CHAPTER VI

THE EVOLUTION OF CULTURE

1. Fox's Collection and his Work at the British Association

The four years following Fox's return from Ireland had served to establish him as a leading member of the Ethnological Society and as a prominent antiquarian. He had been proposed as President of the Anthropological Society, had served as Vice-President of the reorganized Ethnological Society, and was a council member at both the Society of Antiquaries and the Archaeological Institute. As one-time Secretary of the Ethnological Society, he had been involved in redrafting the Society's by-laws in 1868-69. He had helped organize several special exhibits at the Museum of Practical Geology and had made his collection known to other ethnologists and archaeologists through his three papers on primitive warfare, delivered at the United Services Institution between 1867 and 1869. Therefore, while he was in disagreement with many of the basic tenets of other leading figures of both the ethnological and antiquarian communities, by the summer of 1869 his influence and authority could be little questioned.

Much of the previous four years had been devoted to expanding his collection. By 1869, Fox's collection had attained at least the basic outlines of his later museum. In all, it included materials from Africa, Australia, India and North and South America, with further contributions from the Western Arctic and the South Pacific islands. Donors had included Richard Burton, J.D. [*sic* – J.G.?] Wood and Warren Edwards; major purchases had been made from the collections of John Petherick, Edward Belcher and Richard Dunn[1]. Archaeological material, some of it purchased, but most of it resulting from Fox's own field efforts, had rounded out and, to a certain extent, supplemented exotic materials, bringing to the whole a unity of purpose. Included among the latter were pieces from France, Switzerland, Australia, Denmark, Ireland and England, as he revealed in his second lecture on primitive warfare[2]. Again, many of those were original pieces; others were facsimiles or casts. The total number of objects is difficult to estimate but, the collection must have reached into the several thousands. By 1883, or by the time of its donation to Oxford, it would include nearly 14,000 pieces, far larger, for example, than those of either Christy or Blackmore, or indeed nearly any other private museum of its kind[3].

During the sixties, an increasing sense of urgency had entered into Fox's efforts, particularly with regard to the acquisition of ethnographical materials. As he explained in his first lecture on primitive warfare, 'there can be little doubt that in a few years all the most barbarous races will have disappeared from the earth, or will

---

[1] Fox, 'Primitive Warfare I', pp. 631-41; 'Primitive Warfare II', pp. 406-36; 'Primitive Warfare III', pp. 527-29.

[2] Fox, 'Primitive Warfare II', pp. 409-18. Also see 'Flint Implements, Oxfordshire'; 'Marble Armlet, Lukoja'; 'Bronze Spear from Ireland', pp. 35-37; Exhibition of 'A Bronze Spear', PSAL, 2dS, 4 (1869), 195-96.

[3] Report to the Hebdomadal Council of the Committee of Members of Convocation appointed to consider the offer by Major-General Pitt-Rivers, F.S.A., etc. of his Anthropological Collection, and to advise thereon, (1883).

have ceased to preserve their native crafts'. The next year he re-emphasized: 'The time is fast approaching when this class of prehistoric evidence will no longer be forthcoming'[4]. Nor surprisingly, therefore, many of his efforts tended to concentrate on ethnographical pieces, with new materials filtering in from Consul Thomas Hutchinson in Brazil, Edmund Oldfield, with his Australian connections, and Clements Markham of the Geographical Society[5]. In each case, availability probably took second place to his series, and whether or not a given piece fitted into one of his particular displays was probably the deciding factor, as Fox repeatedly emphasized.

While reconstruction of the sequence of the collection's growth remains difficult, it is clear that by the late sixties a number of Fox's better-known series had already been established. Among those were his famous series on the development of the boomerang, malga and parrying shield, a series illustrating the relationship of South Seas paddles and early celt forms, and one tracing the development of clubs and shields. His archaeological collection included separate exhibits on early polished stone tools, a second on flint flakes and another on bronze ornaments. There were also his earlier collection of rifles, and another collection of bows and arrows and another touching upon more local antiquarian matters, including one on early locks, later described in a monograph on the subject. Other series at the time included one on the development of pottery and other vessels and another on primitive navigation, the latter largely made up of canoes and other sailing ships obtained by Fox through other collectors who had travelled in the South Pacific and areas where such models were made. The fact that many objects, ranging from boomerangs and flint tools to more advanced locks and rifles, were made by Fox, and that each series tended to include a number of diagrams and illustrations rather than actual pieces provides an indication to the overall importance of the series system over other considerations.

For Fox it was the very fact of his system which set his collection apart from that of others. 'Until quite recently', he complained in 1867, 'the curators of our ethnographical museums have aimed more at the collection of unique specimens, serving to exhibit well-marked differences of form, than such as by their resemblance enable us to trace out community of origin'[6]. It was that pattern, moreover, which had prevented others from recognizing the value of a truly scientific ethnographical collection and which, in turn, precluded the development of a truly systematic 'science of man'.

The same reasoning tended to enter into his other scientific efforts as well, particularly his schemes for the reorganization of ethnology. In the summer of 1869, Fox had resumed his administrative work with even greater application, especially at the British Association meeting at Exeter. Negotiations between the rival factions had once again broken down shortly before the gathering when the compromise title of 'The Society for the Study of Man in the Widest Interpretation', agreed upon by Huxley, and, surprisingly, by Hunt, was voted down by the more influential and cliquish anthropologists; Fox wrote to Tylor shortly afterward that 'symptoms of

---

[4] Fox, 'Primitive Warfare I', pp. 618-19; 'Primitive Warfare II', p. 438.
[5] 'Primitive Warfare II', pp. 421, 425 and 434. See also Thomas J. Hutchinson, 'On the Chaco and other Indians of South America'; Clements R. Markham, Exhibition of 'Implements from South America', JASL, 2 (1864), lvii.
[6] Fox, 'Primitive Warfare II', p. 406.

cannibalism' had affected the outcome[7]. As a result, both factions entered into the proceedings that summer with more than their usual animosity. Again, the anthropologists were effectively shut out from positions of influence and, in turn, were forced to hold their own meetings separately, as Charnook and others later complained. The unexpected death of Hunt during the course of the meeting, however, effectively brought an end to the by now nearly six-year squabble. It was soon evident to most, including Fox, that amalgamation was again a possibility.

