

CHAPTER IV

PARALLEL INTERESTS IN ETHNOLOGY

1. The Ethnological Society of London

Fox's commitment to an expanded scope and programme for his collection can be traced most clearly to his association with the Ethnological Society of London, an organization to which he was first elected in 1861, or shortly before his move to Ireland. He was present at meetings by the autumn of that year, or just prior to his Canadian assignment, and apparently resumed his involvement the following spring. His appointment in Ireland again disrupted his activities to a certain extent, but he obviously managed to keep abreast of developments through the Society's journal as well as through occasional return visits to London. His initial commitment, however, was by all indications a tentative one, with Fox declining a life membership, as well as what was called a 'Composition Fee', and opting instead to pay the minimum subscription rate of £2 per annum. By the mid-1860s, however, it was clear that his attachment was more firmly established and that the Ethnological Society and its attendant activities were to become a principal focus of his interests¹.

Unlike the Society of Antiquaries, or even the Archaeological Institute, Fox's election to the Ethnological Society was not at all dependent upon personal connections, nor were there any particular preliminary requirements. First founded in 1843, essentially as an offshoot of the Quaker dominated Aborigine's Protection Society, the Society had assumed a relatively open attitude toward recruitment from the first². New

¹ RAI, Membership List, ESL, 1868-74, (backdated for each member to time of initial election), A25; List of Members, TESL, 2 (1863), 3, appendix. Fox first appears in the Council Minutes 15 Jun 1868. RAI, Council Minutes, ESL, A1. It is likely that Fox was one of 21 new members elected in 1860-61; a membership circular was issued in 1860 to induce new members. RAI, A1, at rear. My appreciation to Mrs. Jill Swart, formerly of the Royal Anthropological Institute Archives, for helping untangle the record. Personal Communication, Mrs. Jill Swart, Archives, 28 Jan 1980; Interview 21 Jul 1980. For the Society's 'public face' at the time, see Bohn, p. 587.

² The background on the Society has been discussed many times from several points of view. For the earliest, and in some cases, the most misleading accounts, see: Richard King, 'Address to the Ethnological Society', JESL, 2 (1844), 14-36; James Hunt, 'Presidential Address', JASL, 2 (1864), lxxx-xcv; Thomas Bendyshe, 'The History of Anthropology', MASL, 1 (1864), 335-458; J. Barnard Davis, 'Anthropology and Ethnology', AR, 6 (1868), 394-98; John Beddoe, 'Presidential Address', JASL, 8 (1870), lxxv-lxxxiv. Also: Richard King, 'Thomas Hodgkin', Obituary Notice, TESL, 5 (1866), 341-42. Other accounts are found in: D. J. Cunningham, 'Anthropology in the Eighteenth Century', Anniversary Address, JRAI, 38 (1908), 10-35; Arthur Keith, 'Presidential Address: How can the Institute best serve the needs of Anthropology?', JRAI, 47 (1917), 12-30. Penniman, A Hundred Years, pp. 53-56; H. J. Braunholtz, 'The Centenary of the Royal Anthropological Institute', Man, 43 (1943), 73-74, No. 63; J.L. Myers, 'A Centenary of our work', Man, 44 (1944), 2-9, No.4; Lienhardt, pp. 3-6. More recent accounts include: J.A. Barnes, 'Anthropology in Britain before and after Darwin', Mankind, 5 (1960), 369-85; J.W. Burrow, 'Evolution and Anthropology', and Evolution, pp. 118-27; Stocking, 'What's in a Name?', and Introduction, James Cowles Prichard, Researches into the Physical History of Men (1826; rpt. London: Chicago Press, 1973). The London Society was preceded in 1839 by the Société Ethnologique de Paris. See Paul Broca, 'Report of the Proceedings of the Anthropological Society of Paris', AR, 1 (1863), 278; Donald

members were determined by open ballot and candidates were rarely, if ever, opposed. At the time Fox joined, in fact, the Society was particularly eager to gain new members, the organization's total numbers having declined significantly over the course of recent years so that by the late 1850s there were rarely more than three or four members present at official functions. Often meetings had to be cancelled entirely. Efforts to offset the decline were evidently successful, however, for by 1863, the total number had risen to 211 from less than 40 just three years before³.

The most striking aspect of the Society during the period of Fox's early association was the relative youth and vigour of its membership. A large percentage were, like Fox, still in their twenties or early thirties. Most too were relatively new at the practice of organized science. Figures published in 1869, reveal that of the then total of 230 Fellows (as they were designated by that date), 98 had been elected between 1860 and 1865, and 85 between 1865 and 1869. Only 47, therefore, were members of what might be considered the old guard. As a result, the newer members, again Fox among them, would have considerable opportunity to redirect both the aims and functions of the Society. It was obvious too that they were soon taking advantage of their opportunity. In 1863, meetings began to be held fortnightly rather than monthly, as they had been before, and a new journal published by Trübner, had been established to provide for an ever-increasing outpouring of essays and other notices⁴.

As among most other scientific societies of the period there was a considerable amount of overlap in terms of membership and interests, and again Fox would discover a number of associates from other areas of his involvement listed on the Society's roster. Military men were in fact not that well represented, however, and Michael Thompson is somewhat misleading on that point as he is on other details regarding the Society and its activities⁵. Colonel Chesney, the authority on firearms at Sandhurst, had been active in Section E, Ethnology and Geography, at the British Association in 1853, but was representing the geographical rather than the ethnological side and was not at all active in the field at the time of Fox's election⁶. Captain Douglas Galton, whom Fox knew from the United Service Institution, was a member as of 1863, and the Napiers, father and son, both of whom had been instrumental in convincing the government to accept the new Minié rifle, were also active during that period⁷. But most of those with a military connection fell under the

Bender, 'The Development of French Anthropology', *JHBS*, 1 (1965), 139-51. On the Aborigine's Protection Society in particular and the early connection with ethnology, see Charles Buxton, ed., *Memoirs of Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton*, (London: John Murray, 1848), 562-64; R. Coupland, *The British Antislavery Movement*, (London: Macmillan, 1965), 329-32.

³ RAI, Council Minutes, ESL, A1; List of Members, *TESL*, 2 (1862), appendix; and Richard King, 'Presidential Address', (1844), p. 16. News, *AR*, (1868), 118, rpt. from 'Scientific Societies', *Pall Mall Gazette*, 3 Oct 1868.

⁴ List of Members, *TESL*, 2 (1862), append.; List of Fellows, *JESL*, 7 (1868), append.; List of Fellows, *JESL*, NS 1 (1869), append.

⁵ Thompson, *General Pitt-Rivers*, p. 33. Thompson misleadingly assigns the origins of the Society to 1868, when it was in fact reorganized, thereby neglecting its earlier history and Fox's earlier connection.

⁶ *RBAAS*, (1853); Richard Cull, 'Notice of Ethnological Proceedings at Ipswich', *JESL*, 3 (1851), 51-52.

⁷ Scoffern, 'Preface'.

heading of what might be termed travelers or adventurers, rather than professional soldiers, and indeed there were very few, if any, members of home regiments among those listed as members in 1863. Perhaps the Society's Quaker origins had some bearing on the trend⁸.

More typically in attendance were veterans of land and naval expeditions such as Admiral Fitzroy (1805-1865), previously of the Adventurer and Beagle or Clements Markham, of the HMS Assistant's famous arctic voyage. Geographers were present in force. Frederick Hindmarsh, the Society's Secretary after 1863, and Thomas Hodgkin, a founding member of the Society, were both F.R.G.S. Fox's acquaintance and supporter at the Geographical Society, Henry Rawlinson, who had played an active part in the amalgamation of Geography and Ethnology in Section E at the British Association in 1850, was still an Honorary Fellow⁹. Sir Roderick Murchison, President of the Geographical Society for many years and again one of Fox's sponsors there, was also active after 1860.

The most important factor in terms of Fox's involvement, however, was the large attendance on the part of antiquarians or archaeologists. That community had been active in ethnology since the mid-century. Richard Cull of the Society of Antiquaries had been elected as early as 1845; Thomas Wright by 1853; T.F. Dillon Croker by 1857. Other noted archaeologists within the Society included John Thurman (1810-1873), Beriah Botfield (1807-1863), and most importantly, Henry Christy; Christy due to his Quaker origins, also played a prominent part in the continuing activities of the Aborigine's Protection Society. But while archaeologists had long been active during the early sixties, or the period in which Fox was becoming involved, there was a marked increase both in their numbers and the degree of their involvement. Lord Talbot de Malahide of the Archaeological Institute joined in 1860; John Evans in 1861; John Lubbock and A. W. Franks in 1863. Frederick Ouvry, President of the Society of Antiquaries after 1876-77, followed in 1864. Not surprisingly, their rise to prominence was equally rapid. A year after his election, Lubbock, his organizational talents obviously having been recognized from the first, was elected President. In the same year, two out of four vice-presidents, one of two secretaries and four out of nineteen members of the Council were F.S.A., not to mention the many officers who included archaeology among their other varied interests in a less formal way¹⁰. Fox himself would be elected a member of the Council by 1867, and by the following year was serving as a vice-president.

The ethnological and archaeological communities were, as Fox's own efforts suggest, almost natural allies. In 1851, Sir Oswald Moseley, in his inaugural address to the Archaeological Association directed his audience's attention to what he considered the important works of 'Dr. [James Cowles] Pritchard' (sic), the leading figure among ethnologists, on the physiological character of races, suggesting that descriptions of 'various [modern] nations of the world' provided the archaeologist with valuable

⁸ Soldiers or those with other military backgrounds listed as of 1863 included only Richard Burton, Captain Douglas Galton, and Major General Sir Andrew Scott Waugh (1810-1878).

⁹ RBAAS, (1850). The New Section E, Geography and Ethnology, first met at Ipswich in 1851.

¹⁰ Officers and Council for 1863-64, TESL, 2 (1862). Cf. List of Fellows of the Society, PSAL, 2dS 4 (1870), append.

insights into the nature of 'the first inhabitants of Western Europe'¹¹. During the 1860s, his successors, Lord Houghton and George Tomline, underlined ethnology's contribution to an understanding of 'that primitive race, of which the Druids were an offspring' and of the more general character of 'migrations and connections of races'¹². That, of course, was precisely the interest which Fox reveals in his study of Ogham inscriptions with his suggestion of a racial connection between the primitive inhabitants of Ireland and the modern Eskimo. Again, like so many other archaeologists, he was merely interested in gaining some better understanding—or a 'few glimmerings' as Mosley had put it—of the 'primeval race' which once covered Europe and from which modern man had descended¹³.

As with many other members of the Society, Fox's initial interest in ethnology was sparked in part by the controversy over what he called 'the long ridiculed discoveries of the Relics of Prehistoric Man by M. Boucher de Perthes' and by a broader interest in the questions of race and racial characteristics¹⁴. Darwin may also have had some part in Fox's decision to become involved, although, as suggested before, the overall importance of Darwin to Fox, as well as to other ethnologists, has tended to be overstressed¹⁵.

To some degree, Fox's initial interest might be characterized as a technical one. Ethnology, with its long-standing emphasis on descriptions of physical characteristics, provided many of the more specialized answers to Fox's questions regarding human remains discovered in the course of excavations, such as those in Ireland or those later on the banks of the Thames. The Society itself was well-appointed with anatomists and physicians familiar with the evidence of the kind Fox was seeking. The list of 1863 includes such figures as Hodgkin, Richard King (1811-1876), another early member, John Beddoe (1826-1911) and George Busk (1807-1886), the latter of whom would later help Fox organize the successor Anthropological Institute. Other members of the anatomist community included Robert Knox (1793-1862), the racialist physician best remembered for his implication in the infamous murders by Burke and Hare¹⁶, and his erstwhile student James Hunt (1833-1869), later the founder and principal member of the dissident Anthropological Society, an organization with

¹¹ Oswald Mosley, 'Inaugural Discourse, Delivered at the opening of Derby Congress', *JBAA*, 7 (1851), 180.

¹² Lord Houghton, 'Inaugural Address at Leeds Congress', *JBAA*, 20 (1864), 3; George Tomlins, 'Inaugural Address Delivered at the Suffolk Congress, held at Ipswich', *JBAA*, 21 (1865), 2.

¹³ Mosley, p. 180. Cf. Fox, 'Roovesmore Fort', pp. 138-39.

¹⁴ Fox, 'Presidential Address, Salisbury, 1887', p. 271. The importance of de Perthes' findings on the growth of the subject was stressed by Andrew Lang, Edward Burnett Tylor, and W. H. Rivers, et. al., ed.; *Anthropological Essays presented to Edward Burnett Tylor in Honour of his 75th Birthday* (Oxford; Clarendon Press, 1907), pp. 1-2. De Perthes was elected an honorary member just prior to Fox's own membership. RAI, Council Minutes, ESL, 6 Feb 1861, AI.

¹⁵ Cf. Burrow, *Evolution*.

¹⁶ James Hunt, 'On the Birth of the Anthropological Review', *AR*, 6 (1868), 432; Stocking, 'What's in a Name?', p. 374; Isobel Rae, *Knox, the Anatomist*, (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1964).

which Fox was also to become involved¹⁷.

Fox himself evidently depended on the advice of a number of authorities in the field of anatomy. Richard Owen, President of the College of Surgeons and the Superintendent of the Natural History collections at the British Museum, was sought out at least by 1866 to interpret Fox's Thames River discoveries, and it is probable that Owen's successor and Fox's eventual friend, William Flower (1831-1899), was also consulted at an early period as well¹⁸. But mostly it was the long-standing members of the Ethnological Society to which he turned: Busk, Beddoe, and most importantly John Thurman, a physician and craniologist who together with J. Barnard Davis (1801-1881), another member, had written the standard source on British skull types, *Crania Britannica* (1864)¹⁹.

The connection with Thurman is a particularly revealing one. As with Fox, Thurman's first allegiance was to archaeology, and in fact he managed to hold membership in all three major London societies at the time. It is likely that Fox and he first met in that context, although little material exists on their earliest acquaintanceship. Both Fox and Thurman had a number of things in common, however. Thurman was, for one, a fellow Yorkshireman and was then serving as Superintendent at the Wiltshire County Asylum at Devizes, or not far from Fox's great uncle's estate at Cranborne Chase. Again, as with Fox at a later date, his field activities spanned the two counties as well. It is evident too that Thurman's example provided an important impetus for Fox's own later field work in that area. Fox himself typically wrote of Thurman as a precursor, and much of his early work was obviously based directly on Thurman's own techniques and methodology. In turn, Thurman's compendium of skull types served as a continuing reference for Fox over the course of the next few years, and was to remain his main reference in that increasingly specialized field²⁰.

¹⁷ Hunt's life is outlined in Beddoe, 'Presidential Address, 1870', and 'Death of the Best Man in England', under *Anthro. News*, 8 (1870), 97-103. Fox, 'A Description of certain Piles found near London Wall and Southwark', *AR*, 5 (1867); *AJ*, 24 (1867), 61-63; 'Primitive Warfare II', pp. 412-13.

¹⁸ Fox, 'A Description of certain Piles found near London Wall and Southwark', *AR*, 5 (1867); *AJ*, 24 (1867), 61-63; 'Primitive Warfare II', pp. 412-13.

¹⁹ J. Barnard Davis and John Thurman, *Crania Britannica*, (London: For The Subscribers, 1865). Also see J. Barnard Davis, 'On Some of the Bearings of Ethnology upon Archaeological Science', *AJ*, 8 (1856), pp. 315-27; 'On the Forms of the Crania of the Ancient Britons', *RBAAS*, (1854), 127; and 'On the Method of Measurement as a diagnostic means of distinguishing Human Races', *TESL*, 1 (1861), 123-39.

²⁰ *DNB*. Typical among his offerings before the various societies with which he was associated were: 'A Tumular Cemetery at Lanell Hill, York', *AJ*, 6 (1849), 37-39; 'On Danish Tumuli, and the importance of preserving Crania in Tumuli', *AJ*, 7 (1850), 34-35; 'On the Crania of Skeletons', *PSAL*, 4 (1858), 148; 'Exhibition of Darwin's on a Stone Mould', *PSAL*, 4 (1858), 148; 'Exhibition of Four Flint Implements found in a barrow near Stonehenge', *PSAL*, 2dS, 2 (1864), 427-31. He also collaborated with Fox's late friend, Canon William Greenwell, on his *British Barrows*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1871). Thurman was typically referred to as the authority in the specialized area of ancient cranial remains. See Robert Dunn, 'Archaeology and Ethnology', *TESL*, 5 (1866), 311-12. Probably his most widely read article was 'On the Principle Forms of Ancient British and Gaulish Skulls', *MASL*, 1 (1863), 120-69 and 459-519. Fox first refers to him in his 'Inaugural Address, Salisbury', pp. 266-67. Nothing remains of any possible early correspondence. Thurman and Fox, however, did

Although Fox might be said to be originally attracted to ethnology for the expertise that he lacked, perhaps of even more immediate interest to him at the time was the general question of comparison or 'analogy', as it was commonly known. Fox had for many years been interested in the way in which weapons and other implements of 'modern savages' (or 'savage races' in Fox's terms²¹) could be said to represent those of ancient races. His collection had expressed such a preoccupation from the beginning, with exotic weapons serving, as we have seen, as an explicit substitute for ancient ones. But during the early sixties, in the aftermath of the Somme evidence, Fox's assumption tended to take on an expanded significance. Modern weapons and implements offered to Fox perhaps the single, most important key to understanding prehistoric ones and the ancient races that made them. Correspondingly for Fox, along with many other ethnologists, the tools of ancient man provided a kind of barometer of intellectual and social development—a scale against which the growing catalogue of 'modern races' or 'nations' could be measured²². Fox, associated as he was with both circles, embodied both viewpoints. Others with a similar breadth of interest, such as Evans, Lubbock and Franks, would gradually join him on the same point.

Fox's understanding of the comparative value of the ethnographical evidence varied only slightly over the years. As suggested above, his view was qualified to some degree from the first, and exotic materials were always understood as what might be termed 'approximations' of prehistoric ones, not their true equivalents. Nonetheless, most of his early writings on the subject suggest a more outspoken position, if only for effect. As he explained in 1867:

The existing races, in their respective stages of progression, may be taken as the *bona fide* representatives of the races of antiquity; and marvellous as it may appear to us in these days of rapid progress, their habits and arts, even to the form of their rudest weapons, have continued in many cases, with but slight modifications, unchanged through countless ages, and from periods long prior to the commencement of history. They thus afford us living illustrations of the social customs, the forms of government, laws, and warlike practices which belonged to the ancient races from which they remotely sprung, ...²³

The following year he wrote of 'those semi-civilised and savage races of our own times whom we regard as the representatives of antiquity'. And in 1872 he explained: 'The most remarkable analogies are in reality found to exist between races in the same condition of progress,...'²⁴ His collecting interests can also be said to have consistently been tinged with antiquarian regard. 'These weapons' he explained, referring to his collection in 1867, 'are valuable only, in the absence of other

correspond at a later date. I am grateful to F. K. Annable, Curator, Devizes Museum, for this information. Personal Communication, 14 Jan 1980.

²¹ Fox, 'Primitive Warfare II', p. 406.

