

CHAPTER VII

THE OXFORD GIFT

1. Further Excavations in Sussex

By the mid-1870s, Fox had drifted away from the centre of anthropological interests toward more independent studies of his own. In part, his change of interests was a result of his move to Guildford in the early part of 1873, which, in turn, only allowed him occasional trips to London, as he explained in a letter of apology to the Society of Antiquaries¹. But it was also, as we have seen, a fortuitous move, one which coincided with the shift in his interests away from the main concerns of the Institute of Anthropology toward new experiments in archaeology and field technique. His posting in Guildford merely provided the opportunity for more prolonged archaeological and anthropological involvement.

Interestingly, one of Fox's first projects took place on the base itself. Soon after taking up his duties, he designed a method of measuring recruits in accordance with the latest theories on 'physical anthropology', as it had come to be known. His first exercise was a table of chest measurements; the results were reported in the early part of 1875 in a short notice in the Journal of the Anthropological Institute². The next year his work took a slightly more elaborate turn, and in early May, he began a systematic record of the 459 men and 18 officers of the Second Battalion of the Royal Surrey Militia, 'according', as he explained, 'to the General Instructions drawn up by the Anthropometric Committee of the British Association'³. In all he listed hair and eye colour, chest measurements—and, as an addendum to the latter, 'breathing-capacity' and, finally, body strength. Craniological measurements, later recorded in great detail for his archaeological specimens, were excluded for uncertain reasons. It is clear too that he had yet to develop his own 'craniometer' as he would at a later date⁴.

His findings, overall, were statistical in nature, reflecting particularly the influence of Francis Galton, again a colleague of Fox's from both the United Services Institution and the Anthropological Institute, and soon to be one of Fox's sponsors at the Royal Society⁵. Ninety-two percent of the men, Fox pointed out, came from within 20 miles

¹ Executive Committee Minutes, SAL, 21 Nov 1872.

² Fox, 'Note on the Chest Measurement of Recruits', JAI, 5 (1875), 101-06.

³ Fox, 'Report on Measurements of the Whole of the Officers and Men of the 2nd Royal Surrey Militia, according to the General Instructions drawn up by the Anthropometric Committee of the British Association', JAI, 6 (1876), 443-57. See RBAAS (1875), liv-lv; RBAAS (1876), liv, 266-67; SSW, PRP, P100.

⁴ Pitt-Rivers, Excavations at Cranborne Chase, Vol IV, (Rushmore: Printed Privately, 1898), pp. 118-19. A.C. Haddon wrote soon afterward asking about Pitt-Rivers' craniometer. A.C. Haddon, Letter to Pitt-Rivers, 7 Jun 1899, Pitt-Rivers Papers. It is now on display at Salisbury. Thompson, General Pitt-Rivers, p. 99.

⁵ Galton was the main figure on the Anthropometric Committee. See RBAAS (1875), liv-lv. His earliest articles at the RUSI included 'Models Illustrative of the Art of Camp Life', JUSI, 2 (1859), 453-60. One of his most complete articles on his anthropometric work was 'On the Application of Composite Portraiture to Anthropological Purposes', RBAAS (1881), 690-91.

of Guildford; eighty-one percent were, in his terms, 'pure English'. Lacking comparative evidence, Fox reasoned, the findings were of limited benefit. But the report was still obviously considered by him a first step toward a more complete study, such as those carried out later in the century. Interestingly, James Hunt had proposed just such a statistical investigation in 1863, and it is possible that Fox had Hunt's suggestion in mind when he undertook his own recording programme⁶. There were other proposals as well, including those of Huxley in 1865 and J.H. Lamphrey in 1869, which, together with Galton's proposal, could equally be said to have provided the inspiration⁷.

While Fox's short excursion into anthropometries could easily be accommodated into his military routine—and indeed justified on the basis of it—his excavations posed more of a problem. Nonetheless, he continued to be active. Throughout the spring and summer of 1875, he was excavating at Cissbury, supervising a team of four to five workers and entertaining workers from the Anthropological Institute, and later the Royal Society, as they came to look at the excavation⁸. He also dug barrows in the area, often accompanied by his friend Rolleston, and made occasional forays into other districts as well. The summer of 1876 found Fox carrying out a major series of excavations at an Iron Age hillfort and burial site located at Seaford, on the nearby Sussex Coast⁹. The next spring and summer he spent a holiday with Rolleston, excavating a twin and single barrow at Sigwell, near Compton, Somerset and made a brief survey, reminiscent of that carried out during his Irish days, of various remains in the area¹⁰. Other of his finds were more casual, such as 'the Discovery of a Dug-Out Canoe in the Thames at Hampton Court', reported during 1878¹¹. But generally his work was of a long term and sustained character—precisely what one would not have expected of a full-time brigade commander.

Another area in which Fox became increasingly involved during the mid-seventies was the British Association for the Advancement of Science. In part, his interest was a reflection of the fact that the Association meetings were held only once a year, and he could attend easily as part of his summer holiday schedule. But the Association was also important to Fox as what he considered a centralized base for scientific advancement, similar to that which he had advocated in his work on behalf of the Ethnological Society. It also provided a convenient forum for his work.

⁶ James Hunt, 'On Ethno-Climatology', p. 51. See also 'On Anthropological Classification', p. 382; also, RBAAS (1863), 139.

⁷ Huxley, 'Methods and Results of Ethnology', pp. 257-77; J.H. Lamphrey, 'Method of Photographic Measurement of the Human Frame', *JESL*, NS 1 (1869), 84-93.

⁸ Fox, 'Excavations, Cissbury Camp, Sussex'; Thompson, *General Pitt-Rivers*, pp. 51-53; Thompson, *Catalogue*, p. 9; See also SSW, PRP pp. 23-25, for Fox's own account of his work.

⁹ Fox, 'Excavations at Seaford'; Letters to John Evans, 21 Jun, 28 Jun, 15 Jul 1876, AM, EP. William Greenwell, Letter to George Rolleston, 16 Jun 1876, AM, RP.

¹⁰ Fox and George Rolleston, 'Report on Excavation of a Twin Barrow, at a Single Round Barrow, at Sigwell (six wells) Parish of Compton, Somerset', *JAI*, 8 (1878), 185-94; also see Letter to John Evans, Sep 1877, AM, EP; Letter to George Rolleston, Apr 9 1877, AM, RP; Thompson, *General Pitt-Rivers*, p. 67.

¹¹ Fox 'Dug-Out Canoe in the Thames', pp. 102-03. Also, Fox, Letter to George Rolleston, 2 Jul 1878, AM, RP.

Following his address as Vice-President of the Anthropology Section in 1872, Fox's activities within the association declined for a short period, probably because of his new army posting. While he continued to work on Notes and Queries, with the assistance of Franks, Lubbock, Galton and Tylor, he stepped down from the position of leadership in 1873, and failed to attend that summer's meeting held at Bradford¹². The next year at Belfast, however, he was back as Vice-President of Section D. Anthropology, and again chaired the committee charged with completing Notes and Queries¹³. In 1875, he was once more Vice-President and also one of the members of a 'Committee for the purpose of collecting observations on the Systematic Examination of the Heights, Weights and other physical characteristics of the inhabitants of the British Isles', an interest in keeping with his own work of the previous year¹⁴. Two more positions followed over the next years: in 1876 he was appointed Secretary of a 'Committee for the Purpose of the Exploration of Ancient Earthworks and Other Prehistoric Remains'; in 1877 he was also appointed Secretary of a 'Committee for examining of two Caves containing Human Remains in the Neighbourhood of Tenby'¹⁵. In all, then, he was using the British Association as a means of keeping his interests and organizational ties alive.

Despite his gradual disengagement from the main centre of anthropological interests, he retained at least an official involvement at the Institute. His tenure as President continued until the end of January 1877. He also continued as Vice-President at the Society of Antiquaries¹⁶. There were also papers to attend to: 'On Early Modes of Navigation' was presented in December 1874; 'Excavations in Cissbury Camp, Sussex', and 'Evolution of Culture' the following year; 'The Opening of the Dyke Road, or Blackburgh Tumulus, near Brighton,' in 1876¹⁷. Finally, there were his official duties, including his two presidential addresses before the Institute, both essentially summaries of the previous years' papers, delivered at the annual January meetings in 1876 and 1877¹⁸. In recognition of his work he was finally elected to the Royal Society in June 1876. It was obviously one of his most coveted awards to judge from the frequent use of 'F.R.S.' following his name in subsequent years. Among his sponsors were George Busk, Francis Galton, John Lubbock, A.W. Franks, E.B. Tylor, Joseph Prestwich, John Evans, John Tyndall and Martin Tupper. Darwin supported his candidature from 'General Knowledge'¹⁹.

Although Fox obviously valued the recognition, both from the Royal Society and the Institute, his main interests continued to settle on work nearer at hand. In September 1877, or soon after his return from Somerset and the last British Association meeting at Plymouth, Fox began his most industrious excavations to date. Again, as with Seaford the year before and at Cissbury the year before that, the subject was an Iron-

¹² RBAAS (1873), Iv; SSW, PRP, P104.

¹³ RBAAS (1874), liii.

¹⁴ RBAAS (1875), liv-lv.

¹⁵ RBAAS (1876), liii-liv; RBAAS (1877), lii-liii.

¹⁶ Executive Committee Minutes, SAL.

¹⁷ Fox, 'Cissbury Camp', presented 22 Dec 1879; 'Evolution of Culture', presented 28 May 1875; 'Blackburgh Tumulus' presented Aug 1875.

¹⁸ Fox, 'Presidential Address, 1876', pp. 468-88; 'Presidential Address to the Anthropological Institute', JAI, 6 (1873), 491-510.

¹⁹ Certificate of Candidature, Royal Society. My thanks to N.H. Robinson at the Royal Society for providing a copy. Personal Communication, 1 Nov 1979, 20 Feb 1980.

Age hill fort, known then as Mount Caburn Camp, and located near Lewes just in from the coast at Brighton. Fox spent at least several days a week at the site, and although it is uncertain, he apparently relied on interested volunteers from the post at Guildford and possibly a number of paid local workers. Rolleston again helped, and, since the autumn term at Oxford had yet to begin, he was probably on the site for the duration. As usual, he was responsible for identifying faunal remains and for what Fox termed 'soil analysis'²⁰.

Mount Caburn differed from Cissbury principally in the steepness of its site. Most hill forts of the kind represented by Cissbury tended to occupy flat table areas; that at Mount Caburn was located at the peak of a domed hilltop. As a defensive position the fort was obviously ideal. A large rampart and ditch on the north side where the entry lay and the steep escarpment on the south helped ensure its strength. Again, as with Cissbury, a number of pits, identified by Fox as storage pits, were distributed in the fort itself. Those were generally five feet in diameter and measured from three to five feet in depth. There was also evidence of postholes, revealed by Fox's cross sections of the site. From the evidence, it was obvious that timber had been used both in the inner rampart and as reinforcement for the demi-lune or revetment at the outer edge. A second fort at nearby Ranscombe was soon afterwards excavated for what seems to have been comparative purposes. Examples of Roman pottery were found at the latter, but on the basis of its plan and overall layout, Fox concluded that it was an earlier camp than that at Mount Caburn²¹. Later evidence has tended to back him up on his decision²².

Mount Caburn's trove was an impressive one. Unusually, five British coins were discovered, allowing Fox to assign a relatively firm date of between 50 B.C. and 50 A.D. A number of slingstones were later discovered as were spindle whorls and weaving combs, the latter obviously indicating that cloth was probably woven in the camp. Iron objects included a knife decorated with an unusual dot and circle pattern, referred to by Fox as 'a bastard survival of the great period of spiral ornaments'²³. There were also three distinct types of pottery, ranging from crude utilitarian ware to elaborately decorated examples. To help identify his samples, Fox established a list or 'relic table' on which each find was carefully entered, with the location and the association of the object with other remains, and date of discovery precisely indicated²⁴. Such a procedure would become common practice on his later excavations and, as with his cross section technique, marked a significant advance upon his earlier, more haphazard recording methods.

Mount Caburn was to be the last of Fox's part-time excavations. However undemanding his military duties may have been, they still required that he be on the post most of the time. Again, his only choice, if he wanted to devote himself more

²⁰ Fox, 'Excavations at Mount Caburn Camp, near Lewes, conducted in 1877 and 1878', *Archaeologia*, 6 (1880), 423-95. Rolleston is thanked on p. 428. Also see, Fox, Letter to John Evans, Sep 1877, AM, EP; Letters to George Rolleston, 2 Sep and 10 Sep 1877, AM, RP. Fox referred to it as 'a second Cissbury'.

²¹ Fox, 'Mount Caburn Camp', 23-95. Also SSW, PRP, P28-31.

²² Thompson, *General Pitt-Rivers*, p. 56. See also Jacquetta Hawkes, p. 72.

²³ Fox, 'Mount Caburn Camp', p. 437.

²⁴ *Ibid*, pp. 477-89, PRP, P29.

fully to his archaeological work, was to leave the army entirely. By the time of Mount Caburn, the decision had already been made. In October 1877, or just as his work there was coming to a close, his promotion to major-general was finally gazetted²⁵. That in itself was a prelude to retirement, and shortly afterward he stepped down from his post as brigade commander, retiring, in turn, on a general's half pay. He was at the time only just 50, but it must have been apparent already that his move marked the end of his military career. He and his family would remain, however, at Guildford at least until the end of 1877. When visiting London, the family depended upon relatives, or, in Fox's case, on the Guards Club for housing²⁶.

Surprisingly, Fox's interests continued to focus on the field, rather than on the London-based societies. One of his first major ventures upon retirement was the excavation of yet another hill fort known, misleadingly as it turned out, as Caesar's Camp, located near Folkestone, or not too far from Hythe, where Fox had been posted many years before²⁷. A number of excavations took place in the summer of 1878, with Fox staying in a local hotel. The address of 30 Sussex Place, used by Fox shortly afterward, was evidently a temporary home for his family in London, but they would continue to at least use Uplands as well until the middle of the following year²⁸. Rolleston appears to have joined him at the site and again provided an appendix on faunal remains, as he had at Mount Caburn and at Cissbury²⁹. The actual work was carried out by a team of labourers from nearby Shorncliffe, and was apparently paid for out of Fox's own pocket. The size of the crew varied during the length of the dig but usually numbered around ten.

Unlike Cissbury or Mount Caburn, Caesar's Camp turned out to be a considerably more complex structure. Essentially, it was a 'double' rather than a 'single' enclosure, consisting, then, of an inner citadel surrounded by an outer retaining wall. Long considered a Roman site, as its name suggests, Fox speculated that it dated from a far later period, possibly as late as the eleventh or twelfth century. His reasoning contradicted the general opinion at the time, which tended to hold simply that Normans built in stone, and that only far earlier forts and encampments would have been built of timber or earthworks, as in the case of Caesar's Camp. The best known proponent of that argument was the well-known authority on medieval military architecture, George T. Clarke, who as late as 1884 considered that formula an absolute rule³⁰. Drawing his own conclusions on the analysis of his cross sections, however, and on the associated remains, Fox was relatively certain of his date, assigning, however, 'later speculation on the subject to historians'³¹. The relic tables, again kept by Fox during the operation, include notations for a silver coin of King

²⁵ Thompson, *General Pitt-Rivers*, p. 52; Gray, Index, p. x.

²⁶ Fox, Letter to George Rolleston, 27 Oct 1877, AM, RP; 'I return to Guildford today'. For a chronology of his residences see SSW, PRP, P116.

²⁷ Later described in Fox, 'Excavations at Caesar's Camp, near Folkestone, conducted in 1878', *Archaeologia*, 47 (1880), 429-65. Also William Greenwell, Letter to George Rolleston, 7 Apr 1878, and Fox, Letter to George Rolleston, 7 Apr 1878, 2 Jul 1878, AM, RP.

²⁸ SSW, PRP, P116.