Fox's own contributions that summer were somewhat limited ones. His only formal paper was his description of the Pleistocene gravels at Acton, Middlesex, during which he offered his first description of the sequence of faunal and flint remains seen there[8]. As Secretary of the Ethnological Society, he had some editorial responsibilities, although the latter were obviously far less involved than those of the previous year when he had been virtually in charge of the publication of the proceedings of the International Congress of Prehistoric Archaeology. In 1869, therefore, he was simply another participant. Nonetheless, he was once again involved in the tentative schemes for an Ethnological Subsection, making a number of suggestions of his own. Also, a future edition of Notes and Queries for Travellers was discussed at the time, as was Fox's own scheme for the classification of the science. Fox also proposed that the Society appoint a special field committee to consider the official sponsorship of archaeological excavations as a regular part of the Society's activities[9]. The first proposed site was Stonehenge, and by the following autumn, Fox, with the Society's and the British Association's support, was immersed in negotiations with the property's owner, Sir Edmund Antrobus, to begin work.

It was not at all unusual for the British Association and other organizations to sponsor, or at least provide the impetus, for undertakings of the kind proposed for Stonehenge. In 1858 the Royal Society had provided £100 for the continuation of Pengelly's work at Windmill Hill Cavern near Brixton, an important palaeolithic site. The British Association, in turn, had given money for Pengelly's as well as a number of other similar projects[10]. Most ethnologists and anthropologists, moreover, obviously favoured undertakings of that kind, the Anthropological Society recommending as early as 1865 that the exploration of other sites might be underwritten in the same way.

That Stonehenge should have been the principal target of the invigorated Ethnological Society's efforts is also not at all surprising. Stonehenge had figured prominently in the antiquarian imagination for at least three hundred years, or since the time of Inigo

---

[7] Fox, Letter to E.B. Tylor, 29 Mar 1869, PRM, TP. Also see Stocking, 'What's in a Name? ', p. 383; Beddoe, 'Address, 1870', p. lxxxiii; RAI, Council Minutes, ESL, 12 Jun 1869, 9 Feb 1869, Al; RAI Council Minutes , ASL, 1 Jun 1869, 15 Jun 1869, A3:l.
[8] Fox, 'Flint Implements of a Palaeolithic Type'; also see Thompson, General Pitt-Rivers, p. 49.
[9] Fox, 'Proposed Exploration of Stonehenge'.
[10] 'First Report of the committee for exploring Kent's Cavern, Devonshire', RBAAS (1865), 16-25. See also RBAAS (1866), xlv. The Royal Society's contribution was noted in AR, 3 (1865), xlvii.

Jones' early speculations[11]. Most recently Lubbock had treated its history in his Prehistoric Times, along with the nearby and less well-known henge site at Avebury. In the latter part of 1866, it had been the subject of a paper by the Swedish archaeologist, Sven Nilsson at the Ethnological Society, and again the topic had generated considerable debate[12]. Stonehenge, it was decided during the course of preliminary discussions at Exeter, had in fact never been adequately excavated, nor did it appear, as Fox himself later reported, that the topmost layer of sod had ever been removed to reveal the original floor and foundation.

As a result of the summer's conference, Fox was charged with looking into the matter. In truth, he had been involved since the previous spring when he visited the site and noted the numerous flint chips and tools still to be found on the surface. The latter, he suggested, implied the range of materials that were lying just beneath it. Having contacted E. T. Stevens, then in charge of Blackmore's collection at the Salisbury Museum, about the possibility of carrying out more extensive excavations, he was informed that the owner, Sir Edmund Antrobus, felt that a monument of such tremendous national significance should not be allowed to be used as a testing ground for local amateur societies, and he had therefore previously refused permission to dig there. A new British Association committee, with the further support of the Ethnological Society, Fox reasoned, could hardly fail to obtain Sir Edmund's support[13].

Soon after the end of the summer session, Lubbock and Evans—'the two best authorities of our age upon prehistoric subjects' in Fox's estimation[14]—were charged with designing the excavation plans; George Busk was appointed to identify faunal or other remains; and E.T. Stevens was brought in as the 'local' consultant. Fox was placed in charge of supervising the entire operation and with approaching the owner to secure his permission. Further visits were made to the site and Sir Edmund was contacted again to seek his permission. Fox reported on his progress at a special meeting of the Ethnological Society held that November[15].

Despite the confident proclamations of the committee, Sir Edmund, either out of cautiousness or mere obstructiveness never granted his permission, and as a result the Society's activities came to nothing. In many ways, it was probably just as well. The main interest of the committee, including Fox, was simply to assign a date to the monument, something that Fox was convinced they could do through the process of excavation alone. If, as Thompson has suggested, Fox's series system was to be the sole basis of the new assessment, the results could well have been disastrous[16]. It was,

---

[11] R. J. C. Atkinson, Stonehenge (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1956); Daniel, Idea of Prehistory, pp. 22-23; Royal Commission on Historical Monuments, Stonehenge and its Environs (Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 1979), 386-90.
[12] Lubbock, Prehistoric Times, pp. 128-30; Sven Nilsson, 'Stonehenge; an attempt to explain the above monument', TESL, 4 (1866), 244-64. Also see Rev. of John Lubbock's Prehistoric Times, AR, 3 (1865), 341.
[13] Fox, 'Proposed Exploration of Stonehenge' p. 4 RBAAS (1869) lxxviii. Fox is not among those included in the List of Visitors to Stonehenge … to May 1868 now on deposit at the SSW.
[14] Ibid., p. 4.
[15] JESL, NS 2 (1870), p. 5.
[16] Thompson, General Pitt-Rivers, p. 50.

nonetheless, a useful administrative exercise and one which provided the pattern for later officially sponsored ventures such as Fox and Rolleston's second series of excavations at Cissbury during the summer of 1875. It was also a useful lesson for Fox in his future work as Inspector of Ancient Monuments during the late seventies; Stonehenge itself was to be one of the first of the sixty-four sites to be added to Lubbock's schedule when the first Ancient Monuments Act was finally passed in 1882. That Sir Edmund allowed it to be so—listing was strictly voluntary under the law—was in turn something of a measure of Fox's persuasive abilities.