²² See Fox, *Catalogue*, Part I, 'Typical Human Skulls and Hair of Different Races'.

²³ Fox, 'Primitive Warfare I', p. 618.

²⁴ Fox, 'Primitive Warfare II', p. 406; 'Address Brighton, 1872', p. 159.

evidence, for the light they throw on prehistoric times, ...²⁵ Over twenty years later he still characterized 'ethnology' as the discipline which 'was to enable us to appreciate the social and material condition of the aborigines of our country by a comparison of their relics with the arts of modern savages'²⁶. That his final allegiance was always to prehistory can be little doubted; the evidence derived from ethnology merely helped to fill in the background.

2. The Ethnographical Context

Fox apparently first became interested in accounts of exotic peoples as a means of understanding his other sources of record during the early 1850s, or at the time when he first began to put his collection together. His earliest writings are filled with references to travellers' accounts, histories of naval voyages and memoirs of consular officers and missionaries. The record of Fox's research offers an interesting parallel to his collection, both consisting of isolated 'facts' gleaned from often disparate sources and brought together for the purpose of illustrating a single theme—the progress of technology. Historical context or chronology were only rarely considered. Herodotus's descriptions of the interior of Africa, in his History of the Persian Wars, or travellers' accounts, such as Sir Henry Blount's Voyage into the Levant of 1636, or Bosman's A New and Accurate Description of the Coast of Guinea of 1705, were referred to in the same way as contemporary descriptions and were treated as of equal value²⁷. Among the most frequently cited references were accounts of eighteenth and early nineteenth-century voyages: Banks, Cook and Beechey, for example, were recurrent sources, as were Denham and Clapperton's Account of Travels in Central Africa and William Ellis's Polynesian Researches²⁸. During the early sixties the popular publications of East African explorers, such as Speke, Grant, Burton and Petherick, began to take precedence as did the published accounts of the often far-

²⁵ Fox, 'Primitive Warfare I', p. 613.

²⁶ Pitt-Rivers, 'Inaugural Address, Salisbury', p. 271.

²⁷ George Rawlinson, History of Herodotus, 4 vols., (London: John Murray, 1858-60); Henry Blount, A Voyage Into the Levant, (London: J. L. for Andrew Crooke, 1636); [Willem] Bosman, A New and Accurate Description of the Coast of Guinea (London: J. Knapton, D. Midwinter, 1705), vols. 10 and 16. The latter works were both printed as part of Pinkerton's Voyages: A General Collection of the Best and Most Interesting Voyages and Travels in all Parts of the World, ed. by John Pinkerton (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown, 1810 and 1814), apparently Fox's principle reference together with the slightly later editions of the Hakluyt Society: e.g. C.B. Drinkwater Bethune, ed., The Observations of Sir Richard Hawkins, Vol. I of the series, (London: The Hakluyt Society, 1857); Henry Stanley, ed. and trans., A Description of the Coasts of East Africa and Malabar, Duarte Barbosa, vol. 33, (London: Hakluyt Society, 1866). Both Stanley and the Stanley friend Monkton Milnes were closely connected with the Hakluyt Society and its publications. See Fox, 'Primitive Warfare II', 'Primitive Warfare I'.

²⁸ For example: George Forster, A Voyage round the World in his Britannic Majesty's Sloop, 'Resolution' (London: B. White, J. Robinson, P. Elansly and G. Robinson, 1777); F.W. Beechey, Narrative of a Voyage to the Pacific (London: Henry Colburn and Richard Bentley, 1831); Major Dixon Denham and Hugh Clapperton, Narrative of Travels and Discoveries in Northern and Central Africa in the years 1822, 1823, and 1824 (Boston: Cummings, Hilliard, 1826); William Ellis, Polynesian Researches, 2 vols. (London: Fisher, 1829). For Fox's references, 'Primitive Warfare I', and 'Primitive Warfare II', pp. 424, 427, etc.

flung members of the Ethnological Society²⁹.

Consistently, Fox's main—and indeed almost exclusive—interest remained weapons and their use. Henri Mouhot's Travels in the Central Parts of Indo-China (Siam), Cambodia and Laos, with its several descriptions of native hunting expeditions, might be considered a typical example. First recorded in 1862, in a long article in the Journal of the Royal Geographical Society, Fox probably referred to it soon afterward, or before the appearance of the book in 1864. His main interest, of course, was in Mouhot's details on weapons, several of which were described in Fox's later works³⁰. Burton and Petherick were similarly cited for their eyewitness accounts of native practices³¹. Sources of that kind, after all, were Fox's only means of access to the peoples represented through his collection. William Dilke's published account of stone celts from New Zealand was doubly valued for having been derived 'from the natives whilst travelling in New Zealand'. Edmund Oldfield, whom Fox also knew through the Ethnological Society as well as at the International Exhibition, was praised for having 'written from experience'³².

Throughout Fox's writings there can be detected a certain sense of frustration in that regard. It is as if he resented not being able to see the actual examples for himself. Again, his own travels were relatively limited. He wrote on several occasions of his stay in Bulgaria, during the summer of 1854, and referred more than once to his short-lived tour in Turkey, during the spring of the same year³³. With the exception of his posting in Malta, however, his trips abroad would in the future be restricted to occasional visits to the Continent, unless his short holiday in Egypt in the spring of 1881, or shortly after his inheritance, is taken into account³⁴.

²⁹ Fox, 'Primitive Warfare I', pp. 617, 628. Principle among his references was Speke, Journal; James Augustus Grant, A Walk Across Africa, (London: William Blackwood, 1864); Richard Burton, The Lake Regions of Central Africa, (London: Tinsley, 1864); Petherick, Egypt, the Soudan and Central Africa. Other references included Louis Choris, Voyage Pittoresque autour du monde, (Paris: Firmin Didot, 1822); [Charles Atkinson], The Life and Adventures of an Eccentric Traveler, (York: Printed Privately, 1818); George Grey, Journal of an Expedition to Taranahi (Auckland: Williamson and Wilson, 1881); Henry Walter Bates, The Naturalist on the River Amazon (1860; rpt. London: John Murray, 1895); Eugene Casalis, The Basutos; or twenty-three years in South Africa (London: James Nisbet, 1861); F. T. Gregory, 'Expedition to the North-West Coast of Australia', JRGS, 32 (1862), 373-429; Thomas Baines, Explorations in South West Africa (London: Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts, 1864). Fox's own references have often been misleadingly short and sometimes incorrect, (i.e. 'Baines' rather than 'Bates'). The difficulty of his references was noted by his last editor, J.L. Myers, 'Preface', Evolution of Culture.

³⁰ SSW, PRP, P145; 'Primitive Warfare I', p. 630. See Henri Mouhot, 'Notes on Cambodia, The Lao Country, etc.', JRGS, 32, (1862), 142-63; Travels In the Central Parts of Indo-China (Siam) Cambodia, and Laos (London: John Murray, 1864). It was also published in several French versions as Voyage dans les Royaumes de Siam de Cambodge, de Laos, 4th ed. (Paris: Hachette, 1883). The first edition appeared in 1861.

³¹ 'Primitive Warfare', pp. 617, 628.

³² Fox, 'Primitive Warfare II', p. 434; 'On the use of the new Zealand Mere', JESL, NS 2 (1870), 107-08. See Augustus Oldfield, 'On the Aborigines of Australia', TESL, 3 (1863), 215-98.

³³ Fox, 'Primitive Warfare I', p. 629; 'Early Modes of Navigation', p. 403.

³⁴ Pitt-Rivers, 'On the Discovery of Chert Implements'; SSW, PRP.

Nevertheless, it would be misleading to suggest that Fox felt himself barred from what later anthropologists would call the 'field experience'. He clearly saw his role as a synthesizing one, that is as bringing together material collected elsewhere. There was nothing unusual in such a view, and, indeed, Fox's understanding of the ethnologist's task was, if anything, typical. Few of Fox's fellow ethnologists were travellers themselves, and even those that were had usually only passed through the areas they described, never living there for any length of time as was typical of anthropologists of a later date. Even well-travelled members, such as Henry Christy or E.B. Tylor, were rarely interested in the nature of the societies they visited; Christy and Tylor were mainly interested in gathering archaeological records, not in providing a description of the modern Mexico that they visited together.³⁵ The only notable exception perhaps was the American Lewis Henry Morgan (1818-1881), whose study of Iroquois life, was a presentiment of later field monographs, or eyewitness accounts of those such as Burton or Ellis. The concept of 'field work' itself would wait until the twentieth century when such figures such as A.R. Radcliff-Brown and Bronislaw Malinowski made it part of the anthropologists' rite de passage³⁶.

Fox's impatience with published accounts, therefore, lay not so much in being denied the opportunity to have been able to live among the peoples he had read about, but in his inability to ask the kind of questions he would have liked. How precisely were arrows manufactured? How effectively did the Aborigines of Australia use their boomerangs? How long did it take to manufacture them? How far could they be thrown? In part, he answered such questions through experiment, and once again the character of Fox as a scientific investigator becomes apparent. John Evans taught Fox the rudiments of flint manufacture, and by the mid-sixties Fox too was turning out examples of his own³⁷. The United Service Institution provided prototypes for models of Australian boomerangs and African spears. The Egyptological galleries of the British Museum, under the auspices of his fellow antiquarian Samuel Birch, provided models for ancient Egyptian throwing sticks and other weapons which Fox was soon trying out on Wormwood Scrubs and other areas³⁸. In effect, the lessons of Woolwich and Hythe were merely being transferred to a new domain, with Fox recording the trajectory of each weapon's flight, quantifying and tabulating their accuracy and range.

Not until 1868, however, did Fox have the opportunity to compare his experimental findings with those based on actual observations. The occasion was a demonstration by a number of visiting Australian aborigines at Kennington Common, near Fox's

³⁵ Cf. Burrow, *Evolution*, p. 242-43.

³⁶ Lewis Henry Morgan, *The League of the Ho-de-No-Say-Nee or Iroquois*, 1851, rpt. New York: McGraw Hill, 1901).

Edmund R. Leach, 'On the Founding Fathers', *Current Anthropology*, 7 (1965), 560-67.

³⁷ Fox, 'Primitive Warfare II', p. 419; 'Evolution of Culture', p. 506.

³⁸ Fox, 'Primitive Warfare II', p. 409; *Catalogue*, pp. 31, 35; 'Address to the Department of Anthropology of the British Association at Brighton', *RBAAS*, (1872), 161. Birch was keeper of the Department of Oriental, British and Medieval Antiquities and beginning in 1861. Among his best known works was *The Manners and Customs of Ancient Egyptians*, 3 vols. (New York: Scribner and Welford, 1878). See also 'Inaugural Discourse, Annual Meeting of the Archaeological Institute, July 1866', *AJ*, 24 (1867), 1-12; 'Description of a Fictile Vase', *Archaeologia*, 32 (1848); 150-67.

Park Hill home, of spear and boomerang throwing techniques. Fox was attracted mainly to the latter: 'but as they practised only for range', he explained, 'I had no opportunity of observing the accuracy of the flight'. Again, he was forced to fall back on the corroborative evidence. Edmund Oldfield, the man responsible for the Australian exhibit at the International Exhibition in 1862, helped fill in the details: '100 yards', he explained. Both were struck by what they saw as the evident lack of skill on the part of the demonstrators. Oldfield found that the natives were rarely able to strike the target dead centre. Fox pointed out that an Englishman, 'who had accustomed himself to the use of the weapon, struck it five times out of six with his spear'³⁹.

Opportunities such as those at Kennington Common were seldom repeated, however, and for the most part Fox was to remain dependent on the word of others. Nonetheless, his only real criticism concerned the accuracy of such accounts, not of the accounts themselves, and Fox soon attempted to ameliorate their inconsistencies through the provision of a more systematic guide for recording of practices, particularly those touching upon the use of native weapons. Eventually, his recommendations would take shape in his contributions to the material culture segment of the Anthropological Institute's Notes and Queries for Travellers and Ethnologists, first published under the auspices of the British Association in 1872-3⁴⁰. Until then, however, he had to accept whatever information was available.

The Ethnological Society of the early sixties was perhaps the inevitable focus for someone with Fox's interests. Indeed, in no other organization did descriptions of the technology and customs or arts of exotic peoples form so central a feature. Papers delivered between 1861 and 1862, or the period just prior to Fox's departure to Ireland, included W. Parker Snow's 'A few remarks on the Wild Tribes of Tierra del Fuego from Personal Observations', Spencer St. John's 'Wild Tribes of North, West Kurdistan', and Fox's colleague at the Society of Antiquaries, William Spottiswood's 'Sketches of the Tribes of Northern Kurdistan', all of which touched upon weapons, their manufacture and their use as a matter of course⁴¹. Other papers placed even more direct emphasis on what came to be called 'material culture'. In some papers, such as that of James Hector and W.S.W. Vaux (1818-1885), the latter of the British Museum's Department of Antiquities, on the 'Indians seen by the Exploring Expedition under the Command of Captain Palliser' or that of Henry Dickman on 'The Treatment of Disease by Charms, as practised by the Singalese in Ceylon', artefacts formed a central focus⁴². Often too, examples were brought to meetings for

³⁹ Fox, 'Primitive Warfare II', p. 431. I have been unable to discover any additional facts on the demonstration and surprisingly there was no coverage by the Times or by the Illustrated London News. Oldfield is also referred to in 'Primitive Warfare I', p. 613.

⁴⁰ Notes and Queries on Anthropology, for the use of Travellers and Residents in Uncivilized Lands, drawn up by a committee appointed by the BAAS (London: Edward Stanford, 1874).

⁴¹ W. Parkes Snow, 'A Few Remarks on the Wild Tribes of Tierra del Fuego from Personal Observations', 1 (1861), 261-67. Spencer St. John, 'Wild Tribes of North Kurdistan', TESL, 2 (1862), 232-47. William Spottiswood, 'Sketches of the Tribes of Northern Kurdistan', TESL, 2 (1862), 244-48

⁴² James Hector and W.S.V. Vaux, 'Notice of the Indians seen by the Exploring Expedition under the Command of Captain Palliser', TESL, 1 (1861), 245-61; Henry Dickman, 'Treatment of Diseases by Charms, as practiced by the Singalese in Ceylon', TESL, 2 (1862), 140-47.

demonstration purposes, usually remaining on display at the Society's Saville Street rooms for some time afterwards, where interested members such as Fox, could then view them at leisure.

Probably the single most important presentation of that kind during the period of Fox's early association was that of Sir Edward Belcher (1799-1877), 'On the Manufacture of Works of Art by the Esquimaux', delivered in the autumn of 1861 or shortly before Fox's departure for Canada⁴³. Belcher was a noted explorer having served first under Captain Frederick William Beechey (1796-1827) on the Blossom during its first Pacific voyage of 1825-28, and, most recently, under his own command in search of the Arctic explorer, Sir John Franklin (1786-1847) in 1852. At the time of his paper, he was a retired naval officer living in London where he devoted most of his time to scientific and literary activities including the Ethnological Society, in which he was particularly active. He was also a member of the Royal Geographical Society and gave a number of papers there. Fox and he may well have met as early as 1852, when Belcher was stationed near Woolwich. It was Belcher's collection of harpoon points, gathered during his most recent Arctic venture, which the Navy used as prototypes for their own designs, a fact upon which Fox later commented⁴⁴. Whether Fox received any actual objects from Belcher's collection at that early date as well is less clear, although it is certain that he knew of Belcher's work and interests.

In accordance with conventional practice, Belcher illustrated his 1861 paper with examples gathered during his several voyages. Most of the pieces were the result of his most recent expedition of 1852 and had been gathered at the northern tip of Cape Lisburne. The latter included articles of clothing, ornaments, rattles, drills, models of canoes and, holding the most interest for Fox at the time, harpoons and bows and arrows. Many of the latter, Belcher informed his audience, 'were formed in my presence, from the chert taken *in situ*, and with the tools which I then purchased from them'⁴⁵. The Cape Lisburne pieces were compared to similar ones obtained in the Aleutian Islands and Greenland as well as a few pieces from New Guinea and New Zealand also gathered during his voyages.

Belcher's aim in his paper was to establish a historical connection among the various peoples represented by his 'very complete collection'. As he explained: 'These objects ... may possess a further interest as tending to connect the chain of Arctic Aborigines continuous from the eastern limit of Asia to Greenland'⁴⁶. Those from New Guinea

⁴³ Edward Belcher, 'On the Manufacture of Works of Art by the Esquimaux', TESL, 1 (1861), 129-46. Belcher's article closely parallels that of Richard King of nearly fifteen years before. 'On the Industrial Arts of the Esquimaux', JESL, 1 (1848), 277-300. See also Belcher, 'On Stone Implements of Esquimaux', RBAAS (1866), 94.

⁴⁴ 'Improvement of the Rifle', p. 468; Catalogue, pp. 125-26. Also see Edward Belcher, The Last of the Arctic Voyages (London: Lovell Reeve, 1855), I, 21, on Woolwich and harpoons. Belcher's earlier voyages are described in William Beechey's Narrative of a Voyage to the Pacific: A Voyage of Discovery Towards the North Pole (London: Richard Bentley, 1843); and Belcher's own Narrative of a Voyage Round the World (London: Henry Colburn, 1843). For Belcher's role in Arctic exploration: Patrick Lawrence Kirwin, The White Road: A Survey of Polar Exploration (London: Hollis and Carter, 1959).

⁴⁵ Belcher, 'Works of Art', p. 130.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 129, 130.

and elsewhere in the South Pacific, some of which may have been gathered as early as his inaugural voyage under Beechey, were introduced into his argument in a less systematic way. Labial ornaments from Cape Lisburne, for example, were compared to those found in New Guinea and New Zealand. But always, the theme was one of connections. The manufactures of modern peoples were taken as a key to their common origins and as evidence of their original unity.

Belcher's theme would surface, in a sense, in Fox's own papers on Ogham inscriptions, published in the Society's Journal several years later⁴⁷. Again, the implication was that the modern Eskimo provided a surviving picture of the 'primeval race' which had once extended over Europe during the Ice Age, of which both Lubbock and Worsaae had both conjectured⁴⁸. But beyond that Belcher's paper suggested, or indeed helped inspire, the general programme of Fox's collection. If the records of ancient man could be brought together to reveal a previously obscure history, so too could the artefacts of modern aboriginal races be brought together to reveal their often common histories. Through the 'persistence of forms', as Fox later phrased it, the seemingly disparate reaches of the world's population could be shown to possess a series of common traits and, in turn, reveal some hint of past connection⁴⁹. In many ways, it was such an understanding which would become the main impulse behind Fox's collecting efforts, particularly once the latter were more closely allied with the interests of ethnology.

Fox not only inherited Belcher's general theme but a major part of his collection as well. In all he obtained at least 40 pieces from Belcher, with the remainder going to the United Service Institution and British Museum. Again, whether he purchased them or received them outright is unclear, although the latter is the more likely if we take into account Belcher's many other bequests, particularly those to the United Service Institution. Most of what Fox received was Eskimo in origin, but there were also a number of pieces of the New Hebrides, New Guinea and the Solomon Islands, as well as from the coasts of Assam and West Africa. Most were credited in Fox's later catalogue. One was labelled 'Sword of Ilanoon pirates, with sheath, and a brass crotal and human hair attached to handle. Captured from the pirates by Sir Edward Belcher'. Only Petherick's collection surpassed it in terms of sheer quantity⁵⁰.

