CHAPTER VIII

A GROWING DIVISION OF INTERESTS

1. The Museum at Oxford

In many ways Pitt Rivers' donation of his collection to Oxford represented a disenchantment with the progress of anthropology and his place in it. He had first given up direct control of his collection in 1874, when his own interests had begun to devolve upon field investigations. Throughout the next few years, while he gave occasional attention to his collection and its series, his main preoccupation had been with the development of excavation techniques and the investigation of a number of major monuments in Sussex and elsewhere in the south of England. Beginning in 1880, his attentions had shifted to sites at his Wiltshire estate and to preliminary work on behalf of Lubbock's Ancient Monuments Bill. His collection had become, as a result, something of a burden, and while he continued to have hopes for it, he was happy to pass on his responsibilities on to someone else. Oxford had not been his first choice, but from his point of view, it was apparently the only choice readily available. If anything was to be done with the collection, however, it was for the University to take the initiative.

Oxford, in many ways, was ill prepared to accept Pitt Rivers' gift. Scientific studies had established only a tentative footing in the University, and many, including Pitt Rivers, must have doubted whether a museum devoted to a subject so often controversial as anthropology would ever be accepted by the more conservative elements there. Opposition to the sciences continued to be widespread, with leading figures of the university, such as W.A. Spooner (1844-1930) or J.E. Sewell (1810-1903) of New College and even Benjamin Jowett of Balliol skeptical about the effects of scientific learning on Oxford tradition[1]. Students, for the most part, were little more interested. The most popular subjects for the Examination Schools were still classics, mathematics and scriptural knowledge, with modern history, and the more recently established Modern Languages, falling soon after. J.S. Blakie, writing in MacMillan's Magazine in 1881, referred to Oxford as that 'venerable metropolis of classics and cricket'. Even toward the end of the century the liberal Edinburgh Review commented that 'the "classical prejudice" still holds its own'[2].

---

[1] Mallet, III, 295-96, 397-98. Also, H.W. Davis, A History of Balliol College, rev. by R.H.C. Davis and Richard Hunt (Oxford: Blackwell, 1963), p. 211; Evelyn Abbot and Lewis Cambell, The Life and Letters of Benjamin Jowett (London: John Murray, 1897), I, 50. Also, Charles Oman, Memories of Victorian Oxford (London: Methuen, 1941), p. 209.

[2] John Stuart Blackie, 'Thought on English University Reform', MacMillan's Magazine, 45 (1882), 125; 'Old Eton and Modern Public Schools', Edinburgh Review, 1897, p. 374. W.R. Ward, Victorian Oxford (London: Frank Cass, 1965), pp. xiii-xv. Also see G.C. Brodrick, A History of the University of Oxford, 4th Ed. (London: Longmans, Green, 1900), pp. 219-24, and for personal recollections, Andrew Lang, Oxford (London: Seeley, 1906), p. 256, and Lewis R. Farnell, An Oxonian Looks Back (London: Martin Hopkins, 1934), p. 130. On attitudes toward scientific training in a more general context, see Michael D. Stephens and Gordon W. Roderick, 'Changing Attitudes to Education in England and Wales, 1833-1902', Annals of Science, 30 (1973), 149-64; 'American and English Attitudes to Scientific Education during the Nineteenth Century', Annals of Science, 30 (1973), 435-56.

Nonetheless, great strides had been made in the last few years. Beginning with the Parliamentary Commissioners' Report of 1852 and the resultant reforms of 1854, increases had been made in the number of scientific positions, particularly the number of new lectureships and chairs supported through contributions from the Common University Fund rather than by independent endowments, as they had been traditionally[3]. The Parliamentary Report of 1876, describing the previous five years' progress, listed no less than eight full professorships in the natural sciences, including that held by Pitt Rivers' friend, Rolleston[4]. Their growing influence was inevitable. Henry Acland, the main proponent of the medical school at the University, managed to expand both his department and the number of students doing medical research. Joseph Prestwich helped put geological studies, earlier propounded by such figures as John Kidd (1775-1851) and William Buckland, upon a sounder and more popular footing[5]. As a result, an increasing number of undergraduate and graduate students were drawn to the sciences, and, as new careers began to open up toward the end of the century, their numbers began to make an impact upon university life, despite the continuing prejudices instilled by the collegiate system[6].

The biggest boon to scientific studies at the University had been the provision of a museum devoted exclusively to the natural sciences. The sciences, of course, had been represented in a general way at the University's Ashmolean Museum since the seventeenth century[7]. But, as many early accounts point out, the original seriousness of the effort there had been undermined by the neglect and mismanagement of the collections by the museum's custodians. By the beginning of the nineteenth century, what scientific instruction there was scattered among the college lecture halls and smaller laboratories, such as that used by Buckland at Christ Church[8]. In an effort to improve the situation, a new museum was proposed, first by Henry Acland at the British Association meeting held at Oxford in 1850. His suggestions received official support by the Parliamentary Committee charged with investigating University

---

[3] Oxford Reform Act of 1854 (17 and 18 Vict. Ch. LXXXI). Report and Evidence upon the Recommendations of Her Majesty's Commissioners for Inquiring into the State of the University of Oxford, Presented to the Board of Heads of Houses and Proctors Dec 1 1853 (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1853). The transformation is apparent in the lists of professors in the Oxford University Calendar for the relevant years. See Burn, p. 220; Young; 92-95; Kitson Clark, pp. 272-73; Mallet, III, 295-329; Brodrick, Oxford, 194-98, for an analysis of the impact.

[4] PPH of P, Accounts and Papers, 1876, Vol XIX, Education and Art, No. 349, pp. 327-29; Mallet, III, 340-42.

[5] Henry Acland, Oxford and Modern Medicine (Oxford: Henry Frowde, 1890); S. B. Atlay, Sir Henry Wentworth Acland (London: Smith, Elder, 1903); Mallet, III, 294-95; Ward, pp. 277-79; and L. Rice-Oxley, Oxford Renowned (London: Methuen, n.d.), pp. 154-56.

[6] University Calendar, 1882; mallet, III, 320-28. Stephens and Roderick, 'Changing Attitudes', pp. 150-54.

[7] As explained in the founding 'Statutes, Orders and Rules for the Ashmolean Museum' of 21 Jun 1886. Duncan, 'Introduction', Cat. Ashmolean, 1836, pp. vii-viv; Mallet, III, 496, 502; Josten, I, 248-78; A lengthy account of Ashmole's role is found in Francis Yates, The Rosicrucian Englightenment (1972; rpt. London: Granada Publishing, 1975), pp. 235-49.

[8] Described by Conrad von Uffenbach during his visit of 1710. See Mallet, III, 21-27. The neglect was later described in Henry Slatter's The Oxford University and City Guide, new ed. (Oxford: Henry Slatter, 1845), p. 101; Ingram III, 13. Also see, A History of the Oxford Museum (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1909). H.M. Vernon and Dorothea Vernon, pp. 14-18; and Allen, pp. 218-27.

proceedings two years later. Soon afterward, after a flurry of publicity, a series of proposals were presented to the University, and in 1855, the Neo-gothic designs of the Dublin-based firm of Deane and Woodward were selected. Work began the following year[9].

The new museum immediately captured the support and loyalty of Oxford's leading figures. Mark Pattison of Lincoln considered it 'a vital revolution in Oxford life'[10]. John Ruskin, who, through his friend Acland, had helped select the designs, had lent his hand in laying a brick pier (allegedly later taken down by the workmen at the site). In all, the museum included provisions for lecture rooms, a library, display areas, cabinets for the various University collections and a laboratory. The latter, the design of which was based on the kitchen at Glastonbury Abbey, was placed to the south of the main museum in order that, as with its prototype, 'all noxious operations [could be] removed from 'the principal pile'[11]. First opened to public inspection just before the famous Oxford British Association meeting of 1860, the museum served as both a vehicle and a symbol of scientific advancement. As the University historian, Charles Edward Mallet later put it, 'The museum was the first visible sign that clerical Oxford had opened her gates to the advancing tide'[12]. Pitt Rivers' collection, in turn, would serve as yet another indication that scientific studies had been established at Oxford to stay.

Still, while science in general may have been gradually, if not always widely, gaining acceptance at the University, anthropology was as yet little known. Again, there had been collections of a broadly anthropological or ethnological type at the University since the seventeenth century, particularly if the well-known Tradescant collection of 'Natural and Artificial' wonders (the main basis of Ashmole's collection) is taken into account[13]. Also, a number of faculty members, particularly Rolleston and his successor Moseley, had been involved in anthropological studies, largely through their professional involvement in anatomy. Finally, there were occasional eccentrics, such as the poet Swinburne, who had been a member of both the Ethnological and Anthropological Societies since the early sixties[14]. But throughout those years, there had been little noticeable attempt to establish the discipline in any formal way. The only exception was a short-lived Anthropological Society founded at Oxford in 1867,

---

[9] Henry Acland and John Ruskin, The Oxford Museum (London: Smith, Elder, 1859). Recounted in Vernon and Vernon; Mallet, III, 363-67; and C.L. Eastlake, A History of the Gothic Revival (London: Longmans, Green 1872) pp. 287-88. Also see Pevsner, Oxfordshire, The Buildings of England (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1974), pp. 280-82; F.G.S. 'The Oxford University Museum', Macmillan's Magazine, 5 (1862), 525-33; Peter Ferriday, 'The Oxford Museum', Architectural Review, 132 (1962), 409-16. Among the tracts published at the time were The Old English Style as Applicable to Modern Requirements or Suggestions for the New Museum at Oxford (Oxford: Printed Privately, n.d.); A Dream of a New Museum (Oxford: J. Vincent, 1855).

[10] Mark Pattison, Memoirs (Fontwell: Centaur, 1969). See also V.H.H. Green, The Oxford Common Room (London: Edward Arnold, 1957), p. 283.

[11] John Ruskin, Letter printed in Acland, Oxford Museum, p. 28. Cited Mallet, III, 364. For Ruskin's attitudes toward the museum, see The Works of John Ruskin, ed. by E.T. Cook and Alexander Wedderburn (London: George Allen, 1905), XVI, xliii-xlvii.

[12] Mallet, III, 366.

[13] Tradescant, Museum Tradescantianum. See Allen, Appendix II for a more convenient list.

[14] RAI, List of Members, ASL, A6. Also see Burrow, Evolution, pp. 125-31.

itself considered an offspring of its disreputable parent society in London[15]. Otherwise, anthropology remained unnoticed.

Archaeology, on the other hand, had made more of an impression. Once again, the original focus had been the several collections stored at the Ashmolean, which, unlike the exotic or foreign curiosities in the museum, had continued to attract the interest of a number of serious students. Also, the University's classical bias, while excluding the sciences, had helped to insure a continuity of interest in archaeology, as had the intermittent bequests of major Hellenistic and other Classical collections, such as those of Thomas Arundel (1586-1646) and of the Earl of Harcourt[16]. With, then, the extension of archaeological interests to the medieval period, during the early part of the nineteenth century, the Ashmolean managed to keep abreast, although, of course, many purists among the Institute's supporters obviously wished otherwise. The University's Architectural Society, again a body devoted to the study of medieval—that is, essentially ecclesiastical antiquities—had also helped promote the general notion of archaeological studies in a more basic way. Its members' preoccupation with what was, in effect, local remains, moreover, had helped prepare the way for a more sympathetic view of prehistoric materials, with which medieval antiquities were often associated both institutionally and otherwise[17].

Still, there was no evidence of a coalescence of interests. Few among the anatomists were involved with what work was going on at the Ashmolean. For their part, medievalists and classicists had little reason to look to anatomists either for guidance or for any other reason. As a result, younger members of the University had nowhere to channel their interests. Some, such as A.H. Sayce (1845-1933), the later Assyriologist, tended to lean toward the Ashmolean. Others, such as R. Robinson and H.G. Sharp, both members of the first Anthropological Society, spent most of their time at the University Museum working with scientists such as Rolleston, Westwood and Acland[18].

In the meantime, many of the early collections had suffered through neglect. Much of the original Tradescant and Ashmolean material had been allowed to disintegrate, and even later bequests, such as those of the two Forsters of materials assembled by them during Cook's third voyage, were falling into disrepair or were being relegated to less than hospitable storage areas[19]. Prehistoric antiquities had fared slightly better. They

---

[15] 'Oxford Anthropological Society', AR, 5 (1867), 372.

[16] Ashmolean Catalogue, 1836; John Henry Parker, A Hand-Book For Visitors to Oxford (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1875), pp. 121-24; Slatter, pp. 66-75; and Ashmolean Museum, A List of Donations, 1870. See also Arthur J. Evans, The Ashmolean Museum as a Home of Archaeology in Oxford (Oxford: Parker, 1884). On the Arundel collection in particular, see Daniel, Idea of Prehistory, pp. 15-16.

[17] The Society was known until 1839 as the Oxford Genealogical and Heraldic Society, then as the Oxford Society for promoting the Study of Gothic Architecture. Eastlake, The Gothic Revival, pp. 703-04; James F. White, The Cambridge Movement: The Ecclesiologists and the Gothic Revival (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1962), p. 24.

[18] AR, 5 (1867), 372.

[19] Discussed at length by Allen, pp. 218-27. See also The Assistant Keepership and the New Catalogue of the Ashmolean Museum (Oxford; Printed Privately (1879)) for notes on the controversy. On the destruction of the Cook material in particular, see Pitt-Rivers Museum, From the Islands of the South Seas.

were less subject to deterioration than the often fragile ethnographica. But still, they were looked after only in a cursory way.

It took, then, a bequest such as that of Pitt Rivers to bring all of the necessary materials together, and, in a sense, call attention to what the University already had in its own stores. Moreover, the Pitt Rivers Museum provided a context in which older archaeological studies, and newer, more scientific and 'anthropological' interests, could be brought together, both institutionally and symbolically. Just as the University Museum had provided a home for science, so too did the Pitt Rivers Museum offer a new context for the study of archaeology, anatomy and ethnology, one which could for the first time underline what many understood as the implicit unity of those subjects.

2. The Organization of the Museum

The main problem which lay ahead was to suggest some means of managing or supervising the collection once it had been accepted by Oxford. It was a problem which up to this point had been barely considered. The University's lack of concern, however, was not at all unusual. Indeed, in the past, most of the collections accepted by the University had been taken on with little or no regard to long-term provisions for their care. That had been true of the Ashmolean's many bequests, which since the time of their donation usually had gathered dust in the museum's basement. The same was true for the more recently donated scientific collections, housed in the University Museum[20]. There were exceptions, however. The Hope Entomological Collection was presented with the provision that a professorship in entomology be established to oversee its care, a position filled, in turn, by Pitt Rivers' acquaintance, J.O. Westwood[21]. Other bequests had followed a roughly similar pattern. But overall, considerations of such a kind were rare. Most new collections were simply added to what was already in the University's care with little thought to their continued usefulness or to what might be called their functional integrity.

While Pitt Rivers had obviously taken the problem of keeping his collection intact into account when first offering it to South Kensington, no mention of a curatorial position which might encourage such a course (as in the case of the Hope Collection) had been made in his second offer. The assumption, again, was that the University would take on that responsibility itself. There were, however, hints of a lectureship, but again, such a provision had come to be interpreted as a requirement on the University's part rather than a separate offer by Pitt Rivers[22]. Whether, in fact, both Pitt Rivers and the University assumed that the lecturer should have ultimate responsibility for the collection as well is unclear. Indeed, it was to be the specific lack of clarity over the matter that led to many of the later disagreements over the collection and many of the misunderstandings among those involved with it.

---

[20] Ashmolean Museum, List of Donations, 1870.
[21] Donated by Rev, Frederick William Hope in 1849; the Professorship was established in 1861. University Calendar, 1882, p. 33; Vernon and Vernon, pp. 99-101. K.C. Davies and J. Hull, The Zoological Collections of the Oxford University Museum (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1976).
[22] H.N. Moseley, Letter to A.W. Franks, 30 Mar 1882, PRM, BP.

The immediate concern was to find someone to manage and take charge of the collection during what was essentially a transitional period. The most likely candidate for the task, of course, was Henry Moseley. Moseley's association with the collection was so implicit as to effectively preclude any other choice. Referred to by R.R. Marett as a 'favorite of Darwin', Moseley was, as well, probably the best qualified for the job[23]. His earlier association with the anatomist William Turner (1832-1916), had given him a background in anatomy and physiology, then very much at the centre of anthropological interests[24]. Moreover, his own interests lay in the field comparative anatomy, a specialty which, in turn, extended to the study of prehistoric and 'primitive' peoples. Finally, as a veteran of the Challenger expedition, he had a long-standing interest in the broader field of ethnology, having formed a significant private collection of his own during the course of the voyage; he called attention to that interest by decorating his room at Exeter with trophies and mementos of his travels[25]. Also, his abilities as a scientific observer were well established by his account of his voyage, Notes by a Naturalist on the "Challenger", itself a compendium of observations and comments on subjects ranging from the flora and fauna of Pacific archipelagos to customs of exotic peoples[26]. There could be little doubt, then, of his qualifications.