²⁹ George Rolleston, 'Notes on the two sets of Bones from Caesar's Camp, Folkestone, and from Mount Caburn, near Lewes', pp. 454-55.

³⁰ George T. Clark; *Medieval Military Architecture* (London: Wyman and Sons, 1884). Cf. Thompson, *General Pitt-Rivers*, pp. 56-57.

³¹ 'Caesar's Camp', p. 453.

Stephen, a bronze gilt ornament, a socketed arrowhead, a small copper guilt object, and a range of green-glazed sherds commonly now associated with twelfth century remains. While obviously wary of taking too strong a position, Fox's excavation techniques and system of recording had once again proven themselves equal to the task.

The results of Fox's discoveries at Caesar's Camp during the summer of 1878 were the subject of a lengthy discussion at the Society of Antiquaries³². A number of points of uncertainty caused him, in turn, to reevaluate many of his earlier efforts. As a result, there was a tendency to want to reexamine some of his other earlier sites as well, and by July he was back at Mount Caburn reexamining his work there in a second campaign³³. Since, however, both that and his earlier work were described in a single paper published later in the year, it is difficult to say how much of his report derived from his first campaign and how much from his second period there. It is certainly likely that the more precise relic tables date from the second period, although that cannot be certain. Whether, too, he reconsidered Mount Caburn as a Norman site, in the light of his Caesar's Camp findings, is a matter of speculation, but by the time he had concluded his work his earlier first-century date had been more or less established. In the end, cross sections and relic tables had proven themselves to be equal to the task.

2. The Conservation of Antiquities

With the completion of his work at Caesar's Camp, Fox could look back upon his career as a field archaeologist with a certain amount of satisfaction. The range of his sites had been considerable, including the Iron Age hill forts, Bronze Age burial mounds, Roman camps and finally a Norman castle. His techniques had progressed from what was essentially a system of random sampling and recording—techniques essentially unchanged from those of Richard Stukely or Sir Richard Colt Hoare, a century before³⁴—to the precise and, in Fox's terms, scientific analysis of stratigraphic sections. With the possible exception of Greenwell, there was probably no other archaeologist even approaching Fox in terms of his thoroughness or accuracy, although a number of other figures, most notably Mariette Brey in Egypt and Henry Schliemann at Troy, were beginning to arrive at similar standards independently³⁵. In Britain at the time probably only John Evans and, to a lesser extent, Charles Newton of the British Museum even came close to Greenwell and Fox in that regard³⁶. It is evident that Fox had finally found his calling.

³² *PSAL*, 2dS 7 (1878), 436-37. A sum of 20b was granted.

³³ Fox, 'Mount Caburn Camp', SSEW, PRP, P28-31.

³⁴ See W.M. Flinders Petrie, *Methods and Aims in Archaeology* (London: Macmillan, 1904). On Stukely in particular, Piggott, *William Stukely*, pp. 132-36; *Approach to Archaeology*, pp. 25-40, and *British Prehistory*, Chapt. 2. Pitt-Rivers was critical of both: 'Inaugural Address, Salisbury', p. 265. Also, Daniel, *A Hundred and Fifty Years*, pp. 25-60; *Idea of Prehistory*, pp. 22-25.

³⁵ Daniel, *A Hundred and Fifty Years*, p. 160. Interestingly, Fox credited both as well. See 'Evolution of Culture', pp. 514, 516.

³⁶ As a point of interest, Richard Bradley at the University of Reading suggests that Greenwell's recording techniques were often far less exacting than has often been assumed. Personal Communication, 26 Jul 1980.

Most of Fox's contributions to the journals from that date took on a markedly more archaeological flavour almost as a response to his success. From 1878 on, he published only three articles on subjects dealing with the general subject of material culture or 'comparative technology', as it later came to be known, out of a total of over 30 separate articles³⁷. The same held for his books, those on Primitive Locks and Keys of 1883 and Antique Works of Benin of 1900, or soon after his death³⁸, being the only works in keeping with his earlier interests. It is evident too that the success of his field efforts was affecting Fox's view of his role as a member of the scientific community. In 1877, he stepped down to the position of Vice-President within the Anthropological Institute, and while returning to fill the post of President again in 1880-81, he was gradually assuming a less active role there³⁹. Many of his future papers, as well, would be published in Archaeologia or the Journal of the Archaeological Institute, rather than the Journal of the Anthropological Institute as they had been up to that date. Overall, it was another reflection of what was becoming a basic shift in allegiance and interests.

Another major factor in the reorientation of Fox's views was the fact that he was preparing himself for a new career. Having retired from the military he was, in a sense, 'without portfolio' or position. His various positions within the scientific societies helped to fill the gap in part, but it was clear that Fox still sought a more permanent role or authority. The idea of entering politics, as he considered at a later date, was probably not a serious possibility at the time, since Fox, though wealthy by most standards, was obviously not in a position to finance a political campaign or support himself and his large family once in office. Moreover, he had never really shown much talent in this area, again, as his later unsuccessful campaign for office showed. Overall, it would seem that he was simply too rigid in his views to assume the attitude of compromise necessary in the political game.

His only real hope for political favour or advancement lay, therefore, in an appointment of a more or less technical kind, where he would be called upon to use his organizational skills but would not be required to exercise too great a personal restraint. The logical position for Fox was that of a committee chairmanship or trusteeship, similar to that then held by his father-in-law in the Society of Arts, and it is indeed surprising that he was not approached at that time to serve on the board of some similar organization or, even more logically, to work for a museum⁴⁰. But with the exception of Franks' position at the British Museum, there was really nothing in the latter field. Furthermore, there was probably nothing worthy of or appropriate to his social position. The South Kensington Museum, with which he had considerable contact, for example, was itself far too artistic in its orientation for Fox's taste⁴¹. Moreover, it had no place for an archaeologist of Fox's calibre, most of the positions, in fact, being filled by clerks. Whether he would have wished for a curatorial position

³⁷ See Gray, Index, pp. xxxviii-xliii and Bibliography below.

³⁸ Pitt-Rivers, On the Development and Distribution of Primitive Locks and Keys (London: Chatto and Windus, 1883); Antique Works of Benin (Rushmore: privately Printed, 1900).

³⁹ He was only rarely present at Council meetings, particularly after 1878. RAI Council Minutes, Anthropol. Inst., A10. He remained, however, on the Museum Committee as well as those for Publications and Finance.

⁴⁰ Mitford, Stanleys; Cole, Fifty Years of Public Work.

⁴¹ Fox, Letter to Franks, 1 Jul 1880, PRM, BP.

also remains a matter of speculation. Nonetheless, it was obviously important that he find something, although Fox was definitely not one to go asking for a job.

Probably the most tempting possibility was that of a governmental position of some kind, such as that held by Huxley as Inspector of Fisheries⁴². But then again, as of 1878 there was no position for which Fox might have qualified. With the passage of Lubbock's Ancient Monuments Bill, however, circumstances were to change, and, as Thompson has suggested, there is much to suggest that Fox had been considering the possibility of being Inspector of Ancient Monuments for a number of years before actually becoming so⁴³. Indeed, his decision to leave the army may well have been predicated by such expectations. As it was, it would be a number of years before he would actually secure the post. But in the meantime, he could present his own case, as well as help Lubbock lay the groundwork.

Since its first introduction in 1872, or soon after Lubbock was elected to Parliament, the proposed antiquities bill had passed through a series of changes which, overall, had simply diminished its scope and powers. Fox obviously had worked closely with Lubbock on the bill and its revisions throughout that period⁴⁴. He was clearly aware, too, of its several provisions, first for a governing agency and later for a single Inspector of Ancient Monuments to oversee its implementation. Lubbock himself had preferred the latter course at least since 1865, when he suggested in Prehistoric Times that a 'Conservator of National Antiquities' be appointed to carry the law into effect⁴⁵. Both Lubbock and Fox were concerned, moreover, to establish some means by which the landowners' traditional rights might be circumscribed without entirely ignoring them, and because of that, they intended to press for persuasive, rather than police powers in their various drafts⁴⁶. The other possibility was the establishment of a committee, and in Lubbock's first bill, an independent commission, for which Fox was put forward as a possible member, was proposed. A later revision transferred responsibilities to the Trustees of the British Museum, that time, of course, unavoidably excluding Fox⁴⁷. However, the most promising solution, and the one considered most favourably in 1878, was an Inspectorship, and Fox, as a well-connected aristocrat, well-attuned to the anxieties of landowners, was obviously the ideal choice. There is little doubt that Lubbock mentioned Fox's name frequently in that regard, and as a result Fox and the position were already closely bound up in the minds of those considering the bill. As of 1878, however, nothing had been determined for certain, and while the bill was to reach the House of Lords early the

⁴² Huxley, Life and Letters, II 29; Irvine, pp. 306-07. See G.M. Young, Victorian England, pp. 41-42.

⁴³ Thompson, General Pitt-Rivers, p. 61; 'First Inspector' pp. 103-24.

⁴⁴ SAL, Executive Committee Minutes, 14 Jun 1871; 24 Nov 1873. Fox, Letter to William Greenwell, 29 Aug 1976, AM, RP. Both Fox and Lubbock were on the Antiquaries' Committee to consider the bill. Hutchison, Lubbock, I, 74; Grant Duff, p. 14. They had begun working together as early as 1868, at the Third International Congress of Prehistoric Archaeology. Fox, Letter to J.A.A. Worsaae, 11 Jul 1870, National Museum of Copenhagen. My thanks to Marienne Paulsen, Nationalmuseet, for her help.

⁴⁵ Lubbock, Prehistoric Times, p. 55.

⁴⁶ Fox, 'Address, Bath, 1888', p. 829.

⁴⁷ Kennet, pp. 27-35. Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 3rdS, 218-26 (London: Cornelius Burk, 1874-82). Letter, Lubbock to Pitt-Rivers, 25 Oct 1882, LP, BL, 496459, f. 192. Also, see Grant Duff, pp. 91-94; and Hutchison, Lubbock, I, 126-27, 173-74.

following year, it was evident that there was little real hope of its passage. All Lubbock and Fox could do, therefore, was watch and wait.

Notwithstanding the delays, in the latter part of 1878, Fox began what was in effect his apprenticeship by beginning a survey in the west of France, or the well-known Megalithic area around Carnac. As Thompson has pointed out, the reasons for Fox's trip became more clear when his interest in the possibility of some official appointment are taken into account⁴⁸. One of the main duties of the 'Conservator' or, 'Inspector', as both Fox and Lubbock envisioned the post, was to provide a list, or as it came to be called a 'schedule' of monuments. For most prehistoric monuments what was required was a general record, a practice with which Fox was long familiar and for which he was again in many ways ideally suited. The fact, too, that Fox's trip to Brittany concentrated almost exclusively upon such remains, to the exclusion of monuments such as castles and churches, also suggests a spirit of collusion. The main concern of Lubbock's proposal was the protection of ancient remains, at least in part, as he had argued, because no costly conservation measures would be required should ownership of the proposed listed monuments be taken over by the state⁴⁹. In order to insure, however, the continued care of each site, a careful and complete survey, in the form of plans and elevations and in some cases sectional details, was considered imperative. Fox's work in France, then, was as much a rehearsal for the whole programme as a practice session for Fox himself. Most of all, it was intended to serve as a demonstration for those still doubting the feasibility of Lubbock's bill.

Fox's first trip to Brittany took place in late October 1878, lasting apparently to the end of November or early December⁵⁰. Most of his time was spent in the immediate neighbourhood of Carnac, with only one major side excursion to the north, undertaken toward the end of his stay. Although he often included a representation of a figure (himself?) for scale in his drawings, he was evidently travelling alone, leaving Alice and the rest of his family in London and later meeting them in Paris. Using a set of notebooks now on file with the Public Record Office, he usually produced only a rough plan and a single perspective drawing, although occasionally, elevations or hypothetical cross-sections were added for greater accuracy. Each monument was usually assigned two facing pages, with the plan on the left and the other drawings on the facing page. Among the sites recorded during the trip were Gavrinis, Pierres Plates, Table des Marchands, Mané Lud, Kerhuen Tanqui and Keriaval⁵¹.

By all indications Fox spent the next few months collecting a number of objects for his collection and visiting museums, in addition to actual recording. His address during the period was Maison Amyot, Dinard, Ille et Vilaine⁵². The following spring, however, he returned to the field, again to Brittany. During his second campaign, the sequence was reversed, with the operation beginning in the north and proceeding as

⁴⁸ Thompson, *General Pitt-Rivers*, p. 61.

⁴⁹ Thompson, 'First Inspector', p. 121.

⁵⁰ SSW, PRP, AM1. The two note books dealing with his Brittany trip are in the Public Record office, WORK 39.

⁵¹ PRO, WORK 39. Fox's recording operation in Brittany is summarized in detail in Thompson, 'First Inspector', pp. 104-05.

⁵² SSW, PRP, P16.

far south as Finisterre. Otherwise, he conformed to his earlier pattern, recording plans and perspectives of a number of prehistoric and, at that time, medieval sites. Included in his second notebook are entries for a Megalithic dolmens in the Blois du Rocher near Pleudihan, another near Dinan and a similar monument at Pierre Sonnante. Medieval sites—technically outside his scope but of interest nonetheless—included a tenth-century castle at Le Guildo, the church of St. Michel at Quimperlé and the churches of Notre Dame de Bon Secour and St. Leonard at Plougret. Suggestive to Thompson of a growing lack of interest in simple dolmens, Fox's gradual change of focus also anticipates the general course and expansion of ancient monument scheduling over the next several years, and perhaps was undertaken at least with that possibility in mind⁵³.

With the completion of his survey in April 1879, Fox returned to London, finally establishing himself and his family at 19 Penywern Road in Earls Court⁵⁴. About equally convenient to central London as his earlier South Kensington address, the property was considerably larger, with a full four storeys plus an attic and basement for servants. Still, it was far from a pretentious house, with its simple yellow brickwork and inexpensive terracotta ornaments. The pair of Tuscan columns did little to distinguish it from others in the long row of similar buildings. For Fox, it was a convenient base of operations and little more.

During the spring of 1878, Fox renewed his work with the various societies, at least to a limited degree. As Vice-President of both the Anthropological Institute and the Society of Antiquaries, he had a chance to play a part in committee meetings and organizational efforts. Interestingly, however, his more formal involvement would end around that time, and for nearly two years he would present no major paper of any kind⁵⁵. Attendance at regular meetings also seems to have been significantly curtailed⁵⁶. At the same time, his efforts in the field were on the increase. That summer, for example, he was on the Continent, once again on ancient monuments business. His focus on his second trip was Denmark, probably less for the recording opportunities it offered than the chance to actually witness the results of that country's long-standing protective legislation. While it was possible that he met with Danish officials as well, there is no record of that, other than his earlier correspondence with Worsaae⁵⁷. There is little doubt, however, that he visited the Danish National Museum in the course of his stay. He also took advantage of collecting opportunities, sending a number of pieces purchased through local dealers back to London for later display at South Kensington⁵⁸. Throughout the trip, he was accompanied by his friend Rolleston,

⁵³ Thompson, *General Pitt-Rivers*, p. 61.

⁵⁴ SSW, PRP, P116 and various correspondence. The building is now incorporated into a hotel complex.

⁵⁵ His next paper was 'Excavations at Caesar's Camp'.

⁵⁶ SAL, Executive Committee Minutes. Fox also attended no Council meetings at the Anthropological Institute during 1879. SAL, Council Minutes, AI, A10.

⁵⁷ See above, pp. 406-14. Danish protective measures, described by Worsaae in *La Conservation des Antiquities et des Monument Nationaux en Danemark* (Copenhagen: Thiele, 1878) lauded by Lubbock in *Prehistoric Times*, were considered the model legislation.