Belcher's collection was valued by Fox not only for its extent and variety but for its having been obtained in such a well-documented way. As we have seen, Fox's collection, despite his claims to the contrary, tended to be built up through chance gifts and exchanges, and as a result often included pieces for which the provenance was less than certain. The many unattributed pieces in his catalogue alone give some indication of the extent of Fox's practice. In contrast, nearly every piece acquired through Belcher could be precisely dated, its geographical origins exactly cited. Also, while a few pieces dated from Belcher's earlier voyage, including possibly a club

⁴⁷ Fox, 'Roovesmore Fort'.

⁴⁸ See John Lubbock and Professor Steenstrup, 'On the Flint Implements recently discovered at Pressigny-le-Grand', TESL, 5 (1866), 21-27. Lubbock Prehistoric Times; J.J.A. Worsaae, D.C. Sutherland, 'On the Esquimaux', TESL, 4 (1854), 173-214. See also Dr. Rae, 'On the Esquimaux', JESL, 6 (1866), 151.

⁴⁹ 'Primitive Warfare II'.

⁵⁰ Fox, 'Primitive Warfare I', pp. 663-44; Catalogue, pp. 50-51, 56-57, 59, 113, 127, 177.

obtained in 1828 during his earliest voyage with Beechey, most dated from 1852, or the time of Belcher's last voyage before retirement. Described by Fox as a 'close observer of the culture of the nations whom he visited', Belcher provided the information often lacking for Fox's other materials⁵¹. Rather, therefore, than a mere assortment curiosities, Belcher's collection had all the properties of a scientific assemblage, and it is evident that Fox appreciated it as such.

3. New Influences on Fox

Belcher, of course, was not the only one to provide new materials for Fox during that period, and indeed the Society and its membership was eventually to prove a most advantageous source for Fox. Other contributors known to be associated with the Ethnological Society included: Robert Dunn, the Society's Secretary for a number of years and, together with Belcher, probably the most knowledgeable of the Society's Arctic explorers; Clements Markham, long-time Secretary of the Geographical Society; and Fox's long-time correspondent, Thomas Hutchinson, for many years H.M. Consul in Rosario, Brazil⁵². The Society also helped forge less direct links such as that of Owen Stanley, Commander of the Rattlesnake, and Warren Edwards, the Officer in charge of the Niger expedition of 1863-4. Both were sources of a number of objects, again principally weapons, from the Pacific and West Africa and other areas less well represented in Fox's collection at the time⁵³.

The Society was also a source of new friendships. Principal of those was probably that of George Rolleston (1829-1881), then Linacre Professor of Anatomy and Physiology at Oxford. A fellow Yorkshireman and, like Fox, a veteran of the siege of Sevastopol, Rolleston had been at least marginally active in both archaeological and ethnological circles since the early sixties. He was a member of the Ethnological Society by 1863, although he allowed his subscription to lapse and does not appear on the Society's rolls again until after its reorganization as the Anthropological Institute in 1870⁵⁴. At the time Fox and he met, (probably during the mid-sixties), Rolleston had already established a name for himself as a researcher in human anatomy; his first

⁵¹ Fox, Catalogue, p. 48.

⁵² Fox, 'Primitive Warfare II', p. 432; Catalogue, pp. 86, 127, 130, 149, 178. Dunn's contribution to the literature included: 'Note on a Marble Armlet, Lukoja, West Africa', JESL, NS 1 (1869), 35-36; 'On a Blowpipe, Arrows and Bow, from Costa Rica', JAI, 4 (1874), 365; 'Some observations on the Tegumentary Differences which exist among the Races of Man', TESL, 1 (1861), 59-71; 'On the Physiological and Psychological Evidence in Support of the Unity of the Human Species', TESL, 1 (1861), 186-202; and 'The Arctic Highlanders', TESL, 4 (1865), 125-37. Hutchinson's included: 'On the Social and Domestic Traits of the African Tribes', TESL, 1 (1861), 327-41; 'On the Chaco and other Indians of South America', TESL, 3 (1864); and 'On the Indians of the Panama', RBAAS (1866), 96.

⁵³ Fox, Catalogue, pp. 108, 116. See Valentine Robins 'Notes and Sketches on the Niger', TESL, 5 (1866) 82- 91; Martin Robinson Delany, Official Report of the Niger Valley Exploration Party (New York: Thomas Hamilton, 1861); E.W. Bouill, The Niger Explored, (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1864). Also Christopher Lloyd, The Search for the Niger (London: Collins, 1973); Michael Crower, The Story of Nigeria (London: Faber and Faber, 1962).

⁵⁴ RAI, List of Members, ESL, A25; Membership List, ESL, TESL, 7 (1868). Other materials on Rolleston based on: DNB entry; Turner, Scientific Papers and Addresses by George Rolleston; and 'Professor Rolleston' Obituary Notice, PRS, 33 (1881), xxiv-xxvii.

important lecture on skull types and cerebral development—subjects of interest to Fox at least by 1861 as Kate Stanley's correspondence reveals—was presented at the Royal Institution in the early part of 1862⁵⁵. The archaeologist A.J. Akerman had depended on Rolleston's advice for his classification of crania excavated at Frilford in Berkshire, and it is probable that Fox first approached him in that capacity as well⁵⁶. Eventually the two became close friends and collaborators, with Rolleston, in turn, helping to introduce Fox to the relatively alien realm of university scholarship⁵⁷.

The Rolleston connection is an important one, for it provides some indication in the direction of Fox's thought during those years. While he entered ethnology principally in order to extend his knowledge of human remains turned up in the course of excavation—and in order to extend his understanding of original contexts of the pieces in his collection—it was evident that the problems of race and racial characteristics were to soon attract Fox's attention in their own right. Rolleston, closely associated at the time with the new school of evolutionist anatomists, and one of Darwin's principal supporters at the Cambridge meeting of the British Association in the summer of 1861⁵⁸, provided access to that relatively new field beyond that available to Fox through the popular editions of Bray or others of what was loosely known as the 'phrenological school'⁵⁹. As with most other ethnologists of the period, Fox too was soon looking to the 'modern savage' not only to find insights into the aims and methods of prehistoric man, but in order to understand his mental stature as well. Increasingly, considerations of mental development—up to that time of only general interest to Fox—began to play a fundamental part in his scheme and his understanding of the patterns revealed by his collection. Rolleston helped to provide the guidance.

Of nearly equal importance in that regard was the work and example of Thomas Huxley. Born just two years before Fox, Huxley was already a 'personality' by the time the two met and was widely known as the principal expert on Darwinism, largely because of his famous debate with Wilberforce at the Oxford meeting of the British Association in 1860⁶⁰. Since 1854, he had held the position of Chief Lecturer at the School of Mines, on Jermyn Street, a post which also carried with it the responsibility for the collections of the Museum of Economic Geology. In 1862 he was appointed Hunterian Professor at the College of Surgeons, thus succeeding Owen as lecturer at

⁵⁵ George Rolleston, 'On the Affinities and Differences between the Brain of Man and the Brains of Certain Animals', *JRI* (1862), 407-10.

⁵⁶ *PSAL*, 2dS 3 (1865), 139-41; *PSAL*, 2dS 4 (1869), 124; and *PSAL*, 2dS 4 (1868), p. 67.

⁵⁷ There are some indications that Rolleston's and Fox's friendship was most firmly cemented following the former's collaboration with Greenwell. AM, RP, Letters, William Greenwell to George Rolleston, 10 and 20 Sep 1872, Box 1. Fox's and Rolleston's own correspondence dates no earlier than 24 Jan 1876, although from the familiarity of their exchange at the time they were clearly acquainted long before that date. Nothing of interest regarding details of their friendship survives among Rolleston's papers.

⁵⁸ *RBAAS* (1862), 118.

⁵⁹ Fox, 'Primitive Warfare I', p. 620.

⁶⁰ *RBAAS* (1860), 186.

Rpt. Thomas H. Huxley, *Essays* (New York: D. Appleton, 1895), pp. 22-79. Also see Cyril Bibby, 'Huxley and the Reception of the 'Origin'', *Victorian Studies*, 3 (1959), 76-87.

the Hunterian Museum of Anatomy. It was Huxley more than anyone else who had introduced 'man' into Darwin's Origin, and his series of lectures and later publication, Man's Place in Nature of 1863, along with Lyell's The Antiquity of Man, of the same year, helped bring the problems of man's antiquity before a popular audience⁶¹.

Fox and Huxley apparently met in 1863, or when Huxley joined the Ethnological Society⁶². It is fairly certain, however, that Fox would have at least known of his work, either through his publications or his lectures, long before this. Man's Place in Nature evidently made a great impression upon Fox, and the title phrase, recurred repeatedly in Fox's writings of the sixties⁶³. Concerned as they were with early man and the characteristics of what archaeologists had for some time referred to as the 'primeval race', Huxley's theories on the distribution of races and speculation on the representative value of modern races for understanding ancient ones also formed a central theme in Fox's thinking of the period. The native Australians, presented by Huxley as the most primitive of the existing races (and to some extent as a remnant of the original inhabitants of the globe), were referred to by Fox as 'the best representatives of primeval man', in almost direct response to Huxley's own argument⁶⁴. Indeed, by the late sixties, it is fairly clear that the Australian Aborigines had supplanted the modern Eskimo in Fox's imagination as the best key to an understanding of man's original condition as well as to his early use of weapons and tools. It is during the sixties too that the boomerang and throwing stick, witnessed in use at Kennington Common, began to replace Fox's earlier interest in rifles and bows. Overall, Huxley, therefore, was helping Fox to readjust his own sights in order to include man at the very beginning of his existence.

Huxley was also of interest to Fox as an ethnographer. Not only had he established a hypothetical framework of racial types, but Huxley had also seen 'primeval man' in his own domain. As ship's naturalist on the Rattlesnake during its well-known tour of the Pacific of 1846-7, Huxley had visited the New Hebrides, New Zealand, New Guinea, the Marquesas and Australia and had taken considerable interest in the native populations. He had only narrowly avoided being killed in Australia when an expedition from the Rattlesnake was ambushed by an Aboriginal hunting party; Huxley, luckily, had declined the invitation to join only at the last minute. He also showed an interest in the artefacts, as well as the zoological specimens, of each region, and included descriptions of dwellings, carvings, implements and outrigger canoes—the latter an important topic of interest for Fox at a later date—in his published account of the voyage, commenting on each nation's 'progress in the useful

⁶¹ T.H. Huxley, Evidences as to Man's Place in Nature (London: Williams and Norgate, 1863); Charles Lyell, Antiquity of Man. Other material on Huxley based primarily on DNB and Charles Irvine, Apes, Angels and Victorians; P.C. Mitchell, Thomas Henry Huxley (New York: Putnam, 1900); Leonard Huxley, ed., Life and Letters of Thomas Henry Huxley, 2 vols (New York: D. Appleton, 1900); Harold Cyril Bibby, T. H. Huxley: Scientist, Humanitarian, and Educator, (London: Wolts, 1959).

⁶² RAI, A25; TESL, 2 (1863).

⁶³ See in particular, 'Primitive Warfare I'.

⁶⁴ Fox, 'Primitive Warfare II', p. 423. See Huxley, 'On the Distribution of the Races of Mankind and its bearing on the Antiquity of Man', Trans. 3rd. International Congress of Prehistoric Archaeology, 1869, 92-96; and 'On the Geographical Distribution of the Chief Modifications of Man', JESL, NS 2 (1870), 404-12.

arts ... and grace and design displayed in many of their carved works⁶⁵. It was probably through Huxley as well that Fox obtained a number of clubs and other implements, including ship models, attributed to Owen Stanley, commander of the Rattlesnake during Huxley's voyage⁶⁶.

As a result of his multiple interests, Huxley could be said to have epitomized the new ethnologist of Fox's generation. Indeed, Huxley's almost all-encompassing viewpoint was coming to increasingly define the new limits of what was referred to by Fox and others as the 'science of man'. It is doubtful whether Fox and he ever collaborated or worked together closely, nor is it likely that Huxley ever devoted any amount of time to discussions with Fox. They did play a joint role, however, in the reorganization of the Ethnological Society beginning in 1869, writing frequently to each other over details, and maintained some professional contact throughout their lives. In 1874, in recognition of their work together, Huxley was one of Fox's principal sponsors for fellowship in the prestigious Royal Society⁶⁷.

Fox no doubt appreciated Huxley's efforts on his behalf, but it was clearly Huxley's example rather than his personal influence which had eventually the greatest impact upon him and his work. Through his innovative work at the Museum of economic Geology, Huxley was the exemplar of the new scientific teacher. His lectures and exhibits, directed not simply at the scientific community, but at the interested amateur or even working-man, probably helped set the precedent as well for Fox's own later lectures before mechanics' institutes and workingmen's organizations and obviously helped redirect the tenor of Fox's own museum efforts⁶⁸. Also, Huxley provided a new model of approach to the subject of ethnology, offering Fox a new perspective on the value of his collection and a new set of problems toward which it could be directed. As a result, Fox's interests came increasingly closer to those of the ethnological community, and his collection came to address the problems which that community sought to answer.

4. The Problems of Ethnology

The interests of ethnologists had traditionally settled on the physical differences among men and upon their origins. Indeed, for early ethnologists such as Thomas Hodgkin, Richard King, Charles Malcolm (1795-1851), or James Cowles Prichard (1786-1848), the investigation and description of the 'distinguishing characteristics ... of the varieties of mankind ... and to assert the causes of such characteristics', as it

⁶⁵ Julian Huxley, ed., T.H. Huxley's Diary of the Voyage of H.M.S. Rattlesnake (London: Chatto and Windus, 1935). Also see Huxley, Life and Letters; Charles Ayres, Huxley (New York: W.W. Norton, 1932), 26-28 and Irvine, p. 24.

⁶⁶ Fox, Catalogue, pp. 66, 108.

⁶⁷ Royal Society: The Huxley-Fox correspondence concerning the Ethnological Society is located at the Imperial College of Science. My appreciation to Jeanne Pingree, Librarian, for her assistance. For Huxley's role see Life and Letters, I, 284; and Stocking, 'What's in a Name?', pp. 382-85.

⁶⁸ Huxley's essays were typically delivered at mechanics institutes or before similar organizations; Man's Place In Nature was delivered specifically to working men in a series of six lectures of 1866 in addition to two later lectures at the Philosophical Institute in Edinburgh. Ayres, 134-36. For Fox, see SSW, PRP.

was phrased in the governing regulations, was the Society's principal goal⁶⁹. Discussions and papers of the 1840s and 1850s typically centred on physical appearance as well⁷⁰. Prichard's Physical History of Man (1813 and later editions), as well as his more influential Natural History of Man (1843), were literally structured around lithographic representations of racial types; and while skulls and skull types entered into Prichard's discussions it was primarily 'soft' features, such as hair and skin color, which served as the distinguishing criteria⁷¹. Early meetings of the Society often featured exhibitions of 'living specimens of mankind' brought before the Society in the form of native sailors or others visiting London⁷². 'Do these beings, apparently so different from each other, really belong to one and the same family?' B.C. Brodie asked in his Presidential Address of 1853—'Are they descended from one common stock? Or are they to be considered as different genera and species, descended from different stocks, and the result of distinct and separate creations?'⁷³ Such questions were, of course, as much moral as academic concerns, and, indeed, were understood as such by the still largely philanthropic members of the Society. Even during the time of Fox's first involvement, a Christian sense of moral purpose, coupled with the spirit of intellectual inquiry, was still a consistent feature of the Society's proceedings, as its more consciously scientific detractors were quick to point out⁷⁴.

As with the archaeological community, the ethnologists saw their task as essentially an historical one, and it is in that regard that Fox's own changing interests become most apparent. As Richard Cull (1840-1870), one of the Society's most prominent members during the 1850s announced, 'ethnology is a science of yesterday', or as Prichard explained, 'the object of its investigations is not what is, but what has been'⁷⁵. In contemporary terms its overall methodology was, as J.W. Burrow has stressed, both particular and diffusionist⁷⁶. Various races were shown to have been the offshoots of others. Differences in appearance were seen as adaptations to climatic conditions. Distribution maps were drawn and revised as each race was brought into association with those around it⁷⁷. The basic paradigm, therefore, was a kind of

⁶⁹ ESL, Regulations, (London: Watts, 1850); JESL, 1 (1848), 1; Stocking, 'What's in a Name?' p. 372.

⁷⁰ See Richard Cull, 'On Aztec Race and Aztec Children', JESL, 4 (1853), 120-37, for a typical example. Also, 'A Description of three Esquimaux from Kinnocksook, Hogarth Sound, Cumberland Strait', JESL, 4 (1854), 215-25.

⁷¹ Noted first in Thomas Hodgkin, 'Dr. Pritchard', Obituary Notice, JESL, 2 (1850), 195. See J.C. Pritchard, 'On Relations of Ethnology to other Branches of Knowledge', JESL, 1 (1847). On his first publication, I have referred to 1826 and 1836-47 editions, (London: Arthur Arch and, London: Sherwood Gilbert and Piper). Also J.C. Pritchard, Natural History of Man (London: H. Balliere, 1843).

⁷² Report of the Council for 1845, JESL, 2 (1845), 63. Also, 'Three Esquimaux from Kinooksook'; Richard King, 'Address', (1841), on p. 10; Cull, 'On Aztec Race', pp. 120-37; and Richard Cull, 'On the Recent Progress of Ethnology', JESL, 3 (1852), 165.

⁷³ B.C. Brodie, 'Address to the Ethnological Society of London', JESL, 4 (1853), 99. Cf. Alexander Nasmyth, 'On the Human Mouth', JESL, 1 (1845), 192.

⁷⁴ Hodgkin, 'Pritchard', p. 201. See Stocking, 'What's in a Name?', p. 371; Lienhardt, pp. 3-4.

⁷⁵ Richard Cull, 'On Recent Progress', p. 166; J.C. Pritchard, 'On the Relations of Ethnology', p. 302. Cf. Thomas Hodgkin, 'On the Progress of Ethnology', JESL, 1 (1848), 29.

⁷⁶ Burrow, Evolution, p. 122.

⁷⁷ Ernest Dieffenbach, 'The Study of Ethnology', JESL, 1 (1843), 22; Thomas Hodgkin, 'Progress of Ethnology', p. 29.

genealogical tree, not unlike that envisioned by Darwin, and indeed most ethnologists tended to phrase relationships among races in terms of consanguinity. The founding principle was the determination of whether mankind was 'of one blood', suggesting that moral obligations were both determined by and dependent on such ties⁷⁸. That Debrett's Peerage and Baronetage and Burke's Heraldic Dictionary and Handbook of Commons should have flourished around the same time is a point of obvious significance as is the fact of Prichard's own genealogical researches⁷⁹. Both genealogy and ethnology sought to unify the past through the identification of a continuous series of often disassociated or isolated ties. It was clearly a history based upon minute events and not on natural processes. As such it would have important implications for Fox's own views of man's progress.