Moseley's new responsibilities were given formal recognition in May 1882, when the Hebdomadal Council passed a decree stating that the Linacre professorship would be responsible not only for the anatomical specimens previously under its charge, but also for 'the ethnological collections in the University Museum'[27]. (Since the University Museum as yet had no ethnological collections, the implication is that the decree directly anticipated Pitt Rivers' gift.) Still, such a proposal left his specific duties and responsibilities curiously undefined. As Linacre professor, he was charged with providing a set number of lectures each term and also with offering special instructions to those undergraduate and graduate students under his care. The responsibility for specimens was a more open matter, however, and, indeed, much of the actual process of arrangement, cataloguing, sorting and even cleaning was left to various assistants, usually termed 'demonstrators', or simply to enthusiastic undergraduates[28]. Since his own appointment was a new one as well, procedures were even less clear; the responsibilities of the Linacre professorship itself had been

---

[23] R.R. Marett and T.K. Penniman, eds., Spencer's Last Journey (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1931) p. 21. See also Farnell, pp. 128-30; Penniman, 'A Note on the Beginning of Anthropology in Oxford', p. 12.

[24] See William Turner, 'Address to the Department of Anthropology' RBAAS (1871), 144-47. Also Lectures on the Comparative Anatomy of the Placenta (Edinburgh: A. and C. Black, 1876).

[25] Farnell, p. 128.

[26] Moseley, Henry, Notes by a Naturalist on the “Challenger”. For Moseley's role see Eric Linklater, The Voyage of the Challenger (1972; rpt. London: Sphere Books, Cardinal edition, 1974), pp. 18-21, etc.

[27] University Statutes, 'Linacre Professorship of Human and Comparative Anatomy', Statute IV, 1 & 3, 'Particular Regulations' 4d Statute made by the Commissioners and passed by Privy Council May 1882.

[28] Moseley's demonstrators were Charles Robertson, William Hatchett Jackson and Algernon Phillips Thomas, none of whom were to continue in Anthropology. Oxford University Calendar, 1883.

divided and redefined, adding to the confusion[29]. The impression is that everyone, including Moseley himself, assumed that the particulars would simply work themselves out. Moreover, it was apparently understood that the actual process of arrangement and transfer would be a one-time operation, and that subsequent care would follow more or less routine procedures. The assumption could not have been more wrong.

While Moseley fit [*sic*] the requirements of custodian or curator, there still remained the problem of the lectureship. Moseley, as suggested, had established a reputation for himself as an ethnologist, but he was probably still not well enough known to reside at the head of a collection as important as that of Pitt Rivers, at least from the donor's point of view. The University, moreover, had responded favourably to Pitt Rivers' suggestion that a lecturer would be provided both to 'teach the subject', as it was commonly put, and promote the General's ideas[30]. Understandably, Pitt Rivers was eager to find someone of reputation and stature in the field, someone whom the University and public would respect and who, in turn, would lend his own authority to the collection. Not surprisingly, Pitt Rivers' choice fell upon E.B. Tylor.

Tylor's qualifications for the position of lecturer could be little questioned. He had been associated with the Anthropological Society since its foundation and had begun contributing articles through its journal and that of the Ethnological Society since the mid-1860s[31]. As with Pitt Rivers, he was a member of the several governing committees, as well as numerous special committees formed either at the Anthropological Institute or during proceedings at the British Association meetings. He had served as President of the Institute in 1879-80, or just before Pitt Rivers' own second term in that office[32]. Moreover, for many members of the general public his name was already synonymous with the field. His first book Anahuac had been widely read, and his subsequent Researches Into the Early History of Man of l865, and Primitive Culture, published in 1871, had established him as the leading member of the new evolutionist school. His latest publication, Anthropology, published only in 1881, provided the first general overview of the subject; the title brought his close identification with the subject even more into focus[33].

Interestingly, however, while Tylor figured in most people's minds as a leading personality, he had, as pointed out, drifted away from what Pitt Rivers and other more archaeologically oriented anthropologists considered the subject's rightful concerns. In Anahuac, he had been preoccupied with the question of migration or borrowing, versus independent development, and he had answered his questions in essentially archaeological terms. But his later works, as already emphasized, had taken a

---

[29] Oxford University Calendar, 1882, p. 32.
[30] 'Decrees in Convocation', Oxford University Gazette, 30 May 1882; OUA, HCP, 22 May 1882, HC/M/3/4.
[31] Among his earliest articles were 'Wild Men and Beast Children', AR, 1 (1863), 21-32; and 'Remarks on Buschmann's Researches in North American Philology', TESL, 2 (1863), 130-36.
[32] RAI, Council Minutes, Anthrop. Inst. A10. At the BAAS he had served as a Vice President of the Anthropology Section and had, like Pitt-Rivers, played an important part in the revised edition of Notes and Queries. See RBAAS (1868-82).
[33] E.B. Tylor, Anthropology. For a discussion of Tylor's progress, through his major publications, see Marett, Tylor, pp. 13-14. Andrew Lang referred to Anthropology as Tylor's only 'vulgarism'. Lang, 'Tylor', p. 14.

different direction. Researches had discussed archaeology and material culture in only the most general way, and, as R.R. Marett, one of Tylor's students at Oxford commented, 'Arts and crafts scarcely come within the scope of Primitive Culture'[34]. His latest work, Anthropology, tended to focus on questions of a different order altogether; the development of religion among man, rather than the development of technology, was the central theme.

For Marett and others, Tylor's transition explicitly marked an abandonment of an earlier approach; Tylor now looking 'beyond the body to the soul of the cultural process', as Marett put it[35]. It is not unlikely that Tylor understood his own change of interest in such terms as well. Moreover, Tylor, perhaps as a reflection of his own Quaker background, maintained what might be considered a blind eye to the differences of man's material state, in order, almost, that such differences might not detract from what he considered the central concern of the science, man's essential unity. As Andrew Lang, later one of Tylor's closest friends, emphasized, Tylor's aim was to prove that man everywhere was the 'same unhappy fellow'[36]. Finally, the question of origins had been more or less settled from Tylor's point of view. The search for evidence of past connections, the gradual procedure of reconstructing a history of contacts and migrations, so important to anthropologists in the l860s, had been superceded, in his view, by the grander vision of evolutionism. As a result, the more ambitious research plans which Pitt Rivers held for his collection were of less interest to him, and, indeed, could be seen as merely getting in the way of Tylor's more holistic approach. Whether Pitt Rivers fully understood the magnitude of their difference is unclear, but it is certain that he sensed at least a number of points of disagreement, as his later letters reveal[37].

The first indication of a growing divergence of interests between the two men came in 1874, when Tylor was asked to review Pitt Rivers' catalogue for the Academy. Criticizing Pitt Rivers' views on the boomerang, Tylor explained: 'Colonel Fox is disposed to attach an ethnological signification to the fact that boomerangs, and also a particular class of parrying-shield, are found on the line of distribution of Professor Huxley's Australoid race, ... ', something Tylor clearly did not[38]. While on the surface merely a minor qualification of his more general praise, if considered more carefully it becomes apparent that what was questioned was not simply Fox's observations but the basic premise upon which the collection was based. Nevertheless, Tylor's subsequent comments on the collection, such as those prepared in response to Moseley's request nearly ten years later, while more platitudinous than analytical, at least served to mask any substantial disagreement which may have existed[39]. Moreover, through his praise he managed to avoid insulting Pitt Rivers or even indirectly underestimating the value of his work.

---

[34] Marett, Tylor, p. 201. Marett tried to excuse the amount on material culture in Anthropology.
[35] Marett, Tylor, p. 40.
[36] Lang, 'Tylor', p. 6. Cf. Burrow, Evolution, p. 251.
[37] Pitt-Rivers' differences are well illustrated as well in his comments on Tylor's work in 'Anniversary Address, 1882', p. 506.
[38] E.B. Tylor, Rev. of the Catalogue of the Anthropological Collection lent by Colonel Lane Fox, p. 460.
[39] 'Letters expressing the opinions…as to the value of the (Pitt-Rivers) collection'. Rpt. in University Gazette 30 May 1882.

If, therefore, Pitt Rivers sensed the differences between himself and Tylor, he also sensed Tylor's good manners and general willingness to please. Also, as we have seen, he had been equally critical of Tylor's own interests, particularly Tylor's preoccupation with 'spiritualism' and religious ideas, and was willing, it appears, to live with the differences[40]. As a result, when the question of a lectureship came up shortly afterwards, Pitt Rivers had little hesitation in accepting the fact that Tylor should hold the post[41]. Tylor, in the meantime, merely had to stand on the sidelines, while the University finalized the transfer.

In late September 1882, or just as the Committee's first report was prepared, Tylor wrote to Pitt Rivers explaining something of his own hopes.

> Before long I suppose we may hear of your museum being settled at Oxford. I am not only interested in this on public grounds, but the University establishing your collection may affect a scheme suggested to me by Rolleston years ago, as to a Readership at Oxford which might help to bring Anthropology into the University course. If all goes right with your Museum, it is likely that I may be asked to give one or two lectures at Oxford with a view to some permanent appointment coming afterward. All of this is in the clouds as yet, but some months ago Max Muller asked me to drop by on my way and see Moseley as Rolleston's successor, and some other men whose views could be important in the matter. It looks as if something may come of it, thanks to the impulse given by you to Anthropology at the University. It is true that the appointment if made will be by no means a lucrative one, but I think I could do more effective work in such a position than anywhere else, while there is still work left in me[42].

While Pitt Rivers evidently concurred, nothing could be done until the term began. In early October, however, the Committee appointed by the Council to look into the matter reconvened, and in mid-November a delegation, composed of Professors Acland, Westwood, Henry J.S. Smith, a long-time fellow of Corpus Christy College and also Keeper of the University Museum, and Moseley, approached Pitt Rivers in London to formally discuss his terms and, less officially at least at that point, to present the University's own position. Their interview was followed by a formal report to the Hebdomadal Council on 15 January 1883, published for more general distribution in the University Gazette shortly afterwards[43].

In its report, the Committee outlined the procedures which lay ahead: (1) that the University would build a proposed annex to the museum; (2) that such an addition would be used solely for the Pitt Rivers Collection and a sign attesting to that 'be

---

[40] See above, pp. 385-96.
[41] Pitt-Rivers, Letter to R.W. Rudler, 23 May 1898, SSW, PRP, Corres.
[42] E.B. Tylor, Letter to Pitt-Rivers, 24 Sep 1882, SSW, PRP, Corres.
[43] OUA, HCP, 13 Nov 1882, 15 Jan 1853, HC/M/3/5-6; University Gazette, 6 Feb 1883. See also [Note that the original endnote ends like this, there is nothing added]

affixed over the entrance'; and (3) that the general method of arrangement adopted by Pitt Rivers should be retained during his lifetime 'and that any change in details to be made subsequently shall be such only as necessitated by the advance of knowledge, as do not affect the general principle originated by the donor'[44]. The only thing remaining was for it to be put to vote, and, in the meantime, to establish some means of paying for the University's part of the bargain.

A few days later a second Committee report, prepared in conjunction with that of 'the Committee formed to consider the Acceptance of the Collection of Major-General Pitt Rivers', was presented, governing the requirements for the building itself. Essentially, the second report was undertaken by the same group of individuals but marked, in effect, the first appearance of what was to become the Building Committee[45]. Actual estimates and plans were prepared by Gilbert R. Redgrave, an architect and engineer recommended by the Department of Science and Art at South Kensington. Basing his scheme on that carried out by the Museum of Practical Geology at Jermyn Street, however, he called for a building totaling 7,531 square feet, as opposed to the 9,390 square feet then used by the Pitt Rivers Collection in its arrangement at South Kensington. He suggested that a more judicious use of cabinets and cases would allow for such a reduction. Also, since Pitt Rivers was going to withhold part of his collection—specifically the series of agricultural implements and wood carvings from Brittany—there would be additional space for expansion. The completed building, as Redgrave further explained, would measure 70 by 86 feet, although ideally, the architect emphasized, the longer dimension would be best extended to a full 100 feet to allow for subsequent additions. The plan also called for a central courtyard surrounded by two projecting balconies. The total cost was estimated at £10,120, including the cost of cases and wall screens. That price was nearly £3,000 over the previous year's estimate, and obviously came as something of a surprise to the Council members[46].

As a result of the second report, the Council's Committee on Finance was asked to come up with some additional means of raising the necessary funds. The following day, it was suggested that a special sinking fund be established for the project, and that the costs then be drawn against the income of the University Common Fund. It was further suggested that plans for expansion be detailed and that a second architect, following upon the earlier work of William Burges (1827-1881), the well-known Gothic revivalist, be asked to provide a rough sketch of the proposed annex, along with that for the newly proposed Department of Physiology, upon which work was already completed[47]. The actual site, at the northeast corner of the old museum, had been established several years before in the course of a more general developmental plan prepared by the University's own surveyor[48].

---

[44] 'Report to the Hebdomadal Council of the Committee of Members of Convocation appointed to consider the offer by Major-General Pitt-Rivers…', OUA, HCP, 19 Jan 1883, HC/M/3/6. Rpt. as a pamphlet. See above.
[45] OUA, HCP, 20 and 22 Jan 1883, HC/M/3/6.
[46] OUA, HCP, 20, 29 Jan 1883, HC/M/3/6.
[47] OUA, HCP, 2 Feb 1883, HC/M/3/6. Also Committee Minutes, 2 Feb 1883, EW/2/6/l/ii. See Roger Dixon and Steven Muthesius, Victorian Architecture (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1978). On Burges at Oxford.
[48] OUA, UM, Delegates Minute Books, M/P/2/1,3, VM/P/2/50.

While the various committees in the Council continued to work out the details of the new building, Moseley and Acland worked behind the scenes to prepare a place for Tylor. Their plan was reported to Pitt Rivers by Tylor himself on 4 February 1883.

> I am to give two lectures in Anthropology at Oxford in the Museum Lecture-Room on Thursday 15th and Wednesday 21st at 2:30. In saying something of your collection, I am thinking of the following points as one may mention intelligibly without having the specimens to show—viz. parrying stick and shield; spring-trap and bore; [illeg.] and armour. Also your stone implement in wall of-Egyptian tomb. Is there any other topic connected with the educational use of the collection which you think should be brought forward if there is an opportunity...?[49]

The next day he wrote further:

> I thought I had somewhere in print the account how you were led by serving on an Arms Commission to find that improvements could only be made by small successive steps. If you have printed it anywhere will you send me the passage or reference to it, or if not, will you kindly tell me what is lawful to say about it in a lecture mentioning the collection[50].

Tylor's diplomacy paid off and several days later he heard from Pitt Rivers:

> Thanks for your note. If I were going to lecture about my collection, I should draw attention to the value of the arrangement, not so much on account of the interest which attaches to the development of the tools, weapons in themselves, but because they best seem to illustrate the development that has taken place in the branches of human culture which cannot be so arranged in sequence because the links are lost and the successive ideas through which progress has been effected have never been embodied in material forms, or which account the Institutions of Mankind often appear to have developed by greater jumps than has really been the case. But in the material arts, the links are preserved and by due search and arrangement can be placed in their proper sequence. The psychological continuity can therefore be better demonstrated by means of them than by means of the Institutions and Religions of Mankind they should therefore serve as a preliminary study for the Anthropologist who will by that means have to appreciate the gaps that are to be found in the latter and avoid the errors which the apparent absence of continuity may in some cases engender, and show how in studying the Institutions of Mankind those missing links must

[49] E.B. Tylor, Letter to Pitt-Rivers, 4 Feb 1883, SSW, PRP, Corres.
[50] E.B. Tylor, Letter to Pitt-Rivers, 5 Feb 1883, SSW, PRP, Corres.

> be supplied by conjecture which in the material arts can be arranged in rows so obvious that those who see may read[51].

While he agreed with Tylor as to the value of his presentation, he was mindful that the superiority of his own approach should be stressed. The rules for the future were already being carefully set out.

