

ETHNOLOGY IN THE MUSEUM: A.H.L.F. PITT RIVERS (1827-1900)
AND THE INSTITUTIONAL FOUNDATIONS OF BRITISH ANTHROPOLOGY

William Ryan Chapman

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Anthropology and Geography, University of Oxford,
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Trinity Term, 1981

ABSTRACT

This thesis is essentially a study at two levels. First, it is an examination of the importance of museums to British anthropology during the formative years of the subject, particularly between the years 1860 and 1880 when anthropology was first gaining professional recognition. Second, it is a study of Augustus Henry Lane Fox Pitt Rivers, his life and his contributions to the development of the field, including his efforts on behalf of his own well-known museum.

It is divided into eight chapters, together with a preface and epilogue. The first chapter deals with Pitt Rivers' early life and marriage, his work on behalf of the Small Arms Committee, including his involvement with early rifle tests, and the importance of that work for an understanding of his collection. The second chapter more fully discusses his military career, and covers his first professional connections, including his involvement with the Royal United Services Institution and Royal Geographical Society. His early contacts with Sir Philip de Malpas Grey-Egerton, a noted collector, and Sir Henry Creswicke Rawlinson, the famous Assyriologist and explorer, are touched upon as are some of his earliest collecting contacts. In general, both chapters attempt to place Pitt Rivers in his time and establish the social and intellectual context for his work, including the impact of such figures as Darwin and Charles Bray upon his viewpoint.

The next two chapters focus more particularly on Pitt Rivers' archaeological and ethnological interests, providing background material on the nature of both fields during the 1860s, or the period when he was first involved. The main emphasis is on the organizational character of both ethnology and archaeology and on the reasons for the sudden rise of interest in both fields at the time. The appearance of an organized 'anthropology' and Pitt Rivers' involvement is discussed as are his connections with several leading figures in all three areas of interest. The latter include Albert Way, the founder of the Archaeological Institute; James Hunt, the main figure in the Anthropological Society of London, as well as prominent contemporaries such as John Evans, A.W. Franks, John Lubbock and Thomas Huxley. Finally, the progression of Pitt Rivers' collection, from a simple arms collection to a museum of recognized research potential for both archaeology and ethnology is stressed, as are Pitt Rivers' own special research interests.

Chapters Five and Six cover Pitt Rivers' early field work in Ireland and his work on behalf of the Ethnological and Anthropological Societies, including his central role in the establishment of the Anthropological Institute, the main professional body after 1871. Again his close contacts with Lubbock, Huxley and Evans as well as other leading anthropologists, among them John Beddoe and George Rolleston, are treated in detail. The main emphasis of both chapters, however, is on Pitt Rivers' own disenchantment with the field and with other members of the emergent anthropological community and on his disagreement with the new 'evolutionist school', particularly E.B. Tylor, one of the main proponents of the new approach. His growing interest in archaeological field technique is treated as an outgrowth of that disenchantment. Included are discussions of

his important work at Cissbury and Mt. Caburn Camp as well as his early training under Canon William Greenwell.

The final chapters discuss the progress of Pitt Rivers' museum, beginning with its transfer from the branch museum at Bethnal Green, where it had been since 1874, to South Kensington in 1878, and then its donation to Oxford in 1883, where it was to provide a first institutional base for anthropology during the latter part of the century. Pitt Rivers' difficulties with the new Oxford department, including Tylor and Henry Balfour, are treated in detail as is Pitt Rivers' own shift away from the museum ideal towards the more manageable context of archaeological fieldwork and recording. His well-known work at Cranborne Chase, the Dorset-Wiltshire estate inherited in later life, and his efforts on behalf of the protection of ancient monuments are also covered, as is his work with his later museum at Farnham.

The epilogue draws attention to Pitt Rivers' lasting contribution to anthropology and archaeology and attempts to account for the failure of the anthropological museum, as represented by Pitt Rivers' own museum at Oxford, to provide the institutional base that he sought. The continuing impact of his work as well as the eventual establishment and proliferation of a university-based anthropology—one brought about in part as a direct result of Pitt Rivers' efforts—are discussed in further detail, as is the present status of the Oxford Museum.

Note: the page numbers given below relate to the hard copy version of the thesis which can be consulted in the Bodleian Library and also at the Balfour Library, Pitt Rivers Museum. This on-line version of the thesis does not have page numbers

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	i
Acknowledgments	xiv

CHAPTER I

PITT RIVERS AND THE MID-VICTORIAN CONTEXT

1. Early Life and Education	1
2. The Stanleys of Alderley	12
3. The Development of the Rifle	17
4. The Laws of Progress	25
5. The Beginnings of the Collection	34
6. Extension of the Collection	39

CHAPTER II

A GROWING COMMITMENT TO SCIENCE

1. Active Service in the Crimean War	51
2. Further Work at Malta	58
3. The United Services Institution	62
4. Fox's First Professional Paper	71
5. Fox's Scientific Interests in the 1850s	77
6. Membership in the Royal Geographical Society	83
7. The Impact of Bray and Darwin	86
8. The Growth of Fox's Collection	93

CHAPTER III

ARCHAEOLOGICAL INTERESTS OF THE EARLY SIXTIES

1. The International Exhibition of 1862	105
2. Work in Ireland	110
3. First Interests in Archaeology	118
4. First Archaeological Contact	126
5. Archaeology and the Societies	130
6. New Contacts Within the Antiquarian Community	140
7. Archaeology and Museums	146
8. The Three Age System in Britain	155
9. Ethnographical Analogy	164