Largely because of their historical bias, ethnologists had long sensed a similarity of interests between themselves and the antiquarian community, much as the antiquarians had before them, and there is little doubt that Fox sensed the inherent connection as well. Prichard's early summaries of each year's accomplishments frequently referred to the work of archaeologists such as Rawlinson or Layard in the Middle East or of Nilsson and Worsaae in Scandinavia⁸⁰. The Journal of the Society of Northern Antiquaries had been added to the Society's library at an early date⁸¹. Thomas Hodgkin, Prichard's successor, had called 'for a more comprehensive archaeology', that is, one which incorporated not only the 'minute ethnology' of Europe but that of the whole world, much as Fox would at a later date⁸².

Nonetheless, despite the evident parallels, most ethnologists had tended to settle on a less substantial, although no less ambitious, programme based not on the comparison of man's artefacts, as in Fox's case, but on the comparative study of language. Basing their work on that of early English and German philologists, such as William Jones (1746-1794), Franz Bopp (1791-1867), Jakob Grimm (1785-1863) and, most importantly, Karl Wilhelm von Humbolt (1767-1835), most ethnologists had attempted to reconstruct the history of man's past migrations and connections by a study of vocabularies and by a systematic comparison of vocabulary and grammar.⁸³ Ernest Diefenbach proclaimed such a course at the outset: 'By means of a language we may trace the relation of one race, one nation, or tribe, to another; by means of language, alone, we can follow their migrations, and retrace them, step by step, to

⁷⁸ Stocking, 'What's in a Name?', p. 372. The motto of the parent organization, The Aborigines Protection Society, was ab uno sanguine. On the recurrence of the metaphor, see Prichard, 'On the Relations of Ethnology', p. 329; and R.G. Latham, 'General Principles of Philosophical Classification', JESL, 2 (1850), 225.

⁷⁹ For the background of contemporary genealogical preoccupations, see Burn, p. 254; Kitson Clark, p. 214; Briggs, p. 12; J.H. Plumb, The Death of the Past (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1970).

⁸⁰ Prichard, 'On the Relations of Ethnology', p. 312; 'Anniversary Address on the Progress of Ethnology', JESL, 2 (1848), 146. Cf. Richard King, 'Address, 1844', p. 21; Hodgkin, 'Progress of Ethnology', p. 35.

⁸¹ King, 'Address, 1844', p. 20.

⁸² Franz Bopp, A Comparative Grammar of the Sanskrit, Zend, Greek, Latin, Lithuanian, Gothic, German and Slavonic Languages. Trans. by Lieut. Eastwich (1829-32; rpt. and trans. London: James Malcolm, 1845-50).

⁸³ Ibid.

their source;...⁸⁴ ' For Prichard too, 'the analytical comparison of languages' was 'the most important aid to historical researches into the origin and affinity of nations'⁸⁵ As always, the implicit understanding was that the scriptural record would be vindicated, and once again man's implicit duties to his fellow man clearly defined⁸⁶.

Many of the preoccupations and assumptions of the ethnologists of the forties and fifties were still in evidence during the time when Fox was first connected with the Society. The question of 'monogenesis or polygenesis', as it was typically phrased, remained perhaps the principal consideration, eventually entering into Fox's own writings of the period as well. Also, philology was still the generally accepted method of investigation. Nearly a third of the articles published in the Society's Journal between 1861 and 1865 centred on problems of language⁸⁷. Other more general accounts of exotic peoples usually included a large section on language, often extending to a full lexicon to aid others in their comparative researches. Overall, however, the general tone of the Society was changing. For one thing, a kind of outspoken godlessness had entered into the language of most of the newer ethnologists, and most members, including Fox, were intent on demonstrating their freedom from religious prejudice and their attitude of scientific detachment. Second, and even more importantly, philology was being referred to not only to prove the unity of man, but as evidence of his multiple origins as well.

Such a change of emphasis is best illustrated in the writings of John Crawfurd (1773-1866), President of the Society at the time of Fox's initial affiliation and, according to Richard King, 'unquestionably the most laborious ethnologist since the time of Dr. Prichard'⁸⁸. Crawfurd's objection to the use of language as a key to the history of 'the different races' was rooted, surprisingly enough, in the recent proof of man's antiquity. While Lyell and others were intent on reconciling the discoveries of man's early existence with the understanding that all languages could be traced to a common source, the facts of the matter, he concluded, proved otherwise. 'If 1,000 years, 4,000 years or 10,000 years, or 100,000, supposing this last to be the age of skeletons of the Belgian race contemporary with the mammoth, have effected no appreciable change, it is reasonable to believe that multiplying any of these sums by a million of years

⁸⁴ Dieffenbach, 'Study of Ethnology', p. 21.

⁸⁵ Prichard, 'On the Relations of Ethnology', p. 315. Also, Natural History, p. 132. For a fuller account of the philological underpinnings of the society, see Stocking, 'What's in a Name?' and Burrow, Evolution, p. 123.

⁸⁶ Cf. Stocking, 'Introduction' to Prichard's Physical History of Man, and 'What's in a Name?', p. 372.

⁸⁷ See, for example, John Crawfurd, 'On the Aryan or Indo-Germanic. Theory', TESL, 1 (1861), 268-86; P. Walcott, 'A Short Vocabulary of Aboriginal Words, collected at Nichol Bay', TESL, 2 (1862), 249-51. Frederic Farrar, 'Language and Ethnology', TESL, 4 (1865), 196-205; and James Brodie, 'Observations on the Peculiarities of National Pronunciation as a means of tracing the origin and History of Nations', TESL, 4 (1865), 339-48.

⁸⁸ Richard King, 'Thomas Hodgkin', p. 343. See also DNB entry; James Hunt, 'John Crawfurd', Obituary Notice, AR, 1 (1863), 1-20. Crawfurd had also presented a paper at the United Services Institution. John Craufurd (sic), 'The History of the Horse, and his Comparative Value for Military and Other Purposes', JRSL, 4 (1860), 10-24. He also had an interest in firearms. John Crawfurd 'On the Physical and Mental Characteristics of the European and Asiatic Races of Man', TESL, 5 (1866). His most important book-length work was History of the Indian Archipelago (Edinburgh: Archibald Constable, 1820).

would yield but the same cipher⁸⁹. The beginnings of the earth's races, Crawford argued shortly afterward, preceded that of their languages, and though comparative philology might be 'of great value in tracing the history and migration of nations', it was of no value in tracing man to his original source, as the most recent German philologists including the 'very learned professor of Oxford', [referring to Max Müller] held. Language, Crawford concluded 'affords no true test of ... Race', meaning, as well, no true test of racial origins⁹⁰.

While Crawford could not be considered fully representative of the Society at the time of Fox's first involvement—his contradictory attitudes over the philanthropic responsibilities of the Society and his rejection of the value of anatomical studies both preclude that—his prominent position within the Society and his numerous publications insured that his voice was heard by all, including Fox⁹¹. Others shared his views as well. Admiral Fitzroy, with whom Fox was acquainted as a collector, pointed out that 'unwritten languages change so much, in course of time, that only some very marked and common words seem to remain almost unaltered; and even these it is extremely difficult to trace by writing,...'. And R.G. Latham, himself a talented linguist and long-time proponent of the historical method, argued in his Elements of Comparative Philology of 1861, that Prichard's own early hopes for philology had proven unfounded; as early as 1851, Latham had suggested that 'the value of language has been overrated'⁹². By the early 60s, therefore, it was becoming apparent to most ethnologists, including Fox, as he would soon afterward record, that philological studies had lost much of their early promise and prestige.

The outcome of such a growing hesitancy was that the science of ethnology was suddenly finding itself, particularly at the time of Fox's first involvement, without a programme or methodology. It was one of the ironies of ethnology's changing identity that the interest in ancient man which had initially attracted many members, such as Fox, should have at the same time helped undermine what had for so long served as ethnology's foundation. Papers published in the Society's Transactions between 1861 and 1863, again, the period when Fox's interests in ethnology were first being shaped, ranged from discussions of the influence of climate on race through descriptions of racial types to the summaries of recent archaeological discoveries in the Middle East⁹³. If anything could be said to have defined the Society during this period,

⁸⁹ John Crawford, 'On Sir Charles Lyell's "Antiquity of Man", and on Professor Huxley's "Evidence as to Man's Place in Nature"; TESL, 3 (1862), 61; also AR, 1 (1863), 173-76; and RBAAS (1863), 136.

⁹⁰ John Crawford, 'Aryan or Indo-Germanic Theory', pp. 271, 286; 'On Language as a Test of the Races of Man', TESL, 3 (1863), 1. He repeats the argument in: 'On the Conditions which favour, retard, or obstruct the early Civilization of Man', TESL, 1 (1861), 154-77; 'On the Classification of the Races of Man', TESL, 1 (1861), 354-78; 'On the Antiquity of Man from the Evidence of Language', TESL, 2 (1862), 170; 'On the Origin of the Gypsies', TESL, 3 (1863), 25-36.

⁹¹ Crawford published three out of twenty eight articles published in the Transactions of the Ethnological Society of London, in 1861; six out of thirty the following year.

⁹² Robert Fitzroy, 'Outline Sketch of the Principal Varieties and Early Migrations of the Human Race', TESL, 1 (1861), 9-10; R.G. Latham, Elements of Comparative Philology, London: Trubner, 1861), p. 31; 'Man and His Migrations', p. 78.

⁹³ e.g. John Crawford, 'On the Effects of Connixtive, Locality, Climate, and Food on the Races of Man', TESL, 1 (1861), 76-92; James Hunt, 'Ethno-Climatology; or the

therefore, it was its very lack of definition. As of 1864, when Fox was drafting his first paper on what might be called ethnological topics and carrying out his first field investigations in Ireland, circumstances were little changed⁹⁴. As T.S. Prideaux concluded: 'The want of precision in language, a discordance in opinion, the absence of order and method, or any recognized starting point,...all proclaim that in ethnology the reign of chaos is not yet ended⁹⁵'. It was left for Fox and the other newer members to lay the 'foundation stones of [the] durable and scientific edifice', which Prideaux called for.

While the early 1860s was obviously a period of confusion and disagreement among ethnologists, a number of other more unifying interests were beginning to come to the surface as well. One such interest was the study of human anatomy, as characterized the interests of those close to Fox, such as Rolleston and Huxley. Anatomical studies had, of course, been an important part of the ethnological programme from the beginning; Prichard's own seven-part division of races was based directly on that of the pioneering German anatomist Johann Friedrick Blumenbach (1752-1840). While relying primarily on external features, he took other aspects of human anatomy, including skull types, in particular, into account as well⁹⁶. During the early sixties, in fact, some ethnologists tended to reject the study of skulls precisely because of its indirect association with Prichard and the older ethnology. Crawford, for example, felt that statistical information on skulls was 'too vague and general' to be used as an index of racial affiliation. However, 'cranial capacity', he allowed, 'seems to have more promise⁹⁷'. Others were more convinced that the future lay in craniology. Of twenty articles in the Society's new series of Transactions, published in 1861, seven were devoted to discussions of skulls and skull types, including offerings by Busk, Beddoe and J. Barnard Davis⁹⁸. With the second volume, issued in 1863, the number had been increased by one more. Huxley had written of human remains found in shell mounds; Robert Knox had discussed the 'collection of human crania and other human bones' discovered in the crypt at Hythe, where Fox had been previously stationed⁹⁹.

Acclimatization of Man', TESL, 2 (1862), 50-73; Snow, 'Wild Tribes of Tierra del Fuego', pp. 261-67; Robert Knox, 'Abstract of Observations on Assyrian Marbles, and on their place in History and in Art', TESL, 1 (1861), 146-54.

⁹⁴ SSW, PRP, P17, WM 1866; and Thompson, Catalogue notes.

⁹⁵ T.S. Prideaux, 'On the Principles of Ethnology', TESL, 3 (1864), 408.

⁹⁶ Thomas Hodgkin, 'Prichard', p. 187; and Latham, Man and His Migrations, p. 19, and Prichard's own Natural History of Man, Introduction, and 'On the Relations of Ethnology', p. 306. Blumenbach's own De Generii Humani Varetate Nativa (Goettingae: Andrew Rosenbushiv, 1775), was of course the main source. See Thomas Bendyshe, The Anthropological Treatises of Johann Friedrick Blumenbach (London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts and Green for ASL, 1865).

⁹⁷ Crawford, 'On the Classification of Races', pp. 374, 376; and On Lyell, Huxley', pp. 66-67.

⁹⁸ J. Barnard Davis, 'On the Method of Measurements, as a Diagnostic Means of Distinguishing Human Races', TESL, 1 (1861), 123-29; John Beddoe, 'On the Physical Character of the Natives of some parts of Italy, and of the Austrian Dominions', TESL, 1 (1861), 111-22; 'On the Physical Characteristics of Jews', TESL, 1 (1861), 222-37; George Busk, 'Observations on a Systematic Mode of Craniometry', TESL, (1861), 341-49. Also Robert Dunn, 'Tegumentary Differences'; and R. G. Latham, 'On the Pagan (non-Mahometon) Populations of the Indian Archipelago', TESL, 1 (1861), 202-11.

⁹⁹ T.H. Huxley, 'Letter on the Human Remains Found in Shell Mounds', TESL, 2 (1862), 265-66; Robert Knox, 'Some Observations on a Collection of Human Crania and other Human

Such a growing interest was, of course, bound to have some impact on Fox's thinking, and it was fairly evident that at least by 1864, when he had begun his own collection of skulls, that he too was incorporating a certain amount of what might be called craniological thinking into his own viewpoint.

Nonetheless, while the evidence of craniology could have been said to be one element that was entering into Fox's own understanding, a second was what George Stocking had recently referred to as a 'more harshly racial approach to human differences'¹⁰⁰. In the latter area Crawford might be considered more representative. Not only were the 'unmixed primordial races'—the Eskimo, Hottentot and Australian—created separately, but each, Crawford held, were endowed with different physical, moral and intellectual capabilities¹⁰¹. Other members, particularly the racial anatomist, Robert Knox, were no less explicit¹⁰². Increasingly, ethnologists were coming to see races in terms of a hierarchy of development. Fox, in turn, would be little different.

The last new major area of interest among ethnologists of the early Society, and one which has been touched upon above, was archaeology; and it was in this area that Fox's own representative qualities became most obvious. Again, the influence of the archaeological perspective upon ethnology is most easily illustrated by an examination of the changing contributions to the Society's Transactions. With virtually no archaeological articles in 1861, or the year in which Fox joined, by 1863 a third of the printed papers touched upon archaeological topics, with contributions ranging from William Bollaert's 'On the Ancient Tombs of Chiriqui ...' (also delivered at the Society of Antiquaries and Archaeological Institute) to Thomas Wright's 'On the Human Remains found in Excavations at Wroxeter'¹⁰³. 'Archaeology', Robert Dunn wrote in 1864, 'is the link which connects prehistoric man with history'¹⁰⁴, as few would disagree. As the younger prehistorians, such as Lubbock, Evans and Fox, assumed positions of prominence within the Society, the archaeological perspective assumed an increasing authority. Over the course of a few years, the archaeological record was, as a result, gradually replacing that offered by the comparative evidence of language, and again, Fox, with his own collection of archaeological and ethnographical materials, was in a position to help emphasize that changing perspective.

Bones at Present Preserved in the Crypt of a Church at Hythe in Kent', TESL, 2 (1863), 136-40.

¹⁰⁰ Stocking, 'What's in a Name?', p. 374.

¹⁰¹ John Crawford, 'On the Connixture of the Races of Man as affecting the Progress of Civilization (Europe)', TESL, 2 (1862), 201. Also see, 'On the Early Migrations of Man', TESL, 3 (1864), 335-50; and 'On the Connection Between Ethnology and Physical Geography', TESL, 2 (1862), 4-22.

¹⁰² In addition to his many contributions to the Society's Journal and Transactions, see Robert Knox, The Races of Men: A Fragment, (London: Henshaw, 1862); The Races of Man: A Philosophical Inquiry Into the Influence of Race over the Destinies of Nations, 2nd ed. (London: Henshaw, 1862).

¹⁰³ William Bollaert, 'On the Ancient Tombs of Chiriqui in Veraquas (South-west of Panama), on the Isthmus of Darien', TESL, 2 (1862), 147-66; Thomas Wright, 'On the Human Remains found in the Excavations at Wroxeter', TESL, 2 (1862), 364-69.

¹⁰⁴ Dunn, 'Archaeology and Ethnology', p. 308.

5. The Ethnographical Museum

Until Fox and the other newer, more artefact-oriented members of the Ethnological Society undertook to redefine the Society's scope, the Ethnological Society had shown remarkably little interest in the material culture of ancient or modern peoples. What were known as ethnographical materials had been brought before the Society and were often left on display within the Society's apartments for the benefit of its members. Some early ethnologists, such as Richard King, had similarly centred their talks upon what ethnologists of another era would label the 'material culture' of peoples¹⁰⁵. During the early sixties collectors such as Edward Belcher and Robert Dunn had emphasized the possible use of human artefacts as historical tools¹⁰⁶. But overall such efforts had made little impact on the Society's viewpoint. Examples or descriptions of clothing, ornaments, implements, weapons and so on, were treated usually as what might be considered an extension of physical description. Many members appear to have considered the material arts either as irrelevant or as actually distracting from the scientific evidence at hand. Only during the 1860s was the fundamentally iconoclastic flavour of the still predominantly Quaker Society beginning to change.

It is not surprising, therefore, that few ethnologists at the time when Fox first became involved with the Society had ever seriously considered the best way that artefacts might be organized to reflect ethnology's interests. Moreover, apart from Belcher, none had ever considered treating artefacts in a comprehensive way. Interest in the British Museum's extensive ethnographical collections, for example, had been at best sporadic. Diffenbach had hinted at the potential value of a national collection for the advancement of ethnology as early as 1844, as had Charles Malcolm in his Presidential Address one year later¹⁰⁷. Malcolm had also pressed for the acquisition by the British Museum of the American painter George Catlin's incomparable collection of American Indian portraits and artefacts. Citing the archaeologist Daniel Wilson, he explained:

The British Museum contains the elements of a collection which, if arranged ethnographically and chronologically, would form the most valuable school of instruction that Government could establish; and no other country rests under the same manifest duty to form a complete ethnological museum as Britain: with her humble hundred colonies, and her tribes of subject Aborigines in every quarter of the globe, losing their individuality, when they escape extinction, by absorption and assimilating to their European masters¹⁰⁸.

¹⁰⁵ King, 'Address', (1844), p. 21.

¹⁰⁶ Belcher, 'On the Manufacture of Works of Art'; Dunn, 'Archaeology and Ethnology'.

¹⁰⁷ Dieffenbach, 'Study of Ethnology', *JESL*, 2 (1845), pp. 16-18; Malcolm, 'Address to the Ethnological Society of London, 1845', pp. 41-64. See also Richard Cull, 'Remarks on the Nature, Object and Evidences of Ethnological Science', *JESL*, 3 (1851), 97.

¹⁰⁸ Charles Malcolm, 'Anniversary Address to the Ethnological Society, 1851', *JESL*, 3 (1851), 97.

But other than occasional calls of that kind and the inclusion of material culture questions as part of the Society's first Manual of Ethnological Inquiry, no effort was ever made to aid or promote the British Museum and its collection¹⁰⁹. In Fox's time, the only direct link was through William Vaux, an assistant in the Department of Antiquities and member of the Ethnological Society, whose own responsibilities at least touched upon ethnography as well as the Roman antiquities which were his main interest¹¹⁰.