Tylor's first lecture was delivered at the Museum on 15 February 1883. True to his promise, he presented the material in Pitt Rivers' terms 'playing up' to the collection, as R.R. Marett later put it[52]. As Tylor explained: 'to trace the development of civilization and the laws by which it is governed, nothing is so valuable as the possession of material objects'[53]. He neglected, however, to mention the potential of the museum as a research tool or, at least, to describe how it might be used as such. Also, Pitt Rivers' system for tracing the actual connections among peoples was not even touched upon. But then, it was more an introduction and review than a detailed examination of the museum's possibilities. Moreover, it was the Museum's educational character, as Pitt Rivers himself had stressed to the University, which Tylor was most concerned to emphasize at the time. When notices appeared in Nature and Science, Pitt Rivers was evidently pleased[54], and shortly afterwards, he helped Tylor secure a place for his brother-in-law at the Athenaeum, the prestigious London club to which both belonged[55]. Tylor, in the meantime, delivered his second lecture, and in March 1883, was offered the position of Keeper of the University Museum, apparently in anticipation of his later lectureship[56].

3. Further Provisions for the Collection

While Tylor's position was more or less secured, arrangements for the collection were less certain. Matters came to a standstill in February when the Committee on Finance insisted that the University hold to the earlier cost estimates of £7,500[57]. Discussion continued periodically during the spring, while new efforts were made to find a way of reducing the total expenditure or, alternatively, finding some way of increasing the amount available. In the meantime, the committee appointed to consider the offer was replaced by what was officially called the Museum Building Committee, again with Acland, Moseley, Westwood and Prestwich as its members; Smith, the Professor of Geometry, had died in February giving his place on the Committee over to Bartholomew Price (1818-1998), a fellow of Pembroke College and Sedleian Professor of Natural Philosophy[58].

---

[51] Pitt-Rivers, Letter to E.B. Tylor, 5 Feb 1883, SSW, PRP, Corres.
[52] Marett, Tylor, p. 15.
[53] 'Dr. Tylor's Lecture on Anthropology', Oxford Magazine, 1 (1883), 88.
[54] Nature, 28 (1883), 8-16; Science, 1 (1883), 525.
[55] E.B. Tylor, Letter to Pitt-Rivers, 1 Mar 1883, SSW, PRP, Corres.
[56] 'Dr. Tylor's Second Lecture on Anthropology', Oxford Magazine, 1 (1883), 111-12; Nature, 28 (1883), 58-59; Science, 2 (1884), 57. The date of Tylor's appointment as Keeper is recorded in Historical Register of the University of Oxford (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1900). Also see OUA, UM, Delegates Minute Books, 10 Mar 1883, UM/M/1/4.
[57] OUA, HCP, Committee Minutes, 2 Feb 1883, EW/2/6/l/ii; Council Minutes, 24 Feb 1883, HC/M/3/6.
[58] OUA, HCP, Committee Minutes, 2 Feb 1883, EW/2/6/l/iii; Council Minutes, 12 Feb 1883. HC/M/3/6; UM, Delegates Minute Books, 9 Feb 1883, UM/M/1/4.

In April, at the suggestion of Price, the Committee approached the Dublin-based architect, T.N. Deane, the son of the better-known Thomas N. Deane whose designs had been the basis of the original museum thirty years before[59]. On 10 May, Deane met with the Committee and soon afterward was officially engaged to provide the working drawings and bring the project within the scope allowed by the funds available[60]. His work continued throughout the summer, and, in fact, it was not until nearly two years later that actual construction would begin.

Despite the obvious setbacks, the University proceeded with acceptance. The final announcement was published in the University Gazette in early May. The gift was approved by the University in Convocation—the full body of University members—on 7 May, and on 5 June, a copy of the deed was sanctioned by the same body. All that remained was for the University 'to affix its seal' to the document, something which was not carried out until the following year, on 12 May 1884[61].

In the meantime, there remained the question of the collection's management. Tylor's first appointment, as we have seen, was not as a 'Lecturer in Anthropology', but as Keeper of the University Museum. Technically, as Keeper, he was the Secretary to the Delegates for the Museum and, as such, was responsible for the general administration of the Museum and its collections[62]. His duties, however, were not specifically curatorial, as others often assumed, nor, in his capacity did his responsibilities centre directly on the Pitt Rivers Collection. The question of his responsibilities was, in fact, an important point of issue, and one which was to have considerable impact upon the management of the collection once it arrived in Oxford. In payment for his services, he was to be given the use of a large Gothic Revival house in Parks Road near the Museum and a stipend of £80 per annum. It was not by any means a generous allotment, but was considered sufficient for Tylor's needs, particularly once his readership was approved.

Tylor's appointment as lecturer, officially titled the Readership in Anthropology, was eventually recommended by the Hebdomadal Council in May 1883[63]. As Reader his main responsibility was to 'lecture on the collection', as Pitt Rivers and others had frequently put it. The basic requirements were that he deliver at least six lectures a term, at no less than weekly intervals, and that he also 'receive students desirable of informal instruction and other assistance in the study with which his readership is connected'. Officially approved on 3 December, when it was announced by the Vice-Chancellor, his tenure began officially on the first of January of the following year[64].

It was, on the whole, a curious position. Readerships, unlike many other university professorships, were a byproduct of recent University reforms, particularly the second

---

[59] OUA, HCP, Council Minutes, 23 Apr 1883, HC/M/3/6; Vernon and Vernon.
[60] OUA, HCP, Council Minutes, 10 and 14 May 1883, HC/M/3/6.
[61] University Gazette, 13 May 1884; Deed of Gift and Declaration of Trust of the Pitt-Rivers Collection, OUA, WPB/2/17.
[62] University Calendar, 1882, pp. 42-43. Historical Register of the University of Oxford, p. 102.
[63] OUA, HCP, Council Minutes, 29 Oct and 2 Nov 1883. HC/M/3/6.
[64] University Gazette, 11 Dec 1883.

series of reforms beginning in 1864, and represented the gradual ascendency of the University itself over the traditional powers of the collegiate system. Again, unlike endowed professorships, readerships were paid for from the University Chest or Common Fund, itself made up of contributions from each college in order to help support more general activities, particularly the newer scientific departments[65]. Tylor's position would not become a professorship until 1896, and even then was an honorary position rather than an endowed chair; it would end with his death in 1909[66]. Still, his appointment was a significant step, and one which could not have gone unnoticed by other members of the University community. It was also, from an historical standpoint, notable as the first full-time anthropological position at any British University[67]. In terms of its immediate prestige, however, the position carried little weight.

In financial terms, the rewards were equally modest. Officially, Tylor's readership carried a stipend of £200 per annum, and though his stipend was supplemented by his salary as Keeper of the Museum and further improved by the use of the Keeper's house, it was still not considered generous even by contemporary standards. But then his responsibilities were hardly that demanding. In actual practice, his readership involved his lecture series alone. The material for his lectures, in turn, could be easily gleaned from his earlier publications. Informal instruction of undergraduate and graduate students, as required by statute, was as much a social activity, presided over by Tylor and his wife in their drawing room at Parks Road, as a rigorous requirement[68]. Furthermore, there were as yet few students, and those that he did have were drawn from a small group of undergraduate science students, mostly at the Museum, with whom he already came into contact during the course of his work. None at first chose Anthropology as their principal subject, and the fact that the University did not recognize the field in the Examination Schools effectively precluded such a step. As a result, Tylor found himself little burdened with teaching responsibilities, and since none of his students were required to show their knowledge in the course of examinations, he did not have to be responsible for their performance. His duties as Keeper were only slightly more time consuming. The main requirement of the position was that he simply notify the Delegates of upcoming meetings and that he generally supervise 'the reception of specimens', a task which usually was carried out by the professors and their assistants in each department[69].

Despite the lack of stringent requirements, Tylor took his work seriously. He was also, it should be remembered, hoping to establish Anthropology as an examination subject and to better establish its position within the University. His principle vehicle toward accomplishing that end was, of course, his lecture series. His first lectures on 'The Development of Civilization', delivered in the winter of 1884, were followed in the spring by a second series on 'The Development of Arts and Sciences'[70]. In the

---

[65] Mallet, III, 295-97. The breakdown of the revised incomes for each professorship are found in the University Calendar.
[66] Burrow incorrectly refers to it as 'a chair'. Burrow, Evolution p. 235. Penniman incorrectly assigned his professorship to 1883. Penniman, A Hundred Years, p. 141.
[67] See E.W. Brabrook, 'Anniversary Address', JAI, 25 (1896), 392.
[68] J.L. Myres, 'Memories of Sir Edward Tylor', p. 6.
[69] University Calendar, 1882, pp. 42-43
[70] E.B. Tylor, 'Development of Civilization - Arts of Life', Oxford Magazine, 2 (1884), 20; 'Development of Arts and Sciences, Oxford Magazine, 2 (1884), 220-247.

autumn, his appointment to the Readership having been secured, he turned to a subject closer to his interest: 'The Intellectual Development of Mankind'. And in January 1885, he began his series on 'The Development of Mythology'[71]. He was beginning as well, to attract the attention of other members of the University, and shortly afterward he was made an honorary Fellow at Balliol College as the result of his past contributions. There he came into contact with figures such as Max Müller, the noted Oriental language specialist and Benjamin Jowett, then Master of the college[72]. The actual number of students, however, were few, as predicted. Baldwin Spencer (1860-1929), of the University's Zoology Department and Everard Im Thurn, are among the only names that have been passed down as having attended his lectures[73].

With so much time on his hands, it is not surprising that Tylor should have begun to concern himself increasingly with the collection. Moreover, as his letters to Pitt Rivers had revealed, Tylor admitted to the importance of the collection as a means of illustrating his talks or lectures. Finally, while material culture may not have been a principal concern, it was still considered within the realm of his interests and, particularly as his first lecture titles suggest, played a very central part in the organization of his lecture series. As of January 1884, however, only a fraction of Pitt Rivers' collection had actually arrived at Oxford, that is, a few pieces brought for demonstration purposes. The remainder of the collection, or some 14,000 to 15,000 items, was still on display at South Kensington and would remain so for nearly a year[74].

In the meantime, arrangements and provisions had to be made for packing and shipping and for a place to store materials once they did arrive at Oxford. Technically, however, the task was Moseley's concern, although Tylor apparently made suggestions. During the long vacation of 1884 both undertook a trip to New Mexico, at least partially in search of new specimens, but also to help set the scope and standards of their joint teaching and research venture[75].

The main problem facing the new department of anthropology was the museum building itself. While T.N. Deane had been instructed to provide reduced plans, those were not completed until November of 1884, or after Moseley and Tylor's return from America, and even at that time the matter of the design was far from settled. By reducing the building's length by a third and introducing a number of changes in the design of the roof and galleries, he had managed to reduce the cost to £8,230, or

---

[71] E.B. Tylor, 'Intellectual Development of Mankind', Oxford Magazine, 2 (1885), 371-94; 'Development of Mythology, Magic, Games, etc.', Oxford Magazine, 3 (1885), 44, 61, 63. See 'A Bibliography of Edward Burnett Tylor', compiled by Barbara W. Freire-Marreco, in Anthropological Essays.

[72] Marett, Tylor, p. 7-8.

[73] R.R. Marett and T.K. Penniman eds., Spencer's Last Journey (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1931), p. 9; R.R. Marett, A Jerseyman at Oxford (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1941), p. 167; R.R. Marett and T.K. Penniman, Spencer's Scientific Correspondence (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1932), pp. 160 and 63. Everard Im Thurn, Thoughts, Talks and Tramps, ed. by R.R. Marett (Oxford Univ. Press, 1934).

[74] SSW, PRP, P116. An inventory was begun in the Spring of 1883. G.F. Duncombe, Letter to Pitt-Rivers, 30 May 1883, SSW, PRP, Corres.

[75] Marett, Tylor, p. 14.

almost within the limits prescribed by the Hebdomadal Council. However, as Deane insisted, the reduction in length had only saved some £500, all other factors being considered. Also, a number of other improvements, he further emphasized, would vastly improve the final product, and he asked that the University reconsider its financial restrictions. As a result, the Council asked the Committee on Finance to reconsider, and add an additional £1,500 to the original amount. Unfortunately, the suggestion was rejected. If the museum were to be built, the Committee insisted, it would have to conform to the limits set on costs[76].

Actual construction of the annex began in the early summer of 1885, with little fanfare. The final building measured 70 by 86 feet and, as Deane predicted, it had little of the ornamental interest of the University Museum's main building. The walls were constructed of plain exposed brick, intended to be covered with screens and wall cases. The galleries were extended out four feet, rather than the originally proposed three, in order to compensate for the reduction in length. Only the cast iron rafters demonstrated any attempt at embellishment, and even those were of a standardized type, far removed from the elaborate wrought and cast iron examples found in the main museum. The skylights followed the same utilitarian pattern, again calling attention to the University's parsimony. The main compensation was that the work could proceed quickly, and by the following autumn, the annex was nearly complete[77].

In the meantime, final provisions had to be made for the transfer of the collection from South Kensington. Both Tylor and Moseley had visited the collection on a number of occasions, and, at least since October of 1883. Moseley had been in close touch with the South Kensington staff over technical matters. H. Lloyd, the South Kensington Museum's Storekeeper, had also sent plans for cases and a list of London cabinetmakers to Tylor, in order that Oxford might display the collection in a similar way[78].

Actual packing of the main body of the collection began in the early part of 1885, and by the summer, the exhibit at South Kensington was closed to the public so that work could be completed without interruption. The process was directed by Moseley with the help of South Kensington's technicians. During the summer, however, he asked his new assistant, or 'demonstrator', Baldwin Spencer, to help out[79]. Spencer moved to London where he could work on the' collection daily, and within a month of his arrival, most of the work had been completed. Moseley and Tylor, in the meantime, dropped by whenever possible to see how work was getting on and to discuss the details. 'Moseley', Spencer explained, 'seemed to know a great deal more than Tylor in regard to details. Tylor with his curious way which you may remember of now and

---

[76] OUA, HCP, Council Minutes, 27 Oct and 12 Nov 1884, HC/17/3/7.
[77] It was first described in Building News on 21 Oct 1887, 53 (1887), 610. For a description see Sherwood and Pevsner, Oxfordshire, p. 282; and A History of Oxfordshire, Vol. III of The Victoria History of the Counties of England, ed. by H.E. Salter and Mary D. Lobel (London: for the Univ. of London Inst. of Hist. Research by Oxford Univ. Press, 1954), p. 59.
[78] H. Lloyd, Letter to E.B. Tylor, 30 Oct 1883, OUA, UM, Delegates Minute Books, UM/C/l/3. Also see UM/P/3/21.
[79] Baldwin Spencer, Letter to Henry Balfour, 24 Sep 1920 in Marett and Penniman, Spencer's Last Journey, p. 20. See Penniman, 'Note on the Beginning of Anthropology', p. 12. The date of 1885 is further substantiated by Pitt-Rivers' own account, 'Address, Bath, 1888', p. 826.

then as it were "drawing in his breath"—I don't know how otherwise to express it—simply fascinated me'[80].

By the end of the summer of 1885, materials had begun to arrive at Oxford. The precise order of delivery or exactly how the boxes were initially accommodated are unclear, since no records of the transfer were made either by Moseley or Tylor. No records exist either of the overall nature of the collection at the time other than the two-volume delivery catalogue compiled by the South Kensington staff and given to Moseley presumably at the time of transfer. The latter also provides no indication of the South Kensington books[81], or how the collection was moved to Oxford or what items might have gone first. Pitt Rivers' own catalogues offer even less information, and were not delivered to the museum until a much later date[82].

Something of the sequence, however, can be reconstructed by referring to correspondence of the period. Upon arrival at Oxford the collection was placed in storage, in several rooms at the University Museum and in a number of other University buildings, including the Ashmolean. There it stayed until individual pieces could be properly sorted by Moseley and Spencer. Actual unpacking, however, was not possible until the annex was complete, and during the whole of 1885, the building was still under construction with its scaffolding in place[83]. In the meantime, a preliminary survey could be carried out, and although no record remains of staffs' thoughts on that procedure, it is clear that at least the order of arrangement was established at that time.

4. Henry Balfour and His Work With the Collection

To supervise the actual work at Oxford, Moseley again depended on Spencer and, soon afterward, on another student named Henry Balfour (1863-1939). Balfour, it appears, had helped Spencer occasionally during the early summer of 1885, when the first of the materials began to arrive at Oxford, but following the completion of his degree in July he was in a better position to devote himself to the task[84]. With Spencer already thinking of moving on from his position as Moseley's assistant, it was evident

---

[80] Baldwin Spencer, Letter to Henry Balfour, 24 Sep 1920, in Marett and Penniman, Spencer's Scientific Correspondence, p. 163.

[81] Delivery Catalogues, Vols I and II of Pitt-Rivers Museum Catalogues, Pitt-Rivers Museum. See Beatrice Blackwood, The Classification of Artifacts in the Pitt-Rivers Museum Oxford Occasional Papers on Technology, II (Oxford: the Pitt-Rivers Museum, 1970). The script is identical to that on the South Kensington Receipts (SSW, PRP, P116), and appears to be initialed WRG (W.R. Groser, the South Kensington Museum Storekeeper). My special thanks to Lynne Williamson, Research Assistant at the Pitt-Rivers, for her assistance with the catalogues.