CHAPTER IV
PARALLEL INTERESTS IN ETHNOLOGY

1.	The Ethnological Society of London	174
2.	The Ethnographical Context	183
3.	New Influences on Fox	192
4.	The Problems of Ethnology	197
5.	The Ethnological Museum	206
6.	The Ethnological Museum in Britain	212
7.	The Royal College of Surgeons	218
8.	The Anthropological Society of London	223
9.	The Evolutionist Perspective	235

CHAPTER V
PRIMITIVE WARFARE

1.	Excavations in London and Yorkshire	244
2.	The Changing Museum Ideal	254
3.	Efforts Towards a National Ethnographical Museum	262
4.	Man and Nature; Fox's First Paper on Primitive Warfare	267
5.	Fox's Survey of Sussex Hillforts	275
6.	The Stone Age; Fox's Second Paper on Primitive Warfare	287
7.	Growing Administrative Involvement	293
8.	The Bronze Age; Fox's Third Paper on Primitive Warfare	310

CHAPTER VI
THE EVOLUTION OF CULTURE

1.	Fox's Collection and His Work at the British Association	322
2.	Amalgamation of the Ethnological and Anthropological Societies	334
3.	Work at the Society of Antiquaries and Anthropological Institute	341
4.	A New Edition of Notes and Queries	349
5.	The Degeneration of Ornament	360
6.	The Exhibition of Fox's Collection at Bethnal Green	368
7.	The Principles of Classification	376
8.	Further Excavations at Cissbury	385

CHAPTER VII
THE OXFORD GIFT

1.	Further Excavations in Sussex	397
2.	The Conservation of Antiquities	406
3.	Removal of the Collection to South Kensington	415
4.	Inheritance of Rushmore	427
5.	Pitt Rivers' Retreat to Rushmore	439
6.	Negotiations with Oxford	445

7.	Pitt Rivers' Appointment as Inspector of Ancient Monuments	454
----	--	-----

CHAPTER VIII

A GROWING DIVISION OF INTERESTS

1.	The Museum at Oxford	464
2.	The Organization of the Museum	470
3.	Further Provisions for the Collection	482
4.	Henry Balfour and His Work with the Collection	490
5.	Pitt Rivers and the Farnham Museum	495
6.	Political and Scientific Commitments	509
7.	Disagreements Over the Oxford Collection	517
8.	Pitt Rivers' Final Work at Rushmore	524

EPILOGUE

1.	Anthropology and The Universities	538
2.	Recapitulation	544
3.	The Influence of Pitt Rivers and His Collection	553

Endnotes

Bibliography

Illustrations

Note that these illustrations (which were in any case rather poor quality illustrations because of the technical limitations in 1981, are not included in the on-line version of this thesis.

List of Illustrations

- I Bullet Types and their Development. Taken from 'Improvement of the Rifle as a Weapon for General Use' (1858)
- II The Roovesmore Oghams. Taken from 'Roovesmore Fort, and Stones inscribed with Oghams, in the parish of AGLISH, Co. Cork'. (1867)
- III Illustrations of Arms. Taken from 'Primitive Warfare, Part I' (1867)
- IV Illustrations of Arms. Taken from 'Primitive Warfare, Part I' (1867)
- V Illustrations of Arms. Taken from 'Primitive Warfare, Part I' (1867)
- VI Illustrations of Arms. Taken from 'Primitive Warfare, Part I' (1867)
- VII Development of Spear and Arrow-Head Forms. Taken from 'Primitive Warfare, Part II'. (1868)
- VIII Transition from Celt to Paddle Spear & Sword forms. Taken from 'Primitive Warfare, Part II'. (1868)
- IX Transition from the Malga to the Boomerang. Taken from 'Primitive Warfare, Part II'. (1868)
- X An examination into the Character and probable Origin of the Hill Forts of Sussex. (1868)
- XI Plan of Cissbury, Mount Caburn, Chanktonbury, Highdown and Seaford. Taken from 'An Examination into the Character and probable Origin of the Hill Forts of Sussex. (1868)
- XII Map of the distribution of the Principal Modifications of Mankind. Taken from 'Primitive Warfare, Part III' (1869)
- XIII Stone implements, Moel Faben (North Wales). Taken from 'On the opening of two cairns near Bangor, North Wales'. (1870)
- XIV Dorchester Dyke and Sinodun Camp. Taken from 'On the threatened destruction of British Earthworks near Dorchester, Oxfordshire'. (1870)
- XV Sketch Map of part of the Thames Valley, from Acton to near Chiswick and to the Thames at Kew. Taken from 'On the discovery of Palaeolithic implements, in

