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ABSTRACT

Dorothy Garrod is considered a pioneer of the development of early prehistoric archaeology. She was an advocate of prehistory on a global scale, excavating over a wide geographical area and making connections between continents to achieve her vision. Garrod’s work strongly contributed to the development of prehistoric archaeology as a defined subject in its own right. Garrod was renowned as a field archaeologist, continuing to research and excavate up until her death in 1968. It is her excavations at Mount Carmel for which she is most famous, through which she contributed towards the foundation of the chronology of the prehistory of the Levant, the basis of which remains to this day. Garrod was the first women to be appointed to the Disney Chair of Archaeology at the University of Cambridge, subsequently training the next generation of prehistoric archaeologists and lecturers who took prehistory out into the World. Garrod was not herself keen to be thought a feminist figurehead but today she is considered a pioneer within the disciplines of the Archaeology of Women and Gender Archaeology, providing inspiration even today. As a committed Catholic throughout her life, Garrod’s humility, thoughtfulness and gentleness is evident within her work and no doubt provided her with strength throughout her extensive career.
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INTRODUCTION

One hundred and fifty years since Prestwich and Evans’ breaking of the ‘time barrier’ (Gamble & Kruszynski 2009), and the publication of On the Origin of Species by Charles Darwin, prehistoric archaeology is now a subject to be studied in its own right, and taught in universities throughout the world. Thirty-three years after the revelation in the northern French quarry, one of the most respected, influential, inspiring and forward-thinking prehistoric archaeologists was born: Dorothy Annie Elizabeth Garrod.

Dorothy Garrod first became interested in archaeology after the First World War during her time in Malta where her father, Sir Archibald Garrod, a prominent physician, had been stationed during the war as director of war hospitals (Champion 1998: 187; Clark 1999: 401). Having already obtained a History degree from Cambridge University in 1916 (Davies 1999a: 1), on her return to
Britain she enrolled at Oxford University in 1921, and gained a distinction in the Archaeology Diploma in 1922 under the direction of Professor R.R. Marett (Davies 1999a: 2). Following this she travelled to France to study for two years with the Abbé Breuil at the Institut de Paleontologie Humaine, Paris (Clark 1999: 402; Roberts 1995: 203). Garrod had first met Breuil while studying for her Oxford diploma (Davies 1999a: 2), and he became her lifelong mentor, colleague and friend (though their relationship would cool somewhat towards the end of Breuil’s life).

Garrod’s training and experience in France under Breuil provided her with confidence, a firm basis in archaeological excavations, prehistory, the analysis of stone artefacts, and no doubt fuelled her mind with ideas.

Dorothy Garrod first came to prominence with her excavation of the Devil’s Tower, Gibraltar, in 1925, and at the end of her career was still involved in active research in Lebanon and France, until her death in 1968. During her forty-five years as a prehistoric archaeologist, she contributed extensively to the development of early prehistory, lithic research and exerted much influence within the archaeological community. In the last decade, inspired partly by the rediscovery of her archives at the Musée des Antiquités Nationales, St. Germain-en-Laye, her interests and legacy have begun to be re-explored (Davies & Charles 1999). It is only fitting once more that she be included in a volume that commemorates the birth of the subject she contributed to so extensively.

Garrod’s interests lay in chronology and the spatial distribution of the archaeological evidence, though in the formulation of her ideas and the piecing together of prehistory she was frustrated by the limitations of the archaeological record of the time. She contributed extensively to increasing the archaeological record through her numerous excavations that were designed to explore her global perspective on the Palaeolithic. Through these, Garrod developed the concept of inter-disciplinary work in teams and her publications throughout her career testify to this. Garrod’s dedication to fieldwork highlights her awareness of the value of first-hand experience of a range of archaeological material, and the need to validate and test old hypotheses, and formulate new ones in the light of developing evidence. Through her quest to expand prehistory and increase the wealth of the archaeological record, she was the first to consider looking for, and subsequently find, open-air Mousterian sites in the Levant (Ronen et al. 1999). Her development of a worldwide prehistory also included her British homeland (especially at the start of her career), where her research brought the Upper Palaeolithic of Britain into a broader research framework for the first time (Garrod 1926, nd). Garrod was a highly respected pioneer female archaeologist, though reluctant to be considered as one, and in her day-to-day interactions with others showed great humility, perhaps a result of her commitment to her Catholic faith.

This paper examines her major contributions in piecing together the picture of early prehistory from the archaeological evidence and also considers Garrod’s less obvious contributions and the endurance of her legacy, through her work in the development of world prehistory, her faith, and her influence in the role of women within archaeology.

**DOROTHY GARROD AND THE ADVENT OF A WORLD PREHISTORY**

Dorothy Garrod advocated a worldwide approach to prehistory, taking prehistory beyond Europe, and excavated throughout her career across a large geographical area. This perhaps is her most important and significant contribution to piecing together the fundamentals of early prehistory. Through her worldwide approach, Garrod highlighted south-west Asia as an important area for prehistoric research, developed a
framework of chronology for Levantine prehistory — the basis of which is still in existence today (Belfer-Cohen & Bar-Yosef 1999) — and investigated connections between and within continents and cultures, significantly contributing to a re-definition of the Upper Palaeolithic industries of Europe (Davies 1999b). Garrod introduced the terms ‘Châtelperronian’ and ‘Gravettian’ to replace Breuil’s ‘Lower Aurignacian’ and ‘Upper Aurignacian’ respectively, and even though today Garrod’s terms are applied on more of a localized scale than they were in 1936, the name and nature of these two industries remain part of the Upper Palaeolithic sequence to this day (ibid). Through her extensive excavations, Garrod extended the analytical framework for Europe. She shed light on flaws in lithic analysis by cementing the obsolescence of de Mortillet’s classification scheme (Roberts 1995: 221), breaking away from a Eurocentric classification though her Levantine lithic analysis (Davies 1999b: 271) and upholding the position that the labels Lower, Middle and Upper Palaeolithic should only be used as a chronological markers, rather than simply to infer typology (Garrod 1938: 2). Garrod also developed new fieldwork methods and practices, pioneering a woman workforce at the El-Wad excavations in Palestine (Callander & Smith 2007), and she was the first to incorporate aerial photography into her excavations (Anderson 2001).