⁵⁸ SSW, PRP, p. 116. Also see William Greenwell, Letter to George Rolleston, 6 Oct 1879, AM, RP.

and in late July, the two managed to carry out a small excavation at the Danewirke in Schleswig, later recorded briefly in *Archaeologia*⁵⁹.

In October 1879, or just after his return from Denmark, Fox was again back at Yorkshire, staying with relatives. As a follow-up to his recent work in Denmark, he decided at the time to undertake a more extensive excavation on an earthwork or dyke, called, appropriately, Dane's Dyke, in the East Riding⁶⁰. He had been familiar with the earthwork at least since his short period with Canon Greenwell in 1867, and no doubt knew something of its existence long before that. Rising approximately 10 feet above grade in places, and including both an earthwork and an outer ditch (the latter on the side away from Flamborough Head, which it protects) it was far larger than anything he had ever attempted to excavate before. Again, local labourers were employed, although their numbers are unrecorded. Because of the size of the enterprise, Fox was forced to modify his technique slightly. Rather than a single section, he used a system of boxes, back-filling as he proceeded up the bank rather than cutting a single trench. While his system was apparently successful, the overall results were less so, and, as others had earlier predicted, he found little of interest in the dyke itself, and virtually nothing with which he could date the monument. It was, as Thompson had stressed, a useful lesson, and when he later encountered similar earthworks at Cranborne Chase, he was careful to choose a part for sectioning adjacent to a dateable structure or object⁶¹.

3. Removal of the Collection to South Kensington

Throughout the time of his French and Danish trips, Fox's collection had remained on public display, initially at the Bethnal Green Museum. His own involvement with his collection was, as suggested, essentially a peripheral one, with Fox only rarely communicating with authorities or the curatorial staff. Nonetheless, there was opportunity for interference, and Fox occasionally suggested to Duncombe and others new possibilities for arrangement, or more often, new displays or new series⁶². He also provided a second edition of the catalogue, essentially identical to the earlier one, toward the end of 1877, at the time his military career was winding down⁶³.

It is apparent, therefore, that he had not lost interest in his collection and that he still considered it an important adjunct to his other efforts, particularly his efforts as an archaeologist. Moreover, he seems to have never stopped treating it as a private collection—one temporarily on loan to South Kensington, but still essentially his own.

⁵⁹ Fox, 'Mount Caburn Camp', p. 460. Also, William Greenwell, Letter to George Rolleston, 6 Oct 1879, AM, RP. Thompson, *General Pitt-Rivers*, p. 53.

⁶⁰ His work is described in 'On Excavations in the Earthwork called Dane's Pike, at Flamborough, in October, 1879; and of the Earthworks at the Yorkshire Wolds', *JAI*, 11 (1882), 455-70; also *RBAAS* (1881), 690.

⁶¹ Thompson, *General Pitt-Rivers*, p. 57.

⁶² SSW, PRP, P116. Norman MacLeod, Letters to Pitt-Rivers, 27 May 1874, 5 Jun 1874, 16 Feb 1875, SSW, PRP, P117-119. G.F. Duncombe, Letter to Pitt-Rivers, 4 Sep 1874, SSW, PRP, P118. Occasional borrowings on additions to the collection after 1875 are recorded in the 'Day Book' at Bethnal Green.

⁶³ Grey, *Index*, xxxix.

The best indication of Fox's attitude toward the custody of his collection lay in his approach to acquisitions. New materials were periodically added to the collection by Fox; Duncombe was merely expected to set them up. The additions are extremely well documented, the museum staff having carefully recorded each item as it was transferred. Unfortunately, the earlier 'Day' or 'Van' Book at Bethnal Green has been lost⁶⁴. The record at Bethnal Green, therefore, begins only in the latter part of 1875. The South Kensington receipts, however, date to the first of January 1874, when the collection was initially deposited in Bethnal Green, and extend to the end of the summer of 1879. In each case the form consisted of a description of the deposited item or items, the catalogue numbers and any particulars concerning origins or provenance. Each receipt was signed either by Norman MacLeod, the Administrative Secretary for the Science and Art Department or E. Cunliffe Owen, Director of the South Kensington Museum, and was then countersigned by H. Lloyd and later W.G. Groser, the Museum's storekeepers⁶⁵. As a result, they provide a remarkably accurate record of the collection as it appeared during those years, and as it appeared at the time Fox first presented it to Oxford.

The first major transfer after the exhibit was opened during the summer of 1874 had been a mixed number of West African and Japanese materials transferred on 24 July 1874; other similar materials, sometimes linked thematically, other times organized according to their place of origin, arrived nearly every other month for the duration of the loan period. Whether all of the items were recent additions, or simply materials that Fox had previously not transferred, is less clear, although at least in some cases—judging by the large number of thematic groupings—they must have been part of his earlier collection. There is, nonetheless, no evident order to the transfers; such items as birch-bark canoes were as apt to follow examples of African ornament as models of prehistoric sites. Many are recorded as 'Brought in by hand by General Lane Fox'; others were evidently delivered by those working for him, such as his secretary or a clerk named B.M. Wright⁶⁶. Otherwise, with the exception of the incomplete 'Day Books' at Bethnal Green, no record remains of the procedures involved.

In late October 1878, the receipts for his collection no longer list Bethnal Green, suggesting that the transfer to the main museum building at South Kensington had already begun. The existing day books would appear to confirm such an assumption⁶⁷. For Fox, it was obviously his first step toward a more permanent solution to the management of his collection, and it is clear that he must have pressed for the change, despite the fact that Bethnal Green was obviously to lose what Fox himself saw as a valuable adjunct to the community's educational life. South Kensington, however, offered an even better opportunity. Expanded considerably during the late 1860s and early seventies through the addition of a lecture theatre, refreshment room (one of William Morris's first decorating jobs) and the Square Court, the South Kensington

⁶⁴ SSW, PRP, P116 [*Note that the positioning of this endnote was missing in the original*]

⁶⁵ SSW, PRP, P116; List of staff of the Science and Art Department in South Kensington Museum, Catalogue of the Collection of Munitions of War.

⁶⁶ SSW, PRP, P116.

⁶⁷ The first large scale transfers began on 18 Oct 1878. 'Day Books', Bethnal Green Museum, I.

Museum was indeed the ideal location for a museum of Fox's type⁶⁸. While Fox himself resented the so-called 'aesthetic' flavour of the institution, he was equally willing to reconsider his own assessment, in view of his eventual ambitions. South Kensington was simply the most logical move for him to make.

The details of the transfer can be reconstructed with relative accuracy. Fox and his family's own move to Sussex Place in the autumn of 1878 coincided roughly with the reinstallation of his collection, and it was probable that he was on hand to supervise at least the beginning of the transfer⁶⁹. The museum assigned Richard Thompson, the Assistant Director and hence a member of its curatorial staff, to undertake the actual responsibility for arrangement⁷⁰. Fox was evidently satisfied with the Commissions' choice, and had left for France for his four-month recording expedition before the job was completed. The collection was exhibited in two of the larger rooms of the new west gallery, following, it appears, roughly the same scheme as that at Bethnal Green⁷¹. The fact that the 1877 catalogue was still intended to serve as a guide helps bear such a supposition out. On 21 December, Thompson finally wrote to Fox: 'Your collection was opened for public inspection Thursday last—at South Kensington, and looks well in its new home'⁷². From that date, until over five years later, it would remain a standard feature of the South Kensington Museum's collection.

In the meantime, Fox continued to add to the collection whenever possible. Toward the end of September, or even before leaving for his trip to France, he obtained the collection of Andamese implements, belonging to E.H. Man. One of the largest collections of its type, Man's collection numbered over 400 objects, ranging from harpoons and arms to bamboo water vessels, woven mats, pottery, fish hooks and clothing. The collection had been discussed at length at a number of meetings of the Anthropological Institute, and, again, Fox had stressed the important role material culture could play in reconstructing the histories of the remote peoples represented in Man's collection. As he explained at the time: 'In so far as my examination of this valuable collection enables me to form an opinion, there is nothing in the implements

⁶⁸ The museum is described in Thornbury, v, 112-14; 'The Museum Buildings of South Kensington', The Art Journal, 51 (1889), 340-43. Richards Industrial Art and the Museum; Hudson, pp. 44-46, and various exhibition catalogues. See, for example, South Kensington Museum: Catalogue of the Collection Illustrating Construction and Building Materials, ed. by Henry Sandham, 3rd. ed. (London: for the Science and Art Department, HMSO, 1862); Textile Fabrics; A Descriptive Catalogue, comp. by Daniel Roch for the Science and Art Department by Chapman and Hall, 1870; Catalogue of the Loan Exhibition of Ancient and Modern Jewelry and Personal Ornaments (London: For the Science and Art Department by HMSO, 1872). See also, 'The South Kensington Museum: A French Critic's Opinion', The Art Journal, NS (1897), 146.

⁶⁹ SSW, PRP, P116. On Pitt-Rivers reminiscences of the move: Pitt-Rivers, Letter to Henry Balfour, 28 Nov 1890, PRM, BP. 'When it [the collection] was removed from Bethnal Green to Kensington it took 3 months to do it'.

⁷⁰ Thompson, Letter to Fox, 21 Dec 1878, SSW, PRP, p. 121. List of Staff of Science and Art Department.

⁷¹ For a description, see South Kensington Museum, A Guide to the South Kensington Museum (London: For Science and Art Department by Spottiswoode, HMSO, 1883), p. 63. Three strips of paper designating different series among the Pitt-River Papers appear to refer to the South Kensington display, SSW, PRP, P113.

⁷² R.A. Thompson, Letter to Fox, 21 Dec 1878, SSW, PRP, P121.

of the Andamanese which would lead us to differ from the conclusions arrived at on the grounds of physical constitution and language⁷³. To emphasize his point, Man's collection was placed on display at South Kensington soon after its acquisition and several copies of Man's own monograph The Arts of the Andamanese and Nicobarese, were set out for sale for visitors along with Fox's own catalogue⁷⁴. Fox, apparently, was responsible for the arrangements.

During his stay in France during the winter of 1878-79, Fox's collecting efforts continued unchecked. On 30 December 1879, for example, a parcel — 'not opened' — from H. Paul Recappe, a Paris dealer, was received by Thompson. Other materials ranging from Bulgarian necklaces (familiar to Fox since his own travels there) to peasant implements from Brittany, the latter obviously obtained during his tour, were also sent to South Kensington for later inclusion and display there⁷⁵.

Among the most interesting acquisitions of that period was a collection of 300 photographs 'of natives of upper and lower Brittany and Normandy', some of which, apparently, were taken by Fox himself. Obviously, a response to Fox's involvement, together with Rolleston, John Beddoe and Francis Galton, in the British Association's Anthropometric Committee formed four years before⁷⁶, Fox's collection was intended to form the nucleus of something far more detailed and complete. Other photographic material, the latter acquired mostly through dealers or professional photographers, continued to filter in in subsequent months, thus expanding the physical anthropological component of his own collection⁷⁷.

Prehistoric materials also continued to play a major part in the collection. Again, a number of objects were collected in France and sent on immediately. Others were purchased in Denmark the following summer when he and Rolleston visited there⁷⁸. Finally, a number were obtained through his own excavations, both in France and in Denmark. Indeed, by the late seventies such a procedure had become a standard practice, and, with the exception of his earlier Cissbury materials, some of which were presented to the British Museum, nearly all the prehistoric and later remains excavated by Fox were transferred immediately to the collection⁷⁹. Always, excavated

⁷³ Fox, 'Observations on Mr. Man's collection of Andamese and Nicobarese Objects', JAI, 7 (1878), 450. Also, SSW, PRP, P46a-49.

⁷⁴ E.H. Man, 'The Arts of the Andamese and Nicobarese' (London: Printed Privately, n.d.). See also Man, The Nicobar Islands and Their People (Guildford: RAI and Billings and Sons, n.d.); 'On the Andamanese and Nicobarese Objects presented to Major-General Pitt-Rivers', JAI, 11 (1882), 268-71. A Catalogue of Man's Collection is at the Pitt-Rivers Museum (Delivery Books, Vols III and VII); 'On the Aboriginal Inhabitants of the Andaman Islands', JAI, 12 (1883), 69-116.

⁷⁵ SSW, PRP, P116.

⁷⁶ RBAAS (1875), liv-lv. Rolleston and Fox obviously collaborated on the effort, and a similar collection of photographs is still among the Rolleston Papers at the Ashmolean Museum.

⁷⁷ SSW, PRP, P116.

⁷⁸ See above, pp. 415-26. SSW, PRP, P116, P123.

⁷⁹ Catalogue of the Christy Collection of Prehistoric Antiquities and Ethnography (London: By Order of the Trustees of the British Museum); British Museum, Books of Presents 1867, f. 455. My appreciation to Malcolm McLeod, Keeper of the Museum of Mankind and Jill Swart, Archivist with the RAI, for their assistance. A.W. Franks 'Account of the Acquisitions

materials continued to be supplemented by purchases from antiquarian dealers, despite Fox's claim to the contrary, and entries attributing collections to dealers such as Rollin and Feuudent, located at the time near the British Museum or of Procher and Co., Oxford Street continued to appear on the South Kensington list⁸⁰.

Actual authority for the collection, in the meantime, remained curiously undefined. Technically, it was still Fox's property and only temporarily on loan to South Kensington. On the other hand, the collection was, in an important sense, already in the public domain, subject to interpretation and revision by the South Kensington staff and, therefore, effectively out of Fox's hands. Nonetheless, Fox continued to exert an influence upon the collection, if only through his periodic additions of new materials. He also continued to advise Thompson and others, suggesting new ideas for different series or for changes in display. The situation obviously presented ample opportunity for resentment on both sides, although nothing survives of either Fox's or Thompson's exchanges in that regard. Later complaints by Fox, however, certainly suggest that disagreements were not unknown—and, in fact, were fairly typical⁸¹.

Fox's occasional arguments with those in charge of his collection at South Kensington merely served to underline a far more fundamental concern: whether Fox was planning to make his collection a truly public institution by relinquishing his ties with it or whether he would keep it for himself. It was obvious that it was not an easy decision, and, in fact, it was one that Fox had been avoiding for a number of years. Still, something had to be done soon, and it was fairly clear that the South Kensington authorities would no longer tolerate his attempts to retain control over the details of arrangement or add to or subtract from his collection as it pleased him. The upshot was, as the Council on Education informed him in late 1879, that he was going to have to give the Museum complete control if he was planning to continue to leave the collection on display there⁸². In the light of his changing interests and the fact that he obviously cared less about the day-to-day management of the collection than before, his decision would appear to have been preordained.

Another factor which must be taken into account at the time was Fox's continuing commitment to the idea of a major national anthropological museum, a museum to serve not only as a vehicle of public education—the principal interest of the South Kensington Museum—but also as a centre of anthropological studies. He had first formally broached the topic as early as 1872, in his lecture at the British Association meeting at Brighton, but it is apparent that his ambitions extended back to an even earlier period, probably to the mid-1860s when debate on the importance of the national ethnographical collection reached a high point⁸³. South Kensington, with its emphasis on craftsmanship or artistic design, was in many ways ill-suited to serve as the basis of such an effort, as Fox himself realized, but there was no other institution which offered such opportunities for educational innovation⁸⁴. The British Museum

made in the department of British Antiquities in the British Museum during the year 1867', pp. 128-34.

⁸⁰ SSW, PRP, P116.

⁸¹ Pitt-Rivers, Letter to A.W. Franks Jul 1880, PRM, BP.

⁸² G.F. Duncombe, Letter to Pitt-Rivers 15 Sep 1879, SSW, PRP, P123.

⁸³ Fox, 'Report, Brighton, 1872', pp. 172-74.

