

EPILOGUE

1. Anthropology and the Universities

Pitt Rivers' call for a large and centralized museum, serving both specialists' needs and the needs of the general public, did not go unnoticed. Indeed, during the early part of the twentieth century, or the years just after his death, the plea became a recurrent one. Alfred Haddon, in his 'Presidential Address' at the annual meeting of the Anthropological Institute in 1902, called for the foundation of a museum-based programme comparable to that carried out in America under the auspices of the Smithsonian Institution and the American Bureau of Ethnology. Two years later, on the same occasion, Henry Balfour proposed the formation of a great 'national museum' which would serve to consolidate the various anthropological and folkloric collections in Britain, thereby bringing that nation in line with others on the Continent and America. 'Our own country', he complained, 'suffers from comparison'. C.H. Read, of the British Museum, returned to the subject in 1907, pointing to the success of German museums in particular¹. Finally, in 1910, a deputation from the Anthropological Institute, by now the Royal Anthropological Institute, approached the government with the idea of forming an Imperial Bureau of Ethnology, as Read had suggested several years before. But while the idea was given further support the following year at the British Association meeting, no more delegations were forthcoming². Official involvement on the part of the Institute, then, ended before the first World War, or only a few years after Pitt Rivers' death.

While a few anthropologists continued to be preoccupied with the notion of an Imperial Bureau³, the main development of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and one which went almost unnoticed at the time, was the sudden growth of anthropological studies within the universities. Cambridge had followed Oxford's lead; and in 1885, a new department of Anthropology in the University Museum was formed under the guidance of Baron Anatole von Hugel. With the encouragement of W.L.H. Duckworth and Professor Ridgeway, Cambridge had also established a separate lectureship in anthropology, filled first by A.C. Haddon in 1900. A separate diploma course followed in 1908⁴. The University of London entered upon a similar course of development, with archaeology and anthropology being first offered by the

¹ Alfred Haddon, 'President's Address: What the United States of America is Doing for Anthropology', *JAI*, 32 (1902), 8-24; Henry Balfour, 'Presidential Address: The Relation of Museums to the Study of Anthropology', *JAI*, 34 (1904), 12; C.H. Read, 'A Museum of Anthropology', in *Anthropological Essays presented to Edward Burnett Tylor*, pp. 277; *RBAAS*, 1910, reported in W. Crooke, 'Address on Ethnographical Museums', *MJ*, 11 (1911), 155. Haddon made a similar call and comparison in his *Rev. of Contributions to North American Ethnology*, *MJ*, 5 (1905), 225-27. Balfour had called for an 'ethnographic bureau' in his 'Presidential Address for 1897', *JAI*, (1898), 554.

² 'On a Deputation acting for Imperial Bureau of Anthropology', *Man*, 9 (1909), No. 55.

³ An Imperial Bureau of Anthropology and the Extension of Anthropological Studies', *Man*, 23 (1929), No. 70. For example, see J.L. Myres, 'Presidential Address: The Science of Man in the Service of the State', *JRAI*, 59 (1929), 19-52. A similar proposal was made for the British Museum. *Royal Commission... Final Report*, Part I, p. 59 (PPH of P 1929-30, Vol XVI, p. 431); cited in Miller, p. 327.

⁴ W.L.H. Duckworth, Alfred C. Haddon, W.H.R. River, 'Anthropology at the Universities', *Man*, 6 (1906), No. 57.

University in 1906⁵. Finally, as the newer universities came into existence, they too recognized anthropology as part of their curriculum. The Victoria University at Manchester provided instruction beginning in 1907; Birmingham and Liverpool shortly afterward, and the new University of Bristol in 1920⁶.

Throughout that period, Oxford continued to set the precedent. While the character of each department varied greatly, each tended, therefore, to follow directly upon the model established at Oxford. Usually the subject was divided into the three areas of interest: physical anthropology, social anthropology and material culture or technology. And with the exception of the University of London, a museum usually played a part in the function of each department. (London, however, had the British Museum for reference, so it too was connected with a museum, if only indirectly.) As a result, the museum was still seen as a necessary adjunct to the science, again, much as it had been at Oxford. As the Anthropological Committee of the British Association reported in 1914, 'laboratories, a library, and a museum, readily available for teaching students, are indispensable adjuncts to each school', an observation also made by C.H. Read in his earlier article 'Anthropology at the Universities' published in the Institute's new journal in 1906⁷.

In terms of the development of a programme and courses, Oxford also tended to take the lead. Despite Tylor's failure to have anthropology recognized in the Examination Schools, a separate diploma course was eventually established for graduate students in anthropology and members of the Colonial Service beginning in 1904. In 1908, the first two students, Francis Knowles and Barbara Freire-Marreco, the latter best known as Tylor's bibliographer, were graduated. In the next year, a separate course for Probationers in the Sudan Civil Service was also instituted, expanding the number of students in the field⁸. The faculty's position improved as well. Tylor's professorship was renewed in 1898 and in 1903, as was Balfour's curatorship. The collection continued to expand, with donations from Mary Kingsley, Lady Burton, C.G. Seligman and Mrs. Seligman, A.C. Haddon, and, of course, Tylor and Balfour

⁵ On the establishment of the Cambridge department: Annual Report of the Faculty Board of Archaeology and Anthropology, 11 Jun 1929 for the Year 1928; also MJ, 22 (1922-23), 44. The course was announced by Read 'Anthropology at the University'. On Haddon's role: A. Hingston Quiggin, Haddon the Headhunter (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1942), pp. 103-04; A. C. Haddon, 'The Regulations for obtaining a Diploma of Anthropology in the Univ. of Cambridge', Man, 7 (1907), No. 20. Haddon's Lectureship became a Readership in 1909.

⁶ Announced respectively by Read, 'Presidential Address', JAI, 31 (1900), 9-10; Henry Balfour, 'President's Address, 1904', pp. 12-18 and in the 'Report of a discussion on "The Practical Application of Anthropological Teaching in Universities"; (report of discussion at BAAS meeting, Birmingham, 1913), Man, 13 (1913) No. 102. On Manchester in particular: Victoria University at Manchester, The Manchester Museum Reports, beginning 1907. On Bristol: Man 20 (1920) No. 96. The exact dates are obviously difficult to assign, since a variety of factors must be taken into account and comparison is not always possible.

⁷ Cited in 'Anthropological Teaching in the Universities: Resolutions of the Committee of the BAAS', Man 14 (1914), No. 35; Read, 'Anthropology at the Universities'.