Circumstances were somewhat different on the Continent, however, where ethnologists and those with related interests had traditionally played a more active role in the promotion of the idea of the ethnological museum. The primary exponent, and the one to whom Fox as well as other British ethnologists would eventually turn for guidance, was the Dutch geographer, Phillip Franz Balthazar von Siebold (1796-1866). Siebold, whose own experience as a diplomat had taken him as far afield as West Africa, Indonesia and Japan, was the principal figure behind the foundation of the Dutch National Museum for Ethnology (the Rijksmuseum Voor Volkenkunde) in Leiden, as a result of his bequest in 1831 of his personal collection of antiquities and curiosities gathered during his years of travel. The museum itself had been officially founded in 1837, and by Fox's time was considered the largest and most important collection of its kind. Christian Thomsen of the Danish National Museum had himself visited the collection before reorganizing the ethnographical collection in Denmark, and in many ways Siebold's scheme for a museum of modern curiosities, serving as a supplement to the long-standing European collections of classical and national antiquities, helped set the precedent for the ethnographical museums of other nations as they were first founded beginning around the middle of the nineteenth century¹¹¹. Fox himself knew of Siebold through his well-known publications on Japanese arms and obviously considered Siebold as the leading authority in that area. Whether he ever visited the collection or not is unrecorded, but the importance of the Leiden museum to his thinking is unquestionable¹¹².

The most striking thing about the Leiden collection was its overall emphasis on arrangement, and it was its arrangement that would eventually have the greatest impact upon Fox's ideas. Following Siebold's own example, the Leiden collection was arranged according to what were considered racial or cultural groupings, in part, no doubt, merely reflecting the overall composition of the collection. Such a method, Siebold had stressed, gave the best impression of a 'people's relative progress', 'the

¹⁰⁹ 'A Manual of Ethnological Inquiry', *JESL*, 3 (1851), 193-208.

¹¹⁰ See Hector and Vaux, 'Indians seen by the Exploring Expedition of Captain Palliser'. Vaux held the position of assistant at the British Museum.

¹¹¹ Kristian Bahnson, 'Ethnographical Museums', *The Archaeological Review*, 2 (1888), 3. For further on Siebold's contribution, see Winkler Prins *Encyclopaedie*, 1953; Frese, pp. 39-49; Wittlin, pp. 140-41; Hudson, pp. 52-55; and Sturtevant, pp. 62-66. Also, 'Philipp Franz Balthasar von Siebold', in *Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek*, ed. P.C. Molhuysen, P.J. Blok, L. Khappert (Leiden: A.W. Sijthoff, 1921); and P. Doroteo Schilling, 'Philipp Franz von Siebold', rpt. from *La Cultura nel Mondo*, Anno II, no. 2. Siebold was also the author of *Flora japonica, sire plantae, quas in imperio japonico collegit, descripsit, ex parte in ipsis locis pingendes*, 2 vols. (Leiden: J.G. Zuccarini, 1835-42).

¹¹² Fox, *Catalogue*, p. 126. Siebold's main contribution to weapons studies is found in his *Archiv zur Beschreibung von Japan*, 7 pts, 3 vols. (Leiden: Bei dem Verfasser, 1832-54); pt. 2 concentrates on weapons.

condition of their arts', and the nature of past exchanges with other peoples¹¹³, the main preoccupations of ethnologists in Holland as well as in Britain. In his approach he was specifically opposed to less conscientious methods used elsewhere. The final outcome was what would become known to Fox and others as 'the geographical system', although in the broadest sense such a scheme could be said to have extended back almost indefinitely, or at least to the time when exotic materials first began to filter into European collections during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries¹¹⁴. The main difference, however, was a full understanding of the value of such an arrangement as a coherent technique. For Siebold, it was less an organizational tool than a means of reconstructing man's past, much as Fox's collection would be at a later time.

The most carefully considered alternative to Siebold's geographical system was that propounded by Edme-Francois Jomard (1777-1862), for many years the keeper of the official French ethnographical collections¹¹⁵. As with Siebold, Jomard's interest in the possibility of an ethnographical or ethnological museum for the promotion of science had been drawn from his experiences abroad, in his case from his involvement as part of the French Institute in Egypt. Appointed Conservator to the King's Library in Paris in 1828, Jomard found himself charged with the responsibilities of both the older royal collections of curiosities and the newer collections of exotic materials filtering into the national collections as a result of the various exploratory voyages of the early nineteenth century. During the 1830s and 40s, as the collections were gradually separated from others, Jomard began to concentrate his attentions on the best way they might be reorganized. In his work, he had the support of the Geographical Commission under Baron Georges Cuvier (1769-1832), and the new Ethnological Society of Paris, founded in 1832 (or four years before that of London), of which he was also a member¹¹⁶. Both organizations were concerned that the ethnological

¹¹³ Lettre sur l'utilité de Musées Ethnographiques, (Paris: B. Duprat, 1843). Cited also in Overzicht van geschiedenis van het Rijksmuseum voor Volkenkunde, (Leiden: Rijksmuseum voor Volkenkunde, 1937), pp. 9, 63-69. The collection is later described by Conrad Leemans, Curator of the Museum of Antiquities at Leiden, in 'On the Stone Wedges of Java, and Similar Ancient Objects of Stone, discovered in Borneo', AJ, 11 (1854), 16.

¹¹⁴ E.T. Hamy, Les Origines du Musée d'ethnographie, historie et documents (Paris: Publications du Musée d'ethnographie, (1890), p. 35. Frese, p. 133 n.8.

¹¹⁵ Dictionnaire Encyclopédique Quillet; and La Grande Encyclopédie Inventaire Raisonné des Sciences, Des lettres et des Arts (Paris: H. Limirault, n.d.). Further material on Jomard and his role at Musée d'ethnographie (now the Musée de l'Homme), is found in R. Verneau, 'Le Musée d'ethnographie du Trocadero', L'Anthropologie, 29 (1918), 547-60; E.T. Hamy, 'Rapport sur le Développement et l'état actuel des collections ethnographiques', Société de Géographie in 6thS 20 (1880), 352-65 Les Origines, pp. 40-75; Bahnson, pp. 1-3; Wittlin, pp. 139-40; Frese, pp. 29-32, 38-39; Murray, I; 243-44.

¹¹⁶ D'un Rapport de la Commission nommée par M. le ministre du commerce et des travaux publics, pour examiner la convenance de la formation d'un Musée ethnographique à Paris, Bulletin de la Société de Géographie, 2dS, 6 (1836), 92-100. Earlier mention is found in 'Rapport fait à la Société de Géographie, dans la séance du vendredi 4 mars, sur la collection de dessins d'antiquités Mexicaines exécutée par M. Frank', Bulletin de la Société de Géographie, 15 (1831), 116-28. On the Société Ethnologique's involvement, see Mémoires de la Société Ethnologique, 1 (1841), vi-xv. The Paris Society was, however, an outgrowth of the Aborigines Protection Society in London. Its principal member was the Englishman, W.F. Edwards. Bendyshe, Anthropology, xcii.

collections, then housed on the upper floors of the Louvre, should form the core of a major museum devoted to the new science.

Jomard's 'Plan d'une Classification Ethnographique', first contemplated as early as the mid-1830s, and first published in 1845, suggests a number of parallels to Fox's later scheme¹¹⁷. Rather than grouping ethnographical collections according to place of origin or racial affiliation, Jomard proposed that the collections should be organized on a comparative basis and, moreover, that each comparative category should be subdivided and labelled in the same way as were collections of natural history specimens. Again, not unlike either Wilde or Fox after him, Jomard established several primary categories or 'Classes', according to what he saw as universal themes. The latter included implements used for the procurement of food, clothing, buildings and building materials, and so on through ten major divisions. 'Ordres', in turn, broke those down by type. Among the 'Ordres' of implements, for example, were listed agricultural tools, weapons used in hunting, instruments used in fishing. 'Especies' were a further subdivision. In the case of weapons, weapons used in the chase, weapons used in war and objects associated with falconry. Geographical subdivisions, in several instances, formed varieties or what Fox and his successors at Oxford were more apt to call species.

Although Jomard's scheme was published in 1845, it was never carried out, and the collection which Fox would have known during his visits to the Louvre was organized in a far more conventional way, that is, according to cultural or broadly defined geographical groups¹¹⁸. Jomard remained active throughout the early sixties, however, referring to his scheme in a number of publications of the time. It is probable that Fox met him in the course of his visits as he would have been obliged to get Jomard's permission or that of his assistant, T.J.E. Hamy (1842-1908), when making his facsimiles; he also conferred with Jomard during his involvement on the Prehistoric Congress held in November of 1868¹¹⁹. There is little doubt either that Jomard's scheme was discussed by ethnologists in Britain, and both Richard King and Richard Cull were well aware of Jomard's scheme well before the 1860s¹²⁰. Whether it might be considered precedential in terms of Fox's collection, however, is less certain. If we can accept Fox's claims, it merely served to substantiate or give credence to a system already arrived at independently. Given the popularity of biological schemes at that time, there is little reason to believe otherwise.

¹¹⁷ E.F. Jomard, Caractère et essai de classification d'une collection ethnographique, append. to Lettre a M. Fr. de Siebold sur les Collections Ethnographiques (Paris: Publications du Musee d'ethnographie, 1845), rpt. in Hamy, pp. 25-65. Also see Jomard, 'La Collection geographie de la Bibliotheque Royale en 1845', Bulletin de la Societe de Geographie, 3dS 4 (1845), 201-17.

¹¹⁸ Bayle St. John, The Louvre (London: Chapman and Hall, 1855), pp. 9, 206-7, 214. Jomard's last plea is found in his 'Quelques mots sur L'Ethnographie Asiatique', Review Orientale e Americaine, 8 (1862), 75-77.

¹¹⁹ Trans. 3rd International Congress of Prehistoric Arch. I have been able to trace out the connection in detail, other than from Fox's side of the exchange. No records appear to have been made of Fox's visits. On Hamy's role: La Grande Encyclopedie; and Dictionnaire Encyclopedique Quillet.

¹²⁰ King, 'Address, 1844'; Richard Cull, 'On the Recent Progress of Ethnology', JESL, 3 (1852), 165-77; 'On the Recent Progress of Ethnology', TESL, 4 (1854), 297-316.

6. The Ethnological Museum in Britain

While schemes such as those of Jomard and Siebold were obviously important to Fox, it was examples closer to home which were to have the greatest impact upon his own changing ideals. Again, as on the Continent, a number of schemes had been put forward over the years. The earliest recorded ethnographical collection in Britain, that of the two Tradescants, John, the elder (d. 1637), and younger (1608-1662), formed at South Lambeth during the seventeenth century, tended, like Fox's, to group objects according to function or use¹²¹. Of course, their collection was not merely ethnographical, being composed, as it was, of a wide variety of curiosities and other objects, of which being of exotic origin was only one consideration. Still, the precedent, while short-lived, was undeniable. Later collections, such as those of Richard Greene (1716-1793) in Lichfield or of Sir Ashton Lever (1729-1788), first housed in Manchester and later moved to London, tended to be organized more casually. Greene's display included comparative examples, such as clubs and guns, but tended overall to simply group objects according to their place of origin. Lever's collection, eventually forming a popular display at Leicester Square during the early part of the nineteenth century, followed the same format. As with Siebold's collection in Holland, the impression was of a collection arranged according to geographical origins¹²². The same was true of slightly later collections such as those of William Bullock (fl. 1827) and George Catlin, both of whose popular collections Fox would have known at some time in his life¹²³. Both were clearly popular shows, however,

¹²¹ See Mea Allan, *The Tradescants: Their Plants, Gardens, and Museum, 1570-1662* (London: Michael Joseph, 1964). The scheme was perpetuated at Oxford once the collection was removed there: C.H. Josten, ed., *Elias Ashmole, 1617-1692* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966). The similar scheme was adopted in the roughly contemporary, but more frivolous collection of the Chelsea coffee-house proprietor, 'Don Saltero', *A Catalogue of the Rarities to be seen at Don Saltero's Coffee-House in Chelsea* (London: Printed Privately, 1729); Thoresby, *An Historical and Topographical Description of Chelsea* (London: T. Egerton, Sherwood Neeley and Jones; ed. T. Faulkner, 1810), 37-74.

¹²² 'Richard Green's Museum', *The Gentleman's Magazine*, 58, Pt. 2 (1788), 847; Murray, I, 173. On the Leverian Museum: 'Summary of Proceedings, Third Session of the Present Parliament', *The Gentleman's Magazine*, 52 (1783), 919; 54 (1784), 622, 705; *Catalogue of the Leverian Museum*, London, 1806. Also, Nichols' *Illustrations of the Literary History of the Eighteenth Century* (London: Nichols, Son and Bentley, 1831-58); David Hughson, *London* (London: Printed Privately, 1805); Thornbury, III, 165; VI, 382; Tom Taylor, *Leicester Square* (London: Bickers and Sons, 1874), pp. 447-49; and Murray, I, 175-76. More recently, see Alfred Newton, 'Notes on some Old Museums', *Museums Association: Report of the Proc. of the Cambridge Meeting*, 1891, pp. 28-48; Hudson, pp. 24-25; and Adrienne Kaeppler, 'Cook Voyage Provenance of the "Artificial Curiosities" in Bullock's Museum', *Man*, NS 9 (1974), 68-92.

¹²³ On Bullock: *Original Views of London* (1842; rpt. London the Architectural Press, 1970); Tallis, p. 154; Payne, I, 108; Timbs, pp. 266-67; Thornbury, IV, 257; and Hermoine Hobhouse, *Lost London*, (London: MacMillan, 1971), p. 130; W.H. Mullens, 'Some Museums of Old London', *MJ*, 17 (1917), 51-57, 132-37, 180-87; and Kaeppler. Bullock's own catalogues included *A Comparison to the Liverpool Museum* (London: Privately Printed, 1801--); *Catalogue of the Exhibition Called Modern Mexico* (London: Privately Printed, 1824); *Catalogue of the Unique Exhibition called Ancient Mexico* (London: Privately Printed, 1824). The first went through ten editions, see also his *Six Months' Residence and Travels in Mexico* (London: John Murray, 1824). On Catlin: L.J.P. Gaskin, 'Centenary of the Opening of George Catlin's North American Indian Museum and Gallery in the Egyptian Hall,

and while of interest to the new ethnological community, clearly were outside of the museum tradition from which the ethnological and anthropological galleries of later in the century would eventually spring. It was the British Museum's collections, as the 'official' national collections, which attracted the main attention of ethnologists of the period and against which Fox's own efforts might be most accurately weighed.

The British Museum's ethnographical collections might be said to be as old as the Museum itself. Many of its individual pieces, even in Fox's time, could be traced to the nuclear cabinet of curiosities of Sir Hans Sloane, donated to the nation in 1759 and serving as the beginning of the national collection¹²⁴. Sloan's mostly American and West African collection of 'Miscellanea' was augmented in turn by those of Richard Kaempler and James Petiver (1663-1718), and later, under the Museum's own authority, by the substantial South Seas collections of Byron and of Wallis and Carteret acquired in 1776 and 1770 respectively. Several pieces from the famous Cook collection followed soon afterward through the several loans or bequests of the Admiralty, Sir Joseph Banks (1743-1826), and the Royal Society between 1771 and 1781. Expanded considerably during the early nineteenth century through the successive contributions of British travellers, tradesmen and naval personnel, the collection was, by Fox's day, unrivaled in range and variety, although the museums of other cities with which Fox was also familiar were gradually coming to emulate the British Museum's example¹²⁵.

Administratively, the British Museum's ethnographical collections originally had been linked to the Department of Natural History and Curiosities, remaining there, while other more specialist collections were gradually separated throughout the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. After 1836, the Department of Antiquities, under the charge of the numismatist and antiquarian Sir Henry Ellis, was established, and ethnography was transferred to that new department. The first officially designated 'Ethnological Gallery' came shortly afterward, in 1845. Finally, in 1861, the ethnographical collections, together with Oriental antiquities, were fully separated

Piccadilly', Man, 40 (1940), 17-21; Harold McCracken, George Catlin (New York: Dial Press, 1959), pp. 191-201; Lloyd Haberley, Pursuit of the Horizon (New York: MacMillan, 1948), pp. 124-43, 177-86. Also see Richard Altick, The Shows of London (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1978). Catlin's own account is found in Margorie Catlin Roehm, ed., The Letters of George Catlin (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1966), pp. 154-55, 192-95, 207-10. His collection was partially disbursed, many of the paintings eventually being acquired by the U.S. National Museum. George Goode, The Smithsonian Institution (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1897).

¹²⁴ H.J. Brauhnoltz, 'The Sloane Collection: Ethnography', BMQ, 18 (1953), 23-26; G.R. de Beer, 'Sir Hans Sloane and the British Museum', BMQ, 18 (1953), 2-4; rpt. in Sir Hans Sloane and Ethnography. Also see de Beer, Sir Hans Sloane and the British Museum (London: The Trustees of the British Museum, 1953), pp. 125-33; Miller, pp. 41-48; Hudson, pp. 18-21; Kenyon, p. 59; and J. Mordaunt Crook, The British Museum (Harmondsworth, Penguin Books, 1972), pp. 41-43. On the ethnographical component of Sloane's collection, see The Gentleman's Magazine, 18 (1748), 301-03; and more recently, Soane Jenyns, 'On Oriental Antiquities in the Sloane Collection', BMQ, 18 (1953), 20-38; Edwards, I, 303; and David I. Bushnell, 'The Sloane Collection in the British Museum', AA, 8 (1906), 671-85.

¹²⁵ Among them, Museums in Bristol, Brighton, Ipswich, Exeter, Manchester, Glasgow and Edinburgh. Fox mentions museums at Chichester and Scarborough, among others. Fox, Catalogue.

from other antiquarian departments, and in 1866, they were placed under the charge of Fox's later friend Augustus Franks, along with other 'British and Medieval Antiquities'. It would remain attached to that department well into the twentieth century¹²⁶.

In the broadest sense, the British Museum collection could be said to have followed what Fox would later term, and criticize as 'the geographical method' from the first¹²⁷. Sloan's core collection was catalogued simply as 'Miscellanea', but since many collections, such as those of Governor Nicholson of South Carolina or Captain Middleton, the noted Arctic explorer, had been gathered from single areas, they tended often to be listed together—much as they had been in other countries. During the late eighteenth century, the essence of such a system was promoted, therefore, almost by default, since most of the new materials were from the same general geographical area—the South Seas. The South Seas collections were supplemented, in turn, by a large number of materials from the northwest coast of America, collected both by Cook and by Cook's successors, such as Menzies. In 1808, when the South Seas Room at the British Museum was reorganized 'to illustrate particular Customs of different Nations; their Religion, their Government, their Commerce, Manufacture or Trades', the so-called geographical system was, in consequence, fairly well established¹²⁸. Subsequent collections, such as those of E.T. Bowditch from Nigeria (acquired in 1817), or of Neil Talbot from western Australia (acquired in 1832 and 1839), tended only to reinforce the scheme. The 'Ethnological Gallery' of 1845, with its new cabinets and the beginnings of its labelling system, in turn, gave a coherency or legitimacy to the system¹²⁹. No longer simply a convenient method of classification or arrangement, the British Museum's geographical system was becoming the principal method of organizing collections of that type, as countless collectors and museum curators realized. Only a few, such as Fox, were intent to provide an alternative.