⁸⁴ Pitt-Rivers, Letter to A.W. Franks, 1 Jul 1880, PRP, BP. See Read, 'Museums in the Present and Future', p. 172. Kenyon, p. 72.

only rarely perpetuated the schemes of benefactors, tending rather simply to absorb new collections into the total scheme with little regard to particular interests or methods of display. Christy's collection had been largely stripped of its original emphasis and, by that time, had been rearranged upon more or less geographical lines; within a few more years it would be absorbed into the general ethnographical collection altogether⁸⁵. Greenwell's collection of prehistoric implements, donated just in 1879, was being treated in a similar way, with no thought to its integrity or inner consistency⁸⁶. There was little doubt, therefore, that if Fox's collection were to go to Bloomsbury, it too would lose much of what he saw as its principal value, both from an educational and a scholarly point of view. At South Kensington, with its tradition of accepting whole collections and its own comparative emphasis, at least the chances for independence must have seemed more open.

But arrangement and organization were not the only points of concern from Fox's point of view. Another problem with the British Museum was the matter of staffing. At the time, British and Medieval Antiquities and Ethnography, as the department was known, was still in the hands of A.W. Franks, a man with whom Fox had maintained close ties since at least the early sixties when both were first active in ethnographic and archaeological circles. Other staff members, such as Charles Newton, were marginally involved with either the British or ethnographical collections, but most of the burden fell on Franks himself. In 1874, Franks had attempted to at least alleviate some of his problem by the appointment of Charles Hercules Read (1857-1929), a young technician previously attached to the South Kensington Museum, and later one of the leading figures of the British anthropological community. Read's main, and for several years sole, duty was to help with the Christy collection, then still located at Victoria Street. Only sixteen at the time, he became the principal custodian there, relabelling series and rearranging as well as he could within the cramped quarters Christy's old apartment offered. His work had the desirable effect of allowing Franks to get on with his own project—interestingly, of a decreasingly ethnographical kind—and with Read's appointment as a full-time assistant in 1880, Franks relinquished control altogether⁸⁷.

There was little in the British Museum's administrative arrangement which could have attracted Fox, and it is clear that he was reluctant to entrust his collection either to Read alone or to a museum which, in his terms, devoted so little time and effort to ethnographical or prehistoric studies in general. There was little hope, either, of improvement. James Edge-Partington, later known for his work on the artefacts of the South Pacific, did not join the staff until late in the year 1881, and then only as a supernumerary⁸⁸. The next major figure to join the staff, O.M. Dalton (1866-1945),

⁸⁵ A.W. Franks, *Catalogue of the Christy Collection*, 1870. Contrast with catalogue of 1872.

⁸⁶ 'Memoir, Greenwell'. See also Letter, Franks to Fox, Good Friday, 1879, BL, Percival Papers.

⁸⁷ Henry Balfour, 'Charles Hercules Read', Obituary Notice, *Man*, 29 (1929), 61-62, No. 48; Miller, pp. 316-17. Among Read's articles were 'Stone Spinning Tops from Torres Straits, New Guinea', *JAI*, 17 (1888), 85-90, and 'An Account of a Collection of Ethnographical Specimens formed during Vancouver's Voyage to the Pacific, 1790-95'. He was later President of both the Anthropological Institute and the Society of Antiquaries.

⁸⁸ O.M. Dalton, 'James Edge Partington', Obituary Notice, *Man*, 31 (1931) No. 136. His writings included 'The Ethnography of Matty Island', *JAI*, 25 (1896), 288-95; *An Album of*

was not appointed until 1895⁸⁹. From Fox's point of view, the prospects were clearly not favourable.

But still, as suggested, some provision was going to have to be made soon. Already, the collection was too large for Fox to simply resume control of, a point which put Fox in a somewhat awkward bargaining position. Then, too, there was the equally pressing question of a centre for anthropological studies, something which was becoming increasingly important to Fox at the time. Finally, there was the continuing issue of international competition. Already, major state collections had been formed in Holland, France, Denmark and Germany. Furthermore, many of those, including that of Leipzig's Museum für Völkerkunde, itself based on Gustav Klemm's well-known archaeological and ethnographical collection, were organized along lines directly comparable to that of Fox's⁹⁰. More recently, A.B. Meyer of the Dresden Anthropological Museum had written to Fox, complimenting his work, implying at the same time that the Dresden scheme was based, at least in part, on that offered by Fox through his exhibit at South Kensington⁹¹. That Fox's collection was failing to gain the same recognition at home was obviously something of a sore point with him.

While the place of his collection in an international context was obviously important to Fox, the most significant development, in terms of ethnological museums, was not that represented by the well-known German collections, but recent advances made in America, a nation which up to that period had shown remarkably little interest in the establishment of a national collection. In America's case, it was the Smithsonian Institution in Washington which set the trend of development. First founded in 1857, in the words of Smithson's bequest, 'for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men', the Institution's view of itself as a storehouse of materials had suddenly taken on more ambitious proportions during the late 1870s, in large part as a result of the Centennial Exhibition in Philadelphia⁹². Through the efforts of Spencer F. Baird (1823-1897), then the Institution's Assistant Secretary, the Smithsonian had managed

the Weapons, Tools, Ornaments of the Natives of the Pacific Islands (Manchester: Printed Privately, 1898).

⁸⁹ H.J. Braunholtz 'O.M.D. Dalton', *Obituary Notice*, Man, 46 (1946), 43-44, No. 37; George Hill 'Ormande Maddock Dalton', Proc. of the Brit. Acad., 31 (1945), 357-73.

⁹⁰ See above, p.264. On the foundation of the Leipzig Museum see Fritz Kraus, 'Ethnologische Studien Das Museum für Völkerkunde zu Leipzig', Ethnologische Studien, 1 (1931), 106-33. On other German museums of the period, see in particular Bahnson, pp. 1-16. Significantly, Adolf Bastian's Die Vorgeschichte der Ethnologie (Berlin: Ferd. Dummlers), essentially a description of the Berlin Museum, also appeared in 1881, at around the time of Fox's own offer.

⁹¹ Meyer, Letter to Fox, SSW, PRP. Corres. Dresden's own collection is outlined in the lavish series of publications edited by Meyer and his assistant, Willy Foy, entitled Königliches Ethnographisches Museum zu Dresden, 12 vols. (Leipzig: A Naumann Schroeder, 1883-99).

⁹² Frank Henry Norton, Illustrated Historical Register of the Centennial Exhibition, Philadelphia, 1876 (New York: The Museum News, 1879). G. Brown Goode, 'The Genesis of the National Museum', Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. Report of the U.S. National Museum, year ending June 30, 1891, pp. 273-380; Alice Dinsmoor 'Evolution of Museums in England and America', The Craftsman, 11 (1907), 695-705; Webster B. True, The First Hundred Years of the Smithsonian Institution 1846-1946 (Washington, D.C.: The Lord Baltimore Press, 1946); Walter Karp, The Smithsonian Institution (Washington, D. C.: The Smithsonian Institution, 1965); Morrow MacCloshen, Our National Attic (New York: Richard Rosen Press 1968).

to acquire nearly all of the ethnographical and prehistoric exhibitions on display at the Exhibition and, in turn, had established those as a core of the new National Museum, itself a department of the Smithsonian. A new building to house the collection was begun in 1879, and finished two years later. The important point of the Smithsonian's effort, however, was not the size of its collections—in fact far smaller than those either of the British Museum or its German and French counterparts—but the Institution's newly defined programme for them. The new museum, as a pamphlet published in 1879 pointed out, was to have a threefold function. Firstly, it was to be a 'museum of record, in which are preserved the material foundations of an enormous amount of scientific knowledge'. Secondly, it was to be a 'museum of research', with, as the pamphlet emphasized, a staff to fulfill that requirement. Finally, it was to be 'an educational museum of the broadest type', including in its programme not only illustrative displays and descriptive labels, but popular publications and information sheets as well. It was an ambitious effort and one obviously admired by Fox, as he admitted to Franks⁹³.

Another feature of America's new national museum which was of interest to Fox was its provision for specialist access to the collections and the formation of an independent research institution, known as the Bureau of American Ethnology. The brainchild of John Wesley Powell (1834-1902), William Holmes (1846-1933), Otis Mason (1838-1908) and James Owen Dorsey (1848-1895), as well as other pioneering American ethnologists, the Bureau had been founded in 1879, as a direct offshoot of the Smithsonian's collections. Actual responsibility for its formation had rested with Powell, a veteran of the U. S. Geological Survey and a long-time collector of North American Indian artefacts⁹⁴. An index to the Smithsonian's anthropological publications (the first of which could be said to have dated back to the Smithsonian's first 'Contributions to Knowledge', Squire and Davis's American Mound Monuments of the Mississippi Valley of 1848) was provided in 1879⁹⁵. By the time the National museum officially opened in 1881, organized research was being undertaken in the fields of archaeology, language, religious practices and technologies of native peoples. Lewis Henry Morgan's well-known questionnaire on kinship terms, published by the Institution as Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family was accepted as a project beginning in 1866⁹⁶. Material studies had followed a similar course. Distribution maps were prepared, archaeological specimens and ethnographical pieces were displayed and labelled along the modern lines and, for the first time anywhere, systematic comparisons were made with an ultimate view of

⁹³ Pitt-Rivers, Letter to A.W. Franks, 1 Jul 1880, PRM, BP. Smithsonian Institution, Plan of Organization and Regulations, Circular 1 (Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office 1879); rpt. in 'Report upon the Condition and Progress of the U.S. National Museum' in the Annual Report of the Smithsonian Institution (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1897).

⁹⁴ W.J. McGee, 'The Bureau of American Ethnology', in Goode, Smithsonian Institution; and, more thoroughly, Neil M. Judd, The Bureau of American Ethnology: A Partial History (Norman, Okla. Univ. Okla. Press, 1967).

⁹⁵ Annual Report of the Smithsonian Institution (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1879). Also J.W. Powell, First Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology (Washington: U.S. Government Printing office, 1881).

⁹⁶ Lewis Henry Morgan, Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family (Washington, D.C: Smithsonian Institution, 1871). See Carl Resek, Lewis Henry Morgan: American Scholar (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1960).

reconstructing the cultural history of the continent. The whale effect was something obviously very close to Fox's own aims, and it must have been disappointing for him to see Britain's own efforts flag by comparison. His final decision to part with his collection and establish something along more permanent lines was clearly made in the light of such a contrast.

4. Inheritance of Rushmore

While events and developments elsewhere were obviously having their impact on Fox's ideas, there were a number of personal reasons affecting his decision to give up his collection as well. Most important was a change of status. In the early part of 1880 Fox was suddenly, and apparently unexpectedly, the beneficiary of a major inheritance, the property belonging to his cousin Horace, the Sixth Lord Rivers. The reasons for his good fortune are complex, but in the end it rested on a single phrase in the will of his great uncle George, the Second Baron Rivers (1751-1828): 'It being my will and intention that my own estates and the estates of the late Lord Bingley shall never rest in or belong to the same person so long as there shall be two sons of my said sister Marcia Fox or any issue male of such two sons in esse at the time...' ⁹⁷. Fox, of course, was one of the 'issue' of the two sons and hence was entitled to the estate. Still, it was an extraordinary stroke of luck. Marcia's older sister Louisa had produced a son, and then a grandson who, in turn, had been the father of twelve children of his own. None of the male heirs survived, however, and indeed poor health seems to have run in the family. Lord Stanley, visiting Lord Rivers during the late 1850s, commented that he 'saw the eldest son carried out by a servant and put into a carriage he cannot walk at all and [as he predicted correctly] is not likely to live' ⁹⁸. The second son fared little better and died leaving no sons of his own. Finally, Horace, the last son, had no children at all ⁹⁹. Fox could not have helped but have been aware of the family's unfortunate circumstances, but whether he was fully cognizant of the contents of his great uncle's will at the same time remains less certain. His hint long before that he would have relished a chance to excavate on the estate suggests that the thought may have entered his mind, but only in the most general way ¹⁰⁰.

Fox's inheritance would alter his way of life, and that of his family, almost entirely. The first step was the addition of a new surname, as required by the terms of his great uncle's will. On 4 June 1880, the London Gazette published the announcement of Fox's Royal License to 'take and use the surname Pitt-Rivers in addition to and after that of Fox and bear the arms of Pitt quartering in the first quarter with those of Fox...' ¹⁰¹. Subsequently, his children took on the name Fox Pitt, or in the case of his children and later grandchildren Fox Pitt-Rivers (or Fox-Pitt-Rivers), a name which has been carried down to his successors today.

But if the change of name was important, the change of fortune was even more so. In all, the inheritance carried with it a control of a number of properties, including a vast

⁹⁷ Will of George, 2nd Lord Rivers, DCRO, D396/97.

⁹⁸ Lord Edward, Letter to Lady Henrietta Maria Stanley, 24 Nov 1858, Mitford, Stanleys, pp. 191-92.

⁹⁹ Burke's Peerage. The sequence is discussed in detail in Gray, Index.

¹⁰⁰ See above, pp. 118-24.

¹⁰¹ London Gazette, 4 Jun 1880.

estate totalling nearly 30,000 acres, known as Cranborne Chase, in the rich agricultural land of Dorset and Wiltshire and in fact straddling both counties. The total income from his properties exceeded £20,000, and prior to the agricultural depression of the seventies had actually topped £30,000¹⁰². The Stanleys, in contrast, realized a mere £10,000 per annum. It also meant a change of town house, with Fox exchanging his relatively modest house at Penrhyn Gardens for an impressive mansion in what might be termed a Franco-Italo style, located at No. 4 Grosvenor Gardens, just behind Buckingham Palace. As Thompson has suggested, nothing better illustrates Fox's overall change in fortune than this move from Earls Court to Belgravia¹⁰³.

Fox's family by that period was nearly grown. His eldest son, Alexander Edward, had finished his education and was dabbling in an artistic career. The second son, St. George, had just completed his studies at King's College, London, and was about to begin his short-lived political life; following in the Stanley tradition he was very much in the advanced 'liberal' mould, a factor which eventually led to his father's partial disinheritance. Pitt Rivers' third son, William, was less of a disappointment, and after Charterhouse, he had taken a commission in the Grenadier Guards. In 1879, he was just back from the Zulu Wars, bringing with him, it would appear, a number of souvenirs for his father's collection¹⁰⁴. The other sons were still in school, with the exception of the youngest, Arthur Algernon, who was already showing signs of the tuberculosis to which he would succumb in a few years¹⁰⁵.

His daughters were also reaching maturity. Ursula, the eldest, was married in January 1880, to the son of Major General William Henry Scott, whose wife was a Stanley cousin. The younger sisters, Agnes and Alice had both 'come out' and were both also soon to be married; Agnes to a local Baronet named Sir William [sic, actually Walter] John Grove, Alice to her father's long-time friend, Sir John Lubbock¹⁰⁶. The whole arrangement obviously had, from Pitt Rivers' point of view, an air of settled contentment.

Alice, in the meantime, had finally come into her own. Up to now she had contented herself with the relatively stringent financial conditions of a professional soldier's wife. Although by contemporary standards, the couple's income was relatively high, particularly after the inheritance of his mother's estate in 1874, the family, nonetheless, had been restricted in its finances from the very first. With the inheritance, circumstances changed profoundly, and for several years Alice was

¹⁰² John Bateman, The Great Landowners of Great Britain and Ireland. A List of all Owners of Three Thousand Acres and Upwards, Worth £3000 a Year, in England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales (London: Harrison and Sons, 1878), p. 351. Also see Bateman's earlier The Acreocracy of England. A List of all Owners of Three Thousand Acres and Upwards, with their possessions and incomes (London: B.M. Pickering, 1876). The Estate records are found at the Dorset County Record Office, DCRO.

¹⁰³ Thompson, General Pitt-Rivers, Chapter VII on his inheritance.

¹⁰⁴ SSW, PRP, P116.

¹⁰⁵ Information on his children derived primarily from Burke's Landed Gentry; Gray, Index, pp. xxxv-xxxvi; and Thompson, General Pitt-Rivers, pp. 89-90. See also SSW, PRP, Various Corres.