⁸ 'Oxford Notes', Athenaeum, 10 Dec 1904, p. 807. On the Diploma course: Balfour, 'Presidential Address 1905', JAI, 35 (1905), 16; Read 'Anthropology of the Universities', p. 5. Penniman, 'Note on the Beginning of Anthropology in Oxford', p. 11; Evans-Pritchard, 'A Few Words', p. 17-18. Actual instruction both for the diploma and Colonial Service Probationers is reported in Pitt Rivers Museum, Annual Reports from 1904.

themselves. New staff, including J.T. Long, in 1897, and Harold St. George Gray, Pitt Rivers' one-time assistant, in 1899, were taken on to help with the actual organization of the collection. By the time of the first diploma course in 1907, there was also a new 'Anthropological Laboratory', established under the direction of Arthur Thomson⁹.

What work was carried on at the Pitt Rivers Museum was increasingly supplemented by instruction in other quarters. Again in 1904, a Committee of Anthropology, with representatives from the University Museum and the Ashmolean, was formed to oversee the development of the subject and to offer additional specialist instruction to interested candidates¹⁰. Publications followed shortly afterward. Balfour both lectured and published on the subject regularly, and used the museum as the basis for his own distribution studies and early investigations into the development of art and technology¹¹. Later students and assistants followed a similar course, including a series of experimental studies carried out by Francis Knowles on the flight of the boomerang, beginning in 1904¹². The museum also served as a basis for field operations. In 1908, following Tylor and Moseley's earlier example, as well as that of the recent Cambridge Expedition to the Torres Straits, Balfour traveled to Zambesi to record the life of the inhabitants and collect more materials for the collection¹³. Other students, ranging from civil servants in the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan and later social anthropologists, such as A.R. Radcliffe-Brown and E.E. Evans-Pritchard, followed directly in that tradition. As Andrew Lang later said of Tylor: 'he has sent pupils into many strange lands; they have been the field naturalists of human nature, no less than anthropologists of the study'¹⁴. Oxford, therefore, provided both the base of operations and the professional recognition necessary for the continuation of the new science.

But while anthropology flourished both at Oxford and at the other universities, there were indications of a major change of interest as well a change away from the model envisioned by Pitt Rivers and his contemporaries toward one based largely on the results of field work. Again, the change of interests is well illustrated by developments at Oxford. At the time of the museum's foundation, the subject could be divided, as we have seen, into the three main areas: physical anthropology, social

⁹ Pitt Rivers Museum, Annual Reports, 1883-1907.

¹⁰ University Gazette, 16 May and 6 Jun 1905.

¹¹ Pitt Rivers Museum, Annual Reports. For example, see Origin of Decorative Art as illustrated by the Art of Modern Savages, from the Midland Naturalist, 1-3, rpt. 1890; 'On a Remarkable Ancient Bow and Arrows believed to be of Assyrian Origin', JAI, 26 (1896), 210-20; Balfour, 'Bird and Human Designs from the Solomon Islands', illustrating the influence of one design over another, Man, 5 (1905), No. 50, 81-87.

¹² Pitt Rivers Museum, Annual Report, 1904. B.M. Blackwood and T.K. Penniman, 'Sir Francis Knowles', Obituary Notice, Man, 53 (1953); Penniman, A Hundred Years, p. 87.

¹³ Pitt Rivers Museum, Annual Report, 1904, p. 51; The Torres Straits expedition took place in 1888 (New Guinea) among those involved were A.C. Haydon, C.S. Meyers, C.G. Seligman and W.H.R. Rivers; see A. C. Haddon, 'The Ethnography of the Western Tribes of Torres Straits', JAI 19 (1889), 297-440. Also Quiggin, p. 108; Penniman, A Hundred Years, 99-101; and numerous articles in JAI from 1890 to 1900: Archibald E. Hunt, 'Ethnological Notes on the Murray Islands, Torres Straits', JAI 28 (1898); C.H. Read, 'Presidential Address', JAI, 29 (1899), 13-14; Haddon, 'The Classification of Stone Clubs from British New Guinea', JAI, 30 (1900), 221.

¹⁴ Lang, 'Tylor', p. 1.

anthropology and material culture (ethnology, as Balfour tended to refer to it). Archaeology came under the latter heading and, as yet, had received no formal recognition other than that afforded through occasional instruction offered by associated archaeologists, such as Evans at the Ashmolean¹⁵. (It was as if Pitt Rivers had taken the fourth part of the subject with him.) By the time of the establishment of the diploma course, therefore, there were already signs of what might be called an organizational separation at Oxford. With Tylor's retirement in 1908, the divisions had become even more clear, and there was strikingly little overlap among the interests of students in each field. Even lectures tended to be presented in different places, with Balfour and Thomson continuing to work at the University Museum, while Tylor's successor, R.R. Marett, gave his lectures and tutorials at Exeter College. By 1914, the last and most important break was recognized with Marett's designation of his part of what he referred to as Tylor's 'empire', as a separate Department of Social Anthropology¹⁶.

Similar divisions tended to take place within the anthropological departments of other universities as well. At Cambridge, the separation of interests was represented by the administrative split between James Frazer, whose fellowship at Trinity College continued until his death in 1941, and Baron von Hugel, whose work at the museum continued until 1920. Alfred Haddon, who was obviously more influenced by the breadth of Frazer's teachings than by von Hugel's more traditional interests, attempted to bridge the gap, but he was unsuccessful, as were most Cambridge anthropologists¹⁷. At London, the break was even clearer, with Grafton Elliot Smith, earlier at Manchester, and E.J. Perry, at the University of London, espousing an anthropology based directly on the older German historical tradition. In the meantime, C.G. Seligman and Bronislaw Malinowski were establishing a new functionalist school at the London School of Economics¹⁸. Only in America, among English-speaking nations, was the division less evident. But even there, particularly at Harvard and the University of Pennsylvania, the beginning of the schism could be seen, at least by the 1920s¹⁹. The museum had become less of a centre of interest than a burden carried over from an earlier time. The interesting point is that the universities should have provided the opportunities for the interests which in the long run would lead to the demise of the museum approach. Also striking is the fact that Pitt Rivers himself, as the most outspoken advocate of the idea of the museum as a research tool, should have made the most direct and significant contribution to that end.

¹⁵ Evans, The Ashmolean as a Home of Archaeology.

¹⁶ Marett, Tylor, p. 8.

¹⁷ Demonstrated, for example, by Haddon's own History of Anthropology and Head Hunters, Black, White and Brown and The Practical Value of Ethnology (London: Watts, 1921). Also see Quiggin, pp. 111-18.

¹⁸ See H.R. Hays, from Ape to Angel (1958; rpt. New York: Capricorn Books, 1964), pp. 286-89; Lowie, pp. 220-25; Penniman, A Hundred Years, p. 206. The difference between the two schools is recounted by E. E. Evans-Pritchard in 'A Few Words about the Development of Social Anthropology at Oxford', pp. 18-19. See also Bronislaw Malinowski, A Diary in the Strict Sense of the Term, trans. by Norbert Guterman (London: Routledge and Keegan Paul, 1967), pp. 46-50. For a late defence of the diffusionists, see Edward Westermarck 'Methods in Social Anthropology', JRAI, 56 (1936), 223-48.