- connection with Elephas primigenus in the gravels of the Thames Valley at Acton'. (1872)
- XVI Mid-terrace Gravel, in Chiswick Row. Taken from 'On the discovery of Palaeolithic implements, in connection with Elephas primigenus in the gravels of the Thames Valley at Acton'. (1872)
- XVII Illustrations of Arms. Taken from The Catalogue of the Anthropological Collection lent by Colonel Lane Fox. (1874)
- XVIII Illustrations of Arms. Taken from The Catalogue of the Anthropological Collection lent by Colonel Lane Fox. (1874)
- XIX Illustrations of Arms. Taken from The Catalogue of the Anthropological Collection lent by Colonel Lane Fox. (1874)
- XX Illustrations of Arms. Taken from The Catalogue of the Anthropological Collection lent by Colonel Lane Fox. (1874)
- XXI Ornamentation of New Ireland Paddles. Taken from 'The Evolution of Culture'. (1875)
- XXII Clubs, Boomerangs, Shields and Lances. Taken from 'The Evolution of Culture'. (1875)
- XXIII Evolution of Types of Ancient British Coins. Taken from 'The Evolution of Culture'. (1875)
- XXIV Excavations in Mount Caburn Camp. Taken from 'Excavations at Mount Caburn Camp, near Lewes, conducted in 1877 and 1878'. (1878)
- XXV Augustus Henry Lane Fox Pitt Rivers. Early photograph. c. 1860
- XXVI Pitt Rivers. Retouched photograph. c. 1880
- XXVII The University Museum, Oxford. Under construction, c. 1860.
- XXVIII General Pitt Rivers, F.R.S. Photograph by W.E. Gray from a life-size oil painting by Frank Hall, R.A. (1882)
- XXIX Pitt Rivers in old age. Photograph by H. St. George Gray from a painting by Frederick S. Beaumont. (1897)
- XXX View of Interior of the Pitt Rivers Museum. Photograph by Alfred Robinson. c. 1899. Photographs Courtesy of the Pitt Rivers and University Museums, Oxford

PREFACE

The importance of museums in the early history of British anthropology, particularly its institutional history, has long been overlooked. Most summary texts or introductions to the subject say little on the nature of the contributions of early museum-oriented anthropologists or of the organizational underpinnings which museums represented for many during the nineteenth century¹. More detailed histories, such as those of J.W. Burrow or, more recently, of George Stocking, concentrate on the intellectual and ethical foundations of the subject, neglecting, in turn, the stolid, more thoroughgoing concerns which lay at the heart of anthropology during the 1860s and 70s, or the period when the subject was first becoming recognized². Stocking mentions archaeology and physical anthropology, the obviously more museum-oriented interests, only in passing, little suggesting that the majority of early anthropologists, or at least the members of the Ethnological and Anthropological Societies of the 1860s and of the Anthropological Institute of the seventies, were drawn specifically from those two camps. Burrow writes of another anthropology altogether, one firmly rooted in the intellectual traditions of the late eighteenth century and inspired by the utilitarian theories of Bentham and Mill. Material cultural interests, in turn, are neglected entirely.

The reasons for such an essentially one-sided view of the subject are complex. The most important factor is the relative separation of anthropological and archaeological (and ethnological) interests within the anthropological community today. Most British anthropologists consider themselves 'social' anthropologists. In consequence, their interests have tended to settle upon such problems as the nature of social organization, or more recently, the nature of symbolism and language. Not surprisingly, their view of the history of their field has tended to reflect their bias, or in Herbert Butterfield's terms, their implicit 'Whiggishness'³—therefore, the interest in 'sociological' figures such as Henry

¹ See, for example, such standard British texts as S.F. Nadel, The Foundations of Social Anthropology (London: Cohen and West, 1951); E.E. Evans-Pritchard, Social Anthropology (London: Cohen and West, 1954); Raymond Firth, Human Types, rev. ed. (London: Nelson, 1956); J.H.M. Beattie, Other Cultures (London: Cohen and West, 1964); Godfrey Lienhardt, Social Anthropology, 2nd ed. (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1966); David Pocock, Social Anthropology, rev. ed. (London: Sheed and Ward, 1971). For an earlier, far more museum-oriented approach: A.C. Haddon, History of Anthropology (London: Watts, 1910). Also different are historical introductions by museum specialists, such as that of T.K. Penniman, or by more archaeologically-oriented anthropologists such as that of Robert Lowie (in this case an American). See T.K. Penniman, A Hundred Years of Anthropology, rev. ed. (1965; rpt. London: William Morrow, 1974); Robert H. Lowie, The History of Ethnological Theory (London: George C. Harrap, 1937). Neither, however, are current.

² J.W. Burrow, Evolution and Society: A Study in Victorian Social Theory (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1966); George W. Stocking, 'What's in a Name? The Origins of the Royal Anthropological Institute (1837-71)', Man, NS 6 (1971), 369-90. See also J.W. Burrow, 'Evolution and Anthropology in the 1860s: The Anthropological Society of London, 1863-71', Victorian Studies, 7 (1963), 137-54; George C. Stocking, Race Culture and Evolution (London: MacMillan, 1968), and 'The History of Anthropology: Where, Whence, Whither', JHBS, 2 (1966), 281-90.

³ Herbert Butterfield, The Whig Interpretation of History (London: G. Bell and Sons, 1931).

Maine or Herbert Spencer (never in their own time active anthropologists) during the 1930s and 40s, and early 'linguists' such as Max Müller or Horatio Hale more recently⁴. Only among museum-based anthropologists, that is, those specifically connected with museums, is the story appreciably different. And even in their case, attention has drifted significantly away from the artefactual interests of their predecessors towards the ethnographic or linguistic preoccupations of their university-based colleagues⁵. As a result, the museum has become virtually purged from the subject, relegated simply to providing educational material for the public and forgotten altogether as a source of early inspiration.

But it is not, of course, only the museum which has been forgotten, but those figures in the past most closely tied to it. From the British social anthropological perspective, the museum was, in Thomas Kuhn's sense, a paradigm that failed, and it has suffered the penalty for it⁶. The truth is, however, that anthropology was born in the museum. The earliest members of the parent organizations, or at least those organizations which served as a base of anthropological interests since the 1860s, were, as suggested, all archaeologists or persons with an interest in physiology and anatomy. The early leadership, including figures such as John Lubbock, John Evans, Thomas Huxley and John Beddoe, were also representative of those interests. Exhibitions of artefacts, reports of excavations, illustrations of physiological charts dominated early meetings. The Anthropological and Ethnological Societies promoted the idea of anthropological collections and, by way of example, formed their own museums. The Anthropological Institute, founded in 1871, followed a similar course, later donating much of its material to the British Museum.