Breuil and Garrod were the first prehistorians to consider prehistory on a global scale, most importantly by extensive travel and excavations throughout the world, and to a lesser extent through familiarization with the literature (Davies 1999b: 263). Garrod was the first of the two to extend prehistory firmly beyond Europe. Research was at this time being undertaken outside Europe, though such excavations were confined to limited areas, for example Zhoukoudian, China in 1921 (Lanpo et al. 1990) and Taung, South Africa in 1924 (Dart 1925). These excavations were not considered within a larger theoretical and geographical framework. In his biography of Garrod, Clark (1999: 410) attests to the fact that Garrod was one of those most responsible for the emergence of a world prehistory. Garrod’s commitment to a world prehistory can be seen through her many publications which consider the available archaeological evidence on a far-reaching scale (e.g. Garrod 1938, 1953 & 1965).

During her time as Disney Professor at Cambridge following the Second World War, Garrod introduced a module on World Prehistory (Clark 1989: 91), perhaps unsurprising given that she was also the first prehistorian to hold the chair. She expanded the existing module to include territories outside France and Europe, where previously it had been essentially French in character (ibid). Such a development must have been seen as intrinsic to the development of prehistory and archaeology as a whole: Trigger (2006: 383) records this very event in his History of Archaeological Thought. It was so important to Dorothy Garrod that students should travel and visit archaeological sites that she bequeathed money for a fund to provide travel grants to Cambridge students, especially if they were travelling abroad (Roberts 1995: 226). This fund still exists today in the form of the Dorothy Garrod Travel Fund.

Dorothy Garrod as a Worldwide Excavator

Garrod, first and foremost, was an excavator, assisting with, and directing, excavations from the very beginning to the very end of her career, spending a total of nearly 5 years actively engaged in the field. Garrod excavated over a wider geographical area than any of her contemporaries, and her specialism was not limited to a specific country but extended over continents. She excavated over twenty three sites in seven countries, across two continents: in Britain, France, Gibraltar, Bulgaria, Anatolia, Palestine, Iraq and Lebanon (Table 1). As
Davies (1999b: 266) rightly informs us, it is the geographical range of her practical expertise which makes her work significant.

Today, specialisation of a particular geographical area is the norm, as is the comparison of archaeological material on a large scale. It is rare to find teams of archaeologists following in Garrod’s footsteps and excavating across more than one continent, though where this is occurring it is evident that the practical experience and the results obtained increase the quality of the end results. The combined efforts of Petraglia (Petraglia et al. 2007, 2008; Petraglia & Allchin 2007; Petraglia & Rose 2009) and Rose (2004, 2007; Rose & Bailey 2008) take in research across two continents, Africa and Asia, including the Arabian Peninsula, while addressing one of the archaeological questions that concerned Dorothy Garrod, the emergence of *Homo sapiens*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1923–1934</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>La Quina</td>
<td>Assisted Henri Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Isturitz</td>
<td>Assisted Saint-Perier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Correzi</td>
<td>Assisted Bouyssonie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>Torbryan Valley, Devon</td>
<td>Initial exploration of a series of cave sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925–1926</td>
<td>Gibraltar</td>
<td>Devil’s Tower</td>
<td>Mousterian artefacts and Neanderthal burials uncovered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>Langwith Cave, Derbyshire</td>
<td>Exploration of the cave; discovered scanty (late Upper Palaeolithic) remains, heavily disturbed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>Shukba, Wady en Natuf, W. Judaea</td>
<td>Natufian culture identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Kiruk, S. Kurdistan</td>
<td>Mousterian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Hazar Merd, S. Kurdistan</td>
<td>Mousterian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Zarzi, S. Kurdistan</td>
<td>Late Upper Palaeolithic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929–1933</td>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>El-Wad, Mount Carmel</td>
<td>Middle Palaeolithic, and Natufian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>El-Kebara, Mount Carmel</td>
<td>Garrod dug a small test trench in this cave. Turville Petre directed the 1931 excavations. Neanderthal burials in abundance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>Es-Skhul</td>
<td>Mousterian burials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>Atlit quarries</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Anatolia</td>
<td>Reconnaissance</td>
<td>Proposed excavations met with resistance, so went to Bulgaria instead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Bacho Kiro</td>
<td>Szeletoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 1940s</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Fontéchevade</td>
<td>Assisted Henri Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948–1963</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Angles-sur-l’Angin</td>
<td>With de Saint-Mathurin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>Abri Zumofflen</td>
<td>Upper Palaeolithic rock shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959–1960</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>Ras el-Kelb</td>
<td>Mousterian Cave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>Bezez Cave</td>
<td>Middle and Upper Palaeolithic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: A comprehensive list and brief description of Garrod’s excavations*

Though primarily a research excavator, two of the sites which Dorothy Garrod excavated could also be considered ‘rescue archaeology’. Excavations at Mount Carmel only began in earnest due to their threat of being quarried away in order to build the Haifa harbour (Roberts 1995: 207), and, in 1959, excavations at the Mousterian cave site of Ras el-Kelb, Lebanon were carried out in advance of a new autoroute to extend though the headland on which the cave was situated (Copeland 1999: 154). It must be
noted however, that once the archaeological significance of Mount Carmel was established, it was never quarried. The myth still perpetuates that only commercial archaeology is involved in ‘rescue archaeology’, whereas the research sector is blessed by an infinite amount of time and money (Coelho 2009). Many ‘research excavations’ today are indeed ‘rescue excavations’ in disguise. Research excavations investigating modern humans in Southern India at the site of Jwalapuram are constantly under threat due to ash mining (Haslam & Petraglia 2009). ‘Rescue archaeology’ emphatically affects archaeology both commercial and research. It is impossible to imagine what the archaeological record would have looked like had Dorothy Garrod not excavated at Mount Carmel.

It is important to mention Garrod’s first internationally-renowned excavations at the Devil’s Tower, Gibraltar, between 1925–1926, as this firmly established her reputation as a prehistoric archaeologist (Davies 1999: 3). It was the discovery of Mousterian individuals at Garrod’s site in Gibraltar and at Turville-Petre’s Zuttiyeh cave near the Sea of Galilee that had led Grant MacCurdy to consider the geographical extent of the Neanderthal Mousterian in south-west Asia (Roberts 1995: 205; Clark 1999: 403). This ultimately led to one of the most prolific series of excavations to occur in the history of prehistory, which Dorothy Garrod was to direct as part of an Anglo-American collaboration: Wadi el-Mughara, Mount Carmel, Palestine as a joint venture between the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem and the American School of Prehistoric Research (Roberts 1995: 207; Figure 1). Clark (1989: 46) notes that the decision to excavate “…proved to be one of the most productive research projects ever mounted in Palaeolithic studies”.