¹⁹ Eggan, 'One Hundred Years of Ethnology', in Brew, One Hundred Years, pp. 134-36. Cf. Timothy Thoresen, 'Paying the Piper and Calling the Tune: The Beginnings of Academic Anthropology in California', JHBS 11 (1975), 257-75.

2. Recapitulation

The museum period in the history of British Anthropology was a surprisingly short-lived one. While the earliest ethnologists, particularly the members of the Ethnological Society of London, had expressed an interest in museums, mostly as a means of promoting their concerns, there had been little consideration of the idea of the museum as a research centre during the early period of the subject's existence. That museums might have been useful in answering early questions and that museum materials might have helped to establish the origins of man and his past connections had only been hinted at. The ethnologists' own interests had settled on other areas, primarily the physical appearance of different races and their languages; in effect, relationships among languages were used to 'explain away' the more obvious differences presented by physical appearance and—as an extension of that—material arts.

Gradually, with the appearance of different factions within its ranks and the general shift away from the central core of philological interests toward more generalized concerns, the Ethnological Society entered into a decline. Also, with the increase of protective legislation and the growth of the British Empire, much of the necessary advocational work on behalf of aboriginal populations had been completed. The final shift in orientation came, however, with the new evidence of man's antiquity. Further substantiated through discoveries by Boucher de Perthes in the Somme Valley and the realization that comparable findings had been made in Britain, the limited chronology upon which ethnologists had based their philological investigations was no longer tenable. It was from that point on, no longer a question of thousands of years, but one of millions. As a result, the reconstruction of man's past on the basis of similarities among languages was a programme which could never hope to be realized. The new answer, most now realized, lay first in the physical and anatomical record, increasingly known as the 'anthropological' record, and secondarily, in the evidence provided through archaeological investigation or the comparative study of technology. It was, then, the latter, more material-oriented approach which attracted the generation of anthropologists and ethnologists of Pitt Rivers' time, and which most directly contributed to the rapid growth of the subject during the 1860s.

It is not surprising that anthropologists and ethnologists of that period should have turned to the museum as the main focus of their interests. Basing their expectations on the successes of the natural sciences, the new anthropologists sought out the museum as a means of discovering the answers to their own varied questions. At the same time, they promoted the foundation of private collections and the extension of larger institutional collections, including those of the British Museum. Their overall approach, however, remained closely tied to that of the previous generation of ethnologists. What they sought was a picture of particular developments, specific links among peoples and suggestions of past influences. The latter, however, were represented not by language, but by variations in tools, weapons and decorative motifs. It was, moreover, essentially an historical approach, one based on actual connections and events, rather than a more general concepts of process and change. The same was true of the newer physical anthropologists, who sought to build up a history of changes in man's physical appearance and not a general explanation of

that change. The difference between the newer approach (or approaches) and that of the older ethnologists was, therefore, one of subject matter rather than orientation alone. The museum was simply the new point of convergence.

The enthusiasm for research of the kind at first envisioned through museum work, however, was not sustained. The first indication of a change came by the end of the 1860s, with the development of a more systematic way of looking at man's origins and development. Based in part on a more generalized notion of progress and change and, as J.W. Burrow has argued, on the assumption of necessary relationships within societies as first propounded through utilitarian writings of Mill and Bentham, a new 'evolutionist' approach began to gain acceptance²⁰. Archaeology and its series of necessary technological stages was an obvious and useful reference; the parallel between the Ages of Stone, Bronze and Iron and the developmental stages of evolutionist thinking was one to which many anthropologists of the period pointed. But that was only a beginning. Evolutionism also allowed for a more general shift in orientation away from the 'hard' evidence of artefacts or physical features, toward the 'softer' evidence of religion and thought. The evolutionist's ideal was one of gradual change based on the aprioristic evidence of man's universal development. Different societies of peoples were linked because they could be shown to share the same place on an ideal scale, not because they shared a common historical link. As a result, the evidence derived from archaeology, or even from anatomy, could only hope to substantiate what already was becoming something of general acceptance. The museum and its storehouse of artefacts had suddenly become redundant.

The 1870s saw a continuation of the move away from museums toward the newer evolutionist perspective. Most anthropologists, following E.B. Tylor's lead in particular, embraced evolutionism as a final answer to the dilemma of ten years before. Evolution provided the unity that was needed, one that the museum had also offered, but never fully delivered. During the next few years, a variety of studies emerged, including studies of the evolution of marital customs by McLennan, the development of legal systems by Maine, of kinship nomenclature by Morgan, and of religion and man's intellectual development by Tylor and, later, James Frazer. Archaeologists and physical anthropologists were, in turn, simply left behind and, as a result, followed a separate course of development. By the 1880s, the process was more or less complete, and the link between what might be considered the two schools of thought was clearly broken. In consequence, the museum, while continuing to form an important adjunct to other anthropological interests, had become for many little more than a public face for the new subject.

Pitt Rivers' career and interests followed closely upon the developments just described. Indeed, his changing interests can be said to have directly reflected the shifting interests within the anthropological and ethnological communities. As with many others, Pitt-Rivers had first entered the field as an amateur scientist, interested in the new developments in biology—Darwin in particular—and in the new evidence of man's antiquity. He was also a collector, at first of exotic weapons and other exotic objects, and later of archaeological materials. It was in the latter area that he gained early recognition within both the Ethnological and Anthropological Societies.

²⁰ Burrow, Evolution.

His own ideas on 'progress' and 'development' were those of the conventional Victorian—ones firmly rooted in the notions of material and technological progress as represented most vividly by the Great Exhibition in 1851. His own early collection, particularly the core collection of Western arms, clearly reflected that sensibility. When he became involved in ethnological circles during the early 1860s, however, his collection took on a slightly different meaning. It was intended, from that point, not only to illustrate man's technological progress, but to demonstrate how different peoples were linked, both figuratively and actually, in the past. Darwin, in a sense, provided the paradigm, but it was the earlier tradition of historical philology and the concurrent, and, roughly parallel, approach of British prehistory, which provided the real basis for his programme. By the time of the formation of the Anthropological Institute in 1871, his collection had become for him a means of answering the questions of man's origins—a tool for research with which to fill the gap left through the failure of comparative philology.