In the period during which Fox first knew it, the British Museum's ethnographical collections were spread over 62 glass and mahogany cases and were divided into seven principal areas: India, China, Africa (including Nubia, Abyssinia, and the West Coast), North America (listed separately under North America, northwest coast of America), Mexico, South America (including a second, and equivalent, subdivision

¹²⁶ Braunholtz, 'History of Ethnology', pp. 109-20; Miller, pp. 91-93, 100-12, 265-66, 306-09, 313.

¹²⁷ Fox, 'Principles of Classification', p. 296.

¹²⁸ British Museum, Committee Minutes, vol.9, p. 2391, 29 Jun 1808; Cited in Miller, p. 221. Also see Malcolm, *Londinium*, pp. 520-31. For further on early ethnographical acquisitions by the British Museum see C.H. Read, 'An Account of a Collection of Ethnographical Specimens found during Vancouver's Voyage in the Pacific Ocean, 1790-5', *JAI*, 21, (1891), 99-108; Braunholtz, 'History of Ethnography', Miller, pp. 74-76, and 220-04. B.A.L. Cranstone, 'The Tahitian Mourner's Dress', *BMQ*, 32 (1968), 138-44. Individual acquisitions are recorded in The Minutes of the General and Committee Meetings of the British Museum and Accounts of the Income and Expenditures of the British Museum, published annually.

¹²⁹ Annual Return of the British Museum for the Year 1845, cited Braunholtz, Sir Hans Sloane, p. 5; and Wittlin, p. 115. The gallery at that period is also described in Payne, II, 306; Tallis, II, 27; Synopsis of the Contents of the British Museum, 57th ed., (London: For the Trustees of the British Museum, 1851); and Henry G. Clarke, The British Museum: A Hand-Book Guide to Visitors, 2nd ed. (London: H.G. Clarke, 1847).

for Guiana) and, finally the Pacific region. British and Medieval antiquities, also displayed in the same room, were apportioned some 12 cases of that total, and a number of the larger curiosities such as 'A Model of a moveable Temple, called in the Caratic, Therup, or Rhudum' or a 'Chinese bell, from a Buddhist temple near Ningpo' commanded the centre of the room. Most suggestive for Fox in his role as an archaeologist, was the collection of models of cromlech's from Cornwall and Wales donated by R. Tongue¹³⁰. The whole was notably crowded, and one writer, David Masson, complained that 'only four paltry cases contained the whole of the Chinese, Japanese and Indian collections'¹³¹. Efforts since then had done little in fact to mitigate the problem, as most realized.

Fox was generally critical of the British Museum's ethnological department, referring to the department as an 'ethnological curiosity ... selected without any regard to the history or psychology' of the people which the collections represented. Also, he saw its 'geographical arrangement' as less a considered system than a matter of convenience, which, in terms of its history, was probably true¹³². Indeed, it was only when Fox's own scheme became better known during the latter half of the nineteenth century that the British Museum's system really became accepted as such at all. Even in 1866 the British Museum's full potential was little recognized, and, in many ways its general appearance differed little from that of thirty years before. The only real difference, as Fox himself complained, was the increased crowding¹³³.

But while the British Museum's collection obviously lacked the scientific attributes which Fox sought to establish through his own collection, it had occasionally managed to draw a reaction similar to that espoused by Fox from those who visited it. Indeed, as early as 1802, when Charles Malcolm visited the collection, he viewed it as an illustration of man's development from the earliest period to the present day. 'This room exhibits man's first and imperfect attempts in the arts for the comforts of social life ...'. It provided 'a perfect and most authentic history of untutored Nature, striving to improve her condition'¹³⁴. Later ethnologists came to similar conclusions. The juxtaposition of prehistoric materials with ethnographical ones tended only to re-emphasize the central theme, as did the British Museum's display at Christy's apartments in Westminster. It was left for Fox, merely to make the point more obvious.

7. The Royal College of Surgeons

Another type of museum which was beginning to attract Fox and other ethnologists of this period was the museum of physical types, or the 'comparative anatomical museum'. Such a development was fully consistent with the traditional interests of ethnologists. Prichard's Natural History of Man (1843), for example, was organized

¹³⁰ Synopsis of the Contents of the British Museum, 63rd ed. (London: for the Trustees of the British Museum, 1856); Clarke, Hand-Book, 7th ed., (London: H.G. Clarke, 1856); British Museum, Guide to the Antiquities and Ethnography, 1859.

¹³¹ David Masson, The British Museum, Historical and Descriptive, (London: For the Author, 1850), p. 22; cited by Miller, p. 222.

¹³² Also see 'Principles of Classification', p. 296.

¹³³ Fox, 'Address, Brighton, 1872'.

¹³⁴ Malcolm, Londinium, p. 523.

around a collection of coloured lithographs of the various races of man, and one of the Ethnological Society's first well-publicized tasks was to attempt to compile a complete record of 'ethnological types'¹³⁵. Three artists were employed to carry out the work. 'These gentlemen', Charles Malcolm pointed out in 1846, 'have already presented to us busts typifying the Malayan, and portraits characterizing the Papua and Australian varieties of mankind, and they only wait for material to render us still further service'¹³⁶. In 1854, R.G. Latham helped organize an exhibit of casts and portraits at the newly established Ethnological Department in the Crystal Palace at Sydenham, an exhibit still popular at the time of Fox's initial interest in the subject¹³⁷.

In general, however, ethnologists tended to depend on already existing collections of physical types for their own examples. Prichard, for example, while emulating Blumenbach in forming his own collection of crania, looked mostly to the university collections at Edinburgh for various examples¹³⁸. Most ethnologists of the 1850s and 60s concentrated their attention on the nearby Hunterian Museum of the Royal College of Surgeons, then located at Leicester Square, and it was obviously the last collection, along with Thurman's published accounts, to which Fox turned for his own early investigations.

Originally established by the Scottish physician and anatomist John Hunter (1728-1793), behind his home, the Hunterian collection became the property of the College of Surgeons in 1800¹³⁹. In 1806, funds were voted by Parliament for the erection of a permanent building, and in 1836 the museum had been opened to the public. Richard Owen, whom Fox knew through the Stanleys, took over the Keepership in 1840, and soon made the collection the largest and most varied of its type, rivaled only by the Surgeon's Hall in Edinburgh¹⁴⁰. The only comparable museum in London at the time was that of the Pathological Society on Regent Street, which like many other museums of its type, including Hunter's original collection, tended to combine science with commercialism in a way obviously unappealing to the more scientifically minded ethnologists of the time¹⁴¹.

During the period when Fox knew it, the Hunterian Museum was arranged in two rooms directly adjacent to the lecture theatre of the College of Surgeons. The larger and more important room was over 30 yards long and, like Fox's own collection several years later, included a gallery level in addition to the main floor exhibition

¹³⁵ Report of the Council for 1845, *JESL*, 2 (1845), 63-64.

¹³⁶ Malcolm, 'Address to the Ethnological Society of London, 1846', *JESL*, 2 (1846), 71.

¹³⁷ Richard Cull, 'Progress of Ethnology, 1854', p. 297; 'The Crystal Palace', *Quarterly Review*, 96 (1855), 303-54; R.G. Latham, *The Natural History Department of the Crystal Palace Described* (London: Bradbury and Evans, 1854).

¹³⁸ Remarkd by Latham, *Man and His Migrations*, p. 30; Richard King, 'The Physical Characters of the Esquimaux', *JESL*, 1 (1848), 47; and Robert Dunn, 'Human Crania and the Intellectual Condition of Man', *JESL* 4 (1853), 36-37; See Rudolf Wagner, 'On the Anthropological Collection of the Physiological Institute of Gottingen', in Bendyshe, *Blumenbach*, pp. 347-55; D. J. Cunningham, 'Anthropology in the Eighteenth Century', *JAI*, 38 (1908), 1-9, on Blumenbach's influence.

¹³⁹ Also, see Bohn, pp. 561-62; Murray, I, 245; Taylor, *Leicester Square*, pp. 381, 416-18.

¹⁴⁰ Kincaid, pp. 189-90; Robert Chambers, *Walks in Edinburgh* (Edinburgh: William Hunter, 1825), p. 243.

¹⁴¹ Bohn, p. 588; Thornbury, III, 168.

area. In all the collection was estimated to include over 10,000 pieces and could claim over 1,000 complete skeletons, ranging from modern British examples to those of remote peoples of Australia and Indonesia. Pathological examples, such as the skeleton of Charles Born, the Irish giant, and of a Sicilian dwarf, rounded out the series. Owen's catalogue of 1833-40, entitled Descriptive and Illustrative Catalogue of the Physiological Series of Comparative Anatomy, provided the main key to the exhibit, although, again, most specimens were individually labelled following what had become by the late 1850s, the usual convention¹⁴². Interestingly, 'the fair Sex' was 'rigidly excluded', as in fact they originally were from the Ethnological Society, and here too, considerable pressure was being exerted in order to alter that regulation. Owen, a staunch advocate of the educational potential of museums, was himself open to a shift in policy and, like Fox shortly afterwards, stressed the importance of unrestricted admissions¹⁴³.

Fox and Owen were never closely acquainted. In part, their age difference had something to do with that. Owen had already established himself as one of the nation's foremost anatomists long before Fox had any interest in that area. He was, nonetheless, a frequent guest at the Stanley home¹⁴⁴ and, as an Honorary Fellow of the Ethnological Society, was active there as well. Included among presentations at the time was a lecture on the skull of a supposed Aztec brought before the Society in 1853¹⁴⁵. But while opportunities for contact and advice were frequent, as his analysis of Fox's Thames findings in 1866 demonstrated, Owen's main influence was through example. Owen's efforts on behalf of the popular museums such as the Crystal Palace at Sydenham (where he helped develop an exhibition of extinct animals) served also as a stimulus to Fox as he turned toward a more popular approach to museums¹⁴⁶. When he set up his own collection at Bethnal Green he was, however implicitly following in Owen's steps.

As a comparative anatomist Owen was of less lasting influence on Fox. By the early sixties, Owen was already at the British Museum where he was superintendent of the several natural history departments and therefore no longer involved with the Hunterian collections. His place as curator had been taken by his one-time assistant, William Flower (Huxley was only the lecturer), and it was principally on Flower whom Fox depended for information during his later years¹⁴⁷. As with Rolleston, Fox's other authority for material of that kind, Flower had served in the Crimean War,

¹⁴² 142 Richard Owen, Descriptive and Illustrated Catalogue of the Physiological Series of Comparative Anatomy contained in the Museum of the Royal College of Surgeons, 5 vols. (London: For the Royal College of Surgeons by Richard Taylor, 1833-40); Descriptive Catalogue of the Osteological Series contained in the Museum of the Royal College of Surgeons, 2 vols. (London: The Royal College of Surgeons, 1853-5). See London Interiors, pp. 129-32, for a view of the hall.

¹⁴³ See 'The Crystal Palace', for a description of his role.

¹⁴⁴ Milford, Stanleys.

¹⁴⁵ Cull and Owen, 'Aztec Children'. Other Owen contributions include 'Observations on Three Skulls of Naloo Africans', JESL, 2 (1850) 235-37; and 'On the Osteology and Dentition of the Aborigines of the Andaman Islands', TESL, 2 (1862), 34-43.

¹⁴⁶ 'Crystal Palace'.

¹⁴⁷ Fox first mentions Flower in 1868, 'Primitive Warfare I', p. 412. Other material on Flower based on entry in DNB and Flower's own Essays on Museums and Other Subjects Connected with Natural History (London: MacMillan, 1898).

and like Fox had lived through the cholera epidemic at Scutari – in his case as a surgeon attached to the military hospital there. Along with Fox, he had been forced to return to England for reasons of health, after which time he had begun work at Middlesex Hospital, transferring to the Hunterian only in 1861. He was not officially a member of the Ethnological Society until 1869¹⁴⁸, but must have kept abreast of the Society's activities through their publications as well as through Huxley, who was also connected with the Hunterian Museum during this period. Fox and he must have met shortly afterward.

Flower was to become one of the principal advocates of what later anthropologists called the 'physical anthropological museum', and because of that his influence upon Fox's ideas cannot be discounted. He remained at the Hunterian Museum until 1884 when, following in Owen's footsteps, he acceded to the Directorship of the British Natural History Museum in South Kensington. Fox and he were frequently in touch with each other, both of them serving on the organizing committee for the Anthropological Institute in 1870 as well as on other committees. Though Flower was never as close a friend as Rolleston, Fox clearly valued his companionship and advice. Fox's later scheme for a vast circular museum, tracing the whole history of mankind from the primitive core to the periphery of modern technology, no doubt owed something to discussions with Flower, whose own scheme for a natural history museum closely paralleled that of Fox, as Flower recognized¹⁴⁹. Fox's decision to include materials of a physical character within his own collection probably owed something to Flower's influence as well.

Fox never attempted to compete with other museums of physical types for obvious reasons. His own series was at first primarily the result of his excavations, and in 1874 Fox would admit that physical anthropology was 'only cursorily treated' through his own collection¹⁵⁰. Moreover, he later expressed some doubts as to the value of physiological evidence for understanding man's history. Nonetheless, he did attempt to gather together at least a representative series and included at least thirty skulls in his collection. As with many other collectors, Fox was also dependent to a certain extent on plaster casts, at least for his more important specimens. His Catalogue of 1874 lists the 'Cast of a Negritic Skull' from New Guinea and a 'Cast of a Tartar' skull. He also managed to obtain a replica of the famous Neanderthal skull from Elbertine, on which Huxley and other British archaeologists and ethnologists reported in 1863¹⁵¹. In all, however, his collection was admittedly a limited one. When it was exhibited at Bethnal Green Fox himself directed interested viewers to that of the College of Surgeons or to that established by the Anthropological Institute at St. Martin's Place¹⁵².

Still, there is little doubt that Fox considered physical anthropology an essential

¹⁴⁸ RAI, A25, and A31; List of Members, ESL, JESL, NS 1 (1869).

¹⁴⁹ Flower, Essays on Museums.

¹⁵⁰ Fox, Catalogue. See also, 'Principles of Classification', p. 293.

¹⁵¹ Fox, Catalogue. On the then reaction to the Neanderthal skull, see J. Barnard Davis, 'The Neanderthal Skull: its Peculiar Conformation explained anatomically', MASL, 1 (1864), 281-95; and Hermann Schaaffhausen, 'On the Primitive Form of the Human Skull', AR, 6 (1868), 412-13.

¹⁵² Fox, Catalogue. See also, 'Principles of Classification', p. 293.

adjunct to his other series, and, despite his hesitations, he would insist when donating his collection to Oxford that some provision be made for instruction in that area as well¹⁵³. It was, moreover, a unitary ethnology which he had in mind at the time. Other collections were little different. Christy and Blackmore, for example, both included a series of skulls as part of their total schemes as well. Jomard considered such an exhibition an indispensable feature of his total scheme¹⁵⁴. As with Fox's collection, it was placed at the beginning to make the point clear to anyone who may have thought otherwise.

8. The Anthropological Society of London

Another organization with which Fox was associated during the mid-1860s, and one which eventually helped to define the scope of his ambitions, was the Anthropological Society of London. Founded in 1863, ostensibly to provide an alternative to the Ethnological Society after the latter had allowed the admission of the 'fair sex' to meetings (the anthropologists felt that the presence of women would restrict the range of their discussions), the Anthropological Society was, in many ways, less a scientific society than a polemical club¹⁵⁵. Its principal member was the physician, antiquarian and anatomist, James Hunt, a figure prominent in the Ethnological Society since 1856, and a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries since 1854¹⁵⁶. Hunt's main research interests lay in pathological medicine; his best known work was a study of stammering. But he was even more drawn to the study of racial types, and in that subject followed directly in the tradition of his principal teacher, the outspoken racist anatomist, Robert Knox. Hunt initially formed the Society in 1863, having discussed the possibility with other discontented members of the Ethnological Society the previous year. The first meeting took place on 6 January at Hunt's apartments, with eleven members, including Fox's acquaintance Richard Burton, in attendance¹⁵⁷. Fox himself joined a little over two years later, or while he was still in Ireland¹⁵⁸.

The main claim of the Anthropological Society was that it would encompass 'the

¹⁵³ Report to the Hebdomadal Council of the Committee of Members of Convocation appointed to consider the offer by Major-General Pitt-Rivers, F.S.A., F.R.S., etc. of his Anthropological Collection to the University ... 19 Jan 1883. OUA, HCA, HC/M/3/6.

¹⁵⁴ Jomard's first 'Classe' was 'Images representant le physionomie des indigenes'. Part II Plan d'une classification ethnographique; rpt. in Hamy, pp. 257-59.

¹⁵⁵ Stressed by Stocking, 'What's in a Name?', pp. 366-67. Burrow, *Evolution*, pp. 121-22; 'Evolution and Anthropology', p. 138.

¹⁵⁶ RAI, A-25, List of Members, ASL; Archives, SAL; RAI, Council Minutes, ASL, 8 Jan 1863. Hunt's life is outlined by Beddoe, 'Presidential Address, 1870', and in *Anthropological News*, AR, 8 (1870), 97-103. For Hunt's main contribution: Stammering and Stuttering (1861; rpt. New York, Hafner, 1867).

¹⁵⁷ RAI, Council Minutes, ASL, A: 3, 8 Jan 1863. Hunt, 'Presidential Address, 1864'; Bendyshe, 'History of Anthropology'. Again, a Paris based society, the Société Anthropologique de Paris, took precedence. Hunt, 'Introductory Address on the Study of Anthropology', AR, 1 (1863), 19; *Anthropological News*, AR, 1 (1863), 192, 278, 373; Burrow, *Evolution*, p. 120.

¹⁵⁸ RAI, Council Minutes, ASL, A3:1, 14 Mar 1865; Subscribers Ledgers; Fifteenth List of the Foundation Fellows of the Anthropology Society of London, MASL, 1 (1865).

science of the whole nature of Man¹⁵⁹, and that was no doubt at least part of its attraction for Fox as well as others. Ethnology itself was considered 'only one of the branches of Anthropology', the latter term suggested by Hunt as a far older one for the subject. Anatomy, physiology, psychology, ethnography, philology, history, archaeology and palaeontology were listed as others. The Society's by-laws were based directly on those of the Geological Society, considered by most members as the acme of the modern scientific organization. Its membership was eager as well to stress its reliance on 'demonstrable facts' and were vocal in the renunciation of what Hunt characterized as 'idly speculating'¹⁶⁰. In large part, however, the Society's air of scientific detachment simply masked the more fundamentally racist attitudes of its principal figures, as Fox came to realize. Hunt's best known paper, entitled in obvious paraphrase of Huxley's recent work, 'The Negro's Place in Nature', was a frank apologia for the institution of slavery. 'There is as good reason for classifying the Negro as a distinct species from the European', Hunt argued, 'as there is for making the ass a distinct species from the zebra;...' ¹⁶¹. Other contributors, such as Robert Dunn and Dean Frederic Farrar (1831-1903), offered similar arguments, all based on the presumed hierarchy of races and intended to support what was, in effect, the status quo¹⁶². Governor Eyre's ruthless suppression of rebellious blacks in Jamaica was pointed to as a vindication of the supremacy of the European race as was the extinction of the aboriginal populations of Tasmania and the diminishing populations of Australia and the American West. No longer understood as a cause for moral concern, 'the rapid disappearance of aboriginal tribes before the advance of civilization' was interpreted as simply 'one of the many remarkable incidents of the present age', as Richard Lee explained¹⁶³. The Society, in short, represented what it considered a scientific reaction to the long-standing concerns of the Ethnological Society, as Fox must have been fully aware.