[82] W.K. Hill, Letter to H.N. Moseley, 27 Jul 1886, in 'Blue, Black and Red Books'. Also see Blackwood, Classification, p. 19. The best indication of the date of the end of transfer is found in a letter from G.F. Duncombe to Pitt-Rivers of 21 Jan 1886 asking if the residue of the collection was to be sent to the residence of Pitt-Rivers, SSW, PRP, 133.

[83] Henry Balfour, Unposted Letter to Pitt- Rivers, 2 Dec 1890, PRM, BP. Actual arrangement did not begin, Balfour explained at the time, 'till some time after the year (1886) had turned'.

[84] Balfour took a Class II Honours Degree in Natural Science. University Calendar, 1886. Thomas Penniman again incorrectly gives the date of Balfour's participation as 1883. T.K. Penniman 'The Pitt-Rivers Museum', MJ, 52 (1953), 244.

too that a replacement was going to have to be found for the following year. The choice, almost inevitably, fell on Balfour.

Balfour was in some ways an unlikely candidate for the job. In addition to being an avid fencer and rower, his main academic interests were birds and orchids. Also, though as with most other natural history students, he had a certain amount of training in comparative and human anatomy, those were clearly not his central concerns, nor would they ever become so[85]. Nonetheless, the superficial link was probably the important one, and the one upon which his presumed qualifications were based. At the same time, his biological training must have been considered an advantage as well. His later work on the 'morphology of forms', based on more general morphological studies in biology, only helps confirm that[86].

While Balfour worked on the collection during the summer of 1885, he was first notified of his selection as Moseley's assistant in only early September. As Moseley explained:

> I shall require someone to assist me in arranging and labelling the Pitt Rivers' Anthropological Collection for about a year. I expect to be able to get from the University about £100 paid for such an assistant. I do not know whether such employment might suit you. It would be pretty hard work of a sorts making little drawings, writing and typing on very neat labels, writing catalogue descriptions, arranging things in cases, mending and patching and cleaning, helping a carpenter fix things on screens, looking up objects of all kinds in illustrated books Cook's travels, etc. ...

Not wishing to be overly optimistic Moseley, nonetheless, was encouraging. 'I fear there will be little chance of the thing going on after a year but success in it might lead to other openings'. He could not, however, offer the position officially yet, since he had 'no authority' from the Hebdomadal Council, but he saw no particular difficulties. Balfour accepted immediately. Details were worked out over dinner the following week[87].

Balfour obviously entered into the work with great enthusiasm, and by the end of the year had at least begun to bring some order to the scattered crates and boxes. Actual arrangement and cataloguing, however, could not begin until the end of the year, since, as Balfour himself later emphasized, the building was not yet complete[88]. When unpacking did begin, it was confined first to the upper gallery and to the prehistoric series. Other materials had to wait for completion of the cases and screens and the removal of the packing cases[89]. Throughout that period the collection was closed to the public, and, with the exception of Moseley and Tylor and members of the

---

[85] J.L. Myres, 'Henry Balfour', Obituary Notice, Man, 39 (1939), No. 69.
[86] See in particular his 'On the Structure and Affinities of the Composite Bow', JAI, 19 (1889), 220-46; and The Evolution of Decorative Art (London: Percival, 1893).
[87] Henry Moseley, Letter to Henry Balfour, 11 Oct 1885, PRM, BP.
[88] Henry Balfour, Unposted Letter to Pitt-Rivers, 2 Dec 1890, PRM, BP.
[89] Ibid.

technical staff, there was really no opportunity for anyone to make use of the collection. Pitt Rivers, who was now settled comfortably into Rushmore, paid the whole process little attention, but when he did, it was mostly to stress his disappointment at the way things were being carried out[90].

By the beginning of the summer of 1886, most of the material had at least been transferred to the new annex from elsewhere in Oxford, although, again, much would remain in packing cases until almost two years later when the collection was first officially opened. In the meantime, there were new acquisitions to attend to. Some, such as E. H. Man's collection, had been acquired by Pitt Rivers just before his bequest, but others were presented by new donors. Among the latter were the collections gathered by R.H. Codrington, the-well-known Melanesian missionary, and Commander Cameron of West African fame. Archaeological material from Henry Schliemann's famous Trojan digs and from Arthur Evans' (1851-1941) early work in Egypt were also added, as were occasional gifts from local supporters, such as Max Müller and Henry Acland[91]. Finally, some provision had to be made for Pitt Rivers' anatomical specimens, most of which were transferred to the Department of Anatomy, where, it was assumed, they could be better cared for[92].

While Moseley continued to look in on the work, as did Tylor, most of the responsibility settled upon Balfour. Provided with the help of only one full-time technical assistant and occasional volunteers, Balfour's work proceeded at a slow pace, and by the beginning of the autumn term in 1886, or the time Balfour's tenure should have been up, work in the main courtyard had not even begun. Moseley was able to secure an extension, however, and Balfour was allowed to continue as 'sub-curator' for another year. Probably the most important factor affecting the Council's decision was the fact that Moseley's own health was deteriorating, and he was only rarely able to help Balfour out at all[93].

By the autumn of 1887, it was apparent that some way of speeding the process along was going to have to be established, and, moreover, that some greater recognition was going to have to be given to Balfour for his own work. The initial impetus came from Balfour himself, as he later suggested in his correspondence[94]. Although independently wealthy—his father made a fortune in the silk trade—Balfour was obviously disappointed that his own salary should remain so low. Putting the matter in perspective, a Rugby School Assistant Master received £950 a year, and while an Oxford don might not be expected to receive as much, Balfour's £100 a year paled in

---

[90] Pitt-Rivers, Letter to Henry Balfour, 28 Nov 1890, PRM, BP.
[91] Pitt-Rivers Museum, Annual Reports, 1883-1887, 'List of Donations', 1885-1893. Man's collection is catalogued separately as Vols. III and VII of the Delivery Catalogues. R. R. Codrington's 'Religious Beliefs and Practices in Melanesia', JAI, 10 (1881), 261-315, makes reference to the collection.
[92] Henry Balfour, Letter to Alfred Robinson, 10 Dec 1891, PRM, BP. Robinson was the Assistant to the Secretary of the University Museum.
[93] W. Hatchett Jackson, Letter to Bartholomew Price 3 May 1890, PRM, BP. See also, University Gazette, 22 Nov 1877.
[94] Henry Balfour, Unposted Letter to Pitt-Rivers, 2 Dec 1890, PRM, BP.

comparison to the salaries of those around him[95]. It was obviously not so much the salary, however, as the lack of recognition which the low pay scale implied. Moreover, he was also increasingly committed to the idea of the museum as a career. The only way for him to pursue such a course, at least at Oxford, was to be appointed as a full-time curator, with full control of the collection. It was to that end, then, that he directed his energies.

Fortunately for Balfour, Moseley had also come to the same conclusion and privately suggested to both the Museum Delegates and the members of the Hebdomadal Council that a separate position might be created[96]. During the following spring and summer he became more adamant, despite his own illness. The main champion of Balfour's cause, however, was Henry Acland, who, as the most senior Delegate and as someone well acquainted with University procedures, was also probably in the best position to carry Moseley's proposal through. Acland informed Moseley that he would help out, and by November, through Acland's influence, a consensus had begun to take shape among Council members in favour of Balfour. Around the same time, a short account of the Museum and Balfour's work there was published in the University Gazette, further promoting Balfour's position[97]. Not wishing to exclude Pitt Rivers from the decision, however, Acland was careful to explain the circumstances to the collection's donor. 'Balfour is a good creature', Acland wrote, 'could he not properly give "demonstrations" in aid of Tylor'[98]. Pitt Rivers was evidently pleased with the decision, and while still impatient with Oxford's slow progress, he apparently was willing to accept the judgment of Acland and Moseley in suggesting the appointment.

Tylor, in the meantime, kept Pitt Rivers informed of the details of the University's decision. The main problem had been to arrive at some way in which Balfour's appointment could be made without the University having to commit itself permanently to supporting a new curatorial position. Largely as a point of strategy, therefore, it was suggested that Balfour's appointment be defined in more limited terms—specifically, the completion of the initial arrangement and provision of a complete catalogue. Also, rather than making him a full Curator, it was decided that his title should be upgraded only slightly, to that of Assistant Curator. The latter was still inferior to that of the Linacre Professor. Tylor and others had been warned that the University Chest was 'much depleted', as Tylor shortly afterward explained to Pitt Rivers[99]. But despite setbacks, the Council was able to secure a further grant of £400 a year, half of which was to pay Balfour's salary and the other part to cover the incidental expenses and the costs of producing the catalogue[100]. However tenuous the new position might be, Balfour's future was determined, at least for the next three years.

---

[95] Typical stipends were as follows. Sedleian Professorship of Natural Philosophy: £570; Whyte's Professorship of Moral Philosophy: £400; Camden Professorship of Ancient History: £600. University Calendar, 1887. See Mallet, III, 327-30.
[96] W. Hatchett Jackson, Letter to Bartholomew Price, 3 May 1890, PRM, BP.
[97] University Gazette, 22 Nov 1877.
[98] Henry Acland, Letter to Pitt-Rivers, 3 Dec 1887, SSW, PRP, Corres.
[99] E.B. Tylor, Letter to Pitt-Rivers, 3 Nov 1877, SSW, PRP, Corres.
[100] E.B. Tylor, Letters to Pitt-Rivers, 20 and 21 Nov 1877, SSW, PRP, Corres. See also OUA, RCP, HC/17/3/8-9.

5. Pitt Rivers and the Farnham Museum

Between the spring of 1883, when his collection was presented to Oxford, and late 1887, when Balfour's initial appointment was secured, Pitt Rivers had shown surprisingly little interest in the progress of the new Oxford Museum. With the exception of occasional communications with Tylor, Acland and Moseley, he interfered little with the proceedings of the Council and made no effort to influence decisions over the arrangement of the collection or to determine or insist on a date at which its original organization might be completed. Also, as early as November of 1884, he had accepted that his own efforts to catalogue the collection had come to a standstill, suggesting to Tylor that the University take on the responsibility for any future publications[101]. Finally, with Balfour's appointment in December 1887, he stepped aside even further, replying to Balfour's inquiries in a polite, but detached way. Asked for his suggestions in the arrangement of arrows and spears, he explained: 'My original arrangement was to have arrows and spears separately. [A]s to darts as you say it is difficult to separate them from spears. I don't think it is very important'[102]. His own interests evidently lay elsewhere.

Throughout that period much of Pitt Rivers' time had been taken up with his duties as Inspector of Ancient Monuments. His initial tour of the southwestern counties in the spring of 1883, and of Scotland that summer, had been followed the next year by a similar series of expeditions, first to Swindon and Oxford, taking in such sites as Uffington Castle and Barbury Camp, and then into Scotland, visiting sites near Inverurie, where he stayed for several weeks with his wife[103]. Costs for his trips were paid for out of his salary of £250 per annum. In the beginning of l884, he also had services of a full-time draftsman, W.S. Tomkin, to pay for as well[104].

The following season, he again had the services of Tomkin, enabling him to increase the number of recorded sites to slightly over fifty, and by 1887, he had hired a second assistant, named G.W. Reader, adding, in turn, to the efficiency of the next year's campaign[105]. By the end of the year, five separate notebooks and four sketch books had been completed and nearly sixty monuments and sites recorded. While less successful in convincing owners to enter into protective covenants—even his own

---

[101] Pitt-Rivers, Letter to E.B. Tylor, 27 Nov 1884, OUA, UM. Letters received by the Delegates of the University Museum, UM/C/3/4. See also Pitt-Rivers, Letter to Henry Acland, 3 Dec 1887, PRM, BP.

[102] Pitt-Rivers, Letter to Henry Balfour, 13 Dec 1887, PRM, BP. Balfour was obviously then working on his article 'On the Evolution of a Characteristic Pattern on the Shafts of Arrows from the Solomon Islands', JAI, 17 (1887), 328-32.

[103] PRO, WORK 39, Notebooks 12 and 13; Sketchbook 10. His yearly trips are summarized in Thompson, 'First Inspector'.

[104] SSW, PRP, AM 36 and AM 39, concerning Pitt-Rivers' own salary. Travel expenses are covered in AM 75a, AM 83. Thompson, General Pitt-Rivers, pp. 65 and 94. St. George Gray provides a full list of assistants. Index, p. xxviii. Wages are recorded in DCRO, D396/98.

[105] Thompson, 'First Inspector ', pp. 104 and 106; St. George Gray, Index, p. xxviii. The year 1885 is described in Notebooks 7, 13 and 14 and Sketchbook 4. The year 1886 produced no notebook. A sketchbook, however, was added to (by Tomkin) in October (Sketchbook 5). 1887 is covered by notebooks 6 and 7 and parts of sketchbooks 3 and 5. PRO, WORK 39.

brother-in-law, Henry Stanley had refused to have his property added[106]—he nonetheless did manage to convince the authorities to allow him to extend the list as he felt necessary. In the spring of 1887, he also asked the Society of Antiquaries for their help and support in the matter[107]. Finally, in the latter part of the year, the impasse with the owners was broken when Sir Herbert Maxwell stepped forward to offer his own monument, the Drumtrodden Standing Stones in Wigtonshire, for protection[108]. Within two more years nearly half the originally scheduled monuments had been covered by agreements and an additional 17 had been 'registered', as Pitt Rivers described the protective process.

While his work as Inspector was obviously time-consuming, it only slightly conflicted with his other more personal interests. Excavations, first of barrows near his residence and later of monuments in the neighbourhood, had begun almost as soon as he took up residence in 1880. Those continued in a fairly uninterrupted way through the autumn of 1884. In 1885, starting in October, he began his work at Rotherley and resumed the work at Winkelbury Hill begun two years before. Also in the autumn of 1885, he began work at Woodcut's Common, an Iron Age hill fort nearby, alternating between that site and several others closer to his home for the next year and a half[109].

Typically, all excavation work took place after the summer harvest, with from eight to as many as fifteen agricultural workers being employed. His first full-time field assistant, F. James, who began to supervise actual work in 1881, was joined in 1883 by Tomkin, the draftsman used by him during his trips to Scotland. Two years later, they were joined by G.W. Reader, his second travelling companion[110].

By the mid-1880s a fairly complex hierarchy had begun to take shape among Pitt Rivers' staff. James' title was that of Assistant, and his salary was £150 per year. Tomkin and Jones were officially listed as Sub-Assistants in Pitt Rivers' account books, and were paid approximately half as much. All, with the exception of James, lived at Rushmore and were treated as private clerks or secretaries. There they enjoyed what Pitt Rivers called the 'privileges' of being trained directly under him, and, indeed, all three were well on the way to becoming the first experienced field workers as a result of his efforts. Only James, however, who later obtained a position at the Maidstone Museum as Head Curator, ever put his training to professional use; the other two eventually took jobs in the commercial world[111].

The main interest of Pitt Rivers' excavations during that period, or the years between 1883 and 1888, lies not so much in his techniques or methods, since the latter were substantially the same as those developed at earlier sites, such as Mount Caburn or

---

[106] SSW, PRP, 'List of Ancient Monuments', AM 2.
[107] Pitt-Rivers, Letter to the President of the Council of the Society of Antiquaries, 27 May 1887, PSAL, 12 (1888), 90-91.
[108] Pitt-Rivers, 'Address, Bath, 1888', p. 831; SSW, PRP, AM 2. Also see Pitt-Rivers, Letter to Herbert Maxwell, 17 Aug 1891, SSW, PRP, Corres.
[109] Pitt-Rivers, Cranborne Chase I, 3-7; II, xiv; 'Excavations of Rotherley, Woodcuts and Bokerly Dyke'; also Thompson, General Pitt-Rivers, pp. 96-97.
[110] Pitt-Rivers, Cranborne Chase, I, 7, xviii; and Pitt-Rivers, Cranborne Chase, III, xv.
[111] Thompson, General Pitt-Rivers, p. 94; St. George Gray, Index p. xxviii. Their salaries are itemized in DCRO, D396/98.

Caesar's Camp during the late seventies. Rather, it was in the sudden shift of his work away from more traditional archaeological subjects, such as barrows and hill forts, toward the village sites of the later Romano-British period of which Woodcuts was perhaps the prime example. Overall, it was a radical departure as Michael Thompson has stressed[112]. In choosing such sites, not only did Pitt Rivers forsake his earlier, and apparently well-developed, interest in prehistoric remains, but he was now suddenly committed to materials of a strikingly different character. Most interestingly, there were also fewer objects to collect.