With the advent of what might be broadly considered the evolutionist approach, Pitt Rivers' own interests in the field began to slacken. His first steps toward independence were the by-products of his military career, his relative isolation during his posting in Ireland encouraging him to fall back on other interests, including field surveys and amateur archaeological excavations, even before disillusionment had set in. At first, his work was very much in the mainstream of anthropological concerns, but by the 1870s, he was beginning to arrive at a more scientific methodology and was also becoming more of a specialist in his field. His objections to the new evolutionist approach, an approach to understanding the world's peoples by ranking each according to a universal and hierarchical scheme, were clearly expressed. His denigration of Tylor's researches in religion demonstrated just how great his disenchantment was. The irony was that his own collection, formed only superficially on the basis of evolutionist notions, should have come for many to express the ideals of the very camp to which he was opposed.

During the 1870s, Pitt Rivers became more entrenched in his views. While still serving on various committees and as President of the new Anthropological Institute, his own interests turned increasingly toward archaeology and field work. His excavations grew increasingly more complete and detailed. His publications became models of technique and presentation. By the end of his decade, he was attending meetings of the Institute less frequently and had resigned from any position of leadership there. His only continuing involvement was on behalf of his collection, and even that he considered less seriously at the time. In 1874, when he first presented his museum to the public, it was, from his point of view, already more of a popular display than a scientific research tool. His aim was to demonstrate the progress of man and the development of technology, in order that the general public, and the working man in particular, might learn to appreciate the gradual course of human development, as well as the relatively tenuous state of contemporary civilisation. Its lesson, then, was as much political as scientific, and it was clear from his writings and lectures that Pitt Rivers understood it as such.

But while there was a growing separation between the public and scientific side of Pitt Rivers' collecting interests, he still maintained a hope that his collection might serve as a basis of further scientific investigation. His initial intention was that his collection might form part of a national institution, along the lines of those already

established in America, and, to a lesser degree, on the Continent. His several offers to the nation were turned down, however, and he reacted bitterly. His first impulse was to establish an independent museum, one which would continue to minister to the public but would equally serve as a laboratory for specialists. After 1880, he was in a position to carry such a plan out, but was persuaded, or allowed himself to be persuaded, to choose a more conventional course. The solution was to donate the collection to Oxford, and in 1883, what was to become the first university-based anthropological department was established as a direct result of his gift. Although he was soon dissatisfied with progress there, Pitt Rivers could at least accept that he had helped put anthropology on a scientific footing—one rooted in the tangibility of artefacts and the material evidence.

In the meantime, his archaeological interests were given additional support through his inheritance. At one time forced to conduct his excavations on a relatively restricted budget, being dependent, as he was, upon funds from the British Association or the Anthropological Institute, after 1880 he was able to pay for the work himself. Also, Cranborne Chase, an area partially encompassed by his Wiltshire and Dorset estate, provided not only an income, but an incomparable assortment of prehistoric and Romano-British sites. By the mid-1880s, he had a regular team of some fifteen workers, a full-time assistant, a carpenter and a draftsman to help with the work. The first of his profusely illustrated Cranborne Chase volumes was published in 1886, establishing new standards for recording and presentation. Three more volumes appeared over the next twelve years, and it is upon those works that his well-deserved archaeological reputation rests. His archaeological career, therefore, really only began after his anthropological career had ended.

While his inheritance helped promote his archaeological career, it also provided for new collecting opportunities. One of the first things he did at Rushmore was to establish a new museum in the old schoolhouse in the nearby village of Farnham. In some ways his second collection was comparable to that at Oxford. Displays of materials were organized by subject according to the 'typological' or comparative system long associated with his name. But while it too had a scientific aim, largely because of the presence of his more recent archaeological materials, his main interest was in the educational possibilities of his new museum. No longer was the collection packed in drawers or on screens to provide materials for research, but they were displayed openly in order to better convey a single message, again, the gradual nature of man's progress. In some ways, it followed a simpler plan, but one over which he had greater control.

The final area of Pitt Rivers' involvement during the last twenty years of his life was his work on behalf of the protection of ancient monuments and field remains. Long interested in the preservation of prehistoric and later sites through his experience as a surveyor and field worker, his inheritance gave him the authority to see his hopes realized. Beginning in 1883, he was appointed Inspector of Ancient Monuments and spent several months each year compiling a catalogue of ancient remains. He also persuaded a number of owners to allow their properties to come under state control, or at least to establish protection agreements with the government for their maintenance. In many ways comparable to his long-standing collecting interests, his work as Ancient Monuments Inspector combined the careful recording procedures of his archaeological and anthropological work with the more public-spirited intentions of

his museum displays. Unlike his museum work, however, his work on the part of ancient monuments was a complete success. By the end of his life, there were over forty monuments registered (and, therefore, protected) and he could claim credit for the beginning of a national programme.

During the last years of his life, Pitt Rivers continued to press for a national anthropological institution, one to serve as a centre of archaeological and ethnological interests and further research. But his main interests by the 1890s clearly lay elsewhere. Oxford continued to disappoint him, and his periodic attempts to influence events there ended in frustration. Toward the end of his life, he still expressed concern that neither E.B. Tylor nor Henry Balfour of the Museum's staff understood his full intentions. But, then, neither did others within the anthropological community at the time. The museum-based approach had simply reached its end.

3. The Influence of Pitt Rivers and His Collection

During the early part of the twentieth century anthropology tended to drift further away from the museum, first toward the field and then towards its logical complement, the university. The museum was still held up as an important centre of research and successive presidents of the Anthropological Institute, such as Haddon, Balfour and C.H. Read, typically presented museums as the foundation upon which the subject rested²¹. But the attention of most anthropologists centred increasingly upon the problems of social organization and of societies in their original context. Such a penchant was given further theoretical backing by what came to be called the functionalist approach, as espoused by A.R. Radcliffe-Brown, later at Oxford and, even more importantly, Bronislaw Malinowski, at the London School of Economics.

In the view of the functionalists, the museum not only represented an older, more historical approach but, as Maurice Freedman, writing for a UNESCO study on the role of museums, later phrased it, a 'machine for decontextualization'²². Malinowski's argument was based in part on his own experience. First drawn to field work for the usual reasons and intent at the time upon 'buying old curios' to send back to museums, he soon found that in doing so he was merely stripping a society of its accoutrements and learning nothing about the significance or use of those materials in their original context. As he explained, 'the ordering, the classifying, and interpreting should be done in the field with reference to the organic whole of native social life'. In his first long book on his field experience, *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*, published in 1922, he made the point even more explicitly: 'A canoe is an item of material culture, and as such it can be described, photographed and even bodily transported into a museum. But—and this is a truth too often overlooked—the ethnographic reality of the canoe would not be brought much nearer to a student at home, even by

²¹ Haddon, 'Presidential Address, 1902', Balfour 'Presidential Address, 1904', Read, 'A Museum of Anthropology'. Later pleas are found in Sir Richard Temple's 'An Imperial Bureau of Anthropology and the Extension of Anthropological Studies', *Man*, 23 (1923), No. 70; J.L. Myers, 'Presidential Address, 1929' and H.S. Harrison, 'Address to Section H, BAAS', *Man*, 30 (1930), No. 151.