There is much about the Anthropological Society during its first years of existence—and first years of Fox's association which takes the form of sheer caricature, and here Fox's attraction to it becomes somewhat more difficult to untangle. The unitary monogenetic arguments of the earlier ethnologists were typically ridiculed. Philologists, particularly Max Müller (1823-1900), were upbraided for having 'bewildered themselves and the rest of the world in their search after a primitive

¹⁵⁹ James Hunt, 'Introductory Address on the Study of Anthropology', AR, 1 (1863), p. 2.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid*, p. 7.

¹⁶¹ James Hunt, 'On the Negro's place in Nature', MASL, 1 (1864), 51.

¹⁶² Robert Dunn, 'Some Observations on the Psychological Differences which exist among the Typical Races of Man', TESL, 3 (1863), 9-25; Rev. of Robert Funn's Medical Psychology; AR, 1(1863), 163-66. Frederic W. Farrar, 'Fixity of Type', TESL, 3 (1864), 394-99 and AR, 2 (1864), 302-06; 'On Hybridity', JASL, 2 (1864), ccxxii-ccxxviii. For other representative articles, see: William Bollaert, 'Observations on the Past and Present Populations of the New World', MASL, 1 (1864), 72-119; and Henry F.J. Guppy, 'Note on the Capability of the Negro for Civilization', JASL, 2 (1864), ccix-ccviii.

¹⁶³ Richard Lee, 'The Extinction of Races', JASL, 2 (1864), xcv. Also see, Rev. of Paul Broca, On the Phenomena of Hybridity in the Genus Homo, AR, 2 (1864), 171; Thomas Bendyshe, 'On the Extinction of Races', JASL, 2 (1864), xcix-cviii; and Frederic Farrar, 'Aptitudes and Races', TESL, 5 (1866), 121. The response to Eyre's treatment of Jamaican farmers is conveyed in Bedford Pim's, The Negro and Jamaica (London: Trubner, 1866). On the liberal (i.e. ethnological) response, see Houghton, pp. 212-13. Also, Philip O. Curtin, Two Jamaicas (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1955).

language; ...¹⁶⁴. On the other hand, craniological studies became almost an obsession, and following the example of their American counterpart, Samuel Morton (1799-1851), the Society undertook to form a 'Moratorium' of its own. By 1865, Hunt could claim over 100 skulls on display in the Society's rented apartments on St. Martin's Street, now the site of the National Portrait Gallery¹⁶⁵. Pathological specimens representative of Hunt's own interests as well as of the often morbid preoccupations of other members, predominated. Microcephalic idiots were paraded at meetings. A human skeleton and 'nearly perfect' gorilla skin were prominently displayed in the window at the Society's entrance to the annoyance of the Christian Temperance Society across the street¹⁶⁶. The meetings of the inner circle composed of Hunt, Burton and Bendyshe, and known as the Cannibal Club, were called to order with a gavel in the shape of an African's head¹⁶⁷. While his later writings suggest that he was less than wholehearted in his support for such antics, Fox's association in itself says something about his own attitudes toward race and science during those early years.

Despite its more unsavoury aspects, however, there was much about the Anthropological Society which had legitimate claims to the attentions of committed scientists, and it was that aspect of the Society that must be taken into account as well when assessing Fox's own participation. For one, the members of the Society clearly identified the deficiencies of ethnology's long-standing programme. As with the younger ethnologists, their criticisms centred on the inability of the philological method to trace mankind by either his single or multiple roots. Again, the anthropologists sensed the difficulties presented by the discoveries of man's antiquity. Whereas the ethnologists had been concerned with the period no greater than 75,000 years, in Prichard's estimation, an anthropologist such as Hunt arrived at a time span of as great as 9,000,000 years¹⁶⁸. The Society's very existence was in many ways

¹⁶⁴ Richard Stephen Charnook, 'On the Science of Language', AR, 1 (1863), 194. See also Frederic Farrar, 'Language and Ethnology', p. 196; 'Pott on Myths of the Origin of Man and Language', AR, 2 (1864), 24. Revealingly, George Glidden, the American apologist for slavery, called philology the 'last refuge for alarmed monogenism'. Glidden, 'The Monogenists and the Polygenists', in Alfred Maury, ed. Indigenous Races of the Earth (London: Trubner, 1857), 569.

¹⁶⁵ James Hunt, 'Presidential Address, 1864', pp. 1xxx-1xxxiii; President's Report for 1866; JASL, 4 (1866), iv; 'On the localization of the functions of the brain with special reference to the faculty of language', AR, 6 (1868), 345; Barnard Davis, 'On Cranioscopy', AR, 8 (1868), 386. For the earliest mention of the museum, see Hunt, 'Presidential Report, 1863', JASL, 1 (1863), xxiv-xxv; RAI, Council Minutes, ASL 3 May 1864, A3:1. Samuel Morton's collection in Philadelphia was considered the largest of its type. Charles D. Meigs, Catalogue of Skulls of Man and the Inferior Animals in the Collection of Samuel George Morton (Philadelphia: Privately Published, 1849). See Penniman, A Hundred Years, p. 67.

¹⁶⁶ The complaint was recorded in the Council Minutes, ASL. RAI, 20 Mar 1866, A3:1. For further on pathological exhibits: James Hunt, 'Report 1863', JASL, 1 (1863), xxiv-xxv; G.D. Gibb, Exhibition of 'Two Skulls from Westminster Hospital', JASL, 2 (1864), clxx-clxxii; Richard Burton, 'Notes on an Hermaphrodite', MASL, 2 (1865) 262-63; R.T. Gore, 'Note of a Case of Micro-cephaly', AR, 1 (1863) 168-71. Their premises were shared with the Royal Society of Literature, beginning in May 1864. Hunt, 'Report, General Anniversary Meeting, 1865', JASL, 3 (1866), 1xxix; RAI, Council Minutes, ASL, 3 May 1864, A3:1. They were also shared with the Ethnological Society.

¹⁶⁷ Keith, 'Centenary', p. 20; Stocking, 'What's in a Name? '.

¹⁶⁸ Hunt, 'Introductory Address, 1863', p. 6. See also, 'Notes on the Antiquity of Man', AR, 1 (1863), 105. The estimate originally was Watz's.

symptomatic of that recognition. Hunt explained later that the 'Anthropological Society of London was established partly for the purpose of investigating this abstruse subject [the antiquity of man]¹⁶⁹, and there is little doubt that the Society's increase to nearly 300 members by the end of its first year was an indication of the interest which the subject had generated. It was obviously one of the Society's main attractions for Fox.

A second legitimate concern of the Anthropological Society, and another of its drawing cards from Fox's point of view, was its methodical reliance on hard 'facts', particularly the presumed empirical evidence of craniology and archaeology. Its museum was characterized by Hunt as one of the best in England, and though inferior, as Hunt himself conceded, to that of its 'sister society' in Paris, formed under the guidance of Hunt's then counterpart, Paul Broca (1824-1880), it obviously made an impression on most participants in the Society's activities, including Fox who occasionally referred to it¹⁷⁰. Physiological data of that kind was also accepted more fully as a basis for other studies. Retzius's cephalic index was accepted as a key to mental development, providing most anthropologists with what they felt was a real tool for the investigation of human development. Even phrenology, a subject of interest to Fox during that period, was considered of some interest; one member in a review of the unveiling of Holman Hunt's 'Christ in the Carpenter Shop' suggested that a more strictly 'phrenological' treatment would have added another degree of 'veracity' to the otherwise exemplary work¹⁷¹.

Articles on archaeology, still relatively rare at the Ethnological Society, were also well accepted among the anthropologists. One of the Society's first published articles was that of Alfred Tylor (1824-1884), geologist and brother of Fox's later colleague, Edward Burnett Tylor, 'On the discoveries of supposed human remains in the Tool-Bearing Drift of Montin-Quignon'. John Thurman, also a member, used the Society's journal to present his findings on Wiltshire barrows; Carter Blake, the Society's paid Secretary after 1864, discussed the findings of Lartet and Christy in the Dordogne caves of France¹⁷². Most accepted, too, the fundamental importance of the archaeological record, just as Fox did. 'Archaeology and ethnology have hitherto been kept separate, to the great injury of both sciences', Hunt proclaimed in his second general address¹⁷³. It was part of the Society's programme to bridge that gap as Fox wished to do through his collection.

¹⁶⁹ James Hunt, Rev. of Pengelly, *On Archaic Anthropology of the South-West of England*, *AR*, 7 (1869), 242.

¹⁷⁰ Fox, *Catalogue*. On the Davis collection, see: Hunt, 'Presidential Address, 1864', pp. 1xxx-1xxxiii; Davi, 'On Craniology', p. 387.

¹⁷¹ 'Art in Relation to Comparative Anthropology', *AR*, 5 (1867), 28-33.

¹⁷² Alfred Tylor, 'On the Discoveries Supposed Human Remains in the Tool-bearing Drift of Montin-Quignon', *JASL*, 1 (1863), i-ii; *AR*, 1 (1863), 166-72; James Hunt, 'Report 1863', xxvii; John Thurman, 'The Two Principle Forms of Crania Amongst the Early Britons', *JASL*, 2 (1864), ccxxxii-cxxxvi; 'On the Two Principle Forms of Ancient British and Gaulish Skulls', *MASL*, 3 (1867), 41-80; Carter Blake, 'On Recent Evidences of the Extreme Antiquity of the Human Races', *JASL*, 1 (1863), xxvi-xxxiv. Also see R.A.C. Godwin-Austen, 'On the Alluvial Accumulations in the Valley of the Somme and Ouse', *AR*, 1 (1863), 438-40. George E. Roberts, 'Note on the Discovery of Mammalia Bones Cut and Sawn by Implements of Flint at Audie End', *JASL*, 2 (1864), lxi-lxiii.

¹⁷³ James Hunt, 'Presidential Address, 1864', p. lxxxi.

The last main attraction of the Anthropological Society for Fox was its open espousal of the museum as a potential research tool. While its own collections were for the most part made up of craniological specimens, the Society's museum had other materials as well. Flints and casts of flints were present in great numbers as were the desiderata of the fellows' varied travels. Burton, often through Mrs. Burton, was a frequent contributor as was Clement Markham, one of Fox's own sources¹⁷⁴. Hunt, who also made contributions to the Society's growing collection, explicitly tied the study of human artefacts to that of race. Possibly in recognition of Fox's collection, he explained that 'nothing throws so much light on the early races as the choice of weapons they used'¹⁷⁵. And while he generally accepted that the Society's own resources were probably insufficient to support a major institution, he was ardent in his support of a well-formed national collection. In anticipation of Fox's own criticism he explained:

In this country there is really no ethnographical museum which is really worthy of the British nation. With better opportunities than any other people, our ethnographical museums are still very inferior and imperfect. It will be our duty not to care so much for collecting a museum of our own, as to assisting in forming one that shall be worthy of the country¹⁷⁶.

Fox could hardly fail to join him in his challenge.

There was much about the new and vibrant society that Fox found attractive. Despite the more unsavoury qualities of its leading faction, he appears to have felt relatively at home within its somewhat loosely defined limits for a short period. Perhaps the most obvious attraction was the Society's explicit disavowal of the Biblical record, recognized by many men and women of scientific thought as the chief impediment to an understanding of man's true place in the world. For anthropologists, again Hunt in particular, criticism of the theological viewpoint took on the quality of what J.M. Burrow referred to as 'missionary baiting'¹⁷⁷. In part, such an attitude derived from the Society's objections to the traditionally philanthropic tone of their principal rival as well as to the scriptural foundations of the ethnologists' certainty of the unity of mankind. On the other hand, the renunciation of the Biblical record—or at least a far more liberal interpretation of it—was seen as an essential and progressive step. Only in recognizing that man was part of the natural world and not separate from it would it be possible to establish anthropology on a scientific footing. Only by renouncing a

¹⁷⁴ Richard Burton, 'On Skulls from Annabom in the West African Seas', *JASL*, 2 (1864), ccxxviii; 'A Day Among the Fans', *AR*, 1 (1863), 43-54; Clements Markham, 'On Crystal Quartz Cutting Instruments of the Ancient Inhabitants of Chandry', *JASL*, 2 (1864), lviii-lx. James Hunt 'Presidential Report, 1869', *JASL*, 7 (1869), lxxvii; RAI, Council Minutes, ASL, A3:1.

¹⁷⁵ James Hunt, Discussion following 'Exhibition of Spears from Gaboon by N.B. Walker', *JASL*, 5 (1866), cl.

¹⁷⁶ Hunt, 'Introductory Address, 1865', p. 13. See also 'Presidential Address, 1864', p. xcv.

¹⁷⁷ Burrow, *Evolution*, p. 131. See, for example, W. Winwood Reade, 'Efforts of Missionaries Among Savages', *AR*, 3 (1865), c1xiii-clxxxiii.

philanthropic role could a truly disinterested 'science of man', as Fox phrased it¹⁷⁸, be fully established.

Fox was typical in accepting such a dual premise. His disenchantment with organized religion had many of the qualities of a conversion in its own right. His inherent skepticism, in turn, surfaced in his attitudes toward the new science of anthropology. As with other anthropologists, he was particularly critical of missionary efforts. 'Wherever the generous influence of Christians has set foot', he pointed out in 1867, 'they had been accompanied by the scourge'¹⁷⁹. The imposition of colonial sovereignty was seen too as something altogether 'natural', and like Wallace, Darwin's chief spokesman within the Anthropological Society, Fox tended to agree that 'the mere fact of one race supplanting another proves its superiority'¹⁸⁰. Fox's military background, moreover, had the added effect, particularly at first, of accentuating and colouring his understanding. Echoing other apologists for empire, Fox openly dismissed the 'dawn of utopia, in which some men who think themselves practical appear to indulge'. However well intentioned might be the 'philanthropic efforts of the introducing race, the law of nature', as Fox concluded, 'must be vindicated'¹⁸¹.

The same supposedly disinterested viewpoint characterized Fox's colleagues within the Anthropological community. Burton, of course, was livid on the topic of missionaries, although in contrast to Fox and most others within the Society, he was also far more skeptical of the benefits of colonization¹⁸². Others, such as Sir Roderick Murchison or Clements Markham, both of whom Fox knew from the Geographical and Ethnological Societies, were no doubt more temperate, as was S.E. Bouverie-Pusey, another of Fox's collecting sources¹⁸³. With few exceptions, however, the latter were all committed Darwinians and perceived the Darwinian view of species change as providing the best explanation of racial differences. Indeed, it was over this issue, paradoxically, that most, including Fox, would eventually break with the inner core of the Anthropological Society, Hunt in particular.

While the Anthropological and Ethnological Societies have tended to be treated as mutually exclusive entities, particularly by Stocking and Burrow, there was in fact a great deal of overlap, as Fox's own dual membership suggests. Other members present in both institutions included Huxley, John Lubbock, Henry Christy, John Thurman and John Evans, most of whom were prominent archaeologists as well¹⁸⁴. With the possible exception of Thurman, however, the latter faction was not altogether

¹⁷⁸ Fox, 'Address, Brighton, 1872'.

¹⁷⁹ Fox, 'Primitive Warfare I', p. 619.

¹⁸⁰ Alfred Wallace, 'The Origin of Human Races and the Antiquity of Man deduced from the theory of "Natural Selection" ', *JASL*, 2 (1864), clxxxii. Cf. Fox, 'Primitive Warfare I', p. 619.

¹⁸¹ Fox, 'Primitive Warfare I'.

¹⁸² See Burton, 'Notes on Certain Matters connected with the Dahoman', *MASL*, 1 (1864), 308-21. Also E.W. Brabrook, 'Sir R.F. Burton', Obituary Notice, *JAI*, 20 (1891), 295-98.

¹⁸³ James Hunt, 'Report on Anthropology at the British Association', *AR*, 3 (1865), 363; S.E. Bouverie-Pusey, Discussion following James Reddie, 'On Anthropological Disidiorata', *JASL*, 2 (1864), cxxvii.

¹⁸⁴ See Discussion following Carte Blake, 'On Recent Evidences of Extreme Antiquity of the Human Races', *JASL*, 1 (1863), xxxiii-iv. Huxley was elected an Honorary Fellow on 18 Feb 1863, Lubbock on 12 May 1863. RAI. Evans on 26 May 1863, *TASL*, 1(1863), x; RAI, A25.

comfortable within the Anthropological Society, and the implication is, particularly in the case of Christy, that they are merely there to keep an eye on developments within that potentially volatile organization. Class distinctions, Frank Loveland has suggested, may also have had some part in the growing separation of interests, just as they had among the two main archaeological societies twenty years before¹⁸⁵. But more importantly, it was a difference in terms of attitude and approach—a growing recognition on the part of the ethnologists that Hunt and his closest followers were often motivated by less than acceptable aspirations. But such a recognition took time, and not until the late 1860s was the division manifested. Until that time there was an overriding unity, as Fox's own membership and allegiance suggests. Anthropology was merely another facet of the new science.

Interestingly, some of Fox's closest associates or friends were members of the Anthropological Society alone. Captain Arthur Tupper, Fox's friend from the United Services Institution, never joined the Ethnological Society nor did Fox's rival and long-time correspondent Hodder Westropp. While Tupper appears to have played only a small part in the Anthropological Society's proceedings, Westropp was extremely active, providing a number of papers for publication in its journal and memoirs, and indeed in large part representing the archaeological interest within the Society much as Fox did at a later date within its successor organization, the Anthropological Institute¹⁸⁶.

One of the most uncharacteristic members of the Anthropological Society at the time of Fox's initial association was Edward Burnett Tylor, later to become one of Fox's closest professional associates, as well as the first overseer of Fox's collection after its move to Oxford in 1883. Tylor first joined the Anthropological Society in March of 1863, or shortly before Fox. His geologist brother, Alfred, may have had some influence on his choice, the latter, having presented one of the first papers before the Society soon after its foundation¹⁸⁷. It should be remembered too that at the time in question, the new Anthropological Society was seen by many as the more 'advanced' of the two organizations. John Crawfurd's own racist attitudes and commitment to poly-geneticism in fact did little to attract members to the Ethnological Society and, indeed, the Ethnological Society's growing membership and improved fortunes came about really in spite of Crawfurd rather than because of his own efforts or example. Still, Tylor's choice of allegiance remains enigmatic, particularly given his Quaker background. It can only be suspected that like his and Fox's other friend, Henry Christy, he joined at least in part to counterbalance members such as Hunt or Dean Farrar.

¹⁸⁵ Personal Communication, Frank Loveland, 10 Apr 1979.