In total, excavations were carried out in four caves over a period of almost twenty two months, over seven seasons, recording an almost unbroken Palaeolithic succession from the end of the Lower Palaeolithic to the Mesolithic, firmly placing the prehistory of Palestine on the archaeological map (Roberts 1995: 208). Garrod classified and analysed all 92,000 artefacts (Caton-Thompson 1969: 348; Clark 1999: 404).

The results from Mount Carmel were unprecedented. Garrod recognised the presence of local forms which seemed indigenous to the area and were not encountered in Europe (Belfer-Cohen & Bar-Yosef 1999: 121). Garrod ascribed them new names, and noted that some cases resembled African artefacts (ibid). Through this, foundations for the Levantine prehistoric sequence were established (Boyd 1999: 209). The chronology for the prehistory of the Levant has inevitably altered through time, but it is Garrod’s groundbreaking research in Palestine, combined with that of Rene...
Neuville’s in Palestine and Alfred Rust’s in Syria, that provides the basis of the Levantine prehistoric sequence that exists today (Belfer-Cohen & Bar-Yosef 1999; Boyd 1999).

Through the Levantine evidence, Garrod dismissed once and for all the idea of a Eurocentric prehistory in which all evidence could ultimately be tied into the French data, firmly establishing prehistory outside France. Garrod disagreed with French theoreticians, and especially with Bordes during the 1950s and 1960s (Hovers 2009: 12). Bordes advocated on typological grounds that different technological traditions could have been present at the same time, based on the patterns in Levallois-Mousterian material resulting from the process of branching evolution over time (ibid.), and recognised Mousterian assemblages based on a fixed typology of tool types (Bordes 1961; Prior 1977). However, Garrod believed in a linear path of typological change in Mousterian industries throughout the Middle Palaeolithic, preferring to rely on biostratigraphic changes as more of a reliable marker than the presence or absence of a particular type of artefact (Hovers 2009: 12). Bordes was correct in considering that different technologies could be in use simultaneously, though it is Garrod’s theories and thinking that have stood the test of time and research and form the basis of the Levantine chronology today (Belfer-Cohen & Bar-Yosef 1999).

**Making Connections and Re-defining the Upper Palaeolithic of Europe**

Garrod emphasised a concentration on the details and relationships of ‘cultures’, realising that interpretations of the past depended on the patterning within the available evidence (Davies 1999: 263). As a result of applying this to her Levantine research, it subsequently led Garrod to re-
define the nature of the European sequence. Garrod coined the term ‘Chatelperronian’ to replace Breuil’s ‘Lower Aurignacian’ and ‘Gravettian’ in preference to his ‘Upper Aurignacian’ for the European sequence in 1936 (Davies 1999: 266), and applied them in subsequent publications (Garrod 1938). The geographical distribution of these industries has narrowed in light of new evidence (Davies 1999: 266), but they are still identified today as an established part of the sequence of the Early Upper Palaeolithic industries of Britain. In her 1938 paper, Garrod (1938) made connections between ‘cultures’ across Europe, the Middle and Near East, and North Africa, with her new industries firmly in place, and proposed that such blade cultures developed outside Europe (Garrod 1938: 3). This could be seen as emphasising a global view of prehistory, and highlighting the inappropriateness of a Eurocentric attitude. Garrod argued that connections should be made where appropriate, unnecessary typological splits should not be made, while real differences if present should be reflected in the terminology used (Garrod 1937). Garrod’s viewpoints differed from those of Bordes (see above) and to an extent from her mentor Breuil; Garrod gives consideration in her 1953 paper to the possibility of convergence in tool form, while Breuil argues for evolution within tool types (Davies 1999b: 271).

Dorothy Garrod’s research in the British Palaeolithic culminated in the publication of *The Upper Palaeolithic of Britain* in 1926. This publication was the first to address the Upper Palaeolithic of Britain on a national scale, and the first serious study on Upper Palaeolithic lithic research in Britain, enabling the wealth of information to be accessed worldwide. The book is significant as it signals an important step in the advancement of lithic research. Through Garrod’s dedication, the scattered pieces of the British Upper Palaeolithic were bought together to enable, for the first time, a coherent understanding of the archaeological evidence.

Garrod’s publication remained the only monograph on the subject for half a century (Jacobi 1999: 35); it was used as the starting point for the doctoral thesis of Grahame Clark (Clark 1989: 53), and even today remains an important introduction to the subject (Swainston 1999: 41). For this pioneering book Garrod received a BSc from Oxford University (Davies 1999a: 2), which serves to highlight the importance attached to this research at the time of publication. During the late 1950s/early 1960s Garrod updated her views on the British Palaeolithic, revisiting the evidence from Creswell Crags and Kent’s Cavern as well as incorporating the results from McBurney’s excavations in Wales. However, as this document was kept in St. Germain-en-Laye and not published, it was only her original thoughts on the British Palaeolithic in 1926 that were prevalent.

*The Upper Palaeolithic of Britain* was Dorothy Garrod’s first serious publication of her career. In this publication the direction of her thoughts, which evolve in later publications, become apparent; in the summary of the book, Garrod begins to make tentative links between the collected data, and that of the French archaeological record (Garrod 1926). Throughout the book she followed Breuil’s lithic classification (Roberts 1995: 218), as this was the accepted classification at the time, and her background to date was firmly within the prehistory of France. However, Garrod was already issuing warnings about the continued usefulness of the de Mortillet-Breuil scheme for regions beyond western Europe:

“...we can no more expect the classification of Gabriel de Mortillet to hold good over the Palaeolithic world than we could expect the geological strata of a whole continent to be everywhere at the same time...”

(Garrod 1926: 194)
Within this publication Garrod considered the British variant of the classic Magdalenian to be distinct enough from the rest of Europe as to warrant its own name (Roberts 1999: 21):

“...I propose tentatively ‘Creswellian’, since Creswell Crags is the station in which it is found in greatest abundance and variety...”