²² Maurice Freedman, 'Social and Cultural Anthropology', in *International Study of the Main Trends of Research in the Field of the Social and Human Sciences*, UNESCO, n.d., p. 59.

placing a perfect specimen right before him²³. Increasingly, as Malinowski's approach gained favour, particularly among his students in London, museums and artefacts came to be swept from the new anthropological programme. To collect or write upon the material life of a people was to deny what was coming to be accepted as a new school of thought. Most anthropologists, particularly those trained in the new tradition of the 1920s and 30s, tended to conform implicitly²⁴.

Among a numerically smaller group, however, the museum remained, as it had been in Pitt Rivers' time, an important focus of study. Balfour, Haddon and Read all emphasized the importance of museums themselves, and continued to publish on subjects ranging from the 'Origin and Sacred Character of certain Ornaments of the South East Pacific', by Read to 'Bird and Human Designs from the Solomon Islands', by Balfour. Both were obviously inspired by Pitt Rivers and credited him specifically²⁵. Less theoretical writers such as J. Edge-Partington at the British Museum, and H. Ling Roth, later at the Bankfield Museum in Halifax, also made periodic contributions to the various journals, mostly in the form of short descriptions of objects recently acquired by their institutions²⁶. But, while in terms of actual numbers of articles, material culture studies continued to be well represented until well into the 1930s, as William Sturtevant has recently pointed out²⁷, the main emphasis of the journals was clearly on the newer sociological studies of the university-trained functionalists. The result was simply a growing separation between museum-oriented anthropologists and their newer, more sociologically-oriented colleagues. By 1922, the separation within the anthropological community was significant enough for W.H.R. Rivers to call attention to the obvious divisions within the field and plead for a return to a more unitary approach²⁸. By the end of the decade, it was common for museum-based anthropologists to refer to themselves as 'museum

²³ Malinowski, Baloma, 'The Spirits of the Dead in the Trobriand Islands', *JRAI*, 46 (1916), 418-19. Also see Edmund Leach, 'The Epistemological Background to Malinowski's Empiricism', in Raymond Firth, ed, *Man and Culture* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1957); *Argonauts of the Western Pacific* (1922; rpt. New York: E.P. Dutton, 1961), p. 105.

²⁴ One important exception was A.M. Hocart. See Hocart, 'The Canoe and the Bonito in Eddystone Island', *JRAI*, 65 (1935), 97-111. Another exception was Raymond Firth who continued to write on subjects such as cat's cradles and ornamentation. See Raymond Firth *Art and Life in New Guinea* (London: The Studio 7, 1972). But even Firth recognized his teacher, Malinowski's indifference: 'Malinowski was not much concerned with the visual arts...' Personal Communication, 3 Jun 1975. For his more recent comments see his 'Preface' to Anthony Forge, ed., *Primitive Art and Society* (London: For the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research by Oxford Univ. Press, 1973).

²⁵ Read, 'Sacred Character', p. 140; Balfour, 'Bird and Human Designs', p. 81. See also W.H.R. Rivers, 'Anthropology at the British Association', *Man*, 12 (1912), 165-76.

²⁶ Edge-Partington, 'The Ethnography of Matty Island'; a 'Note on the Matuatonga on the Art Gallery, Auckland, New Zealand', *Man*, 1 (1901), No. 31, featured arrows from Espiritu Santo, New Hebrides, *Man*, 1 (1901), No. 38; etc. H. Ling Roth, *The Fijian Collection*, Bankfield Museum Publication No. 1 (1901). *The Burmese Collection*, Bankfield Museum Publication No. 2 (1901); *Moccasins and their Quill Work*, Bankfield Museum, Museum Publication No. 7 (1901). See Bankfield Museum Notes, *MJ*, 11 (1912), 119.

²⁷ Sturtevant, p. 632.

²⁸ W.H.R. Rivers, 'Presidential Address: The Unity of Anthropology', *JRAI*, 52 (1922), 12-25. The division was also noted in E.N. Fallaize, 'Suggestions for the Classification of the Subject-matter of Anthropology', *MJ*, 20 (1921), 151-52; A.C. Haddon, *The Practical Value of Ethnology*. Later in H.J. Harrison 'Ethnology Under Glass', *JRAI*, 67 (1937), 1.

men', obviously to differentiate themselves from their university-based colleagues²⁹. While brought together for conferences or on journal committees, it was soon evident that the two groups had little in common and that the members were participating in entirely different fields.

But while the separation of interests dominated British anthropology, the museum approach continued to hold sway on the Continent. From his position in Dresden, A.B. Meyer carried on with his lavish series of monographs on the material culture of German colonial possessions³⁰. Willey Foy, associated with the Cologne museum from the turn of the century, wrote on the interconnections of the peoples of the South Pacific, basing his work on the analysis of their shared art and technology³¹. His assistant, R.F. Graebner followed a similar course of study and together gave definition to what eventually became known as the German Cultural Historical School (*Kulturkreislehre*)³². Similar developments followed in Scandinavia, initially with the work of Hjalmar Stolpe, and in America, through the work of William H. Holmes, and afterwards of Franz Boas³³. In each case, it was the objects which took precedence, and, as with Pitt Rivers, it was the classification of objects which was meant to provide the results. That Foy and Meyer should have travelled to Oxford to see what was being done there prior to the reorganization of their own collections, attests in part to the importance of Pitt Rivers as an early proponent of such an approach³⁴. His own work, in turn, served as inspiration in other areas as well, particularly the study of ornamental art, as the work of Stolpe and Holmes and many others demonstrated.

In Britain, the kinds of historical analysis popular in Germany and Scandinavia never attracted particular interest. The work of Elliot Smith, Perry and Rivers roughly paralleled that of anthropologists in Dresden and Cologne, but their own, often conjectural, arguments helped undermine what came to be called diffusionist studies among social anthropologists. Also, the British Historical School, as it was known,

²⁹ See H.J. Harrison, 'Museums and Ethnography', *MJ*, 24 (1925), 226.

³⁰ A.B. Meyer and K.S. Hofrath, *Königliches Ethnographisches Museum zu Dresden*, 12 vols. (Dresden: Königlichen Ethnographischen Museum, 1882-90). Also, *Studies of Museums* (Washington, D. C.: GPO, 1905).

³¹ Willey Foy, *Tanzobjekte von Bismarck Archipel, Nissan und Buka*, Vol. 13 of *Publicationen aus de Königlichethnographischen Museum zu Dresden* (Dresden: Von Stengel, 1900).

