry (ed.), *The art and mystery of historical archaeology: essays in honor of James Deetz*: 23-47. Boca Raton (FL): CRC Press.
- A comprehensive listing of works by Deetz appears at: <http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/users/deetz/Plymouth/JDeetzmem3.html>