¹⁰⁶ Hutchinson, Lubbock, I, 205. BL LP, 4961, f. 59. Letter, Pitt-Rivers to Lubbock, 1 Jun 1884.

involved in redecorating Rushmore, the family seat, and their new London home in a combination of the latest in 'artistic' fashions and a more traditional 'Italianate'¹⁰⁷. For the first time, too, both Pitt Rivers and his wife managed to work together, Pitt Rivers supervising the exterior work; Alice, the interior refurnishing. As a result a general peace prevailed, and despite the occasional bouts of temper, both settled into their new and elevated world¹⁰⁸.

In terms of his professional life, Fox's new circumstances had an impact upon the way in which he perceived his function in the scientific community, particularly the anthropological community with which he was most closely connected. For one, it provided him with a new sense of identity, one emphasized by his change of name. Also, as an important landowner, he was in a better position to work on behalf of Lubbock's still stagnating Ancient Monuments Bill; the possibility of an inspectorship must also have seemed within his grasp. Finally, he was in a better position to finance various enterprises of his own, and, with his new estate at Cranborne Chase, he was in a particularly good position to carry out his work at close hand.

His wealth was of most immediate interest for his archaeological work. For the first time, he did not have to seek out colleagues or occasional paid labourers for his excavations; he now had 30, and sometimes more, full-time labourers at hand. Most of those were agricultural workers on his estate, and, as a result, most of the actual field work began only in the autumn when the harvest was through. They were paid usually 14 shillings a week plus an allowance for beer, or slightly above the average agricultural wage¹⁰⁹. The arrangement, therefore, worked out well for both. In addition to field work, his estate workers were employed making models either of wood or plaster, cleaning and restoring excavated materials and generally carrying out the more tiresome aspects of the work. At the same time, he employed a full-time assistant to supervise field operations, and to record the results when he was not on hand. Also, he had the means by which to pay for the costly illustrated publications required to record the work¹¹⁰. It is little wonder, therefore, that his interests should have turned increasingly toward excavation, even if, as we have seen, his reorientation in many aspects preceded his change of fortune.

Another aspect of Pitt Rivers' wealth concerned his collection. For the first time he had the means to purchase in an unrestricted way, and he soon added a number of pieces to the collection, mostly through dealers. He also now had a more ambitious view of its possibilities. Only a few weeks after receiving notice of his inheritance, he let Richard Thompson at South Kensington know that he would 'extend much more rapidly than hitherto the Ethnographical collection now exhibited at South Kensington'. He was also anxious, as he explained, to provide for a more permanent

¹⁰⁷ SSW, PRP, B402-60. The many purchases of the period are well documented.

¹⁰⁸ I am indebted to Michael Pitt-Rivers for his accounts of life and decoration at Rushmore. Architectural work, carried out by William Morris's partner, Philip Webb, is described in W.R. Lethaby, Philip Webb and His Work (London: Oxford Univ. Press at Humphrey Milford, 1935), pp. 105 and 111.

¹⁰⁹ DCRO, D396/98. On contemporary payscales, see George C. Brodrick, English Land and English Landlords. An Enquiry into the Origin and Character of the English Land System, with Proposals for its Reform, (London: For the Cobden Club by Cassell, Petter, Galpin, 1881), pp. 290-91.

¹¹⁰ Gray, Index.

kind of foundation. Reflective of his change of status, he stated conditions with greater authority as well: 'I shall want nearly double the space at once, and if my intentions are fulfilled, more room will be required immediately'¹¹¹. He also offered to pay the costs of an officer or curator assigned to supervise the installation of new materials and explain the series to visitors, that is if the Council on Education (the body overseeing the educational work at the South Kensington Museum) conceded to his other demands. However oddly stated, it was the first formal indication that Pitt-Rivers was actually contemplating a gift either to the Museum or to the government, whichever was willing to accept the responsibility.

As a result of his proposal, steps were taken almost at once. The first move rested with the Lords of the Committee of the Council on Education. The Council, in turn, appointed a special committee to formally consider the offer. Richard Thompson and Norman MacLeod of the Museum's Science and Art Department were no doubt asked for their own recommendations¹¹². Their first choice was John Lubbock, and shortly afterward Lubbock was appointed chairman. Other members included J.F.D. Donnelly, Huxley and Philip Cunliffe Owen, the latter of whom Fox had worked with on provisions for the collection when it was still at Bethnal Green. The last two members were Edward Poynter (1836-1919), the well-known art critic and instructor at South Kensington, and George Rolleston, Pitt Rivers' long-time friend. John Fergusson, the architect and critic, had been proposed by MacLeod, but for some reason was dropped in favour of Franks¹¹³. The decision, however, appears to have been a strategic one and may have been influenced by Pitt Rivers' own wishes.

Nothing remains of any possible exchange on Pitt Rivers' part with Lubbock or Rolleston, but a letter to Franks of 27 June 1880, gives an indication of the course of the proceedings¹¹⁴. It was obviously not their first communication over the matter and, indeed, there is much to suggest that Pitt Rivers had spoken at great length to Franks prior to his offer. Moreover, there was a hint that Franks was already disappointed that Pitt Rivers' choice had not fallen on the British Museum, and he explained that he was prepared to oppose the establishment of a second collection at South Kensington, expressly on the grounds that it would compete with Bloomsbury. Pitt Rivers was evidently intent to prove him wrong. His decision, he explained, had been largely one of convenience. Furthermore, his own collection with its emphasis on 'continuity', addressed a more general educational purpose.

So far from its being antagonistic to the B.M. it will be a most useful adjunct. The very wealth of the nation's collections precludes the possibility of their being arranged in subordination to educational purposes. As a means of education to the public the B.M. is useless. I shall supply that

¹¹¹ Fox, Letter to Richard Thompson, South Kensington Museum, 14 Apr 1880, SSW, PRP, P136. Fox had apparently approached Thompson informally shortly before, as the letter indicates.

¹¹² Norman MacLeod, Letter to Pitt-Rivers, 25 May 1880, SSW, PRP, P127.

¹¹³ Report to the Committee appointed by the Lords of the Committee of Council on Education on the offer made by General Pitt-Rivers with regard to his Collection', Return to an Order of the Honorable The House of Commons, 27 Jun 1881; SSW, PRP, P136.

¹¹⁴ Pitt-Rivers, Letter to A.W. Franks, 27 Jun 1880, PRM, BP.

want. If you could give me the space I require with a life interest in the management of it I should be very glad but you cannot, and South Kensington can.

His terms, he emphasized, were final ones, and, as he implied, from his present position, he could well afford to hold to them:

If I cannot get more space at South Kensington to enable me to develop my museum on the plan I had developed hitherto the course I shall take will be this. I shall build a museum in or close to London about the size of the room I have at present. Keep the bulk of the collection in trays & drawers & exhibit only a few things in cases but I shall not have space available to continue the series and I shall make the museum valuable in other ways. I shall become a collector of ethnographical gems and when I die, I shall have received no encouragement to leave anything to the nation. If the nation will not accept my offer now on account of a [illeg.] rivalry between the two departments I shall take good care it never gets anything from me. Science is cosmopolitan and I had rather leave everything to the United States. Meanwhile I am waiting for the decision of the authorities ... I hope you will change your mind and support my plans. It is clearly the best thing you can do under the circumstances¹¹⁵.

Within a few days, the beginnings of a compromise had begun to take shape. The main responsibility for its details rested with Franks, who informed Pitt Rivers of the proposal privately. The main point of the proposed agreement was that the collection would remain at South Kensington but that it should be under the control of Franks' department. With Franks now officially on the committee, the chances of acceptance of the scheme seemed favourable as well. Writing to Franks at the beginning of July, Pitt Rivers explained:

I am very glad you are going to be on the committee. There are one or two other points I might as well mention. I see there is a suggestion that my museum, remaining at South Kensington, should be attached to the British Museum rather than the Science and Art department. Of course to me it is a matter of indifference what the department is called [as long as all of] the conditions remain the same. I should prefer the B.M. [in thinking that?] it should be associated with officers who have a thorough scientific knowledge of the subject whereas South Kensington is more aesthetic than scientific. I have experienced the inconvenience of this and have expressed it. On the other hand will the British Museum adapt itself to the peculiar conditions and accept the museum subject to my having the control of it during my lifetime. I consider this a sine qua non. I would not be possible to carry out my views in

¹¹⁵ Ibid.

any other way. My object is, more space with a view to increasing the collection, and as the accumulations will be made with a view to a special arrangement in so far as the arrangement of the objects is concerned must be in my hands. Moreover, the advantage I have over all Government Institutions is that, having one head, I can do as I please...I should not think of giving up that advantage¹¹⁶.

Pitt Rivers was, nonetheless, at least partially aware of the difficulties and admitted to them. He also realized that there were limits to what he could expect.

I should not propose in leaving my collection to the Nation at my death to make any special stipulations. If my system were accepted by men of science, it would be continued. If it were not, there would be no object in continuing it. Moreover, views become so much changed as knowledge accumulates that it would be mischievous to hamper the future with ideas of the present¹¹⁷.

Soon afterward, in response to a formal request by Thompson—and apparently a short note from Lubbock—an official statement of the requirements of the bequest was drafted, and on 21 July, the latter was presented to the committee. The conditions were as follows. First, no part of the collection was to be sold during Pitt Rivers' lifetime. However, during the same period, he would be free to add to it or subtract from it at will, providing the elements for new series or making suggestions for the rearrangement of other ones as he saw fit. The government, for its part, was to be required to provide gallery space, cabinets and screens and would accept the full responsibility for the safety and maintenance of the collection as well as any incidental costs such as labels, guide books and the like. In terms of its details, the conditions became more contradictory. Specimens were to become government property, but only after six months, and even then Pitt Rivers was to have the power to remove objects from the collections, if he found them 'useless for the purposes of the collection'. At the same time, Pitt Rivers' insisted that 'no object could be loaned from the collection without his permission', that repairs had to be undertaken at the government expense and that both insurance and what he described as 'police supervision' must also be paid for by the government. His proposed scientific profession had been 'reduced to a mere 'curator', whose duties, it would appear, were to be more custodial than curatorial. The latter, however, would be paid a salary, at least during Pitt Rivers' lifetime, and the British Museum or South Kensington were to be allowed to make the selection¹¹⁸.

It is a measure of Pitt Rivers' confidence in the importance of his collection and his offer that the terms should have been such unfavourable ones, from the government and Council on Education's standpoint. Understandably the Council found the

¹¹⁶ Pitt-Rivers, Letter to Franks, 1 Jul 1880, PRM, BP.

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

¹¹⁸ Pitt-Rivers, Letter to the Committee Appointed by the Lords of the Committee of Council on Education, 21 July 1880. In 'Report of the Committee appointed by the Lords of the Committee of Council on Education', SSW, PRP, P136.

demands unrealistic and were obviously skeptical from the first. The committee established to consider the offer, on the other hand, was enthusiastic and reported toward the end of the year that its members were 'unanimously of the opinion that the collection offered to the Government, under the conditions stated ... is of great value and interest'. Their only reservation was that the total number of specimens accepted should be limited to those required for the 'efficient illustration of the principles upon which it has been formed', suggesting at the same time the present space allotted to the collection, as a result, would probably be adequate for its future needs¹¹⁹. Rolleston, out of loyalty for his long-time friend, even differed on that point, suggesting that the collection be allowed to extend indefinitely and along the lines suggested by Pitt Rivers. The impression is that neither Rolleston nor the committee members could have recommended otherwise, given their long-time association with the donor. It was, in effect, a preordained decision.

The Council, in the meantime, was slow in forming their official response, and their decision was not made public until June of the following year. Their findings were reported by F.R. Sandford, the Council's Secretary:

I am directed by the Lords of the Committee of Council on Education to acquaint you that their Lordships have had under consideration the report of the Committee appointed to advise them in reference to the liberal proposal you have made in regard your Ethnological Collection now being exhibited in the Galleries belonging to the Commissioners of the Exhibition of 1851 on the western side of the Horticultural Gardens.

The report in question proves the value and interesting nature of the collection, and recommends that it should become the property of the nation.

Their Lordships while accepting the conclusions to which the Committee have arrived, are however compelled, for the following reasons, to decide that it is not possible for them to accept the collection for permanent exhibition in connection with the Department of Science and Art.

In the first place, the space which the collection at present occupies has to be relinquished by the Department, and there is no other space at their Lordships' disposal, or likely to be provided elsewhere, in which the collection could be placed.

It is however chiefly on other grounds than want of space that my Lords have felt it incumbent on them to decline custody of the collection. Ethnology is not now represented in the collections of the South Kensington Museum, and it is undesirable to commence a collection with special reference to this branch of science while there is in another national

¹¹⁹ 'Report of the Committee appointed by the Lords of the Committee of Council on Education'.

establishment, the British Museum, a large collection of a similar kind.

It has been represented to their Lordships that your collection is arranged in a different system than that adopted at the British Museum, and as showing the development of form and shape, it would constitute an appropriate part of a museum like that at South Kensington, which is intimately connected with education in General and Industrial Art. Admitting to some extent the force of this argument it nevertheless appears to my Lords that your collection, if the Trustees of the British Museum should be willing and able to accept it, would not in any way interfere with that already contained in that Museum, but, on the contrary would increase the interest of Ethnological specimens which it now possesses.

My Lords feel strongly the inexpediency of national museums competing against each other, and wish that, so far as possible, a distinct line should be drawn between the collection at South Kensington and those at the British Museum. Each should be made as perfect as possible, but should occupy different grounds. My Lords must add a few words as to the question of expense. Although you have liberally proposed to keep up the collection mainly at your own charge during your lifetime, the whole cost of the maintenance would eventually devolve on the department which accepts your offer. This might lead to heavy expenditure for a curator, attendants, further purchases, cases, &c., and the collection would require an amount of space not only large in itself, but out of proportion to that which they can ever hope to be able to set aside for other branches of science of more immediate practical and educational use. The expenditure would be exceptionally large at the South Kensington Museum, where there is at present no one connected with Ethnological Science on the establishment; and after you had relinquished the management it would be necessary to secure the services of a gentleman with special qualifications for the care of this valuable collection.

My Lords thoroughly appreciate the liberality and public spirit which have prompted you to make the offer, whilst they regret that they are unable to take advantage of it on behalf of the Department of Science and Art¹²⁰.

Fox was understandably taken aback by the Council's decision¹²¹, but it was hardly surprising that the Lords of the Committee should have responded as they did. First of

¹²⁰ F.R. Sandford, Letter to General Pitt-Rivers, 3 Jun 1881. Return to an Order of the Honourable The House of Commons, 27 Jun 1881. Two handwritten copies are among the Pitt-Rivers Papers, PR, P136d.

¹²¹ See Pitt-Rivers, 'Address, Bath 1888', pp. 826-27.

all, as they had explained, there was the matter of the expense involved, a public expense for what was still essentially a private collection. Then, too, there was the problem of competition with the British Museum. Since, of course, Pitt Rivers himself had described his own collection as an 'Ethnological' one it was difficult for them at that time to redefine it as one involving merely 'education in General and Industrial Art'. Even Pitt Rivers had stressed that South Kensington's interests were more 'aesthetic' than 'scientific', as he had explained in his letter to Franks. His attempt suddenly, to restate his own aims, for purposes of the gift, were simply unconvincing to everyone involved.

5. Pitt Rivers' Retreat to Rushmore

If Pitt Rivers was disappointed over the rejection of his offer, there was little time for him to dwell on it. Because of his inheritance and his new responsibilities there were numerous financial considerations, as well as legal matters, to tend to. There were also arrangements to be made for the management of his estates. Farm properties had to be maintained, new additions had to be made to his house and refurnishings had to be planned and negotiated. Although there was no village associated with Rushmore, as there might have been had it been a manorial seat, Pitt Rivers also still had to act the part of the local squire¹²². There were two livings for churchmen under his charge and those had to be filled and seen to¹²³. Also, there were forty agricultural laborers and their families for which he had responsibility. Overall, it was a demanding job, if taken seriously, as Pitt Rivers no doubt took it. As a result, he was finding himself increasingly preoccupied with the problems his inheritance brought with it. In short, Rushmore and the estate at Cranborne Chase were making demands upon him in their own right, and even if he had not been disappointed, both through his failure to be appointed to some scientific Or other honorary position or through the refusal of the South Kensington authorities to accept his collection, he was compelled to redirect his attentions there.