The results of Pitt Rivers' work at Cranborne Chase has been closely analyzed and reinterpreted by Christopher Hawkes in his long article of 1947 and more recently by Michael Thompson in his biography[113]. Therefore, little more than a summary is required here. At both Woodcuts and Rotherley, he discovered evidence of disturbances in the sub-soil chalk layer, and identified, at least at Rotherley, indications of post holes. The latter were correctly interpreted as the foundation posts of the village site, and, in fact, were similar in nature to those earlier recorded at Mount Caburn, as Pitt Rivers observed. More striking, however, were the series of narrow ditches, or 'drains' as Pitt Rivers identified them, and circular pits, the original purpose of which eluded him. On the basis of later evidence and Hawkes' interpretation, it is possible now to suggest that Pitt Rivers' 'drains' were the remains of ditches, originally made by hedges or trenches, and that the pits were storage houses for grain or corn. The latter, in turn, would lend greater strength to Pitt Rivers' assumption at the time that both sites were village occupation areas, probably of the Romano-British period. Other evidence suggests, however, that Cranborne Chase was once the site of an imperial estate, rather than a series of independent settlements, as Pitt Rivers assumed, so there were obviously a number of problems in Pitt Rivers' analyses. The important point, however, is that Pitt Rivers had successfully identified the sites, and that he had correctly identified the Romanizing influences. Also, he had provided a body of information sufficiently detailed to allow for reinterpretation at a later date.

The results of Pitt Rivers' work at Woodcuts and Rotherley, as well as his subsequent work in the area were published in his famous series of quartro volumes, known collectively as Excavations in Cranborne Chase. The latter were printed privately in four volumes between 1887 and 1898, or toward the end of his career. Lavishly produced, and, as Thompson has suggested, providing something of a contrast to the relatively mundane subjects discussed, the Cranborne Chase volumes were printed in limited edition only, mostly for distribution to friends and to various professional societies or libraries[114]. Each copy was bound either in blue cloth or calf, depending on the recipient, and was distinguished by Pitt Rivers' own hallmark. The title page included his name and the titles 'F.R.S.' and 'Inspector of Ancient Monuments in Great Britain'. Each of the four volumes produced included a short text, usually less

---

[112] Thompson, General Pitt-Rivers, p. 103. The village excavations are described in Cranborne Chase, II; 'On an Ancient British Settlement excavated near Rushmore, Salisbury', JAI, 17 (1888), 190-99. Scattered remnants of his drawings and other material are in SSW, PRP, P83-84.

[113] Hawkes, 'Britons, Romans and Saxons'.

[114] Lists of recipients are among his papers at Salisbury. See SSW, PRP, P92. Also among his correspondence. Also, Thompson, General Pitt-Rivers, p. 98.

than two hundred pages, and extensive series of plates, many of them fold-outs. The relic tables and analysis of faunal or skeletal remains were included, in each case, as appendices. The overall impression is of a compendium of information rather than an analytic essay, as Thompson has stressed[115]. The charts and plates formed the organizational backbone, the text itself merely helping to link the latter together.

The first volume of Excavations described his work on Woodcuts Common and appeared late in the year 1887. Pitt Rivers had complained to Balfour at the time of their first communications that autumn that he had 'been so busy in bringing out my excavation series here, that I had no time to attend to the museum things'[116]. Volume II, which contained his work on nearby barrows as well as his earlier excavations at Winkelbury Hill, came out early the next year. Both were well received by the archaeological community and praised for what Miss A.W. Buckland, daughter of the geologist and early female member of the Institute, called their 'details and thoroughness'[117]. Because of their limited distribution they probably made less impact than they might have otherwise. St. George Gray, a later assistant of Pitt Rivers, also suggested that the lack of an index made them difficult to use. (He later supplied that want by providing an index to the four volumes as well as a short biography, in what was to become the fifth volume of the series.[118]) Pitt Rivers himself was obviously satisfied with the publications and could little doubt that they surpassed anything produced in Britain before. That his subsequent volumes followed the same format attests to that as well.

If his work at Rushmore and as Inspector of Ancient Monuments took up the major part of his time, it did not prevent him from continuing his avocation as a collector. As he had let Richard Thompson at the South Kensington Museum know, with his new wealth, he was in a better position than ever to add to his own holdings[119]. Soon after 1880, he began to do so in earnest, maintaining a careful list of objects seen, prices and so on for reference while purchasing. For the first time too, he was able to pay more, and his interest in what might better be considered as art objects such as European or Chinese vases, is well-documented for the first time[120]. His own aesthetic interests, as well as those of his wife, also became more manifest.

As to ethnological materials, he tended to concentrate on local or folk objects, following a pattern first established during his trip to Brittany in 1878-79. His trips to Scotland provided him with even greater opportunities, and soon objects such as a Highland claymore, priced at £15 and a pair of cast-off 'wooden soled boots used by the country people', purchased for six shillings, had been added to his, by now, second collection[121]. Finally, there were his series of models. Following the pattern established in the 1870s, models, either in plaster or wood, were prepared for each site, and, in the case of some sites, of each stage of the excavation. Similar models

---

[115] Thompson, General Pitt-Rivers, p. 98.
[116] Pitt-Rivers, Letter to Henry Balfour, 13 Dec 1887, PRM, BP.
[117] A.W. Buckland, Rev. of Excavations at Cranborne Chase, Vols. I and II, JAI, 18 (1888), 200-04. Other reviews are found in AJ, 45 (1888), 311-15 and The Antiquary, 18 (1888), 148-50.
[118] Gray, Index, p. v.
[119] Pitt-Rivers, Letter to Richard Thompson, 14 Apr 1880, SSW, PRP, P125.
[120] SSW, PRP, P140 and B402-60.
[121] Notebooks, PRO, WORK 39; rpt. in Thompson, 'First Inspector', p. 419.

were also prepared of ancient monuments visited during the course of his inspection tours and beginning in 1889 of Celtic crosses seen in Scotland[122].

Expenses for his collection ran high, as did those for his scientific interests in general. The first year after his inheritance 'Scientific Expenses', as they were listed in his accounts, came to £709. That total included the costs of memberships or subscription fees, drafting materials, equipment and finally, new materials for his second collection. The costs of materials and the labour costs of carpenters and others were, however, excluded as were general labourers' pay. The next year the total amount rose to £1,353, the highest ever. Thereafter, yearly expenses hovered around the £1,000 mark. At the time, however, that was still a considerable sum, as his contemporaries, including his family, recognized[123]. Nonetheless, Pitt Rivers could well afford it, and though Bertrand Russell later suggested that the family suffered on account of his interests, their costs came to only a fraction of his yearly income[124].

Not surprisingly, given his new resources, Pitt Rivers depended less and less upon other means of publishing his works. In 1883, a study of early locks and keys entitled On the Development and Distribution of Primitive Locks and Keys was published by Chatto and Windus, and toward the end of the same year, his long article 'On the Egyptian Boomerang and its Affinities' appeared in the Journal of the Anthropological Institute. Both, however, were extensions of his earlier works and were based partially on material then housed in the Oxford collection. (Most of the locks and keys went to Rushmore, however.[125]) His other publications of the period tended to be general addresses, such as that delivered to the Dorset County Museum or at the Dorchester School of Art, both of which were encapsulations of his earlier work[126]. His own interests, therefore, were concentrated on his excavation series, and, with the exception of a short pamphlet on some short-lived excavations at Pen Pitts at Penselwood, Somerset, during the summer of 1884, he provided no periodic reports on the progress of his work as he had in the past[127]. Obviously, everything was being left for his larger quarto volumes, over which he had complete control.

Nonetheless, as in the case of his collection, many of his earlier interests were still apparent. He continued to collect information on stone tools, having sketches made of those he could not obtain for his new collection, again to illustrate the 'principle of continuity', as he had earlier phrased it, of form and use. His interest in the derivation of ornamental design, if anything, increased, and in 1883, he began to study what he called the 'principle of degeneration' in a more systematic way. To do that he

---

[122] 'On Ancient Monuments and the Development of Celtic Crosses in Scotland', PSAL, 13 (1890), 176-77. Also, PRP, AM56. On his earlier models, see Cranborne Chase, I, xvii. The models are now at the Salisbury and South Wilts Museum.
[123] DCRO, D396/98; Thompson, General Pitt-Rivers, p. 76.
[124] Russell, Amberley Papers, I, 22.
[125] 'On the Egyptian Boomerang and its Affinities', JAI, 12 (1883), 454-63. See also SSW, PRP, P76-78.
[126] Pitt-Rivers, Address delivered at the Opening of the Dorset County Museum, Dorchester, 7 Jan 1884 (Dorchester: J. Foster, 1884); 'Address delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Dorchester School of Art, 7 Feb 1884', Dorset County Chronicle.
[127] Report on Excavations in the Pen Pits, near Penselwood, Somerset (London: Printed Privately, 1884).

instituted a regular 'drawing game', whereby his children and servants would pass an illustration from one to the other, copying it as they went along and noting the changes in its composition, rather like the parlour game of gossip[128]. Also, there was his work on Celtic crosses, again an extension of his interest in ornamental design, and by 1888, Pitt Rivers was collecting materials for an article on changes in Christian symbolism which the crosses illustrated[129].

Still, Pitt Rivers' new interests were more of a circumscribed character than those of a few years before. For one, no longer was the museum ideal at the centre of his activities, and his one-time hopes for establishing a comprehensive private museum of archaeological and ethnographical materials seem to have been diminished. There were occasional lapses, including the late addition of Benin bronzes to his collection[130]. But such efforts were exceptional. Also, most of his publications concerned his excavations near Rushmore and rarely touched upon his general plans for the development of anthropology. From that period on, it was local, rather than universal, history which preoccupied him.

Probably the best indication of his changing perspective is provided through Pitt Rivers' attitude towards his second collection. In the first place, it was comprised mostly of folkloric rather than exotic materials, the central core being his earlier collection of agricultural implements and peasant costumes from Brittany. The latter were supplemented by more recent acquisitions in the immediate neighbourhood and materials gathered during his trips to Scotland[131]. Secondly, there was a change in the collection's aim and focus. Rather than being of interest to his fellow professionals, or even informed London visitors, the collection was, as Pitt Rivers explained, 'calculated to draw the interest of a purely rural population 10 miles distant from any town or railway station'[132]. No longer were his hopes centred on a large centralized museum; it was now a private, folk museum that absorbed his interests.

Pitt Rivers began work on his new museum almost as soon as he took up residence in his new home. He chose for its site an abandoned farmhouse on his property, located about four miles from Rushmore, near the village of Farnham. Once used as a school for Gypsies, the four-room brick building provided perhaps an ideal context for a museum, symbolically combining, as it did, the joint functions of a place of education and a rural homestead. At first, the building served simply as a storehouse for his more recently excavated archaeological materials, and in the first volume of his Excavation series, he wrote of his collections together with maps and early models, being placed there where they could be seen by visitors on application. But soon his more ambitious aims became apparent, and by the end of 1888, he could already claim:

---

[128] SSW, PRP, M39-39a
[129] Pitt-Rivers, 'Ancient Monuments and the Celtic Cross'; SSW, PRP, P151.
[130] SSW, PRP, P144: a press clipping announcing arrival of bronzes in England. Pitt-Rivers, Ancient Works of Art from Benin (Rushmore: Printed Privately, 1900).
[131] See Notebooks, PRO, WORK 39, for itemized lists of Scottish purchases.
[132] Pitt-Rivers, Cranborne Chase I, xvii.

> four rooms ... devoted to agricultural appliances of different nations and peasant handicrafts, including peasant carvings, pottery, embroidery, household utensils, costumes, cookery utensils, and a series showing the development of primitive locks and keys, models of country carts, ... a small series of implements illustrating stone, bone and iron ages [and a] facsimile of Norse mill.

The exhibit was open to the public every day, including Sunday afternoons, and a full-time custodian was provided to act as a guide. For a rural museum, it was surprisingly well-attended. Its 'interest', Pitt Rivers remarked, 'has exceeded my utmost expectations'. During 1888 it was not unusual to have as many as 300 visitors on a given day, particularly Sundays and holidays[133].

The Farnham Museum, however, was only one attraction. Pitt Rivers visualized the Farnham Museum as only a part of a far more ambitious educational programme for the local population. A second scheme involved a so-called 'pleasure ground' at Larmer, located a short distance from the Farnham Museum and Rushmore Park. There the emphasis was on entertainments of an even more salubrious kind. Its open grounds were decorated with temples and statues and eventually featured several pavillions for the use of picnickers. Open daily after 1885, the grounds soon became, like the museum, a well-known local attraction. Visitors were greeted by gamekeepers and caretakers dressed in costumes reminiscent of King John's time, a reference to Cranborne Chase's history, and crockery and cutlery were provided for their use. Children were urged to make use of the rustic buildings, and provisions were made for skittles and bowls. In 1886 a bandstand was added, and concerts, presented by a small band composed of labourers and others from Pitt Rivers' estates, played every Sunday afternoon during the spring and summer. As with the museum, the grounds were extremely popular, and during 1887 alone, there were over 15,000 visitors; the yearly figure would triple by the end of the century[134].

Another part of Pitt Rivers' educational scheme was the manor house at nearby Tollard Royal, known as King John's House. Preliminary work had begun on the building as early as 1888, but even before that time, it was clear that the thirteenth-century house was to form a third link in the Cranborne Chase visitors' circuit. Actual restoration of the original core of the building and later, mostly seventeenth century, additions began the following year, beginning with excavations of the foundations and surrounding area. In the meantime, a fine arts collection was compiled especially for exhibition purposes. Following his long-established plan, it was comprised of pictures representative of the development of painting techniques, as Pitt Rivers

---

[133] Cranborne Chase I, xvii and II, xix. The Museum is further described in Pitt-Rivers own A Short Guide to the Larmer Grounds, Rushmore, King John's House, Farnham Museum and Neighbourhood (Rushmore: Printed Privately, 1894). St. George Gray, 'Lieut-General Pitt-Rivers', pp. 62-63; and Index, pp. xxx-xxxiii; 'Pitt-Rivers', Obituary Notice, AJ, 42 (1900), 175-76; and A Guide to the Models of the Stone and Bronze Ages in Farnham Museum; rpt. from AJ, 44 (1897), 311-39. Later descriptions include L.H. Dudley Buxton' s guide The Pitt-River Museum Farnham (Farnham: Farnham Museum 1929).

[134] 'Signatures of those Enjoying the Larmer Grounds', SSW, PRP, M29. Also, Pitt-Rivers, A Short Guide to the Larmer Grounds, the Museum at Farnham,…2nd and enlarged ed. (Farnham: Printed Privately, 1900). Also St. George Gray, 'Message', pp. 4-5.

emphasized, rather than higher concerns of aesthetics or art. Nonetheless, there were a number of pictures of value and interest, including at least one Tintoretto and a Bellini. An exhibit of pottery-making, was prepared for exhibit in the central gallery space[135].

With the selection of King John's house, the basic core of Pitt Rivers' educational network was established. Clearly fashioned on the folklore museum idea, as exemplified in Sweden by Arthur Hazelius' well-known collection near Stockholm[136], the Farnham and Larmer collections and attractions marked a significant departure in Pitt Rivers' own approach. Much of the collection, of course, still reflected his early concerns with progress and evolution in the arts, and the notion of comparative series was continued there, although on a more modest scale than in his earlier collection. But the important point was the change in focus. The Oxford Museum had been organized for professionals foremost, and while educational considerations had played an important part in his own attitudes toward it, particularly during the period it was housed at Bethnal Green and South Kensington, his implicit aim had been to provide a tool for research and perpetuation of the science. At Farnham, he was given a freer reign [*sic* – rein], and his selections reflected that. Exhibitions, in turn, while expressly 'typological', as he soon afterward characterized his comparative technique, lacked much of the scientific rigour of his earlier series[137]. Also, as Thompson has suggested, they reflected the often varying interests of a private collector, something which Pitt Rivers could now afford to be, rather than the otherwise rigorous concerns of a gentleman scientist.

Another factor to consider, and one which his descendant Michael Pitt-Rivers suggests was particularly important, was Pitt Rivers' changing attitudes toward connoisseurship[138]. No longer was he content merely with every-day objects, although those remained an important part in the foundation of his collection, he was now becoming increasingly interested in fine arts and decoration as well. After 1881, 'Fine Arts' became a category in his accounts, and purchases of objects such as Chinese vases and porcelain, occasionally exceeding £200 for a single purchase, were not at all unusual[139]. The Larmer grounds also reflected his change in attitude. Decorated with Oriental pavilions and Japanese bronzes, the pleasure grounds suggest more the long-standing tradition of a country gentleman with exotic fancies than an attempt to educate by example. In short, 'taste' had become a consideration in his thinking, just as it was among his neighbours and, particularly, his antecedents. He was becoming perhaps less the single-minded scientist and more the gentleman landowner. 'Taste' and good judgment had become a social expectation.