If an uncooperative owner had frustrated official archaeological efforts, there were no such constraints upon Fox's own undertakings. In late August, or just after the British Association meeting, Fox visited his sister-in-law, Kate Stanley, the wife of Lord Russell, on his way home to London.

> 28 Aug. Augustus Fox comes from Exeter where he has been at the British Association. I ride with him on Hampton Common f. 6-8. It interests him very much as there is a camp on it and he thinks all the holes and mounds in it are ancient huts; he also finds several tumuli or long barrows.
>
> Tues. 31 Aug. Augustus and I ride to Wheybury. I hold his horse while he walked over the field and found some flints which proved to be a British camp, at all events pre-Roman. We also went inside a tumulus which had been opened up there. We had to crawl on our stomachs, there were several stone chambers inside. We went home through Woodchester Park[17].

Soon afterwards, Fox joined Alice in Northern Wales, staying, it appears, at Penrhyn Castle, the home of his aunt, Lady Penrhyn, wife of Edward Gordon Douglas, the First Baron Penrhyn (1810-1886). Fox had been at Penrhyn many times before, presumably from early childhood. The fact that his wife had relatives at nearby Penrhos made the visit to Wales even easier to justify, and it appears that he and his family travelled there each autumn for a number of years, mostly for the hunting[18]. The previous year, or in 1868, he had first noticed two stone cairns located within the estate on the summit of Moel Faber. Lady Penrhyn (the owner of the property) had given other antiquarians a chance to excavate there before, and one of those, Elias Owen, had published an account of the cairns in Archaeologia Cambrensis several years before[19]. Anticipated changes in farm management more recently had threatened to destroy the monuments, and, as with his excavations at Roovesmore Fort and Ireland, Fox was anxious to rescue what he could before the next year's ploughing.

---

[17] Kate Stanley, Letter to Lady Henrietta Maria Stanley, 30 Aug 1869; Russell, Amberley Papers, II, 279-80.
[18] Burke's Peerage and Baronetage. Also Russell, Amberley Papers, II, 280. For as description of his work: Fox 'The Opening of Two Cairns'. Thompson incorrectly identifies the state as belonging to Fox's wife's relatives. Thompson, General Pitt-Rivers, p. 50.
[19] Fox, 'The Opening of Two Cairns', p. 306. Elis Owen, 'Arvona Antigua, Ancient Dwellings near Llanllechid' and 'Ancient Remains Hafottai', Archaeologica Cambrensis, 3dS, 13 and 14 (1866-67), 215-28 and 103-08.

Lady Penrhyn supplied three of her gardeners to help in the work, and Elias Owen and his friend, Archdeacon Evans from nearby Bangor, joined Fox at the site.

The two cairns produced the usual range of flint tools and pottery fragments. The latter were, as Fox pointed out, similar in character to the remains of other mounds in the area, suggesting as well the same sequence of tools and pottery fragments. Earlier methods of classifying those materials, he complained, had proven far from adequate for purposes of dating or even simple identification. Thomas Bateman's four-part classification of cinerary urns, incense urns, food vessels and drinking cups, for example, could not adequately take into account the full range of materials, nor did it sufficiently allow for the possibility of more perishable forms used in everyday life but excluded from burials for which more elaborate and ritualistic pieces were more apt to be included. Furthermore, Bateman's division, based as it was upon perceived functional similarities, tended to overlook similarities of what Fox considered a more formal kind. As Fox emphasized repeating the assurances of Cissbury two years before: 'I have little doubt that if a significant number [of urns] of any given period could be brought together it would be found that, like all other prehistoric remains, without exception, the several classes passed into the other in such a manner that it would be impossible to draw any hard and fast line of separation between them'[20]. Similar reasoning, no doubt, would have been applied to the remains of Stonehenge had the project been carried out.

By November, Fox was back in London reporting to the Ethnological Society on the 'proposed exploration of Stonehenge by a Committee of the British Association' and providing his colleagues with at least an outline of the results of his recent work in Wales. He first published his Welsh material in a formal paper the following spring[21]. The value of his so-called series or serial system was stressed too in the discussion following Sir George Grey's exhibition of quartzite implements from the Cape of Good Hope. Again, as Fox pointed out, he was reluctant to impose what he considered an arbitrary system of classification upon what he obviously saw as closely related materials, in that instance, different types of stone tools. Nor was functional affinity an adequate criterion; celt forms, for example, could be shown to have developed out of the broad end of what were usually accepted as spearheads, an observation he had made earlier in his second paper on primitive warfare. In each case, he argued, if a sufficient number of pieces from any given area could be brought together, the original sequence of development could be recognized as well. He was fully convinced, too, that when more systematic excavations were undertaken 'the geological evidence would bear out this classification' even more thoroughly[22]. It was clear that Fox was not to be easily discouraged.