The history of the Cranborne Chase estate, to which Pitt Rivers was to devote most of his time and energy over the next twenty years, is a complex one. At one time it was part of the Honour of Gloucester, descending to King John through his marriage to Isabel, the daughter of William the Earl of Gloucester. It is probable that King John had visited the area several times on hunting expeditions. He also apparently built the core of a manor house at Cranborne to use as a lodge¹²⁴. The property belonging to Pitt Rivers, known as King John's House in nearby Tollard Royal, obliquely reflects that traditional association, but in fact dates from a later period¹²⁵. The Chase itself had been used as a royal hunting preserve for many years, and even into the

¹²² A History of Wiltshire, Victorian History of the Counties of England (London: The Univ. of London, Institute of Historical Research, 1959), IV, 458-60.

¹²³ SSW, PRP, Correspondence to and from Rev's. E. Acton, J. Acton, Baker, T.S. Beesley, S. Davy, E.H. Goddard, W. Moore, G.H. Waterfall; DCRO, Personal and Estate Accounts, D396/98.

¹²⁴ Pitt-Rivers, Excavations at Cranborne Chase, Vol. I (Rushmore: Privately Printed, 1887), pp. xii-xiii. Also, History of Wiltshire, H. Calvin, ed. The History of the Kings Works (London: HMSO, 1963). On the Chase in particular: T.W. Smart, A Chronicle of Cranborne, being an account of the Ancient Town, Lordship and Chase of Cranborne - in County of Dorset (London: Privately Printed, 1846), SSW, PRP, M44.

¹²⁵ Pitt-Rivers, King John's House, Tollard Royal, Wilts (Rushmore: Privately Printed, 1890).

nineteenth century a herd of some 2,000 deer was still pastured there. The whole was overseen by a steward, with a complement of foresters and woodwards. And the various lodges on the grounds had originally been provided for them for their use¹²⁶. When the estate was granted to Lord Rivers in the eighteenth century, the lodges were turned over to the keepers in his employ. Lord Rivers appropriated the site of one of those, Rushmore Lodge, to build a relatively stark and unprepossessing mansion in the then current Adamesque style. Now the site of Sandroyd School, the building preserves much of its original appearance, the major changes being those introduced by Pitt Rivers himself, such as a major extension at the rear undertaken by the architect Philip Webb, and the small Temple of Vesta, built in 1890 to commemorate the birth of his eldest son's first son¹²⁷.

The estate's unusual history provided it with additional interest from an archaeological point of view. Unlike the heavily farmed areas surrounding it, the terrain had been left relatively undisturbed for many centuries, and, as a result, many field remains and monuments had been left untouched. Also, there was an unusual variety of sites. Within a short walk or ride of Rushmore were examples of long and round barrows, Iron Age hill forts, the remains of what is generally accepted as the Roman Imperial estate, as well as other defensive works, a Roman road and the buried remains of several villages, both Romano-British and Medieval. There were also several more recent sites, including an Anglo-Saxon cemetery as well as the thirteenth century remains of King John's house, itself the subject of one of Pitt Rivers' later monographs¹²⁸. It was, in short, an ideal property for someone like Pitt Rivers. Long understanding its interest, he soon began to treat it as a private laboratory for his own work.

Work began almost as soon as he took up tenancy, and by the end of the summer of 1880, he had begun a series of excavations on several barrows actually within site of the mansion. Both Greenwell and Rolleston were contacted, and Rolleston was able to come down from Oxford to help out on the work and to conduct his usual analysis of floral and faunal remains¹²⁹. The results were later recorded in the first two volumes of his lavishly produced Excavations in Cranborne Chase of 1887 and 1888¹³⁰.

In the early part of 1881, Pitt Rivers took a break from his work at Rushmore and made a short trip to Egypt, the source of so much archaeological interest earlier in the century. Organized very much in the Cook tradition—and in fact part of a Cook

¹²⁶ J.C. Cox, 'Royal Forests of Wilts. and Cranborne Chase', in Alice Dryden, ed. Memorials of Old Wiltshire (London: Benbroke and Sons, 1906).

¹²⁷ W.R. Lethaby, Philip Webb and His Work (London: Oxford Univ. Press and Humphrey Milford, 1935), pp. 105-115; DCRO, D396/98; Thompson, General Pitt-Rivers, p. 76. The property is described in greater detail in Marvin Binney, 'The Manor House, Cranborne, Dorset', Country Life 3 May 1973, 1218-22.

¹²⁸ Pitt-Rivers, King John's House. See Gray, Index, p. xi. That the Chase was an Imperial estate during the Roman period was suggested by R.C. Collingwood and J.N.L. Myres, Roman Britain and the English Settlements (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1937), p. 224.

¹²⁹ William Greenwell, Letters to George Rolleston, 3 Jun 1880, 15 Aug 1880, AM, RP; Pitt-Rivers, Cranborne Chase I, p. xix; Excavations in Cranborne Chase Vol. 11 (Rushmore): Printed Privately, 1888, p. 1. The barrows are described in greater detail in the 2nd volume.

¹³⁰ Pitt-Rivers, 'Presidential Address to the Dorchester Meeting of the Institute', AJ, 54 (1897), 312.

tour—the trip was viewed by Pitt Rivers as a chance to test his archaeological acumen, and he clearly saw himself, as his later records suggest, as following in the steps of early Egyptologists such as Henry Salt and Mariette Bey¹³¹. A single chance discovery helped him maintain that self image. During the usual voyage up the Nile to Carnac, he came upon a number of flint implements scattered in situ in the gravel banks. Abandoning the conventional voyage, he spent the next few days on the site. In Pitt Rivers' estimation, it was the first discovery of such a kind that had been recorded¹³². He was careful to ask a fellow traveller to act as his witness to the event. Later the subject of a dispute at the predominantly Christian Victoria Institute, the discovery was something Pitt Rivers took considerable pride in, and, in later years, he ranked it among his major accomplishments¹³³. That such a small, chance discovery should have ranked in his own mind along with his far more considerable accomplishments in England again suggests something of the early importance of the Middle Eastern archaeological tradition in the formation of his image of what an archaeologist should be.

Pitt Rivers' trip to Egypt in 1881 was to be his last. Health factors were probably the main reason for his remaining home bound, and indeed, one of the reasons Pitt Rivers later gave for his retirement to the relative seclusion to Rushmore was his failing health. His main problem was sugar diabetes, a condition which was only diagnosed around that time. From 1880, therefore, until the end of his life he was forced to keep a fairly careful watch on his diet and daily routine¹³⁴. Still, he managed to stay surprisingly active. Immediately upon his return from Egypt, he wrote up a description of his discoveries there for a British Association meeting to be held that summer at York. His other major paper that year, a description of his other excavations at the Ambresbury Banks, had apparently been prepared sometime before; a longer account appeared soon afterward in the Transactions of the Epping Forest and County Essex Natural History Club. He also prepared a short note on the use of fire in canoe-making for the Anthropological Institute and another on Dane's Dyke, Flamborough, for the archaeological community¹³⁵. Still, nothing was done in

¹³¹ Pitt-Rivers account, in which he often compared his work with that of Mariette-Bay was given several times in several forms, 'Discovery of Flint Instruments'; 'Discovery of Chert Implements'; 'Anniversary Address to the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland', JAI, 2 (1882), 495-96; Cranborne Chase I, p.xiii; 'Presidential Address, Dorchester, 1897'. See also SSW, PRP, P74-75.

¹³² Cranborne Chase I, p. xiii.

¹³³ Pitt-Rivers 'Presidential Address Dorchester', pp. 313-15. His witness was J.F. Campbell, a fellow tourist and a geologist from Islay. Pitt-Rivers' opponent was J.W. Dawson of Owen's College Manchester. J.W. Dawson, 'Note on Teeth and Bones, and on Flint Implements', Journ. of the Trans. of the Victoria Inst., 18 (1885), 300-12. See also his earlier 'Letter from Owens College', Journ. of the Trans. of the Victoria Inst., 15 (1882).

¹³⁴ 'Presidential Address, Dorchester', 319. In a letter to Herbert Spencer of 2 Aug 1895, he complained of having experienced the 'same ailment' for the last 13 years', see PRP, M1-23. Letters from medical advisers, SSW, PRP.

¹³⁵ Pitt-Rivers, 'Discovery of Flint Implements'; 'On Excavations in a Camp called Ambresbury Banks in Epping Forrest', RBAAS, 1881, p. 697, also Trans. Epping Forrest and Co. Essex Field Club, 2 (1881), 55-68; 'Letter on the employment of fire in Canoe-making'; JAI, 11, (1882), 290-91; 'Excavating Dane's Dyke'. He also prepared a note 'On the death of Professor Rolleston', JAI, 11 (1882), 312-13.

the field that spring or summer, and it can be assumed that his poor health continued to have some part in his choice of activities.

His increasing absence from Society work may have been a reflection of his ill-health as well. Despite the fact that he had been elected for a second term as President of the Anthropological Institute, he only rarely appeared at meetings and was absent entirely during the spring and summer of 1881¹³⁶. The same was true at the Society of Antiquaries and the Archaeological Institute, where he stopped attending almost completely¹³⁷. Increasingly, then, it was Rushmore which absorbed his interest, if only because it was near at hand.

By autumn his condition had apparently improved sufficiently for him to resume a more active life, and in late September or early October he began the first of his full-scale excavations on the Chase. The subject was an Iron Age hill fort, known as Winkelbury Camp, and again located a short distance from Rushmore Lodge, well within the boundaries of Pitt Rivers' own property. Overall, it was not appreciably different from forts encountered earlier in Sussex, and he approached the job in much the same way. Again, cross sections were made and flint chips and sherds were used to assign an approximate date. Further examination of nearby barrows helped substantiate his findings, as did a later Anglo-Saxon cemetery transecting a portion of the site¹³⁸.

The exercise at Winkelbury lasted until nearly the end of February. It was obviously a successful venture and one which gave Pitt Rivers a certain amount of satisfaction, but still, much of the self-evident pleasure of his earlier work was absent. For one, he was now entirely on his own. Greenwell again had been unable to join him, and other archaeologists and anthropologists had apparently shown no interest in making the trip down, as they might have a few years before. His closest friend Rolleston had died suddenly and unexpectedly the previous summer just before Winkelbury was getting under way¹³⁹. While there were others to do the analysis, Rolleston's absence obviously had an important effect upon Pitt Rivers' attitudes toward his work. At the same time, he was feeling increasingly estranged from metropolitan based societies and, no doubt, was concerned that his own line of work was being neglected. If, then, it was the beginning of a new period for Pitt Rivers, it was also the end of an old one.

6. Negotiations with Oxford

Throughout 1880 and 1881 the question of his collection had remained unanswered. He continued to add to it throughout the negotiation period with South Kensington,

¹³⁶ RAI, Council Minutes, Anthropol. Inst.

¹³⁷ SAL, Executive Committee Minutes, Council Minutes and Ordinary Minutes; Committee Minutes, AI.

¹³⁸ Pitt-Rivers, *Cranborne Chase I*, p. 3; *Cranborne Chase II*, pp. xiii-xv, 233-59; 'Address to the Antiquarian Section at the Annual Meeting of the Institute, held at Lewes,' *AJ*, 41 (1883), 76. No records of his Cranborne Chase series survive among his papers.

¹³⁹ Pitt-Rivers, 'Professor Rolleston'. Rolleston fell ill in Paris following a trip to Peru. R.F. Freeborn, Letter to Henry Acland, 2 Jun 1881 UM, Hopeian Library of Entomology, WP. A subscription fund was established soon afterward. Pitt-Rivers, along with Franks, Greenwell and Westwood, was on the committee. 'Resolution passed at a meeting at the home of Dr. A.B. Shepherd, October 1881,' UM, WP.

presumably in part as a show of his goodwill. Between March and May of 1881, or just before his collection was formally rejected, he presented nearly a thousand new items. After rejection, however, the number of loans were cut back, and between June and September there were less than fifty separate objects placed on loan¹⁴⁰. His series on locks and keys was also removed during July, but was returned soon afterwards; presumably the pieces needed for the monograph he was then preparing¹⁴¹.

Most of the new materials were purchased from London dealers or were obtained through long-time contacts, such as Thomas Hutchinson or J.G. Wood. Other pieces resulted directly from his excavations. Those from Caesar's Camp in Folkestone were given in April 1881, or just after his return from Egypt. As to materials unearthed at Cranborne Chase, however, he assumed a different attitude, and everything resulting from his excavation of the barrows at Rushmore and the camp at Winkelbury remained at Rushmore, where plans were already under way for a new, and more modest, museum of his own¹⁴².

Nonetheless, his as yet unrealized plans for his new museum did not solve the problem of the collection at South Kensington. By the end of the year the authorities there were becoming impatient as well, and when Pitt Rivers submitted a few small items in the autumn of 1881, he was promptly informed that the museum would no longer accept any materials from him on loan, indicating at the same time that new arrangements were going to have to be made soon¹⁴³.

For Fox, South Kensington's attitude posed something of a dilemma. While the possibility of a private museum had been considered, as he had indicated to Franks, he was obviously reluctant to commit himself to such a course¹⁴⁴. The expense alone, as he must have realised, would have precluded such a solution. Also, there were the new demands of the estate at Rushmore and his ill health to be taken into account. The possibility of setting the museum up at Rushmore was evidently considered, but, of course, such a move would have defeated Pitt Rivers' main purpose—to make his museum a centre for scholarly and public interest. The museum later founded there was of a totally different character, devoted largely to materials found on the estate and to examples of local agricultural implements and handicrafts, not to ethnographical materials, although those too were represented¹⁴⁵. If, however, his more comprehensive anthropological collection had been housed there, there was a real chance that it would have been simply forgotten.

His hope, then, was that some more satisfactory possibility would somehow present itself. His most logical choice was obviously one of the universities, as many before

¹⁴⁰ SSW, PRP, P116.

¹⁴¹ Pitt-Rivers, Development and Distribution of Primitive Locks and Keys. Also PRP, P116.

¹⁴² PRP, P116; Cranborne Chase I, p. xvii.

¹⁴³ G.F. Duncombe, Letter to Pitt-Rivers, 14 Dec 1881, SSW, PRP, P131. His last transfers had been of Egyptian materials collected during his trip of the previous spring. SSW, PRP, P116. He would continue sending objects to South Kensington until July 1884.

¹⁴⁴ See above, pp. 445-54.

¹⁴⁵ Pitt-Rivers obviously never intended for his Rushmore-Tollard Royal collection to compete with that of Oxford. See Cranborne Chase I p. xvii; 'Typological Museums', pp. 115-22; A Short Guide to the Larmer Grounds, Rushmore, King John's House, Farnham Museum and Neighbourhood. (Rushmore: Privately Printed, 1896).

him had realised. Oxford, Cambridge and Edinburgh had long accepted private collections such as Pitt Rivers'. Indeed, the first recognisable public museum, Oxford's Ashmolean, was the result of the gift of an individual donor, Elias Ashmole, who two hundred years before had presented his assortment of 'natural and ancient curiosities' to the University with the understanding that the University would build 'a house' for them¹⁴⁶. Other similar bequests, sometimes linked to individual donors and sometimes presented anonymously, had further expanded the collection in later years, as had similar bequests to Cambridge and other universities including Edinburgh in particular¹⁴⁷. Both Oxford and Cambridge, moreover, had received major gifts of both archaeological and ethnographical materials. Oxford could claim Sir Richard Colt Hoare's well-known collection from Wiltshire, among its archaeological treasures, and a number of Cook-related materials, presented by Johann Reinhold and George Forster around 1777, among its ethnographical collections¹⁴⁸. Cambridge had the Disney collection from Greece and an assortment of ethnographical objects gathered over the years¹⁴⁹.