The museum also provided the first professional home for anthropology. Many of the secretaries and librarians attached to the earliest professional organizations were also curators of their collections. Many of those active at the meetings, beginning with A.W. Franks of the British Museum staff and his later assistants, C.H. Read and O.M. Dalton, were drawn from the museum as well. The museum, in the form of the Pitt Rivers Museum at Oxford, provided the first formal instruction in the subject. The Pitt Rivers Museum's first lecturer, E.B. Tylor, was, as a result, the first professional anthropologist,

⁴ On Spencer and Maine, see Lowie; pp. 19-32 and 49-53; Penniman, *A Hundred Years*, pp. 101-04; and, more recently, Burrow, *Evolution*, pp. 137-227. On Müller and Hale: Malcolm Crick, 'Max Müller', *JASO*, 3 (1972), 1-14; Crick, *Some Aspects of Social Anthropology, Language and Meaning*. D.Phil. Thesis, Oxford, 1974; *Explorations in Language and Meaning* (London: Malaby Press, 1976); J.W. Grubner, 'Horatio Hale and the Development of American Anthropology', *Proc. of the Amer. Philos. Soc.*, 3, (1967), 5-37; Edwin Ardener, Intro., *Social Anthropology and Language*, ASA 10 (London: Tavistock, 1971); and Hilary Henson, *British Social Anthropologists and Language* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974).

⁵ Probably the best example is Dell Hymes at the University Museum, University of Pennsylvania, whose several works on language have dominated American Research in this area for a number of years. See Dell Hymes, ed., *Language in Culture and Society* (New York: Harper and Row, 1964).

⁶ Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 2nd. ed., International Encyclopaedia of Unified Science, no. 2 (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1970).

at least in Great Britain. The museum, then, provided not only a focus, but a context for further growth, something which was well demonstrated during the early part of the twentieth century. In short, it provided an institutional base.

To emphasize the importance of museums during anthropology's early years, I have chosen to concentrate on a single figure, one who could be considered to have made a significant contribution to the development of a museum-oriented anthropology but who at the same time might be considered as representative of the interests which made such a development possible. A.H.L.F. Pitt Rivers was perhaps the inevitable choice. For one, his association with museums was unquestionable. His own museum, first founded as a private collection as early as 1851, provided a focus of attention during the 1860s and 70s when museum interests were at their height. Donated to Oxford, it provided the impetus for professional development which the subject needed. Secondly, Pitt Rivers was closely involved both in the Ethnological and Anthropological Societies and could easily be considered a founding member of the Institute, a fact which is often forgotten. Thirdly, he made valuable contributions to the literature of the subject. His early studies on primitive weapons and of the origins of ornamental design were seen as exemplars of the 'inductive method' and had a profound influence on the work of others for a number of years. Finally, there is the very quality of his having been overlooked, particularly by social anthropologists—the fact that he represents a figure so close to the core of the subject that he has been forgotten along with the rest of what signified 'anthropology' in the second half of the nineteenth century.

To approach Pitt Rivers' contribution, I have drawn both upon the standard biographical and historical sources and on more detailed information previously unavailable or overlooked. Pitt Rivers, as a recognized founding father of modern archaeology, has received his share of what Lytton Strachey long ago dismissed as panegyrics but little in the way of critical studies⁷. The archaeologist Leonard Woolley referred to him as 'that great pioneer'; Mortimer Wheeler repeated the accolade, pointing to the revolutionary methods employed by Pitt Rivers at his estate at Cranborne Chase. Stuart Piggott called him a 'natural genius', and more recently J. Forde-Johnston has referred to Pitt Rivers' 'unheard of precision'⁸. The first in-depth analysis of his work, however, was undertaken by Christopher Hawkes who examined his later contributions to archaeological technique in a long article in the *Archaeological Journal* of 1947⁹. More recently Michael Thompson, the editor of the Pitt Rivers Papers in Salisbury, has looked at his role as first

⁷ Lytton Strachey, *Eminent Victorians* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, n.d.), p. viii.

⁸ Leonard Woolley, *Spadework in Archaeology* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1953), p. 14; Mortimer Wheeler, *Archaeology from the Earth*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press), pp. 9-14; Stuart Piggott, *Approach to Archaeology* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959) p. 32; J. Forde-Johnston, *History from the Earth* (New York: New York Graphic Society, 1974), p. 59. Also, among others, see Stanley Casson, *The Discovery of Man* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1939), p. 94; Grahame Clark, *Archaeology and Society* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1957); and Glyn Daniel, *The Origins and Growth of Archaeology* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1967), pp. 236-244.

⁹ C.F.C. Hawkes, 'Britons, Romans and Saxons round Salisbury and in Cranborne Chase, Reviewing the Excavations of General Pitt Rivers, 1881-97', *AJ*, 104 (1947), 27-81.

Inspector of Ancient Monuments and his part in early antiquities legislation. More recently, he has expanded this through a short biography of Pitt Rivers and study of his archaeological work¹⁰. Pitt Rivers' archaeological reputation is secure, then, and I have little to add to what information is already available.