In early January 1870, Fox returned to his thesis with greater hopes than ever. The specific subject was the New Zealand mere or 'Pattoo-Pattoo', a celt-shaped instrument, usually constructed of jade and with a small hole drilled in the narrow

---

[20] Fox, 'The Opening of Two Cairns', p. 320. On Bateman's Classification, see 'Bateman' Museum', Bateman, Descriptive Catalogue.
[21] Fox's paper on his Welsh excavations was presented at the Ethnological Society on 8 Mar 1870.
[22] Discussion following George Grey, 'On Quartzite Implements from the Cape of Good Hope', JESL, NS 2 (1870), p. 42.

end. As he had explained in his earlier papers, that implement, while usually considered as a club, could be shown to be more closely related to axes or other 'thrusting-weapons'[23]. Sir Charles Dilke, recently returned from the area, had confirmed Fox's supposition, explaining that as a weapon it was used in the way that Fox suspected. An exchange of correspondence, initiated by Dr. Joseph Dalton Hooker (1817-1911), of the Museum of Practical Botany, had further born Dilke out. Still used at a time when other more advanced weapons had superceded it, the Pattoo-Pattoo represented, as he explained, what Tylor had recently referred to as a 'survival'. As such, it was not merely of general interest but of historical interest as well:

> I believe that the evidence afforded by the study of weapons and implements will eventually prove to be of the utmost value as a means of tracing back the connection of races and the sources of early culture, owing to the persistent manner in which all savages preserved their ancient types. Whilst language, having no material existence previously to the introduction of writing, is liable to constant change as the words are passed from mouth to mouth; so much so that amongst the Polynesian and Melanesian races, the Bishop of Wellington has told us, there are no fewer than 200 languages, differing from each other as much as Dutch differs from German; these implements, having been otherwise preserved in their original forms, constitute the most enduring memories of the ancestors of the people, and are often found to present strong family likenesses in regions remotely separated[24].

Not only, therefore, did the material evidence lend support to that of philology, but it offered, at the same time, a corrective to what Fox obviously perceived as a continuing question over approach. That other ethnologists were already moving away from the question of origins to one of evolution and development seems hardly to have been considered.

Fox's papers of the following year tended to follow the same model of explanation. On 25 January 1870, he presented a short description of two stone mullers, one from Tahiti and the second from the West Indies[25]. In that instance too a connection of form was seen as self-evident; further comparisons were made with examples found elsewhere in North America. The next month he was at the Archaeological Institute, demonstrating a number of pieces from his collection of firearms. Again the question of past contacts was overriding. 'My object in exhibiting this matchlock', he explained in describing a piece recently obtained from Inverness, 'is to ascertain the opinion of the archaeologists present whether it is of European or Oriental manufacture'[26]. (Fox suggested the latter.) Finally, in March he presented his paper 'On he opening of two cairns near Bangor, North Wales' with its emphasis on the series system as a means of dating and comparison. In each case, it was less a case of growth and development,

---

[23] Fox, 'New Zealand Mere', p. 109.
[24] Ibid.
[25] Fox, 'On Two Stone Mullers', JESL, NS 2 (1870), 121
[26] Fox, 'XVII Century Matchlock', p. 135.

although that consideration was at least behind his notion of serial development, but of connections of a more specific kind. It was such a preoccupation which, in turn, made Fox's approach so distinctive.

2. Amalgamation of the Ethnological and Anthropological Societies

While Fox was showing to be somewhat independent of the mainstream of evolutionists and anthropologists, at least in terms of his own methodology, his work on behalf of the Ethnological Society showed no comparable shift in character. As far as the Ethnological Society was concerned, he was very much a party man, giving his support wholeheartedly to the efforts to the by now unquestioned principles of the Society, Lubbock, Huxley and, to a lesser extent, E.B. Tylor. The Society had obviously made a number of important advances over the course of the past year, as Fox, acting as Honorary Secretary, reported during the annual meeting of 18 May 1870[27]. In all, over 30 papers had been delivered on subjects ranging from 'The Chinese Race, Their Language, Government, Social Institution and Religion' to Fox's several discussions of British archaeological remains. The quarterly Journal itself had been a 'considerable success', so much so that the Council was considering a second printing of the first number. The open meetings at the Museum of Practical Geology had been well attended, and more were planned for the next year. Most importantly, the Society was in sound financial condition. It was hoped, Fox continued in his report, that in the future it would be possible to publish more maps, lithographs and woodcut prints than had been possible the previous year, since 'the majority of papers offered to the Society are upon subjects requiring illustration'[28]. Obviously, he had his own interests in mind as well.

In recognition of the year's success, the officers of the Society remained largely unchanged for the forthcoming year. Huxley was once again elected President; Lubbock, Tylor and Fox's long-time associate in archaeological circles, Thomas Wright, were elected Vice-Presidents. The publisher, H.G. Bohn became Treasurer, and Fox was again elected Honorary Secretary, with Hyde Clark assisting him as Foreign Secretary. The Council included William Blackmore, A.W. Franks, J.W. Flower, Canon Greenwell and Sir Roderick Impey Murchison, all of them, of course, long-time colleagues or friends of Fox[29]. It was clear, moreover, that Fox 's interests had been well represented as well. As he reported, over 30 of the year's papers had been on archaeological subjects; only one touched upon 'Philology'. From Fox's point of view, the Society was obviously taking the right course.

The question of amalgamation with the less-respectable sister society had also been broached again. The matter was obviously something of great importance to Fox as well as to the majority of other ethnologists. Following Hunt's death, the Anthropological Society itself, while still claiming the loyalty of a number of Hunt's followers, had generally lapsed into disarray. With Hunt's death, too, the main financial bulwark had been lost, and few now felt that the Society could survive. Most ethnologists, including Fox, had long since withdrawn their support entirely. Hunt's successor, the anatomist John Beddoe, took a less rigid position on most issues and

---

[27] Annual Report, 1870, JESL, NS 2 (1870), X-XIV.
[28] Ibid., p. xiii.
[29] List of Officers, JESL, NS 2 (1870), xiv.

was clearly eager, as Huxley informed the Ethnological Society that spring, to resume negotiations[30]. Fox as Secretary, would certainly have been expected to play an important part in those. By way of a preliminary effort both organizations had already agreed to meet that summer as a single subsection called 'Ethnology and Anthropology' at the British Association at Liverpool[31].