¹⁸⁶ Tupper and Fox were elected on the same day: 14 Mar 1863. RAI Council Minutes, ASL, A3:1. Tupper's main contribution was to discussions: Discussion of Exhibition of Stone Implements by A. H. Lane Fox', AR, 6 (1868), lviv. Westropp's contributions were more diffuse, but he was rarely able to attend meetings. See Hodder M. Westropp, 'On Analogous Forms of Flint Instruments', AR, 4 (1866), 208; MASL, 2 (1865), 288-93. 'On the Analogous Forms of Implements of Early and Primitive Races', JASL, 4 (1867), clxxxiii-clxxiv, and discusses clxxiv-clxxv; 'On the Phases of Civilization and Contemporaneous Implements', JASL, 5 (1867), cxccii-cxcvii; 'On the Myth Age', JASL, 7 (1869), clxxv-clxxxvi.

¹⁸⁷ 'On the Discovery of Supposed Human Remains', Hunt, Report, 1863, p. 1.

As with Fox, Tylor's introduction to anthropology was primarily through archaeology. Born in 1832 into a family of wealthy brass founders, Tylor, like so many others of Fox's generation, including Lubbock and Evans, initially entered into the family business¹⁸⁸. In 1856, for what has been typically described as 'reasons of ill health', he left the business and, with the family's support and encouragement, began a tour of the southern states of America, in part to view archaeological remains. Soon afterward a chance meeting with Henry Christy on an omnibus in Havana, led to the pair's travels in Mexico. An account, entitled Anahuac: Mexico or the Mexicans Ancient and Modern, was published soon after their return in 1860¹⁸⁹.

As its title suggests, one of the main concerns of Tylor's book was a description of ancient Mexican remains, and, indeed, in many ways Anahuac was less an ethnographical account than a catalogue of antiquarian discoveries. Its central question was, moreover, essentially an archaeological one as well: whether the remarkable civilization which he saw traces of in Mexico had come about independently, or whether, as von Humboldt and others had argued, it was a result of Asian influence¹⁹⁰. Referring to the evidence of stone tools and other remains, his conclusion was, however, a certain one: 'We must admit that the inhabitants of Mexico raised themselves, independently, to the extraordinary degree of culture which distinguished them when Europeans first became aware of their existence'¹⁹¹. Although couched in what are now understood as diffusionist terms, Tylor's answer presented the core of the evolutionist perspective, as Fox understood it.

It is doubtful whether Fox and Tylor met before 1863, but from that date it is clear that they were in fairly close contact for the rest of their lives. Christy, no doubt, was the principal liaison between the two. Both Tylor and Christy had collected extensively while in Mexico, and their shared collecting experience must have acted as a further boon to Tylor and Fox's friendship. Tylor, in turn, helped Fox with his translations, providing, as J.L. Myers, later reflected, pencilled notes in Fox's copies of Klemm and other German writers¹⁹². Despite the slight difference in age, Fox and Tylor represented the young blood in the Anthropological Society, and through their mutual dedication to the advance of the subject as a true science, they systematically helped to set a fresh tone within the Society. While differing on points of detail, they were also in agreement over the changes that were needed.

¹⁸⁸ DNB; Marett, Tylor; Burrow, Evolution, pp. 234-41; C.H. Read, 'E.B. Tylor', Obituary Notice, Man, 17 (1917), 25-26, No. 16; BL, Christy Papers, and own works.

¹⁸⁹ Preface, Tylor, Anahuac.

¹⁹⁰ Stressed by Burrow, Evolution, p. 242. Humboldt's argument was presented in Researches Concerning the Institutions and Monuments of the Ancient Inhabitants of America, trans. from the German from Helen Maria Williams (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown, J. Murray and H. Colburn, 1814). Also, Aspects of Nature in Different Lands and Different Climates, trans. by Mrs. Sabine, 2 vols. (London: John Murray, 1849); and Cosmos: Sketch of a Physical Description of the Universe, trans. from the German by E. Sabine, 4 vols. (London: H.G. Bohn, 1846-58).

¹⁹¹ Tylor, Anahuac.

¹⁹² Myres, 'Memories', pp. 5-6.

9. The Evolutionist Perspective

By the mid-1860s, it was fairly clear that Fox's main allegiances had been established. His own apparent early infatuation with race and racial descriptions had been in part tempered, his bombastic pronouncements on 'natural law' being little more than a carry-over from an earlier time. By 1872, he would stress that it was 'important to remember that anthropology has its practical and humanitarian aspect, and that, as our race is more often brought in contact with savages than any other, a knowledge of its habits and ways of thought must be of the utmost value to us in utilizing his labour, as well as in checking those inhuman practices from which they have but too often suffered at our hands'¹⁹³. Still, a few years earlier he was less certain. Hunt, whom we know Fox to have turned against by at least 1868, was referred to favourably in his earlier archaeological reports, and was obviously treated by him as something of an authority¹⁹⁴. Also, unlike his friend John Lubbock, who referred to anthropology 'as an ugly name for Ethnology', Fox was never particularly opposed to the term and, in fact, appears rather to have favoured its usage as 'etymologically and most accurate for embracing the whole of those many studies which are included in the science of man'¹⁹⁵. Interestingly too, he was for a time strongly in favour of excluding women from the meetings, again, as others, particularly Burton felt, because of the limits they set upon the subjects at hand¹⁹⁶. His main opposition to Hunt and his followers appears fundamentally to have been one of personality rather than viewpoint.

Hunt's criticism of Fox's friend Flower, for the latter's work at the College of Surgeons, therefore, must have helped determine the course of Fox's attitudes. Rolleston, Fox's closest friend for many years, also called Hunt a 'Turkey Buzzard' and referred to him as an 'ignorant charlatan'¹⁹⁷. Lubbock and Huxley were even more emphatic, and it is clear that Fox was influenced by their views. Moreover, despite his respect for Burton and others within the Anthropological Society's inner circle, Fox fundamentally disagreed with many of their procedures. The exclusion of 'the other sex' from meetings came increasingly to be opposed by him; and in 1872, at the annual meeting of the British Association in Brighton he commented: 'Amongst the numerous papers submitted to the Department only one was rejected as being unfit to read before the ladies'. Overall, he admitted, the anthropologists' decision had been not only a 'financial' miscalculation, but a 'scientific blunder' as well¹⁹⁸.

In one sense, however, Fox never really had to make a final choice of allegiance, for by 1866, or just three years after the Society's foundation (and one year after Fox's having joined), it had already entered into a decline. In 1865, the Society's Secretary, Carter Blake, commented on the loss of members, and it is evident that the Society

¹⁹³ Fox, 'Report, Brighton, 1872', pp. 170- 71.

¹⁹⁴ Fox, 'Roovesmore Fort', p. 133.

¹⁹⁵ Fox, 'Report, British Association, 1872 ', p . 158. Lubbock's attitude toward the term is discussed at length by Stocking, 'What's in a Name?', pp. 369, 382-84; and Burrow, *Evolution*, p . 127. Lubbock's own remarks are taken from Lubbock's 'Reply to Carter Blake', *AR*, 2 (1864), 296. See also Hutchinson, *Life of Lubbock*, I, 118.

¹⁹⁶ Fox, 'Report, Brighton, 1872', p. 157.

¹⁹⁷ Davis, 'On Craniology', p. 387. George Rolleston, Letter to T.H. Huxley, 1 Jan 1865, ICS, HP.

¹⁹⁸ Fox, 'Report, Brighton, 1872', pp. 359-60.

was burdened with financial difficulties from the beginning, as Fox himself later hinted¹⁹⁹. Despite continued efforts to expand itself, the Society never obtained the 600 members determined necessary for financial solvency, and it appears that Hunt was, in fact, always forced to bear the brunt of the Society's debts. Opponents were also becoming more numerous every day, not only from within the more conservative Victorian Institute, a staunchly Christian organization with archaeological and ethnological interests²⁰⁰, but among the more progressive factions as well. By 1864, or even before Fox's membership, both Huxley and Lubbock had made their opposition known, and when Lubbock became President of the Ethnological Society, Hunt resigned in protest²⁰¹. It was soon evident too that other members had to make their own choice. Most decided, like Fox, to disassociate themselves permanently from the more discreditable group.

Probably no issue so well illustrates the schism between the anthropologists and ethnologists, and Fox's place within it, as the controversy over Darwin and the implications of Darwinian theory for the new study of man. Surprisingly enough, despite the anthropologists' explicit modernism, they were fundamentally opposed to Darwin. Again, Hunt was probably the most vocal. Referring to Huxley's article in the *Fortnightly Review* of 1864, he exclaimed: 'the recent application of Mr. Darwin's hypothesis of "Natural Selection" to anthropology by some of Mr. Darwin's disciples, is wholly unwarranted either by logic or by facts'. Later he accused the Darwinians as being 'non-empirical', suggesting that they were merely following in a tradition of metaphysical thinking stretching back directly to Kant and Herder. He also described it as merely a reinstatement of the older unitary view of man's origins²⁰². To a certain extent, of course, he was right. Lyell, for example, compared Darwin's hypothesis directly to Müller's series of lectures on the science of language, a point clearly recognized by anthropologists of the time²⁰³. The efforts of Alfred Wallace (1823-1913), on the other hand, to promote the Darwinian theory within the Society in social terms, that is, in terms of the conquest of one race over another, was similarly treated with skepticism, as was any other suggestion of a kind of developmental hierarchy²⁰⁴. In effect, the controversy over Darwin had become a test of loyalties, and few could remain unaligned. For Fox, as a committed Darwinian long before his association, the

¹⁹⁹ C. Carter Blake, 'Anthropology of the British Association', *AR*, 2 (1864), 294; and *Anthro. News*, *AR*, 6 (1868), 457. Blake was one of Fox's sponsors at the Geological Society. He left soon afterward for a better paying position as a mine inspector in Nicaragua. *AR*, 5 (1867), 369.

²⁰⁰ Stocking, 'What's in a Name?', p. 375. See *Journals of the Victoria Institute*.

²⁰¹ Stocking, 'What's in a Name?', p. 377. Hunt's original response to Lubbock's election was more positive. Hunt, 'Presidential Address, 1864', p. lxxxviii. Also see Letter from T.H. Huxley to John Lubbock, 3 Mar 1863, BL, LP, on Huxley's opposition.

²⁰² James Hunt, 'On the Application of the Principle of Natural Selection to Anthropology', *AR*, 4 (1866), 320. See also Hunt, 'On the Doctrine of Continuity Applied to Anthropology', *AR*, 5, (1867), 113,116; 'Address on the Dundee Conference, *AR*, 6 (1868), 77.

²⁰³ Lyell's work was criticised most directly for its Darwinian approach by Hunt, 'Lyell on the Geological Evidence of the Antiquity of Man', *AR*, 1 (1863), 129-37; by John Crawfurd in 'On Sir Charles Lyell's "Antiquity of Man" ', and on Professor Huxley's "Evidence as to Man's Place in Nature" ', *TESL*, 3 (1864), 58-70.

²⁰⁴ Alfred D. Wallace, 'The Origins of Human Races', pp. clviii-clxxxvii. Hunt's response was clear. *JASL*, 2 (1864), clxxviii. Other criticisms were voiced by C.S. Wake, discussion following Richard King, *JASL*, 6 (1868), cxi.

choice was almost predetermined.

While the Darwinian hypothesis provided a measure of allegiance, it was the general concept of evolution that proved the most lasting point of disagreement. It was evolution, in turn, which most clearly underlined the failure of the Anthropological perspective in the period during which Fox was first associated with the nascent scientific community. Interestingly, the evolutionist viewpoint of the mid-sixties was founded less on concepts of biological change, or even upon what later anthropologists would refer to as social change, than on the general concept of a mental hierarchy, as Fox himself revealed in his writings of the late sixties. Several key articles by others helped draw attention to that. In 1862, Robert Dunn argued that the existing races represented, in their various degrees of mental development, an ideal picture of man's historical advancement²⁰⁵. Referring to the evidence derived from human crania, C.S. Wake (1835-1910) in his article 'The Psychological Unity of Mankind' of 1865, helped to clarify Dunn's argument, suggesting that the various races of modern man could be understood in much the same way as an individual in his own mental stages of development. The Australian, for example, represented man in his infancy; the Negro, man in his childhood; the North American Indian, man in his adolescence, and so on. Although many races were condemned to remain essentially the same, in Wake's view, the overall argument was one of common development and advancement, as Fox himself later agreed²⁰⁶.

Of perhaps even more immediate importance than the concept of uniform mental development was the evidence derived from archaeology, and, of course, it was in that area that Fox's own work had the greatest relevance. By far the most influential article touching upon the subject of archaeology and evolution was that of Hodder Westropp 'On the Analogous Forms of Flint Instruments', first read at the Anthropological Society in May 1865 and reprinted in the 1866 volume of the Anthropological Review²⁰⁷. Westropp, who was a resident of Cork and for several years had already been a close contact of Fox's, argued that the weapons and tools of man provided incontrovertible evidence of man's common nature. 'The weapons and implements devised and fashioned by man, in each stage of his development', he pointed out, 'are almost identical in all countries; and 'this similarity', he added, 'affords strong evidence of the unity of the operations of instinct, and the suggestive

²⁰⁵ Robert Dunn, 'On Physiological and Psychological Evidence', pp. 186-202. Also see 'Civilization and Cerebral Development', TESL, 4 (1864), 13-34 and 'On the Influence of Civilization upon the Development of the Brain in the Different Races of Man', RBAAS (1865), 119.

²⁰⁶ C.S. Wake, 'The Psychological Unity of Mankind', JASL, 6 (1868), clxviii-clxx; MASL, 3 (1868), 134-47. Wake's earlier articles include 'The Relation of Man to the Inferior Tribes of Animal Life', AR, 1 (1863), 365-73; and 'On the Antiquity of Man and Comparative Geology', JASL, 5 (1867), cv-cxi. The importance of Wake's contribution has been stressed by Rodney Needham in a short study of his life. 'Charles Staniland Wake, 1835-1910', in J.H.M. Beattie and R.G. Lienhardt, Studies in Social Anthropology (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), pp. 354-87.

²⁰⁷ Hodder M. Westropp, 'On the Analogous Forms of Flint Instruments', AR, 4 (1866), p. 208, 314; MASL, 2 288-93.

principle in the mind of man among all races in all ages²⁰⁸. It was no longer a question of specificities, as the ethnologists had first seen it, but a unity of a more basic kind. The controversy over the monogenesis and polygenesis of man was simply being projected into a new plane, as Fox in his own writings would later demonstrate.

By 1865, the foundations of the evolutionist perspective with which Fox and those closest to him would become soon associated were clearly established. The unifying element was the gradual development of man's mental powers; the supporting evidence was the proof derived from his tools and weapons. Such a fundamental dependency on the material record has generally been ignored by historians of anthropology. Most writers, including J. W. Burrow and George Stocking have tended to view the evolutionist perspective either as a by-product of Darwinianism or as merely the restatement of a general development theme stretching back to the theories of the social philosophers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries²⁰⁹. While evidence of what might be considered a social kind would increasingly play an important part in the evolutionist argument, it was really the archaeological evidence, as Fox and others understood, which proved the determining factor.

Fox was obviously well aware of the controversies of the early sixties, and in many ways his writings and his understanding of his collection continued to reflect those early concerns. As with other ethnologists and antiquarians, he tended to view evolution in terms of mental development and not in strictly social or cultural terms, as would most other anthropologists of a later period. In his view, development was something tied to the individual consciousness. The artefacts manufactured by the Trobriand islander or the Australian or the Eskimo were seen as a measure of their total advancement, as a fundamental key to the state of their evolution as well as that of individuals within those societies. For Fox, the material evidence was perhaps the only fully dependable grounds upon which to base such a view. As with Gideon Mantell's 'ideal archaeologist' of nearly two decades before, he limited 'his inquiries to the remains of man and his works, for the purpose of tracing the development of the human mind, in the various phases of society from the dawn of civilisation and through the historic ages, down to the present time:...' ²¹⁰.

But while Fox accepted the developmentalist argument in broadest terms, he also inherited some of the more racist arguments of the anthropological community. Whereas mental development may have provided a key to man's continuous advancement, that did not mean that the present races were all in fact 'advancing'. As Dunn and Wake both made clear, most modern races, however representative of European 'man's past growth, were in a state of 'arrested development', as Fox himself later phrased it²¹¹. It is as if they had broken off from the 'chain of progress' little changing from the time that event occurred. As Fox explained in 1868: 'The difference observable between existing races is one of divergence ... one race has

²⁰⁸ Westropp, 'Analogous Forms', p. 288. Westropp also wrote on the development of language and thought. See 'On the Mythic Age'; Margaret Hogden, *Anthropology*; 'Origin and Development of Language'.

²⁰⁹ See Hogden as the best example of such precedent seeking.

²¹⁰ Mantell, 'Remains of Man', pp. 327-28.

²¹¹ Discussion following Farrar, 'Aptitudes of Races', p. 123.

improved, while another has progressed slowly or remained stationary²¹². It was an evolutionist perspective but not a universalist one, as we shall see in greater detail below.

If Fox accepted the racial hierarchy of the anthropologists, he also assumed their more outspoken, often tendentious pragmatism. The philanthropic concerns of the older ethnological community were generally dismissed by Fox as irrelevant to the growth of a true science. The extinction of the Tasmanians was seen as inevitable. Governor Eyre's efforts in Jamaica were openly portrayed as a reinstatement of the natural order. Overall, in fact, the supremacy of the European race, or more particularly that of England, was little questioned. '[t]heir can be little doubt', Fox wrote in 1868,

that in the course of time, all that remains of the various races of mankind will be brought under the influence of one civilization. But as this progressive movement is often led by men who have not made the races of mankind their study, they are perpetually falling into the error of supposing, that the work of countless ages or divergence, is to be put to rights by Act of Parliament, and by suddenly applying to the inferior races of mankind laws and institutions for which they are about much fitted as the animals in the Zoological Gardens²¹³.

As with the anthropologists, Fox obviously saw the role of the 'science of man' as essentially a disinterested one.

But if Fox was coming to accept in broad terms many of the basic assumptions of the anthropological community, his overall approach tended to follow even more clearly in the tradition of the Ethnological Society and indeed might be said to have been patterned directly on the model that it afforded. As with Prichard or R.G. Latham, his questions were ones touching upon actual human origins, not on the generalized questions of the beginnings of mankind and his institutions, the obvious concerns of the rising body of evolutionists. They were the particular questions of migrations, intermixtures and diffusion, not the general ones of process and change. As Latham had put it in 1851, 'There are Etruscans—who were they? The Pelasgians—who were they? The Huns that over-run Europe in the fourth century; the Cimmerii that devastated Asia, 900 years earlier?'²¹⁴ The answer, Fox concluded, lay in the ethnological record, a record, in his estimation, composed not only of linguistic or anatomical evidence, but of the material evidence as well. It was the museum, in turn, which offered the ideal forum and tool for discovery.

²¹² Fox, 'Primitive Warfare I', p. 437.

²¹³ Fox, 'Primitive Warfare II'; on Eyre see *Ibid*, p. 407.

²¹⁴ Latham, *Man and His Migrations*, p. 33.