Other than occasional historical summaries, such as those by Arthur Keith in the 1920s or Thomas Penniman twenty years later, however, there has been little notice by anthropologists¹¹. Studies of the museum tradition, such as those of J.H. Frese, or even of the architectural history of museums, such as that of Nikolaus Pevsner, refer to Pitt Rivers and his own collection as a matter of course¹². But more general studies by anthropologists themselves, with the exception of Robert Lowie's History of Ethnological Theory (1937), or Marvin Harris's idiosyncratic introduction to the subject, The Rise of Anthropological Theory (1969), ignore him altogether or simply attempt to treat him as one of several 'evolutionists'¹³. Burrow makes no reference at all to him, at least in his longer work. Stocking, in turn, discusses him only in the context of the Anthropological Institute. None provide details of his life¹⁴. It is, therefore, part of my purpose to supply this background and to place Pitt Rivers within the anthropological and archaeological traditions of which he was a part.

For an outline of Pitt Rivers' career and activities, I depended initially on a memoir published by his one-time assistant, St. George Gray, as a fifth volume to Pitt Rivers' famous series Excavations in Cranborne Chase and published in shorter form at a later date¹⁵. An introduction to the collection by Beatrice Blackwood and another by Thomas Penniman, as well as E.B. Tylor's short notice in the Dictionary of a National Biography,

¹⁰ M.W. Thompson, 'The First Inspector of Ancient Monuments in the Field', JAA, NS 3. (1960), 103-24; General Pitt-Rivers: Evolution and Archaeology in the Nineteenth Century (Bradford-on-Avon: Moonraker Press, 1977).

¹¹ Arthur Keith, 'What Should Museums Do For Us?', MJ, 26 (1927), 229-35; T.K. Penniman, A Hundred Years, pp. 160, 246 and 268. Also see N.G. Annan, 'The Intellectual Aristocracy', in Studies in Social History ed. J.H. Plumb (London: Longmans, Green, 1955), pp. 241-87, for brief notice. More recently notice has settled, usually facetiously, upon his rifle collection: P.R. Mills, 'Anthropology as a Hobby', JRAI, 83 (1953), 1; Brian Street, 'Anthropology Outside the Classroom', JASO, 6, 1 (1975), 57.

¹² H.H. Frese, Anthropology and the Public: The Role of Museums (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1960), p. 39; Nikolaus Pevsner, A History of Building Types, Bollingen Series XXXV - 19 (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1976), p. 133

¹³ Lowie, pp. 19-20, 28, 60, 69. Marvin Harris, The Rise of Anthropological Theory: A History of Theories of Culture (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969), pp. 150-51. Significantly, both are American writers; another once standard text, Alexander Goldenweiser, Anthropology: An Introduction to Primitive Culture (New York: F.S. Crofts, 1937), however, makes no mention of him.

¹⁴ Stocking, 'What's in a Name?', p. 381.

¹⁵ Harold St. George Gray, Index to 'Excavations in Cranborne Chase' and 'King John's House, Tollard Royal' (Taunton Castle, Somerset: By the author, 1905), Vol. V of Excavations in Cranborne Chase: 'Lieut.-General Pitt-Rivers', in Memoirs of Old Wiltshire, ed. Alice Dryden (London: Bemrose and Sons, 1906), pp. 47-65.

helped to supplement those¹⁶, but again, provided little of critical interest. The only exception has been Michael Thompson's biography of 1977, which, together with his notes on the Pitt Rivers Papers in Salisbury, has been extremely useful. For other, mostly autograph sources, I have drawn upon the Pitt Rivers Papers in Salisbury and on the letters of his relatives, principally those of his wife's mother and grandmother, published during the 1930s¹⁷. Also helpful have been archival sources in Yorkshire, Pitt Rivers' original home, and as well more general materials in the Salisbury and South Wilts Museum.

Other archival materials have been uncovered in the Public Records Office, mostly relating to his early life and military career, at the Society of Antiquaries, regarding his involvement there and at the companion Archaeological Institute, and at the Royal Anthropological Institute, which possesses a number of Pitt Rivers' letters and other materials relevant to activities there. Other sources include the records of the Grenadier Guards, those of the Royal United Service Institution, an organization with which Pitt Rivers was associated in the late 1850s, and of the infantry training school now located at Warminster, and the successor to the one at which Pitt Rivers himself as a young army officer once instructed. The correspondence of some of Pitt Rivers' contemporaries, among them Albert Way, Henry Christy, John Lubbock, John Evans, A.W. Franks, Thomas Huxley, George Rolleston and Henry Balfour, held by the British Museum, the Society of Antiquaries, the Imperial Science Museum, and the Ashmolean and the Pitt Rivers Museums at Oxford, respectively, have been helpful as have been several other sources.

The main emphasis, however, has been on published materials, most importantly the journals of the several societies with which Pitt Rivers was connected. While my thesis is in part a biographical study, this has in many ways been considered of incidental concern—simply to fill in the gaps not covered elsewhere. My main purpose has been to place Pitt Rivers in his time, and here journals and other publications by his contemporaries have proved the most helpful. In addition, there are contemporary publications of a more general kind. Not only has it been important to place Pitt Rivers in the anthropological world, but also to place his ideas and writings in a greater literary and social context. As a result, subjects as diverse as the Crimean War, in which he played a small part, and the impact of Darwin on contemporary readership, nineteenth-century attitudes towards colonialism and popular views on education had a part in the study as well. My purpose in treating those subjects has been simply to fill in the background as far as possible so as not to view his work in isolation.

¹⁶ 'Pitt-Rivers, Augustus Henry Lane Fox', Dictionary of National Biography, ed. by Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1885-).

¹⁷ Bertrand Russell and Patricia Russell, eds., The Amberley Papers: Bertrand Russell's Family Background, 2 vols. (New York: W.W. Norton, 1937); Nancy Mitford, ed., The Stanleys of Alderley: Their Letters, Between the Years 1851-65 (London: Chapman and Hall, 1939); Mitford, ed., The Ladies of Alderley (1938; rpt. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1967).