---

[135] SSW, PRP, P80; Pitt-Rivers, King John's House, Tollard Royal, Wilts (Rushmore: Privately Printed, 1890).
[136] Pitt-Rivers' admiration for Hazelius is explicit in a letter to A.W. Franks, 1 Jul 1880, PRM, BP. See Dinsmoor, p. 692, for a short description of Hazelius' Museum. Also, Bazin, Museum Age.
[137] 'On the Uses and Arrangement of Arts Museums, illustrated by Series from the Pitt-Rivers Museums at Oxford and Farnham, Dorset', TS, SSW, PRP, P142a and d; 'Typological Museums', pp. 115-22.
[138] Michael Pitt-Rivers, Rev. of General Pitt-Rivers: Evolution and Archaeology in the Nineteenth Century, p. 24; Interview, 13 Jul 1980.
[139] SSW, PRP, P115 and B402-60.

6. Political and Scientific Commitments

Another indication of the change in Pitt Rivers' attitudes and interests came with his sudden involvement in politics. Long denied an opportunity for office, presumably because of his financial status and his obligations to his family, Pitt Rivers' new wealth allowed him to reconsider the matter. Taking the lead from his by-then son-in-law, John Lubbock, as well as several of his Stanley relatives, he began to seek a seat in Parliament. A draft of a speech, apparently written in 1884, and presenting himself as a candidate, remains among his papers, although there is no record of it ever having been presented[140]. Whatever the delay, be it ill-health or simply a change of mind, it would be several years before he would try again.

Interestingly, by that period his political views had taken something of a turn as well. Long a passive liberal, largely through association with the Stanleys, his new wealth and position had the effect of bringing his more implicitly conservative attitudes to the surface. In 1885, he wrote to his neighbour and fellow landowner, John Clavell Mansel-Pleydell (1817-1902), that he had broken with 'the liberal party in the country'. As he continued, 'the time has passed for such a temporizing policy'[141]. Shortly afterward he offered the same opinion in an open letter to the Dorset County Chronicle[142]. His first active involvement in Conservative politics, however, came with his membership in the Handley Branch of Lady Churchill's famous Primrose League, an organization with which he first became involved during 1888[143]. While he often characterized his break with Liberalism as a disagreement over Irish Home Rule, his main concern remained with what he considered the 'Socialism we [as Liberals] are expected to uphold [under Gladstone's government]'[144]. Sometime later he became equally involved with the Liberty and Property Defence League, an organization with which a number of his relatives, both on his own and the Stanley side, had been associated for a number of years[145]. His inherent conservatism had come home to roost.

In 1888, Pitt Rivers finally took his first steps into the political arena, attempting first for a seat on the County Council, presumably later hoping to stand for Parliament on the basis of that position. His speeches of the time express something of his concern:

> I confess that I am not enamoured of political life at the present time, it never was at a lower ebb than now. So long as party was subservient to political principle government went on well enough but of late principle on both sides has been made entirely subservient to party interests and I believe the country will be ruined if it goes on much longer...

---

[140] Unfinished draft of speech presenting himself as a candidate for Parliament, SSW, PRP, M30.
[141] Pitt-Rivers, Letter to John Clarell Mansel-Pleydell, 11 Oct 1885, SSW, PRP, M36b.
[142] Dorset County Chronicle, 31 Oct 1885; SSW, PRP, M37c.
[143] PRP, M31. The Primrose League, an influential conservative organization, was established in the late 1870s through the influence of Lady Randolph Churchill, see Ralph Guy Martin, Jennie Churchill, (Englewood Cliff, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1971), II, 180-82.
[144] Pitt-Rivers, 'Address, Bath, 1888', p. 829. See Pitt-Rivers, Letter to Henry Stanley, 30 Dec 1895, SSW, PRP, Corres.
[145] Dorset County Chronicle, 31 Oct 1885; SSW, PRP, M37c.

Referring to his own scientific interests he explained:

> The progress of the world is regulated and properly so by antagonisms as Darwin, Huxley, Herbert Spencer and just recently Sir William Grove have impressed upon us. This is an age of science and we slowly listen to the voices of scientific men; they are our instructors. They see the affairs of the world from a higher standpoint than political men who are merely wire-pullers and self-interested partisans. The proper function of conservatism is to serve as a check upon violent changes...[146]

Despite a hard-fought campaign, Pitt Rivers was defeated in December by the Honourable Humphrey Stuart, the son of another wealthy neighbour, Lord Arlington. Interestingly, it was Pitt Rivers' own remarks which led to his defeat; rumors circulated that he was an atheist and radical exponent of Darwinian theories, something which set less well with his rural constituency than he had assumed[147]. In the end, his bid for County Council was to be his only attempt at office, and it seems that any further ambitions he had were stifled as a result of that experience. It is clear, however, that his outlook was now coloured by his conservative ideas, and he would continue to espouse the conservative viewpoint, in other contexts, throughout his life. His political views had simply assimilated to his change of status.

By the time of his defeat for County Council, Pitt Rivers had fairly well established himself as a figure of prominence among the local gentry. Most of his interests revolved around local or county matters, and much of his time was taken up with the mundane concerns of estate management. What other time he had he devoted to his excavations or to further work as Inspector of Ancient Monuments. In consequence, his scientific interests tended to take on an increasingly provincial character as well. The Wiltshire Natural History and Archaeological Society, with its offices in Devizes, soon became the principal vehicle of his interests and his correspondence on scientific matters tended to follow a similar course. By the 1890s, he was more apt to write to H.J. Moule, Curator of the newly-established Dorchester Museum, or the staff at Devizes than Franks at the British Museum for advice on archaeological matters[148]. He had, in short, settled into the country life.

For friendship he also looked to his immediate surroundings. Most of his friends during that period were fellow landowners with, of course, similar interests. Also, Pitt Rivers had to quickly acquire the experience which he had previously lacked and, as a result, it was a class of men from whom he could hope to gain some help in managing his properties. Probably his principal guide was John Clavell Mansel-Pleydell, with

---

[146] SSW, PRP, M31.

[147] Thompson, Catalogue, p. 71; PRP, M36. For the results of the campaign, see Dorset County Chronicle, 17 May 1888; PRP, M31a. Handley Division of Dorset, Lists of those elected, Jan 1889; SSW, PRP, M32.

[148] H.J. Moule and Pitt-Rivers exchanged approximately 40 letters on various topics. PRP, Index to Correspondents. Thompson; Catalogue. The material in the Devizes Museum consists of three letters and several hand-written notes, mostly identifying pottery specimens. My thanks to F.K. Annable for this information. Letter, 14 Jan 1980.

whom he also exchanged ideas on politics. Mansel-Pleydell was the model amateur scientist. He was a founder and President of the Dorset Natural History and Archaeological Field Club and a member of the Linnaean and Geological Societies. He was also the author of a number of works on natural history, the most recent of which was The Birds of Dorchester, which had just appeared in 1888. As with Pitt Rivers, he had spent time in the army and was currently a member of the local Militia. The two exchanged letters frequently and visited each other's estates for dinner and conversation. It was in turn Mansel-Pleydell, himself disillusioned with the Liberal Party, who helped initiate Pitt Rivers' own break during the late eighties and helped promote his political ambitions[149].

Pitt Rivers' friendship with Mansel-Pleydell and other members of the local gentry suggests how far he had drifted from his earlier intentions, particularly his scientific and anthropological work in London. His position of leadership in the Anthropological Institute had been allowed to lapse, and after 1884, while he served again as a Vice-President, he no longer held any office in the organization, or even attended meetings[150]. The Society of Antiquaries played an even smaller part in his life. He twice wrote to the Council to request support for his activities as Inspector of Ancient Monuments, but only rarely showed up at meetings himself. At the Archaeological Institute, too, his absence was noticeable, and he also stopped attending there because of the pressures of his new responsibilities[151]. Other scientific commitments, such as his membership in the Zoological Society or the Geological Society, became little more than titulary.

One exception to Pitt Rivers' disengagement from active scientific life was the British Association, and during the late 1880s he became, if anything, more active in that organization. Rarely did he miss a summer meeting, and what work he did in fact do on behalf of the Anthropological Society, such as continuing work on Notes and Queries for Travellers, was done under the auspices of the British Association and was usually carried out during its annual meeting or shortly afterward. In 1888, he was again present at the week-long session, held that year at Bath, carefully collecting copies of many of his lectures and other proceedings for his files[152]. As usual he served on a number of committees, most importantly that 'appointed for the purpose of investigating the effects of different occupations and employments on the Physical Development of the Human Body'. He also served as President of Section D, delivering the keynote address[153].

Pitt Rivers used the occasion of his presidential address to recapitulate his own work and to air some of his grievances. Referring to his work at Winkelbury and, even more recently, at Bokerley Dyke and Wansdyke, he suggested that the apparently shorter stature of the Romano-British population could be used as an index of earlier

---

[149] Their friendship is discussed at length by Thompson, General Pitt-Rivers, pp. 88-89. See Correspondence (155 letters), SSW, PRP. Also, SSW, PRP, M37b . On Pleydell: DNB. His works included: The Birds of Dorsetshire (London: R.H. Porter, 1888): The Flora of Devonshire (London: Whittaker, 1874).

[150] RAI, Presidents, Officers and Members of the Council.

[151] Pitt-Rivers, Letters to the President, 27 May 1886, 30 Aug 1886, 28 Mar 1888, SAL, Corres. Files; also SAL, Executive Committee Minutes; AI, Committee Minutes.

[152] SSW, PRP, P97a.

[153] RBAAS (1888), 100 and 235. See newspaper clippings, SSW, PRP, M44, P100.

ethnic barriers, or the division between the earlier 'long barrow' peoples associated with the Bronze Age and later the Saxon invaders. It was, then, less a reflection of the stature of Romanized Britain than of an even earlier configuration of an indigenous peoples, suggesting, in turn, that the people of the southwest had indeed always shared such characteristics. The implications, therefore, went beyond the immediate concerns of his own work. If true, he explained, 'we shall find ourselves in the presence of anthropological deductions of some value in their bearing on the history of England'[154].

His second topic, his work on behalf of the Ancient Monuments Commission, pointed to many of the same interests. Not only, he explained, were ancient monuments of interest as often picturesque relics in the landscape, but they served also to document historical and ethnological change. His main concern, however, was whether the present 'permissive act', was sufficient to carry out the work at hand, or whether compulsory powers would have to be instituted before landowners could be induced to come to some agreement with the government. Sir John Lubbock, he explained, had held out for compulsion and had declined to have his own property 'registered' as a protest against the weakness of the act. Pitt Rivers confessed that he had many of the same misgivings at first, but he had counted on 'his own position as landowner' to help persuade the more recalcitrant owners to voluntarily place their monuments on the list. For several years, he had been discouraged, but recently, with Herbert Maxwell's gesture in offering up his monuments, the course looked more certain. As of that year, 36 sites had been officially placed under governmental protection. 'I think it speaks well for the landowners that so many should have been willing to accept the Act, considering that few of them take much interest in antiquities. Where archaeological societies and the government had failed noblesse oblige had again triumphed. 'There is not', he concluded, 'a more public-spirited body of the world than the much-abused landowners of England'[155].

His main topic during his address of 1888 was museums. It was the first time for a number of years that Pitt Rivers had addressed the subject publicly, and because of that, it is of particular interest here. Many of his ideas obviously stemmed from the time of his original collection. The importance of museums both for scholars and 'the education of the masses' was stressed, with, as suggested, an increasing emphasis on the latter. The need for a great 'national museum, constructed and maintained at the public expense' was also put forward, as was the value of the 'arts of life' in establishing the 'connecting links' in a way in which 'laws, customs and institutions could only do indirectly'[156]. The most important difference between his address of 1888 and his earlier comments, however, was in the terms of the scope of his ambitions. Pointing to the large iron buildings left over after several recent temporary exhibitions, including that used at Earls Court the previous year, he suggested that one such building could serve as a 'permanent museum'. Stressing his plans for a 'giant anthropological rotunda', he suggested that exhibits could be distributed among concentric circles, beginning in the centre, with objects and copies of objects dating from the Palaeolithic period, and extending outward through prehistoric Britain. Contemporaneous examples from elsewhere in the world and casts and original

---

[154] Pitt-Rivers, 'Address, Bath, 1888', p. 835.
[155] Ibid, p. 832.
[156] Ibid, p. 825.

materials dating from the early Middle Ages were to fill the next circle, and around the outer rim would be exhibited the often more perishable artefacts from more exotic reaches of the world which, as he explained, showed a 'continuity with those of antiquity'. As he continued:

> The advantages of such an institution would be appreciated, not by archaeologists and anthropologists only. It would adapt itself more especially to the limited time for study at the disposal of the working classes, for whose education it is unnecessary to say that at the present time we are all deeply concerned...Anything which tends to impress the mind with the slow growth and stability of human institutions and industries, and their dependence upon antiquity, must, I think, contribute to check revolutionary ideas, and the tendency which now exists, and which is encouraged by some who should know better, to break directly with the past, and must help to inculcate conservative principles, which are urgently needed at the present time, if the civilisation that we enjoy is to be maintained and to be permitted to develop itself[157].

While it had been hinted at before in his lecture at the Whitechapel School, the inherently political message of his scheme could not now be doubted.

7. Disagreements Over the Oxford Collection

Considering Pitt Rivers' preoccupation with the educational possibilities of a museum, such as he described in his Bath address, it is not surprising that he should have been increasingly disillusioned with how things were working out at Oxford. First of all, as he realized, Oxford was a very different institution from that envisioned originally. It was relatively isolated from large centres of population and therefore less accessible than a public museum in London might be. Secondly, as he again realized, it was intended almost exclusively for the use of scholars and the instruction of their students, not for the education of the 'working classes' as he had put it. While meeting half of his expectations, though, it failed in other ways. His more recent work and success with his own museum at Rushmore only helped confirm his misgivings. It was finally time, as he obviously felt, to intervene.

The first hint of Pitt Rivers' renewed interest in the Oxford collection came with his Bath address. The tone, despite the obvious references to Oxford's failings, was generally complimentary. Moseley was credited with having done 'justice to the original collection'. Balfour, in turn, appeared to Pitt Rivers to 'follow in the steps of his predecessor and former chief, and will do his best to enlarge and improve it'. Referring to Balfour's own modest publication, one upon which he had commented the previous year, he explained that 'he has already added a new series in relation to the ornamentation of arrow shafts', suggesting that such independent work was to be encouraged[158]. Shortly afterward, as a gesture of his interest, he presented the first

---

[157] Ibid, p. 828.

[158] Pitt-Rivers, 'Address, Bath, 1888', p. 826. He refers to Balfour's 'Evolution of a Characteristic Pattern on the Shafts of Arrows from the Solomon Islands'.

materials since the original donation, a number of flints and other remains from Rotherly Camp, the site of his last year's campaign[159]. Finally, he had made overtures to Tylor about the possibility of visiting Oxford, both to see the collection and to help Balfour out. As Tylor explained regarding the uncompleted series, 'I feel sure that your going over the series with him will promote their getting arranged so as to be open to the public'[160].

Pitt Rivers' Oxford visit—the first since his receiving his D.C.L. in Encaenia two years before[161]—came at the end of October 1888. It was evidently a disappointment, particularly from Pitt Rivers' point of view. Much of the collection was still in storage, and only the upper galleries had been completed. Balfour had labelled many of the series and had provided larger signs for visitors, but as yet no members of the public had actually seen the collection. Moreover, nothing had been done on the catalogue, obviously something of primary concern to Pitt Rivers[162].

In the meantime, Balfour was being overwhelmed with work. That same autumn he had had to contend with the transfer of the Ashmolean collection, as well as a number of new acquisitions. Also, as a perfectionist himself, he was never satisfied with what he had done. 'The frequent arrival of the new important additions... ', he explained in hi s report that year, 'necessitates constant slight rearrangements, in order to increase the educational value of the series'[163]. Unfortunately too, although Tylor was well aware of Balfour's problems, he tended to acquiesce—if only to keep the peace of the moment—to Pitt Rivers' often negative views. Moreover, in his correspondence to Pitt Rivers, he tended to blame Balfour almost entirely for Oxford's failings, although the management of the collection was almost equally his responsibility[164]. Balfour was fast becoming the scapegoat.