In the meantime, Fox's interests were diverted, at least momentarily, by new developments in archaeology. Foremost of those was Canon Greenwell's recent work at Grime's Graves near Brandon, Norfolk. Fox and Greenwell, despite their apparent differences of opinion, had been in relatively close contact throughout the previous year, both serving as officers in the Ethnological Society as well as participating in the activities of the Archaeological Institute and the Society of Antiquaries. Greenwell had also published a number of papers and short notices, many of them concerned with the preservation of threatened field remains, a subject obviously close to Fox's heart[32]. Sometime in 1869, Greenwell began an impressive series of excavations at Grime's Graves. Fox apparently visited the site, along with J. W. Flower and other interested members of the Ethnological Society, during May or June of 1870[33].

Grime's Graves were in actuality some 300 separate debris-filled flint mines or shafts dug in the Norfold breckland. Each was on the average approximately 15 feet in diameter and about 40 feet deep. Most had radiating galleries at the bottom, from which the flint cores were originally removed. Unlike Fox at Cissbury, Greenwell had concentrated on a single shaft, looking again not for particular objects or for verification of a system, as had Fox, but for the context or association of objects. In the end he produced a number of detailed sections and plans as well as careful illustrations of each object extracted and its location within its respective shaft.

Fox was present at Greenwell's presentation before the Ethnological Society in July 1870 and was obviously impressed by Greenwell's work, saying so during the discussion[34]. Thompson has suggested that it must have been a 'galling experience' to realize what he himself had overlooked at Cissbury[35]. But in truth, there is no indication that he saw the work as any way out of line with his own. Greenwell's efforts were, if anything, simply an improvement upon those previously offered by Fox.

Fox's own work of the spring consisted of a reworking of his earlier work of Ogham inscriptions. Such a task was, of course, of a far more general nature than that

---

[30] Thomas Huxley, 'Presedential Address, 1870', JESL, NS 2 (1870), xvii-xxiii. Also see AR, 8 (1870), cxliii.
[31] Roderick Impey Murchison, 'Address to Section E', RBAAS (1870), 158-66.
[32] Greenwell, 'Two Stone Axes'. See also C. Monkman, 'On Discussions in Recent Deposits in Yorkshire', JESL, NS 2 (1870), 157-68.
[33] William Greenwell, 'On the Opening of Grimes Graves, Norfolk', JESL, NS 2 (1870), 419-33. Also see Greenwell, 'Exhibition of Objects found in the "Grimes Graves", Norfolk', AJ, 27 (1870), 221-22. The importance of Greenwell's work at Grimes Graves is discussed in Jacquetta Hawkes, A Guide to the Prehistoric and Roman Monuments in England and Wales (London: Sphere Books, 1973), pp. 248-49.
[34] Discussion to Greenwell, 'Grimes Graves', pp. 439-40.
[35] Thompson, General Pitt-Rivers, p. 50.

represented through Greenwell's work, and suggests something of Fox's continuing commitment to a more comprehensive approach to ethnology and archaeology. Responding to a rubbing of a stone impression sent by his one-time colleague Richard Caulfield, Fox concluded that Caulfield's example was not an Ogham inscription but simply markings derived from natural causes. By way of contrast he exhibited a second rubbing, apparently one of his one, made at Glauthane, near Cork. Again he returned to the question of distribution and 'typology' as he would later phrase it. 'It is only by comparison of similar relics from different parts of the country that we are able to form a conception as to the object of these prehistoric remains'[36]. It was collecting rather than excavation which took precedent.

Of more immediate interest to Fox at the time was the 'threatened destruction of the British Earthworks near Dorchester'[37]. Again, Fox appears to have visited the site, located on the Thames just east of Oxford, early that spring. Again too, the threat was one that the monument was to be leveled in the course of 'agricultural improvement'. Fox carried out a number of test excavations, providing a plan and crude section of the Dyke (actually Roman in origin) for the Society's Journal. A special presentation was also made at a general meeting of the Society on 21 June, held at the United Services Institution, the choice of place obviously a result of Fox's influence.

Fox's response to the threatened destruction of the dykes at Dorchester had a catalytic effect upon the Ethnological Society. In response to pressures from Fox and others concerned with destruction of field remains, particularly Lubbock, a special committee, first proposed two years before at the Norwich British Association Meeting, was formed 'for the purpose of describing and preserving the Prehistoric Monuments of Great Britain and Ireland'[38]. Fox again was a key member, and it was probably due to his example that the Society took a new interest in the problem. There were, however, a number of other factors as well. For one, a number of Irish ruins and remains, most of them ecclesiastical in nature rather than prehistoric, had recently been transferred to the Board of Works in Ireland, thus fulfilling a number of Fox's earlier recommendations for state control there[39]. Lubbock's election to Parliament that spring also promised to bring fresh impetus to the cause in England. Concerned with the problem at least since the publication of Prehistoric Times, Lubbock openly praised the Danish Ancient Monuments Commission and argued that a comparable body be instituted in Great Britain. His first proposed bill, apparently drafted in consultation with Fox, was submitted soon after he took his seat[40].

Throughout the summer Fox and Lubbock worked closely on behalf of Lubbock's proposal. Writing in the Pall Mall Gazette Fox explained:

> The historic monument is if interest as a means of realizing
> the information which history conveys to us; but the

---

[36] Discussion to Richard Caulfield, 'On a Supposed Ogham Inscriptions', p. 402.
[37] Fox, 'On the Threatened destruction of British Earthworks near Dorchester, Oxfordshire', JESL, NS 2 (1870), 412-15. See Also JESL, NS 2 (1870), 477-82.
[38] Report of the Council at the Ethnological Society, JESL, NS 1 (1869), x-xi.
[39] Cf. Thompson, General Pitt-Rivers, p. 60; 'First Inspector', p. 120/n. 2.
[40] Lubbock, Prehistoric Times, pp. 55-56. Also see Keith, pp. 85-94: Hutchinson, I, 204-06; Grant Duff, pp. 14-16, 91-94.

> prehistoric monument assumes double importance from its affording the only available evidence of the period to which it belongs. Judging from the rapid progress which prehistoric archaeology has made during the last ten years…nothing compared to what is stored up…and the duty of having them drawn intact for the more enlightened judgement of posterity is one which the Government of a civilized country will do ill to neglect[41].