The source material has presented a number of difficulties. Unfortunately, Pitt Rivers left no diaries, and his early private correspondence, as with that of many other eminent figures of the period, was destroyed before his death. The Pitt Rivers Papers include approximately 4,000 letters, but those date only from the period after 1880 or at a time when his career and fortune were already well established. The crucial years, approximately 1850 to that date, are covered only by occasional letters in other archives, such as those to Huxley or to the Anthropological Institute. Materials in the Leeds City Archives concerning his early life contain little of a personal kind and consist mostly of estate papers and records of financial settlements. The same is true of materials in the Public Records Office which, with the exception of the sixteen notebooks and sketchbooks dating from the time of his tenure as Inspector of Ancient Monuments, consist of little more than military lists and other even more general materials. The manuscript collections at the Dorset County Record Office consist of estate papers from his later days and also provide little on his early life and even less on his involvement as an anthropologist. Unfortunately as with Michael Thompson, I have had no opportunity to examine the letters in the possession of Anthony Pitt Rivers, many of them relating to his military career. But while no doubt useful, again those apparently contain nothing on his anthropological work.

One problem not generally encountered by a biographer is the fact of a change of names. Pitt Rivers was born Augustus Henry Lane Fox, receiving the second set of surnames only in 1880, as a result of an inheritance from his great uncle. While occasionally referred to before that period as Lane Fox, he was usually called simply Fox and was indexed as such in his military records as well as in journals and other publications. The names of Pitt and Rivers were typically used together, despite the absence of a hyphen (since added by his descendants). To add to the confusion, he was occasionally known as Fox Pitt Rivers as well. In keeping with his own usage, however, I have referred to him as Fox prior to 1880, and as Pitt Rivers, also without a hyphen, after that period.

A number of questions arose in the course of researching Pitt Rivers' life and work. One was to what degree could Pitt Rivers be viewed as a conventional Darwinian? Did his own, widely touted evolutionist views derive from Darwin or, as Burrow has argued in the case of several other leading anthropologists of the time, did they derive from more general notions of progress and change? Also, as a corollary to that, to what degree could Pitt Rivers be viewed as an evolutionist at all; was it possible, for example, that his ideas were tied to a more traditional framework of historical reconstruction, one connected more to the archaeological tradition of which he was firmly a part than to the concepts of process and development which characterized evolutionist thought of the period? Finally, and most importantly, what part did his museum play in his overall scheme; what were his fullest ambitions for it; how did he understand its role in the formation of the new science?

To answer such questions it has been necessary to throw off many of the preconceptions about the nature of the subject at the time. For one, the idea propounded by both Burrow and Stocking that the anthropological community was comprised largely of Quaker philosophers, as represented by the Ethnological Society, or by Godless racialists, as

represented by the Anthropological Society, has had to be dispelled. Quakers and atheists were well represented in both groups, and, in fact, much of the membership, including Pitt Rivers, overlapped. The eventual schism was obviously one of personality more than anything else, and that I believe has been made more clear in my own treatment. An even more important point, however, is the profound impact of both archaeological findings and the archaeological approach on the subject at the time, again something overlooked by Burrow and Stocking. Closely coupled with that was what might be called the anatomical or physical anthropological approach. Anthropologists and ethnologists of the late nineteenth century were preoccupied with the material evidence, their aim was to find an explanation for man's origins, to in fact trace his origins to the very beginning. To do that they depended not on hypotheses, but on a framework of ascertainable truths. The museum, in turn, provided the ideal forum for their discovery, as Pitt Rivers strove to emphasize.

Overall, what I have been seeking, then, is an explanation of Pitt Rivers' interests in terms of the preoccupations of the time—to know, in R.G. Collingwood's phrase, what the questions were¹⁸. To do so I have attempted to chart a common use of language (or in Michael Foucault's sense a 'scientific discourse'¹⁹), a shared commitment to a single ideal—and, in turn, an abandonment of that ideal. The museum-oriented tradition was one of limited duration, lasting only from about 1860 to 1880, and while of obvious importance well into the twentieth century, from the 1880s most leading anthropologists had turned away from museums toward more general problems of cultural history and development, an approach commonly labelled as 'evolutionism'. As a result, it was evolutionism which could be said to have replaced the museum rather than having contributed to it as it is often assumed. Evolutionism allowed for new interests: the growth of religious ideas, the development of thought, variations in marriage customs and so on, all of which had been more or less excluded from the museum. Evolutionism provided an opportunity for a reexamination of those less tangible facts. At the same time, evolutionism subverted the museum approach, something which the more staunchly empirical anthropologists, such as Pitt Rivers, realized at an early date. Therefore, rather than providing simply a parallel to his own interests, evolutionism tended to contradict many of Pitt Rivers' plans. In the end it was that very shift of many of his contemporaries away from the viewpoint that he espoused which caused Pitt Rivers to abandon many of his ethnological colleagues and build what was, in effect, a second career as a field archaeologist. His museum had become simply an impediment.

A number of terms should be defined at the outset, particularly since they appear in the title. By 'ethnology', I refer to the comparative study of world cultures or societies as characterized by the interests of the nineteenth-century or 'Victorian' anthropologists. Still used today, mostly to describe the study of 'material culture' as opposed to ethnography or the study of contemporary societies, ethnology is used here specifically to

¹⁸ R.G. Collingwood, *An Autobiography* (1939; rpt. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1970), p. 31.