(Garrod 1926: 194)

What constitutes the ‘Creswellian’ today has been revised and now refers to, in a British context, only to the Late Magdalenian-style industry (Jacobi 1991). Garrod’s Creswellian has been a part of the British Upper Palaeolithic industries for over eighty years, only recently questioned by Jacobi and Pettitt who prefer to subsume the “Creswellian” within the Late Magdalenian (Jacobi & Pettitt 1991). For a first publication, to identify and name a new ‘culture’ which is still recognised eighty years on, can only be a reflection of her archaeological ability even at the very beginning of her career.

On reflection, Roberts (1995: 220) considers Garrod’s publication to be “…disappointing …”, though this judgement isn’t entirely fair. The Upper Palaeolithic of Britain is written in a clear and concise manner (as was to be the hallmark of Garrod’s publications), with more attention given for sites considered of greater importance; Kent’s Cavern and Creswell Crags, which are still regarded as such today. We must also remember and praise accordingly the immense task Garrod chose to undertake as her first academic publication.

Whatever the criticism regarding the nature of the publication, the fact still remains that it was then a pioneering book, synthesising a complex period for an entire country, and that is what gives it its importance. The publication provided a comparison for other sites and new research, encouraging connections and inter-continent comparisons.

Regardless of subsequent criticism, it achieved its intentions:

“...A general survey of the Upper Palaeolithic in Britain shows that in spite of scanty material and imperfect records it is possible to distinguish some kind of outline, which, incomplete in itself, may yet serve as a basis for future work in this field...”

(Garrod 1926: 191)

It was Garrod’s knowledge, experience and skill in her fieldwork methods and lithic analysis that led her to pioneer the chronology of the Levant, re-define the European sequence, and synthesise the British material. Her skill as a lithic expert is directly linked to her role in developing world prehistory. Garrod possessed a command of the principles of lithic analysis, understood the importance of an objective outlook in actively attempting to approach lithic analysis without a pre-conjectured cultural affinity in mind, and had a confidence in the artefacts and the ability to extract from the artefacts the information she knew they held. These skills are fundamental when faced with new assemblages that are addressed with questions to be answered not just on a local scale, but with those which have connotations on a global scale, i.e. the origins of modern humans.

Subjective and Objective Lithics

Lithic classifications and typologies were introduced and have been refined from as early as the 1870s (de Mortillet 1872) to the present day (Clarkson 2009). The preconceptions of those undertaking lithic analysis, a subjective approach, were most prevalent within the early attempts at classification, e.g. de Mortillet (1872) and Bordes (1950), whereas today a more objective approach is advocated, considering the artefacts independently from the preconceptions of the lithic analyst (Andrefsky 2005; Clarkson & Lamb 2005). Garrod was aware of the limitations of the early classificatory schemes (Garrod 1928)
and through her Levantine lithic material attempted to address these limitations.

Dorothy Garrod’s lithic training background was, as that of most prehistorians at the time, grounded within a French world. De Mortillet’s original classification scheme had been subject to a radical revision by Breuil between 1906 and 1912 (Davies 1999b), though parts of it were still in use later on, as Garrod highlights its limitations in her publication in 1928 (Garrod 1928). Garrod herself was operating within Breuil’s revised classification (Davies 1999b), and by 1938, with the expansion of prehistory out of Europe, it was finally realised that de Mortillet’s scheme was only applicable on a localised scale. Garrod takes delight when referring to the “…demolition as a system of world-wide application…” (Garrod 1938: 1) of de Mortillet’s classification, arguing that regional scales of analysis would allow more reliable interpretation of artefacts.

It was Garrod’s work at Mount Carmel that contributed to this ‘demolition’ while securing the prehistoric chronology of the Levant. Even though Garrod initially followed the original French subdivision of the Upper Palaeolithic, as was the ‘norm’ (Belfer-Cohen & Bar-Yosef 1999: 121), this was where it also ended. Garrod tried to classify the artefacts objectively without too many preconceived notions as to their chronology, through considering the various assemblages as primarily local phenomena (Belfer-Cohen & Bar-Yosef 1999: 130), proposing changes to the then current French terms (Copeland 1999: 163), and by considering the artefacts on their own merit, as independent from the established European criteria rather than subjectively incorporating them into the then current Eurocentric cultural framework. Garrod compared the Levantine material to Europe, though she did so in order to emphasise its difference, e.g. her “Tayacian”, “Acheulean” and “Levalloiso-Mousterian” of Tabun (Garrod 1937). Belfer-Cohen & Bar-Yosef (1999: 130) paid tribute to Garrod’s insight in her decision to consider the industries as local phenomena, and her subsequent recording of them using local names.

Ronen (1982: 26) heavily criticised Garrod’s handling of the Mount Carmel material, saying her reports show a “…careful observer uninterested in details…” and that on the whole, Garrod’s work has needed a great deal of substantiating over the last fifty years as the terms she used were not precise enough for thorough understanding. Garrod’s work was designed to answer her research questions, which focussed on the Palaeolithic record of the Near East, and its importance as a “gateway of prehistoric migrations”. She was also interested in the social and economic nature of the Mesolithic and the Natufian (Garrod & Bate 1937). Ronen’s comments seem too harsh a judgement when you consider Garrod was attempting to develop a chronology for the Levant while working within a Europe-focussed era, though attempting to ‘break the mould’ but lacking comparable data and evidence from the archaeological record at the time. Garrod understood more than anyone else in her field the problems of the existing methodologies (Roberts 1995: 215), and constantly pointed out the limitations surrounding nomenclatures and typologies (Garrod 1926, 1938, 1946). It is right to agree with Belfer-Cohen & Bar-Yosef (1999: 130), who praise her decisions in developing the Levantine nomenclatures and typologies as displaying ingenuity and foresight.

In her 1938 paper, Garrod takes the idea of change in classification one stage further and proposes that “…the time has come when the labels Lower, Middle and Upper Palaeolithic should be used exclusively in a chronological sense without any typological connotation whatsoever…” (Garrod 1938: 2).