In either case, then, Pitt Rivers' collection, despite its vast size, would simply have conformed closely to the expected pattern. From his point of view, however, that was precisely one of the problems. It was true that he needed a place in which to house his collection, but at the same time it was important to him that the integrity and method of arrangement be maintained. Other collections, of course, had been allowed to

¹⁴⁶ Anthony Wood, The Life and Times of Anthony Wood, Antiquarian of Oxford, 1632-1695, ed. by Andrew Clarke (Oxford: The Clarendon Press for the Oxford Historical Society, 1892), II, 391. For additional on the original Ashmolean's foundation, see Allen, The Tradescants, pp. 210-20; Murray, I, 107-10. Also, see John Shute Duncan, 'Introduction to the Catalogue of the Ashmolean Museum (Oxford: Ashmolean Museum, 1836), pp. v-viii and John Henry Parker, The History of the Ashmolean Museum (Oxford: James Parker, 1870). On the founder see Josten I, 252-76. Finally, the building is described in The Royal Commission on Historical Monuments, An Inventory of the City of Oxford (London: HMSO, 1939), pp. 13-14; Charles Edward Mallet A History of Oxford (London: Methuen, 1424-27), II, 435-36 and III, 498- 502.

¹⁴⁷ On Oxford's earliest donation: Ashmolean, Catalogue, 1836; James Ingram, Memorials of Oxford (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1837) III, 10-16. On Cambridge, see F. A. Reeve, Cambridge (London: B. T. Batsford, 1964), pp. 146-47; John Steegman, Cambridge: As it Was and As it is Today (London: B.T. Batsford, 1949), pp. 92-95; and The Fitzwilliam Museum (London: Trianon Press, 1958). The background on Edinburgh is provided in Anand C. Chithis, 'The University of Edinburgh's Natural History Museum', Annals of Science, 26 (1970), 85-94. Other university based collections are described in Murray, I, 227-47.

¹⁴⁸ Ashmolean, Catalogue 1836; Ashmolean Museum, A List of Donations to the Antiquaries and Ethnological Collections in the Ashmolean Museum (Oxford: The Ashmolean Museum, 1870). On Sir Richard Colt Hoare's collection see: John Henry Parker, A Hand Book for Visitors to Oxford (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1847) pp. 15-17; On the Cook materials see George Forster, A Voyage Round the World in His Majesty's Sloop, Resolution, 2 vols (London: B. White, J. Robinson, P. Elmsley and G. Robinson, 1777); W.M. Wade, Walks in Oxford (Oxford: R. Pearson, 1817), II, 312-14; Pitt-Rivers Museum, From the Islands of the South Seas 1773-4 (Oxford: The Pitt-Rivers Museum, n.d.). The Forster's (father and son) also published a Catalogue which had been mislaid at the time of the Ashmolean's 1836 catalogue.

¹⁴⁹ J.H. Marsden, 'Introductory Address', AJ, 12 (1855), p. 6. Fitzwilliam Museum, pp. 8-12; Daniel, A Hundred and Fifty Years; L.C.G. Clarke, 'The University Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Cambridge', Ant. Journ., 5 (1925), 415-20

remain intact. Colt Hoare's collection at Oxford, for example, was displayed separately in the Clarendon Building¹⁵⁰. But more often they were simply absorbed into the general collection and reassigned to their special departments. Moreover, with the exception of Ashmole's original Oxford gift, none could be said to form the foundation of a new and separate discipline, as Pitt Rivers would have liked. New departments and research schools based on museum collections had been established over the years, but it was the universities that made the decision, not the donor himself.

Pitt Rivers' aims were not unprecedented, however, and recent developments in America, in particular, demonstrated how an institution such as that envisioned by Pitt Rivers might be established. The main figure in America's case was George Peabody (1795-1869), the well-known American born, but British based, financier and philanthropist whose efforts in London had resulted in the foundation and establishment of the Peabody Dwellings and other charitable concerns. As an amateur archaeologist, Peabody shared many of Pitt Rivers' ambitions, and, as early as 1866, he had helped provide an institutional base for the subject through the donation to Harvard of his extensive personal collection, mostly of North American Indian remains. Again, as with Pitt Rivers, he insisted that the museum be maintained separately and that a full-time instructor and curator be appointed to watch over it and provide tuition to interested students. The only difference was that Peabody was willing to provide both the building and an endowment to cover the instructor's salary¹⁵¹. Pitt Rivers, in turn, would be less generous in his own offer to Oxford.

Interestingly, Oxford was not Pitt Rivers' first choice. The later Cambridge anthropologist Alfred Haddon (1855-1940), in a single reference many years later suggested that Pitt Rivers considered Cambridge, but had changed his mind for uncertain reasons¹⁵². Haddon knew Pitt Rivers during the nineties, corresponding on occasion, and it is likely that Haddon's remark had foundation in fact, but little more is known of Pitt Rivers' choice. There were, of course, good reasons for picking Cambridge. His friend Lubbock's connections were there, as were Franks'. Moreover, Cambridge had already demonstrated at least the beginnings of a commitment to the promotion of the study of British prehistory, largely through the Cambridge Antiquarian Society; the latter had donated its own collection in 1880, and had established a central gallery in the newly founded University Museum in 1881¹⁵³. Nothing survives, however, among the Pitt Rivers papers of any correspondence on the matter, and exchanges with the Baron Anatole von Hugel (1852-1925), the later Curator of Ethnology and Archaeology, involved technical matters and contained no hint that Pitt Rivers had once considered presenting his collection to those later under

¹⁵⁰ Ingram, III, 12.

¹⁵¹ Peabody Museum, Archaeological and Ethnological Papers of the Peabody Museum (Cambridge: Peabody Museum, 1888). For additional on the Peabody and his museum see: DNB; and J.O. Brew, *One Hundred Years. Peabody's bequest* was noted enthusiastically by the anthropological community at the time. *Anthropological News*, AR 5 (1867), 369. The Peabody Museum did not become an official part of Harvard, however, until 1897.

¹⁵² Alfred C. Haddon, 'Pitt-Rivers', p. 59. As of the mid-1870s Fox had not considered Cambridge, in contrast to Thurman. William Greenwell, Letter to George Rolleston, 18 Jan 1873, AM, RP. Pitt-Rivers himself simply stated that 'wishing to find a permanent home for it (his collection) ... I presented it to the University at Oxford... ', 'Address, Bath, 1888', p. 826.

¹⁵³ Clarke, 'The University Museum, Cambridge'.

von Hugel's care¹⁵⁴. The fact, nonetheless, that Cambridge had taken steps to form an archaeological museum must have acted as a final inducement to Pitt Rivers to make some arrangements for his own collection before it was too late. Furthermore, the fact that Cambridge had already begun to take steps of its own must have made his own choice of Oxford even easier.

Toward the end of March 1882, Franks received a letter from Henry Moseley (1844-1891), then Linacre Professor of Human and Comparative Anatomy at Oxford, that Pitt Rivers, on the suggestion of J.O. Westwood, had finally offered his collection to the University¹⁵⁵. Westwood, who had been Hope Professor of Zoology since 1861, was obviously someone for whom Pitt Rivers had a high regard. A long-time friend of Pitt Rivers' uncle, Albert Way, Westwood was also considered the preeminent authority on the derivation of ornamental design¹⁵⁶. Pitt Rivers must have hoped that Westwood's presence would have at least a residual influence on actual provisions for the collection once it was moved to Oxford, something which, in fact, never worked out according to plan. Moseley, Franks' correspondent, was also acquainted with Pitt Rivers, having been an active member of the Anthropological Institute since his return from the three-year voyage as Chief Naturalist on the H.M.S. *Challenger* in 1877¹⁵⁷. Pitt Rivers had once praised a paper of Moseley's at the Institute for 'the evident accuracy of the observations which the author has made upon these ... almost newly discovered tribes'¹⁵⁸. And to return the compliment, Moseley had presented a number of objects from his own collection, principally of Andamanese and other implements from South Asia and the Pacific, to Pitt Rivers shortly afterward¹⁵⁹. That Moseley would in the end be connected with the collection, therefore, was then another factor in favour of Oxford. Moseley's own written protestation to Westwood that the credit for attracting the collection was Westwood's suggests that he was aware of his own influence on Pitt Rivers' decision as well¹⁶⁰.

Probably the deciding point in Pitt Rivers' choice, however, was the fact of his friend George Rolleston's connection with the University. A fellow of Pembroke since 1851 and Linacre Professor of Anatomy and Physiology since 1860, Rolleston had been closely involved in the establishment of scientific studies at the University, and during the early 1850s, was one of the first lecturers at the new University Museum. He had been close to Pitt Rivers since the late sixties and early seventies, advising him on faunal remains and helping him on excavations on a number of occasions. His death in the summer of 1881 was a shock to everyone; Pitt Rivers wrote his obituary for the

¹⁵⁴ SSW, PRP, Corres.

¹⁵⁵ Henry Moseley, Letter to A.W. Franks, 30 Mar 1882, PRM, BP.

¹⁵⁶ W. Tuckwell called him 'the highest living authority on fictive images and inscribed stones'. *Reminiscences of Oxford* (London: Smith, Elder, 1907), p. 156.

¹⁵⁷ Henry N. Moseley, *Notes by a Naturalist on the "Challenger"* (London: Macmillan, 1879).

¹⁵⁸ Comment on Henry N. Moseley's 'On the Inhabitants of the Admiralty Islands', *JAI*, 6 (1877), 421. Moseley also published 'Note On Stone Club from the Sandwich Islands', *JAI*, 6 (1877), 430 and 'On the Inhabitants of the Admiralty Islands', *JAI*, 6 (1877), 379-429. His collection is described in *Notes by a Naturalist*, pp. 93, 310, 340, 355, 381, 452.

¹⁵⁹ PRP, P116; *Notes by a Naturalist*, p. 451.

¹⁶⁰ Henry Moseley, Letter to J.O. Westwood, 26 Mar 1882, UM, WP. My appreciation to Mrs. Audrey Smith for her assistance in locating the Moseley-Westwood correspondence.

Institute's Journal and contributed generously to the Rolleston Memorial Fund¹⁶¹. His decision to leave his collection to Oxford, therefore, could be seen as a further gesture to Rolleston's memory. That Moseley had inherited Rolleston's chair (or technically speaking, a subdivision of it) only makes the point more evident.

Nonetheless, the matter of the collection's donation was far from settled, and it was up to Moseley to persuade the University authorities to accept Pitt Rivers' offer. One of Moseley's main reasons for approaching Franks at the time was on precisely that point; he needed backing in his campaign on Pitt Rivers' behalf. Shortly afterwards, E.B. Tylor and John Evans were also approached, and, together with Franks, each was asked to provide a short statement of support to be read before the Hebdomodal Council, the main University governing board, later that spring. As Moseley explained to Franks: 'I think the collection would be a splendid gain to Oxford and would do much [illeg.] in the way of letting light into the place and would draw well'. Furthermore, as he continued, 'it would act as an introduction to all the other art collections ... and would be of extreme value to students of anthropology in which subject we hope all men to take degrees very shortly'¹⁶². Anticipating the opposition of some members of the Council, Moseley asked that both the collection and its arrangement be represented as favourably as possible.

Franks, Evans and Tylor complied shortly afterward, offering their own justifications for its acceptance. Franks was the least enthusiastic. 'The collection is a very instructive and valuable one', he explained: 'the system upon which it is arranged is different from that I have adopted in arranging the national collection of ethnology, but it seems to me very desirable that collections should be arranged on different principles from each other, as each system brings out special points of information and enables the student to see the various aspects of a subject'. Evans struck a similar note, again offering as much an apology as a commendation. 'As a school for studying development in form and in art it is unrivaled, and the mere fact of its peculiar arrangement, with the view of illustrating development, does not at all distract from the value of the Collection from an ethnological or anthropological point of view'. Only Tylor, apparently already anticipating the possibility of a position, offered unrestricted praise: 'Oxford would I think do a very important service to Anthropology and History by taking and housing the Collection, which would not only do its own work but would enhance the value of the Ashmolean [Museum] by making it intelligible'¹⁶³.

¹⁶¹ Rolleston Memorial Fund, undated pamphlet among Westwood Papers. UM, WP. Pitt-Rivers' effort on behalf of the fund is documented in PRP, M38. See also additional Rolleston Papers, Zoology Department, University of Oxford.

¹⁶² Henry Moseley, Letter to A.W. Franks, 30 Mar 1882, PRM, BP. The Council was (and is) composed of the Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor, the Proctor, the heads of six 'houses' (colleges), six professors and six other members; each served for six years. University Calendar (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1882). Among the council members for 1882 were Benjamin Jowett, master of Balliol, Bartholomew Price, University professor of Natural Philosophy, Henry George Liddel, Dean of Christ Church and Thomas Hill Green, Whyte's Professor of Moral Philosophy.

¹⁶³ 'Letters... expressing the opinions...as to the value of the (Pitt-Rivers') collection'. Rpt'd. University Gazette, 30 May 1882.

Armed with his letters of recommendation, and under a directive from Pitt Rivers, Moseley made the offer to the University in late April 1882¹⁶⁴. Pitt Rivers' own conditions were similar to those offered the previous year to South Kensington. The University, for its part, would be required to accept the collection as it presently stood (including its arrangement), and Pitt Rivers would continue to have the final word over its control until his death. The University would also be required to provide a building and supply the necessary museum cabinets, cases and screens. The subject of a stipend for a lecturer or curator, however, had apparently been dropped, as had Pitt Rivers' earlier stipulation that he be allowed to borrow from the collection at will. Otherwise, the University was free to do as it chose. As a further inducement to the members of the University, copies of the Catalogue and offprints of an article in Nature of 1880 describing the collection were placed in the Radcliffe Science Library at the University Museum. Again Moseley was responsible for the arrangements¹⁶⁵.

Moseley's efforts were successful, and on 30 May 1882 the Vice-Chancellor of the University, Evan Evans delivered the Council's opinion, 'That the offer of Major-General Pitt Rivers, F.R.S. to present his Anthropological Collection to the University be accepted'. It was also suggested that arrangements should be made for its management and maintenance and further suggested that an annex be appended to the east end of the existing museum. Echoing Moseley's earlier findings, it was proposed that such an accommodation could be carried out at a cost of between £7,000 and £8,000. 'It will be seen that the Collection, besides having great intrinsic value, which from the scarcity of the objects themselves must necessarily increase as time goes on, it is of very wide interest, and cannot but prove most useful in an educational point of view to students of Anthropology, Archaeology, and indeed every branch of history'¹⁶⁶. All that remained was for a committee, comprised of Henry Acland (1815-1900), Regius Professor of Medicine, Prestwich, Moseley, Westwood, Henry J.S. Smith (1826-1883), Keeper of the University Museum and Henry T. Pelham (1804-1886), one of the Curators of the Park, all 'selected from Convocation', to provide a more detailed set of recommendations to the Council and establish guidelines for acceptance¹⁶⁷. While as cautious as ever, the University had taken its first steps toward acceptance.

7. Pitt Rivers' Appointment as Inspector of Ancient Monuments

Pitt Rivers was surprisingly unconcerned about the results of the negotiations, or at least his lack of correspondence on the matter would suggest that. But then again, unlike his earlier offer to South Kensington, the whole transaction was fairly well decided from the first, and, despite the inevitable formalities ahead, there was never really any doubt that the collection would eventually find a home at Oxford. Pitt Rivers also had new business of his own to occupy him. Much of the spring and

¹⁶⁴ OUA, HCP, 17 Apr 1882, HC/M/3/4. Also OUA, UM, Letters received April 1882, UM/C/3/3.