¹⁹ Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*, trans. (London: Tavistock Publications, 1970), p. xiii.

suggest the interests of another era²⁰. By 'anthropology' I mean the organizational context for ethnological, ethnographical or even archaeological and physiological interests. Anthropology was first used to designate the subject, at least in Britain, beginning only in 1863, with the foundation of the Anthropological Society of London. Despite considerable opposition from other factions, it was eventually selected as the title for the Anthropological Institute, the main professional body since the time of its inception in 1871. It is, then, a term of more or less continuous usage²¹. Finally, by 'museum' I wish to suggest not only the museum as a concrete phenomenon—that is a collection of objects brought together for study or for educational purposes—but also the museum as an ideal²². In Pitt Rivers' terms it was no 'mere repository of objects' but a 'means of conveying knowledge' and establishing 'the true causes for all the phenomena of human life'²³. His own ambitions for it account in part for its failure as an approach.

²⁰ Already in 1906, C.H. Read regretted 'the suppression of the term'. Read, 'Anthropology at the Universities' *Man*, 6 (1906), 58. The term derives from the Greek *ethnikos* and Latin *Ethnicus*, meaning 'racial'; akin to *ethos*, 'character', and 'ethos', 'custom'. See Eric Partridge, ed., *A Short Etymological Dictionary of Modern English* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, n.d.). First widely used in Britain by James Cowles Prichard. For contemporary definitions, see Prichard, *The Natural History of Man* (London: H. Bailliere, 1843), p. 132; R.G. Latham, *Man and His Migrations* (London: Jan Van Voorst, 1851), p. 3; T.H. Huxley, 'On the Methods and Results of Ethnology', *Fortnightly Review*, 1 (1865), p. 257; A.H. Keane, *Ethnology* (1895; rpt. Cambridge: at the Univ. Press, 1901), p. 2. For more recent definitions and the terms identified with museum-based studies: Adrian Digby, 'Ethnography in Museums', *MJ*, 59 (1959); Lienhardt, p. 5; Claude Levi-Strauss, *Structural Anthropology* (New York: Basic Books, 1963), p. 2-3.

²¹ See Stocking, 'What's in a Name?'

²² For general background see: David Murray, *Museums: Their History and Their Use*, 3 vols. (Glasgow: James Maclehose and Sons, 1904); Frederick Kenyon, *Libraries and Museums* (London: Ernest Benn, 1930); Alma Stephanie Wittlin, *The Museum, its History and its Tasks in Education* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1949); and Germain Bazin, *The Museum Age* (Brussels: Desoer S.A. Publishers, 1967). On the etymology: L.W.G. Malcome, 'The Word "Museum" and its Precursors', *MJ*, 35 (1936), 121-22; and Hans Huth, 'Museum and Gallery', in *Essays in Honor of George Swarzenski*, ed. by Oswald Goetz (Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1951). Finally, Clifford Williams, *Bibliography of Museums and Museology* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1923).

²³ Pitt-Rivers, 'Address as President of the Anthropological Section of the British Association, Bath', *RBAAS* (1888), 825 and 826.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The number of people who have helped me on the project and institutions which have provided both space for me to work and materials for my research are myriad. It is obviously not possible to thank everyone, but a number of those involved should be singled out for their particular assistance. If anyone has been left out, it is an oversight only, and my full apologies to them.

For information on Pitt Rivers' institutional associations, I would like to thank: S. M. Arnold at the Royal Institution; Brian Atkins, for his inquiries on my behalf to the Geological Society of London; Anne Bedford, Assistant Curator at the Royal Military Academy, Sandhurst; R. Fish, Librarian, the Zoological Society of London; Christine Kelly of the Royal Geographical Society; Winifred Phillips of the Royal Archaeological Institute; N. H. Robinson of the Royal Society; B.G.R. Thompson and Richard Tubb at the Royal United Services Institute; Sarah Wilcox of the British Association for the Advancement of Science; and Major P.A.J. Wright of the Grenadier Guards, the latter particularly for details on Pitt Rivers' service record.

For answering my several inquiries on early ethnographical collections, I would like to thank: H. C. Adamson of the Glasgow Museums and Art Galleries; G.H.A. Banks, Keener of Ethnography, Brighton Art Gallery and Museums; Pauline Beswick and John Marjoram, City of Sheffield, Museums Department; John Bradshaw, City of Kingston Upon Hull Museums and Art Galleries; L.H. Pole, Curator, Saffron Walden Museum; David C. Devenish, Curator, Hastings Museum and Art Gallery; Laurence N.W. Flanagan, Keeper of Antiquities, Ulster Museum; E.F. Greenwood and Ann Bridson, Merseyside County Museums; R.H. Hughes, Principal Keeper, Derby Museums and Art Gallery; Dale Idiens, Assistant Keeper, Department of Art and Archaeology, The Royal Scottish Museum; David L. Jones and Patricia Butler of the Borough of Ipswich Museums; Shelagh Lewis, Assistant Keeper, Department of Ethnology, The University of Manchester; R.D. Lockhart, Curator of the Anthropological Museum, University of Aberdeen; E.W. Mackie, Assistant Keeper, The Hunterian Museum, The University of Glasgow; Tertia McMeehin, Perth Art Gallery and Museum; J.C.S. Magson of the Calderdale Museums and Art Galleries; Raymond Mitchell, Leeds City Museum; S.M. Pearce, Curator of Antiquities, Royal Albert Memorial Museum; Jane Pierson-Jones of the City Museums and Art Gallery, Birmingham; P.S. Rawson, University of Durham; J.R. Rimmer, Director, Warrington Borough Museum and Art Gallery; C.A. Sizer, Curator, The Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine; Graham Teasdale, Bournemouth Museums; Marion G. Wood, Assistant Curator, Horniman Museum, Forest Hill; Adrian Zealand, City of Dundee Museums and Art Galleries.