Garrod recognised that these terms were used more or less synonymously with handaxe, flake and blade industries.
respectively (ibid). Garrod heeded this warning in 1938, but this connection was still being taught at an undergraduate level only ten years ago. It is only in the last decade that steps have truly been made to attempt to view our subject in a more objective way with regard to the development of lithic industries and their chronologies, moving away from assumptions of certain time periods, e.g. the Upper Palaeolithic, being synonymous with particular industries, e.g. blade technology (Bar-Yosef & Kuhn 1999). Upper Palaeolithic elements occur within the ‘Middle Palaeolithic’, and can be associated with ‘Middle Palaeolithic’ hominins, e.g. Neanderthals (Foley & Lahr 1997). There is also more emphasis on technological analysis as opposed to rigid typological classifications (Clarkson et al. 2009). This shift has occurred due to recognition of the significant role that the environment played in prehistory, as Garrod recognised in 1946 (see below). Garrod was cautious of typologies from an out-of-date classification system, in particular the Palaeolithic cultures developed by French prehistorians and finalized by Breuil in 1912 (Clark 1999: 404), when developing a new chronology for the Levant. Eighty years on, the same warning is given by Rose (Rose & Bailey 2008) as pioneering work is undertaken in Arabia. A purely objective approach will never be truly possible as the baggage of preconceptions, judgements, culture, and specific research agendas will always accompany us. However, as Palaeolithic archaeologists, we must at least try.

What is also interesting to note about the research being undertaken in Arabia is that it is inter-disciplinary in nature, with research groups such as Human Origins and Palaeo-Environments (HOPE) at Oxford Brookes University being involved. Dorothy Garrod was not only a pioneer of research in the Levant, but developed the concept of inter-disciplinary teamwork. Eighty years on, pioneering inter-disciplinary research is being undertaken in the almost unknown area of Arabia.

**Inter-disciplinary Research**

Interdisciplinary studies involve different disciplines uniting together to address a common question, whereas in a multi-disciplinary approach each discipline involved will yield its own specific results with integration left to a third party observer. Garrod was not interested in multi-disciplinarity, but developed the concept of inter-disciplinary work in teams, with the emphasis on the common goal (Davies pers. comm.). This can be seen throughout all her excavations, especially at Mount Carmel where she combined the expertise of prehistoric archaeology (herself), zooarchaeology (Dorothea Bate), and

It is interesting to note here that, in 1927–28, Henry Field surveyed the prehistoric sites in the North Arabian Desert (Field 1960), and Garrod analysed the lithic material from these surveys (Garrod 1960). With observations from further discoveries in Yemen and Saudi Arabia, Field envisaged a widespread Palaeolithic population throughout the Arabian peninsula (Field 1971), and in her 1946 paper Garrod dedicated a section to the Palaeolithic of the North Arabian Desert, summarising the widespread distribution and temporal nature of the artefacts which included Acheulean-type bifaces, Levallois-Mousterian cores and flakes and Upper Palaeolithic scrapers (Garrod 1946: 19). This testifies to Garrod’s awareness of the importance of corroborating together evidence over a large geographical scale rather than a specific area in order to assess and compare the nature of lithic assemblages and the hominins who made them, to address such issues as the origin of modern humans. As research develops in Arabia, it will be interesting to see the nature of the artefact assemblages, the possible connections with other geographical areas, especially the Levant, and perhaps compare with Garrod’s initial observations eighty years ago.
In her 1946 paper, Garrod acknowledged the importance of the disciplines of geography, geology, palaeontology and ethnology. She recognised the potential of their contributions to prehistory especially with the reconstruction of the environment, which she saw as a vital aspect to understanding and interpreting stone tools and early man (Garrod 1946).

“...Man as a human being, and not Man as a fossil, is the true subject of the prehistorian...”

(Garrod 1946: 11)

Throughout her career Garrod was engaged in ‘inter-disciplinary’ archaeology that today is considered vital to all archaeological research undertaken. Even on her first excavation in Gibraltar she incorporated the analyses of flora and fauna into her discussion, rather than appending them after her conclusions, which Roberts (1995: 204) states was to become a “...hallmark of Dorothy Garrod’s painstaking, thorough excavation reports...”. Today may be the age of inter- and multi-disciplinary research, but Garrod was not only thinking along these lines seventy years ago, but actively pursing what she advocated (see Garrod’s extensive list of publications in Davies & Charles 1999).

This can be so evidently seen with the publication of the Palestine caves. The excavation report (Garrod & Bate 1937) was jointly authored with Dorothea Bate, the pioneering palaeontologist, zoologist and ornithologist, who is considered the founder of the discipline of zooarchaeology (Shindler 2005: 229). The report combining the results of the archaeology, fauna, climate and environment of the Mount Carmel excavations served as a pioneering monograph of the time, highlighting the wealth of understanding to be gained through inter-disciplinary research. The monograph was published remarkably soon following the end of the excavations, and Garrod obtained a D.Sc. from Oxford for this publication (Davies 1999a: 6). Bate was, in fact, involved in most of Garrod’s projects including Gibraltar, Shukha, Mt. Carmel and at the Athlit quarries (Garrod 1942).

During Garrod’s excavations at Ras el-Kelb, Lebanon, 1959, she discovered the Levalloiso-Mousterian artefacts on a marine shingle beach on the cave floor (Copeland, 1999: 156). This provided a link between the independently-constructed ice age chronology of the Quaternary, and for the first time in the Near East, relationships between specific marine evidence and specific industries had been established (ibid).

Such inter-disciplinary research forms the basis of much archaeological research today, with such research groups as the Centre for the Archaeology of Human Origins (CAHO) at Southampton University, and excavations at Jwalapuram, Southern India which draws on expertise from disciplines ranging from geomorphology, volcanology and climate modelling (Haslam & Petraglia 2009).

Dorothy Garrod’s Fieldwork Methods and Approaches

Garrod herself did not excavate in her large-scale projects (notably Mt. Carmel), but was always on site supervising with a controlled manner (Callander & Smith 2007: 78; Callander 2009). She was more actively involved in her smaller-scale excavations. Even later in life, when her health was fading, she would sit upon a chair with full view of the excavation. There can be no doubt that Garrod kept meticulous records from her excavations, and the discovery of the ‘lost archive’ of Garrod’s papers and field notebooks in the Musée des Antiquités Nationales (Smith et al. 1997) will in time shed more light on the way Garrod conducted her fieldwork.

Garrod’s field methods, in regards to her
excavations in France, are considered “...models of superb specialized methodology...” (Ellis 1999: 133). Three specific fieldwork methods are particularly noteworthy here. In his biography of Garrod, Davies (1999: 9) draws our attention to the fact that Garrod employed the use of dry sieves on her excavations and had done so since her days in Gibraltar, continuing to use them throughout her excavations in Palestine and Bulgaria. Davies (ibid.) notes that the use of dry-sieving would have placed Garrod’s excavations among the most up-to-date of the time. The ‘dry sieve’ is a fundamental component of the prehistoric archaeologist’s equipment and is used on excavations throughout the world, from Europe to Asia. Given that Garrod was active in the field during the early stages of the development of fieldwork methods, Garrod’s recognition of the information that would be lost without the use of correct excavation equipment is testament to her expertise as a field archaeologist.