During the early part of 1889, primarily as a result of Pitt Rivers' dissatisfaction, Balfour resumed his work with greater zeal. Work on the main floor court space began, and by the end of the summer, a number of new series, including one on ornamental art and the second on the 'artificial deformation of the human body', had been added. A special Cook exhibit, based on the Forster materials in the Ashmolean collection, was also organized. In November, the first Petrie material from Egypt began to arrive, and it too was soon distributed among the other series. Whenever needed, illustrations were prepared for further reference, as in the case of the exhibit covering the flight of the boomerang. In obvious response to Pitt Rivers' own methods, maps showing the geographical distribution of objects were displayed whenever possible[165].

---

[159] Receipt and remarks of appreciation Oxford University Museum, 18 Oct 1888, SSW, PRP. H is work at Rotherley began on 4 Oct 1886.
[160] E.B. Tylor, Letter to Pitt-Rivers, 4 Oct 1888, SSW, PRP, Corres.
[161] He received his D.C.L. on 30 Jun 1886.
[162] E.B. Tylor, Letters to Pitt-Rivers, 20 Oct and 4 Nov 1888, SSW, PRP, Corres. The progress of the collection is also described in the Pitt-Rivers Museum, Annual Report for 1888.
[163] Pitt-Rivers Museum, Annual Report, 1888, p. 31.
[164] E.B. Tylor, Letter to Pitt-Rivers, 4 Oct 1888, SSW, PRP, Corres.
[165] Penniman, 'Pitt-Rivers Museum', pp. 244-45, Pitt-Rivers Museum, Annual Reports, 1883-87, 1888. See Pitt-Rivers Museum; From the South Seas.

As a result of his work, although much of the court area was still in disarray by May 1890, the collection was described as 'sufficiently advanced to be opened to the public in the afternoons'[166]. For the time being, however, only the galleries could be visited, and it would be another two years before the whole museum was opened. If Pitt Rivers had suddenly become optimistic (which is doubtful), his hopes were short-lived.

Not surprisingly, the University itself was becoming increasingly impatient with the progress of the collection, and by the beginning of 1889, possibly under pressure from Pitt Rivers, it had begun to look for a way of speeding up completion of the task. As usual, the blame tended to centre on Balfour, with Tylor doing little to defend the charges made against his co-worker, as Balfour later learned. To speed the work up, a Committee of Council was formed on 16 May 1890, to look into the possibility of the transfer of responsibility for the Museum from Balfour 'to the Reader in Anthropology'[167]. Whether Tylor had instigated the measure himself is unclear, but by June it looked as if the University's decision had been made.

In the meantime, Balfour began to press his own case. Unfortunately, his efforts were ill-timed, and not realizing that his position was about to be terminated, he decided to make fresh demands of his own. Suggesting that he no longer wished to serve as an assistant to the Linacre Professor, he pressed to be made full Curator. Writing to Professor Price, of the Committee, just before it made its recommendations, Balfour complained:

> I have for some years performed the duties and assumed the responsibilities of executive curator, without having the privileges or title. In view of the fact that Dr. Tylor, as he fully admits to me, could not possibly devote to the collection one quarter of the time required for its management, and as he has not studied the system of working the department, I am somewhat surprised that he should be so ready to accept the responsibilities[168].

What surprised Balfour more, was that Tylor should in the next few days support the Committee's decision as well[169].

Fortunately, for Balfour, the arrangements would not go into effect, largely due to the intervention of Professor W. Hatchett Jackson, then standing in for Moseley as Deputy Linacre Professor[170]. In June, matters finally were settled, and a further grant was provided for the continuation of the work, along the lines originally recommended by the Council. Nothing had been done as of yet about securing

---

[166] 'Report of Mr. H. Balfour, M.A. Sub-Curator at the Pitt-Rivers Museum', University Gazette, 2 May 1890.
[167] OUA, HCP, Council Minutes, 16 May 1890, HC/M/3/9. Explained later in a letter of 9 Nov 1891 from Henry Boyd to Balfour, PRM, BP. Balfour was not warned until 12 Jun 1890. E.B. Tylor, Letter to Henry Balfour, PRM, BP.
[168] Henry Balfour, Letter to Bartholomew Price, 15 Jun 1890, PRM, BP. He had written on 2 Jun as well.
[169] Revealed later in a letter from Balfour to Sir Herbert Warren, 1 Oct 1919, PRM, BP.
[170] W. Hatchett Jackson, Letters to Bartholomew Price, 3 May and 2 Jun 1890, PRM, BP.

Balfour a permanent position, but at least his temporary job was secured for another year. Tylor's original offer that he would have been able to 'keep the place going'[171], was forgotten, at least for the time being.

Throughout the summer of 1890, Balfour had been given little support from Pitt Rivers himself. Although Tylor's intervention may account in part for Pitt Rivers' absence from affairs, it is still surprising that Pitt Rivers did nothing, since more than anyone else, he should have understood the difficulties involved in managing the collection. But then Pitt Rivers had expectations of his own, and was used to having things done his way and on time. Also, that circumstances were far more complex for Balfour at Oxford than they were for him at Rushmore, with his literally unbounded resources and total control over both staff and resources, seems to have been unappreciated entirely.

Developments in the autumn of 1889, however, helped bring the full scope of the problem into the light. The main issue was a publication of Balfour's to which Pitt Rivers took strong exception. Although Pitt Rivers had not denied Balfour's right 'to publish on the collection', as he typically put it[172], and had advised him on his first paper on ornamental arrow patterns, he was reluctant to give up what he considered to be his personal copyright on the material. When preoccupied with his own work at Wiltshire and Dorsetshire, it little mattered and generally, he had professed a preference for his work there. But now, particularly after his speech at Bath, he was eager to reassert his priority and, perhaps, was jealous that anyone else should even begin to take credit for what he considered a system and approach of his own.

The paper in question was 'On the Structure and Affinities of the Composite Bow', given by Balfour at the Anthropological Institute in 1889[173]. Viewed by Balfour as fully in keeping with the requirements and obligations of his position, and as a project very much in line with Pitt Rivers' own aims, Pitt Rivers saw it merely as an impertinence. Writing shortly after its presentation, he exclaimed:

> If I have listened with some interest to this paper, it has not been without surprise that I have heard the remarks which Mr. Balfour has made in the opening portion of it, to the effect that what has previously been written on the subject, has been characterized by vagueness and superficiality...

Complaining that his own work had been relegated to 'a remote corner of his paper', he continued:

> But it is at all times desirable that young Gentlemen should acquire the habit of giving due credit to those who have

---

[171] Quoted by Henry Balfour, Letter to Henry Boyd (Vice-Chancellor), 14 Oct 1891, PRM, BP. An extension of funds was announced on 28 May 1890, University Gazette.
[172] See Pitt-Rivers, Letter to Henry Balfour, 28 Nov 1890, PRM, BP.
[173] Balfour, 'On the Structure and Affinities of the Composite Bow'.

> preceded them, which is part of good manners that might be taught at Oxford...[174]

To Balfour in a letter of 28 November, he was equally direct:

> Your paper on my series of composite bows, as at first submitted to the Anthropological Institute, was not at all flattering to the original collection or to me, and I have to guard against a recurrence of anything of this kind. When I have done, I shall be glad that you should publish anything relating to the Museum that may be consistent with your position as curator of it[175].

Balfour, it was implied, was merely to wait until Pitt Rivers was finished with the work at hand.

Balfour was understandably taken aback by Pitt Rivers' response. His initial reaction was to resign immediately, as he explained to Professor Henry Boyd, then Vice-Chancellor[176]. Boyd, however, was consoling in his advice, explaining that Pitt Rivers' letter to Balfour 'was more brusque than the one he sent me' (implying that his exchange was almost as brusque), and suggesting further that Balfour take no steps for the time being[177]. Balfour was evidently convinced by Boyd's argument and soon afterwards wrote to Pitt Rivers. He explained that the paper would be altered prior to publication, just as the General wished. It had been, he reemphasized, his plan to do so originally. Finally, the charge that he had kept the collection 'in the background for six years' was ignored. His closing remarks were that his only aim was 'to advance the branch of Anthropology with which your name is chiefly connected'[178].

Pitt Rivers was evidently placated, and nothing more was said about the matter. Balfour was obviously disappointed but assumed correctly as it turned out—that he would be able to circumvent the General's dictates once his own authority increased. For the time being, however, Pitt Rivers remained unyielding on the matter of publication. When Balfour pointed out early the next year that he wished to publish a short essay on 'Decorative Art', Pitt Rivers refused to give his permission[179]. As Pitt Rivers had explained, he hoped to say something on the subject himself, and at the time he still planned to give a lecture on the derivation of ornament at Oxford later that spring. (The promise was never carried out, however.[180]) For Balfour it remained a bitter pill to swallow, but he made the necessary accommodations for the sake, mainly, of the collection.

---

[174] Remarks on Balfour's 'Composite Bow', TS, 1890, SSW, PRP, P 62. Also 'Remarks on the paper "On the Structure and Affinities of the Composite Bow" by Henry Balfour', JAI, 19 (1899), 246-50.
[175] Pitt-Rivers, Letter to Henry Balfour, 28 Nov 1890, PRM, BP.
[176] Henry Balfour, Letter to Henry Boyd, 2 Dec 1890, PRM, BP.
[177] Henry Boyd, Letter to Henry Balfour, 2 Dee 1890, PRM, BP.
[178] Henry Balfour, Letter to Pitt-Rivers, 3 Dec 1890, PRM, BP; SSW, PRP, Corres.
[179] Henry Balfour, Letter to Pitt-Rivers, 4 Mar 1891, PRM, BP; SSW, PRP, Corres.
[180] Pitt-Rivers' plans were revealed in a letter from Balfour of 3 Dec 1890, PRM, BP.

8. Pitt Rivers' Final Work at Rushmore

Pitt Rivers' exchange with Balfour over rights to the collection was his last effort to influence events at Oxford. From then on he would continually express his dissatisfaction, or allude more indirectly to the priority of his own work, but never again did he attempt to contact Balfour or Tylor about the particulars of the collection or to fulfill his stated wish to 'publish on it'. In effect, as he later explained to F. W. Rudler of the Anthropological Institute, he had given up on Oxford[181].

In the meantime, there was his work at Cranborne Chase to attend to. In 1889, he was involved with excavations at Bokerly Dyke and Wansdyke, and the following year, beginning in January 1890, he returned to those sites, working too at Wansdyke the following summer[182]. There was also his smaller excavation at King John's House in Tollard Royal and the publication of the short monograph on his findings. As to his museum, he was involved with the completion of his series of models and Celtic crosses, an account of which was delivered at the meeting of the Society of Antiquaries in the spring, and with the extension of the building at Farnham to provide space for their display[183]. Finally, there was his project for a miniature 'Temple of Vesta' on the Rushmore grounds, built to commemorate the birth of his eldest son's first child. The latter was begun in the summer of 1890 and completed toward the end of the year[184].

As a result of his involvement at Rushmore, Pitt Rivers was finding it increasingly less convenient to deal with his other responsibilities, and in 1890, he gave up his salary as Inspector of Ancient Monuments. That summer, he confined his travels to Somerset and the immediate vicinity, the annual trip to Scotland being undertaken by his assistant, Tomkin and another assistant, C.W. Gray[185]. From that date on he served as Inspector in an honorary capacity only.

Most of his work on behalf of the Ancient Monuments Act had been completed. Forty-four of the original fifty monuments had been entered into the notebooks. The only sites on the original schedule not visited were those in the Shetland Isles, for which an expedition had once been planned, although never carried out[186]. Sites of Cadbury Camp in nearby Somerset and Plas Newydd in Argyleshire [*sic*] were also not visited, apparently because they were already known or had been seen before. So much had been done, then, that as early as 1889, his annual Scottish trip was taken more with intentions of collecting materials on Celtic crosses than with the scheduling or recording of new monuments. The following year's expedition, undertaken by his two assistants, was solely involved with providing additional material, mostly photographs, of sites already visited[187].

---

[181] Pitt-Rivers, Letter to F. W. Rudler, 23 May 1898, SSW, PRP, Corres.
[182] Pitt-Rivers Cranborne Chase, III; 'Excavations in Bokerly and Wandyke and their bearing on the Roman Occupation of Britain', Trans. Lancs. and Cheshire Antiq. Soc., 1890; 'Excavations in Wansdyke, 1889-91' Wits. Arch. Mag.; 25 (1891), 335-42.
[183] Pitt-Rivers, Cranborne Chase, II, xix.
[184] DCRO, D396/98; Thompson, General Pitt-Rivers, p. 76.
[185] PRO, Ancient Monuments Notebooks, WORK 39; Thompson, 'First Inspector'; General Pitt-Rivers, p. 64.
[186] Thompson, 'First Inspector', p. 111.
[187] Ibid, pp. 109-10.

But while the near completion of his work was the main reason for Pitt Rivers' disengagement from his duties on behalf of the Ancient Monuments Act, another factor affecting his decision was his declining health. Toward the end of the year all of his work fell off entirely, apparently because of his illness. No excavations took place in 1891, and his publications of that year referred to work completed two years before; it is likely that they had been written then as well. His only public presentation was a lecture at a meeting of the Society of Arts in December, or toward the end of the year[188]. Otherwise, he seems to have been forced to take to his bed.

Pitt Rivers' lecture of 1890 marked a final effort to describe his continued hopes for a satisfactory anthropological museum. As he emphasized: 'I hold that the great desideration of our day is an educational museum, in which the visitors may instruct themselves... '. The key to such a museum, he held, was his comparative series: 'Typology forms a tree of progress and distinguishes the leading shoots from the inner branches'. It was only by presenting the materials in this way that the layman could hope to grasp a 'knowledge of the facts of evolution'—or more grandiloquently 'the one great knowledge'. It was his last attempt to promote his conception, and despite his references to scientific understanding 'the problems of the naturalist and thus of the typologist are analogous'—it suggests how little he had drifted from the core of his earlier scheme despite revisions. While his priority had shifted from research to the public, the same impulse continued to inspire his interests[189].

Pitt Rivers' illness of 1891 extended well into the next year, and other than his presentation at the Society of Arts, he was incapable of working at his usual level until 1893, when he began work at the South Lodge Camp, on the Rushmore grounds[190]. In the intervening period, his condition had become recurrently critical. In the spring of 1892, he experienced an attack of bronchitis which he only just survived. The summer was spent in France, first at Clermont-Ferrand, and then at Paris[191]. In his better moments he used his time to work on the third volume of his Cranborne Chase series, the account of his work at Bockerly Dyke and Wansdyke[192]. Otherwise, he had simply to rest.

In the meantime, Oxford was carrying on in spite of Pitt Rivers' absence from affairs. Most of the collection was set up by the end of 1891, by which time the number of new collections had been added and arranged[193]. Balfour's official appointment as Curator, first announced in the Annual Report of 1891, had finally become a reality, after considerable pressure on Balfour's part. It was to last from January 1892 until 31 December 1898. To Balfour's satisfaction he was also given a full-time assistant for the first time and an increase of £100 per annum for his own salary. Moreover, his insistence that the Curator of the Museum 'should have the same status in regard to

---

[188] Pitt-Rivers, 'Typological Museums'. His other articles included 'Excavations at Wansdyke' published in the Wilts. Arch. Mag.

[189] Pitt-Rivers, 'Typological Museums', pp. 115, 116.

[190] Pitt-Rivers, 'Excavations of the South Lodge Camp, Rushmore Park', Wits. Arch. Mag., 27 (1893), 206-22.

[191] Thompson, General Pitt-Rivers, p. 103; SSW, PRP, Corres.

[192] Published in 1892.

[193] Changes are recorded in the Pitt-Rivers Museum, Annual Reports.

the University Museum with professors teaching in the Museum' had been effectively agreed upon[194]. His place was finally established.

While the long-awaited catalogue was never to appear, Balfour was also able to proceed with his own publications, completing a number of short notices for the Journal of the Anthropological Institute and finishing his own book on Decorative Art in 1894, or just in time to compete with that of Alfred Haddon and W. J. Holmes, as he had hoped[195]. Most of his time, however, was spent with students, and many hours were devoted to 'demonstrating' with the collection. In practice, as Beatrice Blackwood later recalled, demonstrations involved removing objects from the case and explaining the characteristics of each to the students and then passing pieces around for them to examine. In later years he often provided facsimiles so as to avoid damaging any of the more precious pieces[196]. His other responsibilities included answering inquiries, preparing the annual report and setting up the schedule for visitors, including, by the mid 1890s, groups of school children[197]. Pitt Rivers' hopes for a public and permanent museum, then, were not entirely forgotten, as Balfour demonstrated.