For help with archival material, I should mention the following: F.K. Annable of the Devizes Museum; G.L. Beech at the Public Records Office, Gavin Bridson, Librarian, Linnean Society of London; Penelope Bullock at the Balliol College Library; Rosamund Campbell and Gillian Grant of St. Anthony College; H.J. Case of the Ashmolean Museum; J.M. Collinson and William Connor of the Leeds City Archives; D.P. Dawson, Curator of Archaeology and History of the City Museum, Bristol; Brigid Dolan, Librarian

at the Royal Irish Academy; J.A. Floyd, Peter Arbuthnot and Hermione Waterfield of Christie's; Peter Gathercole of the University Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Cambridge; Peter Glenn at the Bethnal Green Museum; Elizabeth Gunn, previously of the Pitt Rivers Museum; James Hull and Keith Davies of the Department of Zoology, Oxford University Museum; Trevor Kaye, Sub-Librarian, Trinity College Library, Cambridge; Colonel C.S. Kirby, Commandant of the Institute of Army Education; J. Loupikine and J. Dunkley of the Oxford University Zoology Department; Felicity Nicholson at Sotheby's; Marianne Poulsen at the National Museet, Copenhagen; A.E.B. Owen, Senior Under-Librarian at the Cambridge University Library; P.R. Saunders, Jennifer Price at the Salisbury and South Wiltshire Museums; A.N.E.D. Schofield and W.H. Kelliher of the Manuscript Department of the British Library; Audrey Smith, Hope Librarian, University Museum, Oxford; Jill Swart, Audrey Gregson, Jean Arrow-Smith, Chris Spring and Kenneth Forrest at the Royal Anthropological Institute; M.M. Sweet, Research Assistant at the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts; Ruth Vyse of the Oxford University Archives; Lynn Williamson, Research Assistant at the Pitt Rivers Museum.

For permission to quote from unpublished material, I would like to thank: The British Library, The Dorset County Record Office, The Imperial College of Science, The Leeds City Archives, The Pitt Rivers Museum, The Public Record Office, The Royal Anthropological Institute, and the Salisbury and South Wiltshire Museum. Also: T. H. Aston, Keeper of the Archives, University of Oxford and the Committee for the Ashmolean Library for permission to quote from the Rolleston and Evans Papers.

Special mention should also be made of: Sir Raymond Firth for his comments on 'functionalist' lack of interest in artefacts; Fred Gjessing for a useful Danish translation; Richard Hill for his insights on John Petherick and for allowing me to read the proofs of his book; Tony Hoffman and Gus Pantel for help with the copying and binding; Kate Kornicki for some last minute research at Oxford; George Lane Fox, for help on Pitt Rivers' early life and his generous hospitality; Franklin O. Loveland of the Department of Anthropology, Gettysburg College, for his suggestions on the early Anthropological Society of London; Jenny Lawrence, for helping research a number of problems which arose at a distance; Emily Lundberg, for her help on several references; M.D. McLeod, Keeper, Museum of Mankind, for numerous insights and assistance throughout the project; J. Moss-Eccardt for his insights into Pitt Rivers' character and interests; Major Frederick Myatt for his most generous help throughout the project and his hospitality at Warminster; Peter Narracott for helping to locate and print most of the photographs; Jeanne Pingree at the Imperial College of Science and Technology for her great help with the Huxley papers; Anthony Pitt Rivers for his help and insights; Michael Pitt-Rivers for his most generous help on several occasions and a delightful day as his guest at Tollard Royal; D.K. Smurthwaite, Keeper of Books and Archives at the National Army Museum for his several useful suggestions; Margie Spring for helping with some last minute references; F.H. Thompson and the staff at the Society of Antiquaries for their kind assistance during the course of my research there; Michael Thompson for his several suggestions and for copies of helpful material; Geoffrey Turner for his recollections of early Oxford anthropology and his wife's kind hospitality; Gary Vescelius for his

comments and for proofreading several chapters; Joyce Whalley of the Victoria and Albert Museum for her assistance on the Museum's history.

I would also like to thank the staffs of the Bodleian Library, the British Library, the Public Records Office, Avery Library of Columbia University, New York; the Ashmolean Library and Rhodes House, Oxford; the New York Historical Society and the New York Public Library for their help throughout my research. Also, an expression of particular gratitude is extended to the staffs of the Institute of Social Anthropology and the Pitt Rivers Museum for their generous assistance.

For guidance on the project I would also like to thank: my supervisor, Wendy James for encouraging me to see the project through; Richard Bradley of the University of Reading for his valuable suggestions on Pitt Rivers' archaeological career; Dennis Britton at the Pitt Rivers Museum for his most useful advice during the period when my research was just getting underway. I would also like to thank Godfrey Lienhardt for his early encouragement of my topic.

To Carol Prescod goes particular praise for having typed the manuscript and worked through an often difficult text. Also for help on the typing I would like to thank Sandy Bingle, Susanne Grigg and Susan Siegel. Betty Ausherman deserves special thanks for helping arrange and correct the bibliography; Jerry McCrain for having proofread the text.

To the Master and Fellows of St. Cross College and the Trustees of the Philip Bagby Studentship, I would like to express my special gratitude for their financial support and encouragement. I would also like to thank my parents, Howard and Mary Jane Chapman for their continued faith and assistance.