Shortly afterward, he wrote to J.A.A. Worsaae in Copenhagen with 'regard to powers assigned by the Government of your Country in preserving those monuments which are the private property of individuals and which are threatened with destruction by their owners'[42]. Fox, in turn, recommended strong protective measures. For someone who himself was to become a major landowner, as well as a member of a conservative organization called the 'Liberty and Private Property Defence League', the length to which Fox was apparently willing to go at such an early date is perhaps surprising[43]. Then, too, the urgency of the cause was obviously foremost in his mind.

As Fox and Lubbock realized, the bill would probably be slow in gaining favour. The 'question of state interference', as Fox had put it earlier, was obviously an extremely sensitive one, particularly in the context of mid-nineteenth century ideas on property rights[44]. The difficulty for the lawmakers was to convince the owners of the importance of the state establishing some rights over the monuments without actually pressing for condemnation or state ownership. The concept of easements and rights-of way, long in force at least with regard to water rights and thoroughfares, had never really been applied in any systematic manner to properties of the type involved in the case of ancient monuments. Most owners were understandably reluctant to have any kind of ties on their property—even Lubbock declined to have Silbury Hill near Avebury listed in the schedule at least in part because of the possibility that his own property's value would fall as a result[45]. Fox himself favoured a voluntary system, whereupon recognition on the owner's part of a public interest would take the place of any police power. At least that was his position at a later date. In 1870, he may have been slightly more 'advanced' in his thought, although that is doubtful. It is evident, nonetheless, that his concern was a real one, and over the course of the next few years he would become increasingly, although intermittently, involved in bringing Lubbock's proposed bill to a conclusion.

More immediately, Fox's organizational talents were required at the Ethnological Society, then over the final amalgamation with the 'anthropologists'. Once again, Fox was present at the British Association meeting, held that year at Liverpool, where the first steps were taken. Most of the ethnological faction agreed that Beddoe,

---

[41] 'Letter from a Late Assistant Quarter-Master General', Pall Mall Gazette, 11 Jul 1870.
[42] Fox, 'Letter to J.A.A. Worsaae, 11 Jul 1870, Nationalmuseet Copenhagen. I am indebted to Marianne Poulsen at the Nationalmuseet for this information. Personal Communication, 14 May 1980.
[43] See Pitt-Rivers, 'Address, Bath, 1888', p. 829.
[44] Trans. of the 3rd Session, Internatl. Congress of Prehistoric Arch., p. 316.
[45] See, Thompson, 'First Inspector', pp. 120-21; Pitt-Rivers, 'Address, Bath, 1888'. For a brief yet concise account of the course of ancient monuments legislation, see Wayland Kennett, Preservation (London: Temple Smith, 1972), pp. 27-35.

considered relatively innocuous by the ethnologists, should be made a member of the Ethnological Society's Council[46]. Unfortunately, the anthropologists were not impressed by the gesture and failed to rise to the bait. Also, being generally more adept at political maneuvering, they managed to exact a few additional concessions of their own. Still, by autumn their bargaining position was anything but certain (their last official meeting had been held on 14 June[47]) and despite the continued pressure of the central core 'the Anthropophagi or non-scientific party' as Fox later referred to them[48]—it was obvious that the general membership of the Anthropological Society would support any moves decided in their favour. Final negotiations, undertaken by Huxley and Fox and four members of the opposing party, took place in January 1871[49]. The final name, the Anthropological Institute, by which it is still known, was generally accepted, despite Lubbock 's continued reservations over the word 'anthropology'. It was also decided that Huxley would step down in favour of Lubbock as President. Evans, it was determined, would be the second President, as Fox later informed him[50]. While not the end of the controversy, for most members, including Fox, it must have seemed that the worst of the battle was over.

3. Work at the Society of Antiquaries and Anthropological Institute

During the spring of 1871, with the debates over the organization of ethnology and anthropology having been settled, Fox was free to concentrate his efforts elsewhere. His main interests settled on his collection and, in a related sense, on the general promotion of collecting or museum interests within the newly-founded Institute. Exhibits or presentations of his own were typical. In November, or just before amalgamation, he exhibited 'an unusual stone implement', presumably the same stone axe obtained from Honduras and exhibited soon afterward at a meeting of the Society of Antiquaries[51]. Other materials included 'Two small penannular Rings of Gold...from Africa', a 'Flint Implement from the Isle of Wight', and a 'Wooden Instrument [from] Skull, near Skibbereen', also exhibited at the Society of Antiquaries[52]. His main efforts, however, were focused on preparations for the Society's Palaeolithic Exhibition, held during the latter part of May at Burlington House, Piccadilly. Fox, who the year before had been elected to the Council of the Society of Antiquaries and in early May was elevated to the position of Vice-President, appears to have had a central role in organizing that special event[53].

---

[46] Stocking, 'What's in a Name? ', p. 383. John Beddoe, Memories of Eighty Years (Bristol: J. W. Arrowsmith, 1910), pp. 209-16. RAI, Council Minutes, ASL, 31 May 1870, A/3/2.
[47] JASL, 8 (1870).
[48] Fox, Letter to John Evans, 18 Dec 1872; John Evans in Time and Chance, p. 157
[49] RAI, Report of Delegates to Amalgamation Meeting, 21 Jan 1871, A/3/2.
[50] Fox, Letter to John Evans, 18 Dec 1872, in John Evans, Time and Chance, p. 157. See also RAI, Council Minutes, Anthrop. Inst., 31 Jan 1871, A10. On Lubbock's opposition to the terms, see Stocking, 'What's in a Name? ', p. 369; Hutchinson, Lubbock, I, 74; Grant Duff, p. 14.
[51] Proceedings of the Anthropological and Ethnological Societies of London prior to the date of amalgamation, JAI, 1 (1871), append. Xxviii; Fox, 'On Flint Implements from Honduras', PSAL, 2dS 5 (1871), 93-95.
[52] Fox. 'On Two Penannular Rings of Gold, from Africa', Archaeologia 43 (1871), 558; 'On a Flint from the Isle of Wight', PSAL, 2dS 5 (1871) 113-14; 'On a Wooden Instrument from Skul, near Skibbereen', PSAL, 2dS 5 (1871), 148.
[53] SAL, Executive Committee Minutes, 3 May 1871. Also PSAL, 2dS 5 (1817), 148.