During the ‘rescue excavation’ at Ras el-Kelb Cave, Lebanon, the disturbance of work on the road tunnel, combined with the compactness of the brecciate deposits, resulted in Garrod systematically removing the hard deposits in blocks which were later ‘excavated’ and their contents analysed in Beirut (Davies 1999a: 11). This meant that the deposits could receive more attention than if they were excavated under the time constraints and unsuitable conditions in the field. Such an innovative solution to a problem, while not compromising the archaeology, again must shine as an example to her mastery of field archaeology.

At Mount Carmel, Garrod employed people from the local villages to assist with the excavations, preferring to employ the girls and women (Callander & Smith 2007: 79; Figure 2). Perhaps Garrod can be seen as a pioneer of ‘Community Archaeology’, involving and training local people in their own prehistory and heritage (Davies pers. comm.). Such ‘Community Archaeology’ is flourishing on many different projects today (Price & Stevenson in prep.) and perhaps part of its roots can be traced back to the 1920s. A photograph of her Arab workforce at the excavations of El-Wad, 1929, depicts twelve women as opposed to only 4 men (ibid.), and Garrod even planned to obtain a place at Cambridge University for one of them (Smith 2000). Women were preferred as workers, and continued to be employed throughout all Garrod’s field seasons at Mount Carmel, with some men employed for the more heavy-duty tasks (Callander & Smith 2007). Davies (1999: 6) states that the women worked well, and considers the contribution their wages would have made to their families. Callander and Smith (2007: 77) consider that Garrod could guarantee their safety and honour with easier work than they were accustomed to. Women can be more methodical in their way of thinking and Dorothy Garrod would have been aware of the status that may have been attached to those women and their families while employed during the course of her excavations. Even today, local villagers are employed by research excavations and women preferred for certain tasks such as dry-sieving due to their eye for detail, e.g. in India (Haslam & Petraglia 2009).

Through her extensive excavations across Europe and south-west Asia, Garrod’s vision of prehistory on a worldwide scale continued to consolidate. The archaeological literature was enhanced by her many excavation reports which opened further the door of prehistoric archaeology. It wasn’t only in the field that this was achieved but also in the classroom. However, Smith (2000) informs us that lecturing was not Garrod’s strength; she preferred teaching in small, informal groups. Garrod felt more comfortable in these situations (ibid.), which were perhaps more familiar to her, mirroring somewhat the dynamics of a small intimate field team to which she was much more accustomed.
The Prehistoric Door is Opened

Dorothy Garrod helped to open up the subject of prehistory, prehistory in its worldwide context, and expanded the accessibility of the discipline.

This can be seen as a direct result of her election to the Disney Chair in 1939 which she held until her retirement in 1952. Her appointment placed her within a position of great influence which she used to change the way that prehistory was considered and taught within the Department of Archaeology. Not only did she introduce a module on world prehistory, as discussed earlier, she spearheaded a re-organisation of the Cambridge Tripos. Garrod designed, won acceptance for, and implemented a system which greatly increased the options for the candidates of Archaeology (Clark 1989: 59), thus creating Part II (Archaeology) of the Cambridge Archaeological and Anthropological Tripos (Daniel 1969: 1). This system was implemented in 1948 (Davies 1999a: 9), and remains to this day.

This meant that Cambridge was the first
British university to offer undergraduate courses in prehistoric archaeology (Clark 1989: 99). Garrod was therefore responsible for introducing the study of prehistory in its own right in the British University teaching system. Garrod was a teaching fellow and Director of Studies at Newnham College from the beginning of the 1930s (Davies 1999a), though when it is considered that until she was elected to the chair, Garrod had never held any academic lecturing position (Daniel 1969: 1), the connotations of what she achieved are immeasurable. Clark (1989: 143) considered that Cambridge University’s most important service to prehistory is that of ensuring prehistory as an acceptable subject for teaching and by training the necessary staff to take prehistory into other institutions. This has its roots in the dedication, forward thinking and passion that Dorothy Garrod and her team held for the subject, and in the long line of prehistorians that Garrod herself personally inspired and encouraged.

Dorothy Garrod’s influence on her students and the ‘next generation’ of prehistorians, and what these individuals subsequently went on to achieve, can be considered an integral part of Garrod’s legacy, and her indirect influence on the advancement of prehistoric archaeology. As a tutor, she encouraged students to fulfil their potential and explore archaeology further. Dorothy Garrod inspired many of her students and young colleagues to make major contributions to archaeology.

Among her colleagues were Grahame Clark (her successor in the Disney Chair, from 1952), who excavated at Star Carr and wrote extensively on the Mesolithic; Charles McBurney (later Professor of Quaternary Prehistory at Cambridge University), whose 1967 book on Libya was considered, in its day, the most important single contribution made to the prehistory of northern Africa (Clark 1989: 64). He dedicated it to Dorothy Garrod (ibid). Emeritus Professor John Mulvaney was a student of Garrod’s in the 1950s, and was the first university-trained prehistorian to make Australia his subject, and has been described as the ‘Father of Australian Archaeology’ (Australian Archaeological Association 2004). Professor Hallam J. Movius Jr. was part of Garrod’s team at Mount Carmel, and obtained a Cambridge PhD (Clark 1989: 46), later introducing the concept of the Movius Line in 1948, and excavating at many sites, notably Abri Pataud. Other students of Dorothy Garrod and those she influenced include Ann Sieveking (Smith 2000), Jacquetta Hopkins (Clark 1989: 43), Lorraine Copeland (Copeland 1999), John Waechter (Clark 1989: 143) and Louis Leakey (Smith 2000).

**DOROTHY GARROD AND HER FAITH**

Since 1859, a ‘science versus religion’ debate has persisted. Beliefs in science and in religion are questioned by beliefs in the other. Darwin himself agonised over the publication of *Origin of Species* due to the very reason that it would contradict the teaching of the church (Darwin Exhibition at Auckland Museum 2007). Only in 1950, in his encyclical *Humani Generis*, did Pope Pius XII (Pius 1950) state that evolution as a theory was not incompatible with the Catholic faith.