³² Clyde Kluckhohn, 'Some Reflections on the Method and Theory of the "Kultur Kreislehre"', *AA* 38 (1936), 157-96; Penniman, *A Hundred Years*, pp. 128-30; and Anthony Forge, 'Introduction', *Primitive Art and Society*. On the use of museums as a research tool, see Frese, pp. 52-57; Sturtevant, p. 523.

³³ See Frank Willett, *African Art* (New York: Praeger, 1971), 11-12. Penniman, *A Hundred Years*, pp. 156-57; Firth, 'Preface' to Forge, *Primitive Art and Society*. Stolpe's work is best reviewed in *Collected Essays in Ornamental Art* by Hjalmer Stolpe, trans. by Mrs. H.C. Marsh (Stockholm: Aftonhladets tryckeri, 1927). See also H. Colley Marsh, 'Polynesian Ornament and Mythology; or Symbolism of Origin and Descent', *JAI*, 22 (1892), 184-203 for a detailed discussion of his work. On Holmes' contribution see 'Classification and Arrangement of the Exhibits of an Anthropological Museum', *JAI*, 32 (1902), 354-71. Boas's work included: *The Use of Masks and Head-Ornaments* (Leiden, n.p. 1890); *Representative Art of Primitive People* (Washington, D. C, Smithsonian Inst. 1916); *Primitive Art* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1927).

³⁴ Pitt Rivers Museum, *Annual Report*, 1902, p. 3.

never successfully placed their studies on a firm museum footing, as had taken place on the Continent. Their own references, rather, were to language, religious ideas and social practices, more reminiscent of the earliest ethnologists than of more recent specialists in archaeology and material culture, Pitt Rivers among them. As a result, by the late twenties, their work was already held in disfavour by the majority of anthropologists in Britain, and by the thirties, with the implicit alignment of German anthropologists with the Nazi theories of racial origin, the British Historical School was even further discredited. Diffusionism, because of its racialist overtones, became simply ideologically untenable³⁵.

But while the majority of British anthropologists rejected both the historical or diffusionist approach (and with it museum studies) the early twentieth century proved to be an important period in the development of anthropological museums themselves. At the time Pitt Rivers began his own collection, ethnographical and archaeological collections were still relatively rare. Circumstances had changed slightly by the 1870s and 80s, as we have seen, when a number of private collections were established and larger institutional ones, both in Britain and elsewhere, were significantly expanded. But overall, anthropological museums were still something relatively novel. It was only in the early twentieth century that they became a normal feature of most people's experience.

The early twentieth century, then, witnessed the great flourishing of the anthropological museum. America witnessed the expansion of the United States National Museum under Holmes, and the foundation or extension of several important collections such as the Museum of Natural History in New York, the University Museum in Philadelphia and the Field Columbian Museum in Chicago. In France, following the Paris Exhibition of 1889, the early Musée Ethnographique was moved to new quarters in the Trocadero, where it became the nucleus for the present Musée de l'Homme. Holland experienced the foundation of the Museum voor Land-en Volkenkunde in Rotterdam. And, in Germany there was a vast expansion of the Ethnographical Museum in Berlin and again of Meyers' collection in Dresden and of Foy's in Cologne³⁶.

Similar developments followed in Britain despite the changing interests of British anthropologists. The British Museum collection was expanded many times over,

³⁵ Lowie, pp. 222-30; See Penniman, *A Hundred Years*, pp. 206-08; Hays, pp. 282-93; and Adam Kuper, *Anthropologists and Anthropology: The British School 1922-72* (London: Allen Lane, 1973). See in particular Smith's own *The Diffusion of Culture* (London: Watts, 1933) and Westermarck on Smith, A.P. Elkin and N.W.G. MacIntosh, eds., Grafton Elliott Smith: *The Man his Work* (Sydney: Univ. Press, 1975); Warren R. and Dawson, eds., *Sir Grafton Elliott Smith: A Biographical Record by his Colleagues* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1938). See also Leslie White, 'Diffusion vs Evolution', *AA*, 47 (1945), 337-56.

³⁶ On American Museums, see Holmes', 'Classification and Arrangement'; Brew; and Sturtevant. On European collections particularly and dates of their purchase, Bahnson, pp. 1-18; Frese, pp. 9-13; Murray I, 241, 53. Studies of specific collections include: Geoffrey Hellman, *Bankers, Bones and Beetles: The First Century of the Museum of Natural History* (Garden City, N. J.: The Natural History Press, 1969); Germain Bazin, *The Louvre*, trans. by M.I. Markin (New York: Harry N. Abrams, n.d.). The Field Columbia Museum was first described by the one-time member of the ASL, C. Staniland Wake, 'The World's Columbia Exposition, 1893', *JAI*, 21 (1891), 320-21. Wake was a first employee. Needham, 'Wake'.

eventually approaching, at least in size, to a museum of the type proposed by Pitt Rivers thirty years before³⁷. Provincial museums, formed and founded in increasing numbers after the Municipal Museums Act of 1891, invariably included an anthropological wing or gallery among their other displays³⁸. Glasgow and Hastings, for example, established anthropological collections around 1900; Liverpool and Brighton had similar museums by the 1920s³⁹. Smaller collections, in turn, were established in public and private schools in other institutions. By the turn of the century, both Stoneyhurst and Eton had small ethnographical collections, successively added to as old boys returned from colonial service or sent back mementos of their travels⁴⁰. By the twenties, then, the anthropological museum had become an accepted presence, despite the varying treatments of the materials themselves.

With the expansion and establishment of newer anthropological museums, their social and educational orientation, as well as the expectations of those who presided over them, shifted accordingly. At first, the newer collections were mere assortments of 'ethnographical curiosities', as Pitt Rivers had put it, occasionally arranged to reflect a major scheme, such as the geographical system at the British Museum. But most often they were allowed to grow as donors and curators saw fit. By 1900, however, the notion that collections should be made more intelligible for the general public, an idea promulgated early on by Pitt Rivers, as we have seen, had clearly gained favour. Promoted by professional organizations such as the Museums Association, itself founded in 1891⁴¹, provincial museums, in particular, gradually changed their displays in order to allow for greater public benefit. Publications on proper materials for display cases, the arrangement of materials on screens, lighting of galleries, became typical by the teens and twenties. Loan exhibitions, to allow for a better distribution of collections, also became popular⁴². Displays were gradually thinned out, lighting improved, exhibitions of objects of particular interest to the general public, such as

³⁷ Miller, pp. 327-29, 350-55; Brauholtz, 'History of Ethnography' and Sir Hans Sloane. Also, Handbook to the Ethnographical Collections (London: For the Trustees of the British Museum; 1910).

³⁸ Kenyon, n. pg.