¹⁶⁵ University Gazette, 30 May 1882.

¹⁶⁶ OUA, HCP, 22 May 1882, HC/M/3/4.

¹⁶⁷ First listed in OUA, HCP, 19 Jan 1883, HC/M/3/6. The members of Convocation consist essentially of all members of University. It was required to vote on all formal business of the University. University Calendar.

summer was devoted to the first draft of his lengthy monograph on Primitive Locks and Keys, and while he undertook no new excavations that year, there was still the material from Winkelbury to sort through¹⁶⁸. The British Association meeting, held that year in nearby Southampton, also demanded some of his time; his main responsibility that year was as the secretary of a committee established 'for the purpose of determining the Facial Characteristics of the Races and Principal Crosses in the British Isles', again, a subject which had been of interest to him and others for several years. Other members included Brabrook, Galton, Park Harrison and F.W. Rudler, or, in fact, most of the key members of the Anthropological Institute¹⁶⁹.

His main preoccupation, however, was his impending appointment as Inspector of Ancient Monuments. While the original bill had lain dormant for the past several years, despite Pitt Rivers' and Lubbock's efforts, a new bill had been introduced by the government that spring. Somewhat less ambitious in its programme, the bill, nonetheless, provided for both the scheduling of monuments and the appointment of someone to negotiate with owners on the government's behalf and to insure their protection and preservation. Lubbock, who had been returned to Parliament as a member for the University of London, was obviously consulted, and by the summer most of the details had been worked out¹⁷⁰. By autumn, as the Ancient Monuments Act was being passed, the question of an inspector was once again a principal concern.

The first indication that Pitt Rivers was being singled out for the position came on 25 October 1882, in a letter from Lubbock. In it, he asked Pitt Rivers his views on the title as well as his estimates of total cost involved and what the salary an inspector might expect. Diplomatically he also asked who Pitt Rivers thought 'would be the best man', indicating that from his point of view the decision had already been made¹⁷¹. Three weeks later Pitt Rivers wrote to Lubbock that Lord Richard Grosvenor of the Board of Works had contacted him, and that he had provisionally accepted the position. As an indication of his own understanding of the powers and nature of the position's authority he explained that the title of 'Inspector General' (curiously recalling that held by his one-time supervisor, Colonel Hay at the Hythe School) was the one he preferred¹⁷². A week later, he accepted both the position and Lubbock's title—Inspector of Ancient Monuments¹⁷³.

It is probably a measure of the importance that Pitt Rivers assigned to the job that he should have taken the question of the title so seriously. Pitt Rivers was, despite his claims to liberalism and professed skepticism over so-called older and conservative—or at least 'unscientific'—ways was very much a traditionalist, and had few qualms about seeking out a title in order to promote his standing and authority. Soon after

¹⁶⁸ SSW, PRP, P56-60; Thompson, General Pitt-Rivers, p. 96.

¹⁶⁹ RBAAS (1887), SSW, PRP, P96. The 'Facial Characteristics Committee' was essentially an outgrowth of the Anthropometric Committee, on which Pitt-rivers also still served. RBAAS (1881), lxvi, 225-72.

¹⁷⁰ Hutchison, Lubbock, I, 126-27, 150, 153, 167, 173-74. The best short account of the progress of the bill is found in Kennet, pp. 27-35.

¹⁷¹ John Lubbock, Letter to Pitt-River, 25 Oct 1882, BL, LP, 49645. Also, SSW, PRP, AM1a.

¹⁷² Pitt-Rivers, Letter to John Lubbock, 13 Nov 1882, BL, LP, 49645; SSW, PRP, AM64; and 'Address, Bath, 1888', pp. 828-33.

¹⁷³ Pitt-Rivers, Letter to John Lubbock, 25 Nov 1882, BL, LP, 49645.

assuming his inheritance, he petitioned to have the baronetcy revived¹⁷⁴. That failing, however, he tended to fall back upon his military rank, itself given further weight in the 1890s by his appointment as Honorary Colonel of the Lancashire Regiment¹⁷⁵. His fellowship in the Royal Society was also something of a point of pride, and most of his official correspondence after 1896, was appended with an F.R.S., as would be his memorial at Tollard Royal¹⁷⁶. With his new appointment as Inspector of Ancient Monuments, he could, therefore, add yet another embellishment, and it is interesting to note that in all four of his Cranborne Chase volumes he used his full title. Thompson has called attention to the parallel with the famous French archaeologist and architect Eugene Viollet-le-Duc (1814-1879), Inspecteur de Monuments de France, whose ten-volume work on French monuments was purchased by Pitt Rivers just as he was assuming his own position¹⁷⁷. Again the parallels, from Pitt Rivers' point of view, were self-evident.

Pitt Rivers' duties as Inspector of Ancient Monuments began on 1 January 1883, when the Ancient Monuments Act went officially into effect. For his work he was to receive £250 per annum, plus expenses. Later assistants were to be paid for out of his own pocket and reimbursed from a general account. It was obviously a token salary for a man of his wealth, and after 1890, when his increasingly bad health required that he cut back on his activities, he would accept the post without pay¹⁷⁸. Also, by that date, much of what was originally intended to be accomplished by the Act already had been carried out, so his full attention was no longer required.

The main provision of the Act, from an administrative point of view, was that the Inspector was given the power to negotiate with owners over property rights and to arrange for the transfer of responsibility for maintenance of the monuments to the government. As a preliminary measure, a list of some fifty monuments in England, Scotland and Wales was appended to the Act. (Fourteen sites were also listed for Ireland, but as those were already placed under the authority of the Irish Board of Works, they were not to be considered by Pitt Rivers.¹⁷⁹) The list was intended primarily to provide a working basis for the Inspector in carrying out his duties, but also suggests something of the scope of the job.

Most of the sites on the British list were ones familiar to anyone with even the most general knowledge of ancient monuments. They included Stonehenge, Avebury Circle, the Rollright (Rollrich) Stones near Oxford, Silbury Hill and so on. Others, such as Kit's Coty House in Kent, or Hob Hurst's House, near Manchester were somewhat less known, although still within the bounds of what might be considered

¹⁷⁴ St. George Gray, *Index*, p. x.

¹⁷⁵ St. George Gray, 'Lieut. General Pitt-Rivers', p. 50.

¹⁷⁶ His memorial is in the church at Tollard Royal. Richard Bradley first pointed out to me the obvious importance of Pitt-Rivers' 'F.R.S.'!

¹⁷⁷ Eugene-Emanuel Viollet-le-Duc, *Dictionnaire Raisonne de l'Architecture*, 10 vols (Paris: Bonaventure et Ducessois, 1854-58). See Thompson, *General Pitt-Rivers*, p. 64.

¹⁷⁸ Thompson, *General Pitt-Rivers*, p. 73. 'First Inspector', n.2 p.l. His expenses are itemized in PRP, AM 75a-77. Beginning in 1884, he also began to pay his own travel expenses.

¹⁷⁹ *Ancient Monuments Protection Act*, London: HMSO, 1882. (45 and 46 Vict. Ch. 73). See Thompson, 'First Inspector', pp. 120-22. Also see Charles Phillip Kains-Jackson, *Our Ancient Monuments and the Lands Around Them*, (London: Elliot Stock, 1880), for a more detailed account.

uncontestably important sites. As Lubbock had earlier reasoned, medieval monuments, including abbeys and castles, were excluded, partly because of the difficulties such structures would pose for upkeep or stabilization. Monuments of that kind were not added until after 1900 when the powers and scope of the Act were greatly expanded¹⁸⁰.

It was Pitt Rivers' main duty to visit each site and make a record, much as he had earlier in France. It was also his prerogative, as he insisted, to add to the list, and by the time of his retirement he had 'scheduled' and, in turn, 'registered', to use his term (that is, entered into a deed of guardianship with the owners concerning their protection), seventeen additional sites. Actual work began in the spring of 1883, with an inspection tour of those sites located in the vicinity of Rushmore. Travelling alone, he visited West Kennett, Silbury, Earl's Barton, the Rollright Stones, and a number of other monuments in the southwest, including Stoney Littleton and Nymphsfield¹⁸¹. While he managed to provide a fairly accurate record of each site, he made little progress in persuading any of the owners to enter into an agreement with the government and, in fact, would not be able to do so for several years. Even Lubbock turned down the offer, although Lubbock's decision may have been as much governed by his dissatisfaction with the weak powers of the Government's Act as with the protection of his own property rights, as earlier suggested¹⁸².

From the beginning, Pitt Rivers was concerned to treat the task in as methodical a way as possible. A systematic mapping system, discussed for several years among like-minded anthropologists, was considered an immediate concern, and in March, or just before his tour began, he was in touch with the Secretary of the Office of Public Works over a new system of symbolic designations for monuments, suggesting that such a uniform system might be applied to future printings of the Ordnance Survey maps. 'It may be assumed that the object of the Act is a scientific one, not merely a provision for the amusement of excursionists to Ancient Monuments'¹⁸³. The symbols, in turn, were intended to underline that motivation.

It is through his work as Inspector of Ancient Monuments that Pitt Rivers most closely approaches the preoccupations of present-day archaeologists and anthropologists. Indeed, his concerns for management and protection seem strikingly modern in retrospect, and many of his specific recommendations are only now being introduced into the relatively newly-defined field of 'cultural resource management'. The same is clearly less true of his other areas of interest. While his pioneering work as a field archaeologist can never be ignored, by modern standards it obviously conformed far more closely to the mould of nineteenth century practice than has generally been assumed. Moreover, his staunchly empirical pronouncements have

¹⁸⁰ Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 2dS 218 (1874), 574-575, etc. In 1900 county councils were authorized to take medieval remains into guardianship and the list was increased by 140 over the next 13 years. Report of the Inspector of Ancient Monuments for the year ending 31st Mar 1939 (London: HMSO, 1939).

¹⁸¹ PRP, AM32, 33. Pitt-Rivers' activities on behalf of the Ancient Monuments Act have been thoroughly discussed by Thompson and are only covered in a summary fashion here.

¹⁸² See above, pp. 406-14.

¹⁸³ SSW, PRP, AM 58. Also see PRP, AM 58a, 59, 60, 61. Earlier efforts included that of Evans: 'On a New Code of International Symbols for use on Prehistoric Maps: RBAAS (1875), 173.

more the quality of slogans than guidelines for actual practice, a fact which Richard Bradley has recently demonstrated in his reworking of several of Pitt Rivers' sites¹⁸⁴. It is, however, his museum interests which now appear the most out of date and which, in turn, seem the most bound up in what might be called the Victorian world view. For one, there was the simple faith that artefacts could in themselves be brought together to tell the whole story of mankind's origin and development. Secondly, there was the assumption that museums alone provided a proper context for the extension of the subject; that the tangibility of both the specimen and the institution was the necessary bedrock for scientific advancement. That anthropology was going to not only have to look to the field, but be centred there as well in order to attain the accuracy Pitt Rivers required, was never really considered.

Yet while the discrepancies in his viewpoint are apparent in retrospect, it is also possible to identify a common thread of unity throughout Pitt Rivers' interests. As Inspector of Ancient Monuments, his aim was to establish a uniform system for the identification of sites. As a field archaeologist, he applied the same attention to detail in a more restricted sense, classifying names and materials of each site as he might the distribution of megalithic monuments. Finally, as a collector and a champion of the museum ideal, he attempted to bring such disparate evidence together, combining the meticulously recorded results of his archaeological sites with the more heterogeneous, and less accurately recorded, materials of modern primitive peoples. In each case, the aim was to construct a history, a history based not on the speculation of philologists, or even that of the more recent evolutionist anthropologists, but one based on the dependability of objects themselves. It was, therefore, a coherent approach, but, at the same time, one not easily realized. It was easy enough to map and record the principal ancient monuments or other sites of Britain; it was another thing altogether to try to complete the artefactual record of all of mankind, as many of his colleagues were coming to realize.

As the result of his adherence to what might be considered the older model, Pitt Rivers was coming to find himself increasingly isolated in his work. Most of his colleagues, with the possible exception of John Evans, were involved in subjects far removed from what might have been predicted twenty years before. Lubbock had turned away from archaeological subjects altogether, and was concentrating much of his attention on his popular works on natural history and moral philosophy¹⁸⁵. Franks, at least in part because of his position at the British Museum, was finding himself increasingly involved in the art of patronage; his research interests at the time had drifted away from strictly ethnographical objects of concern toward the study of objects more traditionally associated with connoisseurship, such as Ming vases or Japanese ceramics¹⁸⁶. Among those still most active at the Anthropological Institute the story was similar. Tylor, for example, had turned even more to the idea of an abstract sequence of evolutionary development; the evidence of the material world

¹⁸⁴ Richard Bradley, Personal Communication, 2 Aug 1980. As of this date Bradley's reworkings of some of Pitt-Rivers' earlier sites at Cranborne Chase have not reached publication.

¹⁸⁵ For example, John Lubbock, *The Origin and Metamorphosis of Insects* (1873), *Addresses, Political and Educational* (1879), *The Pleasures of Life* (1887).

¹⁸⁶ See A.W. Franks, *Catalogue of a Collection of Oriental Porcelain and Pottery; Japanese Pottery* (London: For the Committee of Council on Education by HMSO, 1885).

had been replaced by that of mental and religious development, as his general text, Anthropology of 1881, most clearly demonstrated¹⁸⁷. Newer figures attracting the attention of anthropologists, such as the jurists Henry Maine (1822-1888), or J. H. McLennan, held to a similar line of argument, the first tracing the evolution of legal systems, the second the evolution of marital customs¹⁸⁸. In each case, the emphasis was on something altogether distinct from the material record. Even Lewis Henry Morgan's Ancient Society of 1877, with its central theme of economic stages, was little concerned with the actual question of technological advancement in the way in which Pitt Rivers was¹⁸⁹. Moreover, the idea that objects, such as distinct tool types or ornamental motifs, might be used to reconstruct a history of past contacts and common origins was rarely considered in that work. It was as if Pitt Rivers' programme had been forgotten entirely.

It is a point of interest, therefore, that Pitt Rivers' donation of his collection to Oxford should have come at the time that it did. Pitt Rivers himself would remain relatively loyal to his earlier vision, but he too appears to have sensed that the majority of anthropologists were losing interest in what might be called the museum approach. His gift called attention to that and served as an indication that he too was sensing the change in direction. At the same time, his commitment to field work took on a heightened significance, particularly now that he was established at Rushmore. In effect, his inheritance allowed him to make the choice.

For the next few years, Pitt Rivers would find himself increasingly estranged both from his collection and the interests which it represented. The museum effort and field work traditions may have shared certain features, and, fundamentally, a common focus, but as ongoing activities, they were clearly distinct. The one required continual presence on the site, supervision of labourers, recording of finds and the general responsibility for an effort of relatively limited duration. The museum required long-term commitment, enormous expense and little on-going supervision. While the museum ideal allowed for and, indeed, even depended upon, the records derived from individual sites, such as those excavated by Pitt Rivers at Cranborne Chase, it was, nonetheless, based on the different approach to man's history. In short, the two approaches were fundamentally incompatible, as the difficulties over the collection at Oxford were soon to demonstrate.

¹⁸⁷ E.B. Tylor, Anthropology: An Introduction to the Study of Men and Civilisation (London: Macmillan, 1881).

¹⁸⁸ Henry Maine, Ancient Law (1861; rpt. London: J.M. Dent and Sons 1965); Lectures on the Early History of Institutions (London: John Murray, 1875); John F. McLennan, Primitive Marriage (1865; rpt. London: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1970). See also Burrow, Evolution, pp. 135-78.

¹⁸⁹ Lewis Henry Morgan, Ancient Society, or Researches in the Likes of Human Progress from Savagery through Barbarism to Civilisation (1877; rpt. New York: Meridien Books, The World Publishing Company, 1963).