Together with Franks, who was also a Vice-President, he was also responsible for setting the collection up.

The tradition of special exhibitions of the kind held that spring by the Society of Antiquaries was fairly well established by the early seventies. Both the Archaeological Institute and Archaeological Association had sponsored similar exhibitions since their inception. One of the first major displays of the Institute was an exhibition of British and Medieval antiquities, held at Marlborough House in conjunction with the Great Exhibition of 1851. The Antiquaries themselves, however, had been generally more reluctant to mount anything of such a popular nature; while presentations by members were still a fairly typical component of meetings, the latter never had been intended for the entertainment of the general public. Franks had helped to change the Antiquaries' approach, first promoting the idea of public admission to the Society's small museum and then pressing for more open exhibits, such as those held at the Archaeological Institute where he was also active. Among the first products of his efforts was an exhibition of wax seals and illuminated manuscripts held in 1861 and two more exhibits, one of printed books and another of autograph letters and heraldic documents of two years later[54]. Fox, as a new member, probably had no official part in the latter exhibits, although he certainly knew of their occurrence.

For several years the Council of the Society had voted against further exhibits of such a popular kind, largely because of the technical difficulties involved, and, as a result, the Palaeolithic Exhibition of 1871 marked something of a precedent[55]. Mostly, it was an expression of the majority of the members' opinion that the facilities of the Society should be used more effectively. The exhibition was officially opened on 18 May, with Franks and Evans presenting the introductory papers[56]. Fox's main contribution was to the collection itself, and in all he lent over 60 specimens from his own collection, or nearly a fifth of the total number of objects on display. Other pieces came from Evans, Lubbock, Franks, the Blackmore Museum and the Society's own collection. Whether all of the loan collection was displayed in accordance with Fox's series system, as suggested by the charts among his earlier papers, is unclear, although the main emphasis appears to have been on sites of origin, or geographical location, over other considerations. Overall, the exhibit was considered a great success, with over 500 people visiting it during the two and a half weeks when it was open to the public[57]. While the numbers were few by modern standards, the exhibition’s organizers were evidently pleased with the results.

The Palaeolithic Exhibition was followed, logically enough, by a second series on 'Neolithic Implements' held the next November and early December. For that end, Fox's role was an even more important one, and, together with Franks and Evans, he

---

[54] SAL, Executive Committee Minutes.
[55] Evans, Antiquaries, p. 306.
[56] A.W. Franks, 'On the Remains of Primitive Man, recently discovered in the Caves and Rock Shelters of La Bordogne in France', PSAL, 2dS 5 (1871), 165; John Evans, 'On the Occurrence of Flint Implements in the Drift; their various types and characteristics', PSAL, 2dS 5 (1871), 165. Evans’ paper was later expanded as Ancient Stone Implements
[57] Evans, Antiquaries, p. 306; SAL, Executive Committee Minutes, 3 May 1981.

was asked to give one of the introductory lectures[58]. Again, he contributed a large number of specimens to the displays themselves, including objects from Britain, Ireland, Germany, Borneo, Japan, Australia and the Americas—in all over 150 different items. Other contributors again included Fox's friends, Flower and Tupper and long-time associates such as Westropp and Bernard Smith, as well as such regulars as Franks, Evans and Lubbock[59]. Fox apparently had an even greater part in putting the whole exhibit together that time, although again the exhibit was organized along geographical lines rather than according to Fox's obviously more ambitious plan. Fox was disappointed by the choice, and was also critical of the range of contributed pieces, commenting:

> That as every exhibitor had sent a selection of the most remarkable specimens in his collection, the exhibition was calculated to convey an exaggerated idea of the skill and originality of primeval man, and was ill adapted to impress the mind with the very slow progress and continuity by which even the comparatively simple arts of the stone age of culture had been brought about[60].

His own collection, he implied, would have supplied that want. Fox's other activities during 1871-72 are less clear. He had been an active member of both the councils of the Society of Antiquaries and the Anthropological Institute, occasionally exhibiting objects or joining in discussions at meetings[61]. No major projects appear to have been undertaken, however, nor does it appear that he took any part in the British Association meetings that summer at Edinburgh[62]. Other than possible visits to other sites, he also did not carry out any field investigations of his own. The same was true of the early part of 1872, when again, the nature and extent of his activities are unknown other than to note his more routine involvement in Society work[63]. Thompson has suggested that his attachment to his collection and series system of dating acted as a direct impediment to further work and that his uncertainty over method caused him to doubt the worth of his own system[64]. Such an argument, of course, assumes that Fox saw his own methods inferior to those of Greenwell, which, despite noted differences in technique, was clearly not the case. The more likely explanation is simply that the demands of society business were more taxing than the record conveys, and that possibly ill health, a recurrent pattern in Fox's life since his

---

[58] Fox, 'Address to the Neolithic Exhibition', PSAL, 2dS 5 (1871), 233-35. Fox's address is in draft form among his papers. Thompson, 'Introduction', pp. 22-23. See also, A. W. Franks, 'Address', PSAL, 2dS 5 (1872), 232-33; and John Evans, 'The General Classifications of Stone Implements of the Neolithic Period', PSAL, 2dS 5 (1872), 229. Also, SAL, Executive Committee Minutes, 15 Nov 1871. Evans' contribution is further discussed by Pennimann, A Hundred Years, p. 161.

[59] 'List of Contributors to the Neolithic Exhibition', PSAL, 2dS 5 (1872), 224-29.

[60] Fox, 'Address to the Neolithic Exhibition', p. 233.