³⁹ Murray, III, Appendix, pp. 291-312. On the Hastings Museum, I would like to thank David C. Devenish for his information, Personal Communication, 7 Oct 1975. On Liverpool, City Liverpool Libraries and Museums Annual Reports, and 'Liverpool Museums', 'New Ethnographical Gallery', MJ, 10 (1910-11), 329. On Brighton, Herbert A. Thomas, 'Notes on Recent Developments at the Brighton Museum', MJ, 11 (1911), 93-111.

⁴⁰ See MJ, 15 (1915), 206.

⁴¹ Museums Association Reports of Proceedings, beginning 1891. The Museum Journal superseded the Report in 1901. From one issue of The Museum Journal: A.B. Meyer 'The Structure, Position and Illumination of Museum cases', MJ, 6 (1907), 231-43; H. Bantty White, 'Some Improvements in Museum Cases', MJ, 6 (1907), 265-68; P. A. Lucas, 'The Structure and Arrangement of Museum Cases', MJ, 6 (1907), 269-71; and H.C. Bumpus, 'A Contribution to the Discussion on Museum Cases', MJ, 6 (1907), 297-301.

⁴² On loan exhibits: W. Ruskin Butterfield, 'Suggestions for Loan Exhibitions of Local Antiquities', MJ, 9 (1910), 225-31. Also see H.M. Platnaeur, 'Presidential Address: Definition of a Museum', MJ 11 (1911), 3-9; and Frederick G. Kenyon, 'Presidential Address: Museums in Modern Life', MJ, 21 (1921), 17-31, both of which commended the changing emphasis.

weaving techniques or 'primitive art', became increasingly frequent⁴³. The anthropological museum had become simply more 'public' than 'scientific' in its aims.

By the 1920s, many museums were also experimenting with ways in which the 'context' of the objects could be more readily conveyed, leading in turn, to the establishment of what could only be called 'functionalist' displays. Franz Boas of the Museum of Natural History in New York undertook to arrange the hall of the Northwest Coast American in order to suggest the forest habitat of the people whose art was displayed there. Walls were painted a dark colour, lighting was dimmed, and a model of a log house placed at the centre⁴⁴. The Smithsonian, following Boas' example, began system of 'lay-figure groups' around the same time. The latter were composed of life-size wax figures dressed in native apparel backed by dioramas illustrating village scenes, ceremonies and ways of life⁴⁵. In the late twenties and early thirties, similar developments took place in Britain, first at the African gallery at Liverpool and then with individual displays at the British Museum⁴⁶. Trevor Thomas, again at Liverpool, expressed the educational approach most clearly. 'We are the showmen', he declared, 'not the performers'⁴⁷. It was a long way from the kinds of interests which had attracted anthropologists a half-century before.

As a result of such a change of focus, a collection such as that of Pitt Rivers came to be reappraised largely in terms of its display technique rather than for its original purpose. Discussions tended to enter on whether museums should choose a 'geographical' approach, such as that exemplified by the British Museum, or a 'subject' approach, as exemplified by the Pitt Rivers Museum at Oxford. At first, a surprising number chose the latter, often in direct reference to the Pitt Rivers example, but occasionally, as with Paris' Musée Guimet or the Hall of Religions at the U.S. National Museum, through independent efforts⁴⁸. By the 1920s, comparative exhibits

⁴³ On 'primitive art', see Forge, 'Introduction', *Primitive Art and Society*; R. J. Goldwater, *Primitivism in Modern Painting* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1938). The 'artistic' discovery of the 'primitive' in Britain is discussed in Clive Bell, *Since Cezanne* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1922), pp. 113-16; *Civilization, An Essay* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1928), pp. 81-82; *Old Friends, Personal Recollections*, (London: Chatto and Windus, 1956), pp. 154-55. Also see Roger Fry, *Last Lectures* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1939), pp. 75-76; *Vision and Design* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1920), p. 57.

⁴⁴ Frese, p. 53. Also see Donald P. Rohner, ed., *The Ethnography of Boas* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1969).

⁴⁵ Described in 'Smithsonian Exhibits at the Panama-Pacific Exposition', *MJ*, 15 (1915-16), 172-74. Also see Goode; Karp; and Geoffrey T. Hellman, *The Smithsonian*, (New York: J.B. Lippincott, 1967).

⁴⁶ Joseph A. Clubb, 'Liverpool Museum Report', *MJ*, 15 (1915-16), pp. 397-98; J. Withers Gill, 'The African Gallery in-the Liverpool Public Museums', *MJ*, 31 (1931), 89-92. Displays of such kind appear to have been used-as early as 1889 at the Paris Exposition. See John Beddoe, 'Anniversary Address, 1890', *JAI*, 19 (1890), 482; and Ralph Piddington, 'Museums and Social Anthropology', *MJ*, 47 (1947), pp. 111-14, for a discussion of the phenomena. J.H. Hutton, 'The Place of Material Culture in the Study of Anthropology', *JRAI*, 74 (1944), 1-6.

⁴⁷ Trevor Thomas, 'Penny Plain Two Pence Coloured: The Aesthetics of Museum Display', *MJ*, 39 (1939), p. 2.

⁴⁸ On Guimet: Leon de Milloue, *Catalogue du Musée Guimet* (Lyon: Musée Guimet, 1883), Murray, I, 241-42, Bahnsen, p. 16; Asia Society, *Rarities of the Musée Guimet* (New York: The Asia Society, 1975); Odette Moned-Bruhl, *Guide-Catalogue du Musée Guimet* (Paris:

had been established at the Royal Scottish Museum in Edinburgh, the Bankfield Museum at Halifax, at the Wellcome Historical Medical Museum in London and, in its most complete form, at the Horniman Museum at Forest Hill⁴⁹. In the latter, H. S. Harrison, one of the staunchest advocates of the museum approach, attempted to duplicate the Pitt Rivers scheme directly. Still, much of the original interest was lost. The assumption, moreover, that collections organized in such a way could help promote research, as well as provide a means of transmitting the subject to the general public, was largely forgotten.

Of the many anthropological collections founded in Britain, that established at Oxford by Pitt Rivers probably came closest to fulfilling the ideal of the museum as a research institution. Cambridge and the British Museum continued to have anthropologists on their staff and continued to produce studies based on their collections. But generally the 'museum men' were more concerned with innovations in display, accommodations for school children, fire precautions and insurance costs, than more academic or theoretical studies. Even at the British Museum successive curators, such as O.M. Dalton and H.J. Braunholtz and, more recently, William Fagg, were more concerned with catalogues raisonné for the collections under their care

Musée Guimet, 1939). On the U.S. National Museum: Holmes, 'Classification and Arrangement'; and 'Anthropological Museums in the United States', MJ, 2 (1902), 87-91.