Dorothy Garrod was a committed Catholic throughout her adult life, converting from Anglicanism in 1913 (Callander 2009). She experienced doubts within her faith due to her prehistoric studies, though returned to the Church with the help of Teilhard de Chardin’s philosophy of evolution (Caton-Thompson 1969: 343). Garrod had met Teilhard de Chardin in the early 1920s, when they worked at adjoining tables in the basement of the *Institut de Paléontologie Humaine* in Paris (de Saint-Mathurin 1970). Himself a priest and a prehistorian, de Chardin’s (1965) philosophy followed an evolutionist understanding with a belief in human evolution emphasising the
development of the human consciousness towards an overall ‘omega’ point (still to come) of the divinisation of humanity. Along with Dorothy Garrod, other prominent prehistoric archaeologists of her time also shared her belief in a Christian God; Nina Layard, Gertrude Caton-Thompson, and of course the ordained Abbé Breuil. Breuil has been called “…The Pope of Palaeolithic Archaeology…” (Straus 1994); if this is the case then Garrod, as his student, must be a Cardinal. As Davies (1999a: 3) interestingly points out, Garrod nicknamed the Neanderthal child remains she discovered at Devil’s Tower, Gibraltar, “Abel” (Davies 1999a: 3), one of the sons of Adam and Eve in Genesis (Genesis 4:2).

The concept of human evolution is much debated and scrutinised between Christians who hold differing views of the bible, and the theory of how we became into being. Christians who hold a literal belief in the bible advocate without question the theory of ‘creationism’ as it is stated word for word in Genesis chapters 1–2. Those who consider the bible a collection of books of different types of writing, including historical, prophetic, poetry and stories, still believe it is God’s word, but consider Genesis chapters 1–2 as a ‘myth’, not in the modern sense but in the sense of man attempting to understand how he came to be. These Christians accept human evolution as fact, but the process as guided by God; the mystery for them is how He guided the process. There is no doubt that such a debate was also prevalent in Garrod’s time, and perhaps this dichotomy of opinions contributed to the doubts she experienced within her faith. It is perhaps interesting to note that the majority of her research was undertaken in Palestine, what is now modern day Israel, and the Mount Carmel caves are merely twenty-eight miles from Jerusalem. Being so close to the Holy City of Jerusalem, where Jesus ministered and was crucified, while undertaking fieldwork and uncovering Neanderthal burials must have made quite an impression on Dorothy Garrod (Figure 2).

Plunkett says of Nina Layard that:

“It is an essential part of her legacy that she lived and experienced within herself the transition from a pre-Darwinian religious consciousness to a type of 20th Century spirituality which is still valid — and that she made this transition through the study of prehistory”

(Plunkett 1999: 256)

Perhaps then it is an essential part of Dorothy Garrod’s legacy that she was part of the new post-Darwin scientific age; a supporter and enthusiast of new scientific developments (e.g. radiocarbon dating), advancing and expanding prehistoric studies while at the same time remaining committed to her own personal belief in a Christian God, in which she found “…conviction and strength…” (Caton-Thompson 1969: 343). This can be seen in the 1st Maret Lecture she gave on 17th May 1948 entitled ‘Early Man and the Threshold of Religion’ in which she considers cave art as evidence of the religious life of Palaeolithic Man through the current scientific evidence, theories and debates.

During her advancement of prehistoric studies, Garrod grappled with two of the most debated questions of human evolution, which are still in contention today. Through her prehistoric research, especially in Palestine, Garrod addressed two of the most crucial ‘transitional’ periods of prehistory — those of the Middle to the Upper Palaeolithic, and the Mesolithic to the Neolithic.

**Dorothy Garrod as a ‘Revolutionary’**

Overall responsibility of the Levantine cave excavations fell to Garrod, who trusted the young T.D. McCown to excavate es-Skhu during her absence owing to illness (Caton-Thompson 1969: 347). The Mousterian burials subsequently discovered there caused much controversy, with McCown advocating the remains to be that of atomically modern

The Levant has proved to be a key area regarding the development from the Middle to the Upper Palaeolithic, partly due to its geographical setting and due to the wealth of the sometimes conflicting evidence that it yields. It is now one of the most researched areas in the world.

Garrod's work in Palestine contributed in highlighting the significance of this particular era of prehistory, but also, as McCown's conclusions attest, the contentious nature of this transition. In her 1938 and 1953 papers Garrod discussed environmental conditions, colonisation, population diffusion and movement to explain the spread and distribution of lithic industries, industrial/cultural interpretations, and dating: the main aspects of the Middle to Upper Palaeolithic transition debate (Davies 1999: 271 & 269).

In 1928 Garrod conducted her first fieldwork in Palestine at the Shukbah Cave, Wadi en-Natuf. Here she discovered an unknown Epipalaeolithic culture that she named Natufian (Garrod 1957: 212). Further evidence for the Natufian culture was unearthed at Garrod’s excavations the following year at el-Wad (Callander & Smith 2007), and at el-Kebara, the cave having been discovered by Garrod in 1931 (Boyd 1999: 214).

Boyd (1999: 215) details that Garrod proposed as early as 1931 that the Mesolithic layer at el-Wad provided evidence of agriculture due to the high number of sickle-blades and hafts discovered. In 1957 Garrod agreed with Neuville that “…the Lower Natufian people were probably the first agriculturists…” (Garrod 1957: 216).

Renfrew (1999: ix) unequivocally states that Garrod’s work on the Natufian forms the “…indispensable basis for the understanding of the first farming cultures which followed…”. The nature of the Natufian and its relationship to the subsequent Neolithic are issues still trying to be resolved today, and many of Garrod’s concerns are still contested today (Boyd 1999: 218).

Garrod strongly believed in the testing of hypotheses (Copeland 1999: 162). It is the nature of our subject to test old hypotheses in the light of new evidence, work with new theories and new sites, re-define and re-discover forgotten sites, propose new questions and avenues for research and be ‘in-tune’ with new archaeological developments. Without all this then prehistory will become stagnant.

Dorothy Garrod was not afraid to change her original ideas without compromising her fundamental theories (Davies 1999b: 268). Davies (ibid.) informs us that Garrod realised that re-examining and changing ones ideas in light of new evidence was the only way to conduct prehistoric research. Davies (1999b) analyses the way in which Garrod constantly altered her current thinking in the light of new evidence. We can see Garrod’s re-assessing of ideas throughout her publications. As Boyd (1999: 218) illustrates, Garrod had previously suggested that Anatolia was a likely source for the origins of the Natufian, but in her 1957 paper she retracted the suggestion and concluded that she could not discern its traceable roots in the past (Garrod 1957: 225).