Tylor, too, fell into the daily pattern of his work. Lectures continued to be given each term, usually on matters dealing little with 'material culture' as Marett pointed out[198]. A number of those were reprinted in the Institute's Journal, but most were little more than reiterations of his earlier work[199]. Although a corps of students gathered around him, his audience was usually small. As with the lectures of the Ashmolean Museum, many of those attending were young women, many of them from the newer and as yet unrecognized women's colleges[200]. According to J.L. Myers, one of his students at the time, his wife was also there to insure that there was no 'confusion among the specimens'[201]. The impression is, at least by the nineties, of an ageing academic, respected for his past work and the affection which he inspired, but clearly someone past his prime.

---

[194] See Henry Balfour, Letter to Henry Boyd, 14 Nov 1891, PRM, BP. His position was announced in the University Gazette, 1 Mar 1892.

[195] Henry Balfour, Letter to Pitt-Rivers, 4 Mar 1891, PRM, BP. Haddon's eventual work on Evolution in Art (1895; rpt. London: W. Scot, 1914); Holme's efforts included Instructions to Collectors (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1902).

[196] Henry Balfour, Letter to Pitt-Rivers, 3 Dec 1890, PRM, BP. Interview, Beatrice Blackwood, 10 Oct 1974; Penniman, 'General Pitt-Rivers'; and 'A Note on the Beginning of Anthropology in Oxford', p. 12.

[197] Pitt-Rivers Museum, Annual Reports.

[198] Marett, Tylor, p. 210.

[199] For example, Tylor's ' The Tasmanians as Representatives of Palaeolithic Man', JAI, 23 (1893), 141-52; 'On the Occurrence of Ground Stone Implements of Australian Type from Tasmania', JAI, 24 (1894), 335-40. Both had been presented earlier at Oxford.

[200] The presence of women at Tylor's lectures was commented on by E.E. Evans-Pritchard in Social Anthropology at Oxford', JASO, 1 (1970), 103. See also Vera Brittain, The Women of Oxford (London: George C. Harap, 1960). The same was true of archaeology, as John Henry Parker remarked in 1870: 'The ladies are already taking the lead in this matter'. Parker, The Ashmolean Museum.

[201] Myres, 'Memoires of Edward Tylor', p. 6. See also, Penniman, 'A Note on the Beginning of Anthropology in Oxford', pp. 12-13; Marett, Tylor, p. 200; and Jerseyman, p. 117.

While he tacitly accepted his retirement from the forefront of anthropology, Tylor nonetheless continued to fight doggedly on behalf of anthropology at the University. His own readership, renewed annually, was converted to a professorship in 1895; and although it was only an honorary position, lasting until his retirement in 1909, the appointment did have the effect of increasing anthropology's prestige in the University[202]. Tylor's influence at Balliol, where Jowett invited him to spend his free time, was also important in that regard. In 1895, or just as his professorship was established, he pressed to have anthropology recognized as a special subject for Honours in Natural Science, enlisting the support of other scientists in his bid before the Hebdomadal Council[203]. But the 'unholy alliance' as he later reflected to J.L. Myers, 'between Theology, Literae Humaniores and Natural Sciences' prevented its acceptance[204]. Never forgiving his opponents, particularly Spooner of New College, he continued to press for recognition, and almost immediately after rejection of his initial proposal, he suggested that a special diploma course for graduate students might prove a better alternative, something which was finally accomplished in 1906[205]. In 1895, he was also able to persuade Arthur Thomson (1858-1935), an anatomist and author of the well-known book on Anatomy for Art Students (1886), to teach physical anthropology, thereby rounding out the department and providing for instruction in that previously neglected subject[206]. While relations between he and Balfour remained tense, much of the earlier competitiveness between the two had dissipated. Each, in turn, simply got down to their own 'special subjects' and proceeded with the work of the Department. Only later, when Tylor came to be credited with having 'created and inspired' the museum, did Balfour's anger over their earlier disagreements become apparent[207].

The late 1890s was also a surprisingly productive period for Pitt Rivers. After a halt in excavations for nearly two years, he was again able to resume work in the spring of 1893, first, as he explained, at South Lodge Camp, and later with the Handley Hill Entrenchment, also nearby[208]. In September, he began work on the Wor Barrow Ditch, undertaking work on the mound itself the following spring. Finally, in April of 1895 work began on the barrows at Handley Down, and in November, at Martindowne Camp. The results were compiled for inclusion in the fourth, and as it would turn out the last, of Pitt Rivers' Cranborne Chase series. Publication finally took place in 1898.

---

[202] University Gazette, 5 Jun 1895. The position is listed in the Statutes as Statt. Tit. lv. Sat. 11 E. 12. Edward Brabrook commented on the significance of Tylor's appointment in his 'Anniversary Address, 1896', p. 392.

[203] E.B. Tylor, Letter to Thomas Huxley, 14 Nov 1894, ICS, HP.

[204] Myres, 'Edward Tylor', p. 7.

[205] Pitt-Rivers Museum, Annual Reports, 1907-08.

[206] Penniman, 'Notes on the Beginning of Anthropology in Oxford', p. 13; A Hundred Years, p. 98. Arthur Thomson, A Handbook of Anatomy for Art Students, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906).

[207] The controversy concerned an address by Sir. Herbert Warren in the Museums Journal, whereby credit was given to Tylor for the work at the museum. Similar attributions had been made by Haddon ('Edward Burnett Tylor' Obituary Notice, Nature, 98 (1909), 373) and by Andrew Lang ('Edward Burnett Tylor', p. 14). Balfour attempted to set the matter straight on several occasions: Letters to Herbert Warren, 1 and 16 Oct 1919. Also, Andrew Lang, Letter to Henry Balfour, 30 Nov (1907), PRM, BP.

[208] Pitt-Rivers, 'South Lodge Camp'; Cranborne Chase IV; SSW, PRP, R2.

In the meantime, occasional papers describing his work were provided for the journals[209].

Pitt Rivers' excavation work during that period showed little change in method or approach, but there was a considerable refinement in technique. Wor Barrow well demonstrated that change. The first large prehistoric site to be excavated by him in a number of years, Pitt Rivers was able to use all of the skills and insights developed by him over the years. The first campaign in 1893 consisted of distinguishing the later trench from the broken ditch originally surrounding the mound. Debris was considerable, particularly considering the few number of artefacts anticipated. It was perhaps characteristic of Pitt Rivers' approach at that time as well that such a potentially unrevealing feature should have been excavated first. The evidence, however, was to prove of fundamental importance, and as Thompson has stressed, it was really on the basis of the few objects found, mostly a few antler picks and pottery sherds, that it was possible to date the mound at all.

Pitt Rivers began work on the actual mound itself the following spring and, in keeping with an approach first developed at Mount Caburn Camp, the whole monument was excavated as a series of boxes. Several sections in the centre of the mound were also kept for later reference. The results of his mound excavations were also predictable. Listed in his relic tables were bits of skeletons and cist remains. Also, evidence of post-holes in the chalk strata were carefully recorded. Soon afterward he returned to the ditch, principally to determine the sequence of its deterioration and to establish its original shape and proportions. Referring to experimental evidence on the erosion of features of such nature, he was able to chart the original location and profiles of the ditch. The whole process was carefully noted, using the same painstaking topographical techniques. Also, as a further improvement, the whole work was being documented at each point with photographs rather than sketches, as was common before. The latter, in turn, were published in the fourth volume of the Cranborne Chase series, the first volume to be illustrated in that way[210]. Overall, it was a model of exposition and technique, standing in relative contrast to the equally exemplary, but less precise, work of contemporaries such as Schliemann in France or even Petrie in Egypt, both of whose work Pitt Rivers followed closely[211]. As later archaeologists recognized, Pitt Rivers had established what was indeed a scientific archaeology[212].

Wor Barrow was to be Pitt Rivers' last full-scale excavation. A new campaign was contemplated at the Romano-British site of Iwerne, Dorsetshire in December 1897 and some work was begun there. But, because of his health, Pitt Rivers was never able to devote as much time to it as he had hoped, nor was he able to visit the site consistently himself. For the on-site work, therefore, he had to depend on his assistants, including by then his Chief Assistant, St. George Gray. It was obviously frustrating for him to have to work by proxy in such a way. Originally planned for

---

[209] Pitt-Rivers, 'Excavations in Wansdyke'; and 'South Lodge Camp'.
[210] Cf. Thompson, General Pitt-Rivers, p. 98.
[211] See Pitt-Rivers, 'Presidential Address, Dorchester, 1897', p. 329.
[212] Kendrick, Wheeler, p. 18; Daniel, Prehistory, p. 72.

publication in the fifth volume of his Excavation series, Iwerne was only given a short description in The Reliquary and Illustrated Archaeologist[213]. Gray himself eventually used Pitt Rivers' life, rather than his excavations, as the subject for the fifth volume of the series.

During his final years, Pitt Rivers lavished increasing attention on his museum and grounds, perhaps because they required less active involvement on his part. Much of his effort was concentrated on the Larmer Grounds. In 1895, a 'Singing Stand' was added; the next year a hall for picnickers. A Japanese Bronze horse was added in 1897, and over the next two years the last of the Oriental Indian rooms were completed. Based on examples found on the Earls Court Exhibition in 1897, (and possibly removed from the Exhibition itself), the latter gave full expression to Pitt Rivers' general theme of enlightened entertainment[214].

Corresponding efforts were centred on the Farnham Museum. In 1894, an L-shaped gallery was added to the rear of the original building, more than doubling its display area. The next year a false half-timbered extension was added to the house for the accommodation of larger agricultural exhibits. At the time of the publication of the second edition of his guidebook in 1900, the museum included nine rooms with exhibits ranging from displays of British and Classical pottery to local weavings and embroidery techniques[215].

In the latter part of 1897 Pitt Rivers also began a new collection of West African bronzes based on the Benin materials brought back by members of the famous Punitive Expedition of earlier in the year. Again, St. George Gray served as his representative at auctions, often bidding, as Gray remembered, against Read and others of the British Museum staff in pursuit of the General's last major collection[216]. With the addition, finally, of 'fancy stock' at Rushmore, including yaks, reindeer, llamas and kangaroos, Pitt Rivers' combined museum and pleasure grounds had reached its final development. It would remain a feature of the region until the 1950s, when it was finally closed down for reasons of cost.

Pitt Rivers would seem to have been well satisfied with his accomplishments. His last major address, given at the Annual Meeting of the Archaeological Institute, held at Dorchester in 1897, attests to that, consisting essentially of a catalogue of his work over the years, centring on what he considered as his major accomplishments, such as his discoveries of early tools in Egypt and of his improvements in techniques in Britain. He also suggested a programme for future development, based obviously on the lines inaugurated by him. But there were some hints of dissatisfaction as well. His regrets at having been unable to work in Egypt or the Middle East become explicit for the first time. His envy of those such as Petrie or Schliemann, who were able to

---

[213] Pitt-Rivers 'On a Roman tile marked with a Cross found at Iwern, Dorset', Reliquary and Illust. Arch., 2 (1896), 111-12.
[214] DCRO, D396/98; Pitt-Rivers, A Short Guide, 1900; Dudley Buxton, The Pitt-Rivers Museum Farnham (Farnham, Dorset: The Farnham Museum, 1929); St. George Gray, Index, pp. xxx-xxxiii. The expansion of the grounds is also summarized in Thompson, General Pitt-Rivers, pp. 78-86.
[215] Pitt-Rivers, Short Guide, 1900.
[216] St. George Gray, 'Memoirs', p. 4. Works of Art from Benin. On the British Museum's own collection, see Miller, p. 319. Also, Crower, pp. 104-05.

devote themselves to archaeology on a full-time basis, unburdened as he had been by the responsibilities of a family and an income-producing career, is also apparent. But his main dissatisfaction, as he suggested in his address, was not a personal one, but one relating to the nature of the subject at hand. It was, namely, the failure of both the British archaeological and anthropological communities to set their disciplines upon better scientific foundations, both institutionally and procedurally. Most important was the lack of a museum base. Until, as Pitt Rivers stressed, anthropology was set within the framework of the scientific museum, and recognized both its responsibility to the public and its own research needs, there could be little hope of advancement[217].

It is not surprising given his continuing ambitions that Pitt Rivers' main disappointment should have been with the Oxford Museum. For one, the museum there was constrained by the often limited resources of the University. There could be little hope that it could ever attain the proportions hoped for by Pitt Rivers himself, or that it would ever answer fully to the needs of either anthropology or the public. Located outside of the greater London area, it could only rarely be visited by the public, and, even for scholars, it was often inconvenient. Finally, neither the University nor those charged by the University with maintaining the collection seemed to understand the full scope of his scheme. The lack of published research, paradoxically brought about in part by Pitt Rivers' own intervention, and the failure of the department to attract students all pointed to the University's failure. His final comments, offered in 1898 to F.W. Rudler, then President of the Anthropological Institute, provide the background to his unhappiness. Describing his own system of arrangement, he explained:

> I hardly think that the system has been favourably tried at Oxford. Mr. Tylor and Mr. Balfour have done their best no doubt, but they have not had the means, the materials, or the funds to work the system thoroughly, and as I soon found out that it was quite impossible that a method communicated by one person should be worked out effectively by others. Some of the series have not been developed at all, and others very imperfectly. The whole collection was out of sight for a long time, five years, I think, whilst the building was being erected, and my health has not allowed me to go there much since. It is not the kind of a building for a developmental collection, which would be better in low long galleries well lighted from above and without pretention; the large and lofty space was not wanted. Rolleston and Moseley were the heads when I gave the collection to Oxford, and Tylor though the best man possible for Sociology, had at that time but little knowledge of the material arts. Balfour, though hard-working, does not, I believe know fully to this day what the original design of the collection was in some cases. I do not however complain of the men. They have done their best to carry out an idea which was an original one at the time, and circumstances have been against it. Oxford was not the place for it, and I should never have sent it there if I had not been ill at the time and anxious to

[217] Pitt-Rivers, 'Address, Dorchester, 1897'.

> find a resting place for it of some kind in the future. I have always regretted it, and my new museum at Farnham, Dorset, represents my views on the subject much better. I shall write a paper about it before long if I live...[218]

Beyond that, nothing more could be done.

Pitt Rivers died on 4 May 1900, in his home at Rushmore. His cremation, itself a final expression of both his individualism and his adherence to his credo of scientific rationalism, took place at Woking soon afterward. He left a surprisingly small amount of work undone. The last of his Cranborne Chase volumes was only in the planning stages, his museum and pleasure grounds, while well along in their development, still needed refinement and extension. But most of his explicit ambitions had been fulfilled. His four volumes on Cranborne Chase stood as examples of what could be accomplished, given the time and material resources. They also showed Pitt Rivers to be the leading practitioner in a field which only recently aspired to scientific veracity and, as he complained in his last address, had yet to attain it[219]. His museum at Oxford, while never satisfying him, stood as a reminder of the full scope of his ambitions and served both as a means of education for future anthropologists and as a laboratory for further investigation in the field. The museum at Farnham provided the alternative: a popular museum designed for the enlightenment of the masses. Finally, there was his last monograph on Benin bronzes, completed early in 1900 and published shortly after his death. The first detailed investigation of a major African art form, it too stood as a memorial to the scope of his vision.

Pitt Rivers was perhaps too harsh on himself and Oxford for what he saw as his failure there. Oxford was, it is true, not the ideal location. The reasons have been explained many times. But still it served as a professional home for the new science—in some ways the first professional home. Anthropologists and archaeologists had been employed in the past, either as secretaries and librarians, or as curators for the various membership organizations, such as the Society of Antiquaries. More recently, they had been employed by the Anthropological Institute, again primarily as librarians. There were also specialists in the British Museum and to a lesser extent in smaller municipal and university museums. But none of those figures were professionals in the fullest sense of the term. Secretaries were looked upon essentially as caretakers, employed to maintain the records of the institution with which they were associated but never equals to the members. The same was true of earlier museum workers, with, possibly, the exception of A.W. Franks, whose independent wealth set him apart from most other museum employees. C.H. Read at the British Museum was seen as little more than a clerk, and, indeed for any years, his salary was paid for out of Franks' own pocket. James Edge-Partington, Franks' only other assistant, was employed as a supernumerary only.

Pitt Rivers' bequest to Oxford helped to change all of that. For the first time, with Tylor's readership, a position was created for a full-time professional anthropologist, a position which, in turn, was eventually accorded the status of a university professorship. The eventual provision of a curator for the museum itself—again,

---

[218] Pitt-Rivers, Letter to F.W. Rudler, 23 May 1898, SSW, PRP, Corres.
[219] Pitt-Rivers, 'Address, Dorchester, 1897', p. 327.

through Balfour's insistence that he be granted the status of a professor—improved the status of the museum and the prestige of the new science. The positions of others, C.H. Read at the British Museum in particular, were obviously enhanced as a result. The Oxford Museum, then, brought anthropology into its professional stage, and while the final recognition would take a different direction from that ever envisioned by Pitt Rivers, the new 'science of man' was never to be the same.