⁴⁹ On the Royal Scottish Museum: Annual Report of the Royal Scottish Museum, 1921-22, p. 3; The Royal Scottish Museum, Guide to the Gallery of Comparative Ethnography (Edinburgh: HMSO, 1978). Robert Kerr of the staff was responsible for the work. It was dismantled in 1967. Annual Report of the Royal Scottish Museum, 1967, p. 8, 1970, p. 8; Personal Communication, Dale Idiens, 12 Nov 1975. The Bankfield Museum established its comparative series as early as 1904. 'Bankfield Museum, Halifax', MJ, 10 (1911), 286-90; 'Bankfield Museum Publications', MJ, 14 (1914-15), 226-27; 'The Bankfield Museum, Halifax', MJ, 18 (1918-19), 82-84; and 'Halifax Yorks. Bankfield Museum, New Ethnographical Room', MJ, 32 (1932-33), 372. H.L. Rot and his successor G.R. Carline (himself once employed by the Pitt Rivers Museum) explicitly based their series on Pitt Rivers' system. See A.C. Haddon 'H. Ling Roth', Obituary Notice, Man, 25 (1925), No. 57; H. Coote Lake, 'George Reginald Carline', Obituary Notice, Man, 33 (1933), No. 55. On the Wellcome Museum, see notice for 'Historical Medical Museum', MJ, 13 (1913), 187; C. J. S. Thompson, 'The Wellcome Historical Medical Museum, London', MJ, 15 (1915-16), 349-56; E.N. Fallaize, 'Suggestions for the Classification of the Subject-Matter of Anthropology'; and 'The Wellcome Historical Medical Museum', Man, 27 (1927), No. 69; S.H. Dawkes, 'The Historical Medical Museum – Its Future and Possibilities', MJ, 44 (1944), 17-21; and C. A. Sizes, 'The Museum of the Wellcome Institute of the History of Medicine', MJ, 70 (1970), 13-18. The collection was opened in 1913 and partially dismantled and rearranged in the late 1950's. Personal Communication, Mrs. Shelagh Lewis, 5 Nov 1975. Finally, on the Horniman Museum: Notice, 'Horniman Museum, Forest Hill, London', MJ, 11 (1911-12), 276; H.S. Harrison, 'Notes on One Kind of Museum', MJ, 11 (1912), 315-19; 'Ethnographical Collections and their Arrangement', MJ, 14 (1915), 220-25; 'Museums and Ethnography'; 'Ethnology Under Glass'; D.M. Boston, 'Purpose and Discrimination in Acquisition', MJ, 69 (1969), 110-13; and Personal Communication, Marion G. Wood, 25 Nov 1975. Elsewhere, of course, single 'evolutionist' exhibits were mounted, including, for example, one on the 'evolution of currency' in the Cambridge Museum of Ethnology and Archaeology. Annual Reports; Personal Communication, Peter Gathercole, 5 Nov 1975.

than with systematic studies of the type envisioned by Pitt Rivers. The other demands of museum work simply stood in their way⁵⁰.

Oxford, on the other hand, tended to concentrate on what came to be known as 'ethnology'. Francis Knowles, one of the first students in the Diploma programme, studied the flight of the boomerang and its geographical distribution. Beatrice Blackwood worked on New Guinea stone technology, Geoffrey Turner on North American hair embroidery. In the 1940s, the effort was given even greater clarity by the establishment of the Pitt Rivers Museum's well-known Occasional Papers on Technology, in which some of the former studies were published⁵¹. At the same time, relations with archaeologists remained active, and British prehistorians continued to be associated with the museum, both as curators and contributors to the Occasional Series⁵². Only the social anthropologists drifted away, first with the establishment of a separate Department of Social Anthropology in 1914, and later with the new designation of the Institute of Social Anthropology, now based at Banbury Road⁵³. While those returning from the field continued to make contributions to the Pitt Rivers collection, the interests of the two communities were clearly separate. In 1961, two distinct Diploma courses were offered to entering students as further evidence of their differences⁵⁴. At the present time, both departments continue to function separately, even maintaining their own libraries.

The last effort to unite the two schools at Oxford came in the 1960s, when the then-curator of the museum, Bernard Fagg, sought to raise funds for a major anthropological research centre. The latter was to include libraries, seminar rooms, laboratories for physical anthropologists and conservators, and, of course, a vast central museum. Basing his scheme on that propounded by Pitt Rivers, Fagg called for a large rotunda with collections organized both by subject and according to their geographical origin. Designed primarily for the use of research students, the general public was to be directed to various special exhibits and to a more general permanent display. Much of the collection was to be kept in storage for the use of researchers

⁵⁰ See Fagg's, 'A Museum of Mankind: Ethnography in Burlington Gardens', MJ, 71 (1971), 149-52. Fagg, besides his own researches in West African archaeology, also helped promote a more popular understanding of African art forms. For example, his catalogue for The Webster Plass Collection of African Art (London: For the British Museum, 1953). Also, Fagg, 'The Antiquities of Ife', Image No. 2 (1949), 19-30; 'De l'art des Yoruba', Presence Africaine, No. 10-11 (1951), 103-35, and Nigerian Images (London: Lund Humphries, 1963), among others.

⁵¹ Blackwood and Penniman, 'Sir Francis Knowles'; Annual Report, Pitt Rivers Museum, 1906. G.E.S. Turner, Hair Embroidery in Siberia and North America, Occasional Papers on Technology No. 7 (Oxford: Pitt-Rivers Museum, 1955). Beatrice Blackwood, The Technology of Modern Stone Age People in New Guinea, Occasional Papers on Technology No. 3 (Oxford: Pitt-Rivers Museum, 1950). See also T.G.W. Knowles, Man and Other Living Things (London : George G. Harrap, 1945). The Occasional Series on Technology began in 1943.

⁵² Dennis Britton, et al., Metallurgical Reports on British and Irish Bronze Age Implements and Weapons, Occasional Series on Technology (Oxford: PRM, 1970).

⁵³ Evans-Pritchard, 'A Few Words', pp. 13-14; Marett, Jerseyman, pp. 172-73.

⁵⁴ Pitt Rivers Museum, Annual Report, 1964, p. 4.

alone⁵⁵. Efforts to secure the necessary funds, however, were unsuccessful. By the early seventies, it was clear that a far less ambitious programme would have to be carried out. Presently, such a project is being completed, with the Pitt Rivers materials gradually being shifted to new 'modular units', designed to fit in with the late Victorian buildings of North Oxford, from their original place in the main museum. Soon, the last remnants of the original museum will have been dismantled, and what was in effect a document in the history of the subject will have been lost. Pitt Rivers, we can imagine, would have been disappointed by the lack of foresight, but also would have recognized the necessity of the decision.

⁵⁵ The New Pitt Rivers Museum and Proposed Centre for the Study of Anthropology and Human Environment (Oxford, n.d.); Pitt Rivers Museum, Annual Reports, 1964, p. 3; 1971, p. 1.