DOROTHY GARROD AND THE ROLE OF WOMEN

Perhaps a less obvious, but important, contribution of Dorothy Garrod’s to the development of early prehistory and its lasting legacy, is that of her influence as a pioneer woman archaeologist.

Dorothy Garrod was the first woman to hold the prestigious Disney Chair, and
inadvertently contributed to allowing women full status within Cambridge University. Garrod was a pioneer of women in field archaeology, and was considered one of the ‘Three Graces’ in France alongside Suzanne de Saint-Mathurin and Germaine Henri-Martin.

In the *Encyclopaedia of Great Archaeologists* (Murray 1999), Garrod is one of only 2 women whose biographies appear alongside those of fifty-six men. Today, she is studied within the archaeological disciplines of Gender Archaeology and the Archaeology of Women, is considered a ‘beacon’ within the circle of women archaeologists, and her lasting legacy gives us a realisation of what women in archaeology have the potential to achieve.

On the 6th May 1939, Dorothy Garrod became the first woman and first prehistorian to be elected to the Disney Chair at Cambridge University (Smith 2000: 265). Garrod was however, a reluctant pioneer, and struggled with the hierarchical nature and formalities that the Disney Chair bought with it (Smith 2000: 136). Nevertheless, her time as Disney Professor was intensely successful. At this time, there were very few women in teaching posts in Cambridge (Smith 2000: 278) and women did not have full university status. As the Cambridge Review in May 1939 stated:

“...The election of a woman to the Professorship of Archaeology is an immense step forward towards complete equality between men and women in the University...”

(Smith 2000: 267)

Cambridge University gave full membership to women in 1947 (University of Cambridge 1999), and it is more than likely Garrod’s appointment and success as Disney Professor contributed to this decision, as well as to the appointments of other women to professorships as occurred in the years following her appointment Davies (1999a: 9).

Garrod collaborated with de Saint-Mathurin in excavations at the Angles-sur-l’Anglin Magdalenian rock-shelter between 1947 and 1963 (Ellis 1999: 133). She wrote extensively about the sculptures, paintings and engravings uncovered (Davies 1999a: 10), significantly contributing to the development of studies in French prehistoric rock art. Garrod also assisted Henri-Martin in her excavations at Fontéchevade in the late 1940s (Davies 1999a: 10), where even today new evidence continues to be unearthed (Chase et al. 2009).

Dorothy Garrod was uncomfortable as a ‘figurehead’ (Smith 2000), and no doubt her modesty and humility did not allow her to fully appreciate the effects of the extent of her achievements, the influence she yielded and the inspiration she gave. Garrod’s prestigious position within the disciplines of Gender and Women Archaeology, and as one of the ‘pioneers of prehistory’, stands as a lasting legacy of her immense contribution and high regard within archaeology.

In a letter written shortly after her election to the Disney Chair in 1939, Garrod stated:

“The election was a tremendous surprise to me, as I had never seriously considered it possible. Naturally, I am tremendously pleased, and I hope it may quickly lead to full membership of the University for women up here.”

(Suzanne de St Mathurin & Germaine Henri-Martin archives)

**Dorothy Garrod and the Archaeology of Women**

Although Champion (1998: 193) asserts that Garrod did not express feminist interests within her works, this is perhaps unsurprising given her background. Nevertheless, she was a prominent, successful, well-known prehistorian of her time, gender aside, and the discipline of
‘feminist and gender archaeology’ was yet to be born. Garrod saw herself as continuing the family’s academic traditions, especially after the deaths of her three brothers in WW1 (Caton-Thompson 1969). The only reference from Garrod herself regarding the male-dominated world of prehistoric archaeology in which she lived is: “…It is noteworthy that among those who have built up the study of Early Man nearly all the outstanding names belong to men…” (Garrod 1946: 7). Dorothy Garrod is most certainly an outstanding name that can be added to this flock, and the words inscribed on an ornate scroll presented to her on her retirement by the Faculty paid homage to this (Smith 2000: 136).

Thus it was a surprise to Garrod that she now found herself as the first woman in the Disney Chair However, she was well aware of the connotations of her appointment (see her letter above) as the first woman in the Disney Chair, and as Roberts (1995: 227) points out, “…the very presence of a woman professor at the head of a thriving department could only act as a spur and an encouragement…”, especially if one was a woman (Smith 2000: 134).

Today, Dorothy Garrod is considered a pioneering woman archaeologist (Diaz-Andreu & Sorensen 1998; Hamilton et al. 2007). This is also recognised by the diverse number of ‘Women In Archaeology’ websites she appears on, including Pagans for Archaeology (Pagans for Archaeology 2009) which has links to her online biographies, and the Anthropology department of Southern Carolina (Smith 2008) which honours her as one of the greatest women in Anthropology. Garrod even appears on a website of ‘Ladies’ Firsts’ in recognition of her election to the Disney Chair (Dockers 2000), and with the development of organisations such as British Women Archaeologists (Teather et al. 2008), perhaps one can argue that Dorothy Garrod is amongst one of the most significant figures in the history of British Women Archaeologists.

It is to Dorothy Garrod as an inspiration, a women archaeologist and a significant contributor to the development of early prehistoric studies that my generation of female archaeologists and generations to come will look to as an example of how much can be achieved.

CONCLUSION

Dorothy Garrod excavated some of the best-known Palaeolithic sites still considered today, including Mount Carmel and the Devil’s Tower. The results of her excavations became renowned worldwide and encouraged prehistorians to address issues on a global scale, adhering to Garrod’s vision of a worldwide prehistory. Garrod established the foundation for the chronology of Levantine prehistory and addressed the complex relationships of the differing Upper Palaeolithic cultures of Europe. She addressed some of the major issues in archaeology still in contention today and changed forever the way prehistory was considered and taught, opening up the subject to its awaiting eager audience.

Garrod’s career spanned forty-five years and was an invaluable and irreplaceable contribution to the early development of lithic research and prehistoric archaeology, particularly of Europe and the Near East. Her immense contribution to prehistory was influential not just to her contemporaries and immediate successors, but has a lasting legacy even today, which will continue no doubt to inspire future generations. Garrod’s achievements were numerous and extremely important milestones in piecing together the fundamentals of early prehistory from the archaeological record.
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