[61] SAL, Ordinary Meeting Minutes; RAI, Council Minutes, Anthrop. Inst., A10. On 15 Feb 1872, for example, Fox exhibited 'a Bronze representing a Boar obtained at Abbeville', PSAL, 2dS 5 (1872), 269.

[62] RBAAS, (1871).

[63] RAI Council Minutes, Anthrop. Inst. 9 Jan 1872, 12 Jan 1871, 3 Feb 1872, etc., A10.

[64] Thompson, General Pitt-Rivers, p. 51.

Crimean days[65], or even a lack of opportunity, prevented him from taking part in anything more strenuous. Overall, it was probably a matter of his simply having taken on more than he could effectively handle, a not at all surprising circumstance for someone with such diverse interests.

Some indication of the full range of Fox's interests during the year 1871-72 is glimpsed in his introductory lecture before the Anthropological Section at the British Association meeting that summer[66]. There, as one of the Section's Vice-Presidents, his authority was again unquestioned, and he used the occasion to promote his own conception of a unified, although at the same time increasingly specialized, 'science of man'. For Fox the problems facing anthropology could be reduced to two related questions: how were the 'remarkable similarities' in ancient and 'savage and barbarous' races to be accounted for, and in what way did the latter in turn represent ancient man? Other questions, he explained, had already been answered. The problem of monogenesis or polygenesis, he pointed out, long of interest to ethnologists, had been handled satisfactorily by Darwin's hypothesis and by acceptance of the more general theory of uniformitarianism. The problem of whether man had descended from a previously elevated state, as Bishop Whately contended, or had gradually improved himself and his mental and moral state had been adequately treated by Lubbock and Huxley, Lubbock demonstrating that the mental intellectual powers of man had always been a product of progressive development; Huxley, that 'there is really no cerebral barrier between men and animals'[67]. His own questions, however, while related in general terms to others already treated, had never been addressed in any detail, and it was his aim, as he emphasized, to do so.

In Fox's terms the solution hinged on two more or less general assumptions. The first, and least acceptable, was that each culture – or more accurately each level of a society's culture—was arrived at independently. The second was that similarities among peoples, their languages, or, in Fox's terms, their arts and technology were representative of past connections, either based on race or more recent intercommunications. The first solution, described by Fox as the 'theory of ... spontaneous generation'[68], had the effect of diverting attention away from the possibility of specific or actual connections, suggesting, as it did, that similarities of a particular kind were merely further proof of the basic evolutionist position that man was everywhere the same. To deny the possibility of specific connections, however, Fox charged, was simply a measure of ethnology's ignorance of nature of the social or intellectual advancement and the history of each race. The only acceptable solution was one in which every aspect or component of a given race or culture was examined separately. 'There is in fact no royal road to knowledge on this subject by the application of general principles', he explained. 'The history of each art, custom, or institution must be diligently worked out by itself, availing ourselves of the clue offered by race as only the most probable channel of communication and development'[69].

---

[65] See Mitford, Stanleys.

[66] Fox, 'Report, Brighton, 1872'. Also see SSW, PRP, P97; and JAI, 2 (1872), 353-73.

[67] Fox, 'Report, Brighton, 1872', p. 158. The reference is to Lubbock's lecture of 1867 and to Huxley's Evidences as to Man's Place in Nature (1863) in particular.

[68] Fox, 'Report, Brighton, 1872', p. 164.

[69] Ibid, p. 160.

By way of illustration Fox referred to several examples from his collection. His first choice was the boomerang, which he again traced over the southern hemisphere. The bow in its various forms was also discussed and plotted on a distribution map, with Fox documenting its changes over time and the special characteristics of each of several 'varieties'. The use of metal, the distribution of megalithic monuments, and the degeneration of ornamental design on canoe paddles were treated in similar ways. In each case, a pattern revealed itself when distribution was plotted geographically. Moreover, based as such a pattern was on physical evidence, the conclusions were irrefutable: 'To the religions, myths, institutions, and language or a people we are naturally drawn, as affording the best indications of their mental endowments'; he explained, 'but it is evident that these carry us no further back in time than the historic period;… '. Moreover, they were all subject to what he later characterized as 'constant variation'[70]. Betraying a typically Victorian understanding of language and its evolution, he suggested that only through the introduction of writing did language assume any kind of permanence. The Arts, 'on the other hand', offered no such difficulties:

> The language of the arts may be said to have been a written language from the time of the first appearance of man upon the earth; less liable to variation and transmission, the links of connection between lower and higher forms had been preserved and handed down to us from the remotest periods of time, and by testifying to the comparative status and continuous development which had taken place, encouraged us to hope that by diligently prosecuting our studies in this department of anthropology, every relic of prehistoric ages may eventually be made to mark its own place in sequence, if not time.[71]

To carry out his plan, Fox emphasized, it would be necessary not only to extend the scope of anthropology but to establish a comprehensive science of a new order. In practical terms, such a measure meant an amalgamation of the various and societies in London and, eventually, the country. The latter, as he explained, were subject to an increasing differentiation of efforts, just as he problems of the Ethnological and Anthropological Societies had developed an increasing factionalism. Rather, therefore, than continuing to operate separately, it was suggested that each Society be brought beneath a single umbrella and then assigned special functions and activities. One society, for example, could be devoted to 'Proto-Historical Researches', another to 'Prehistoric Archaeology', another to 'Philology' and so on through five different subjects. Local chapters or 'the country cousins', as he put it, could then address the subject or subjects of their choice, eventually submitting their findings to the appropriate metropolitan organization. To further unify such efforts, he recommended that a standardized format be accepted for the publication of lectures and other materials.

Facilities, he explained could be centralized in a similar way. Libraries, numbering

---

[70] Ibid, p. 165.
[71] Ibid, p. 166.

four or five 'to one or two students who habitually read the books in them', as he complained, and museums, limited to 'a stray Chinese umbrella or two and a stuffed monkey or a few bronze implements in a case', could be assembled within a single building, comparable to that of the Society of Antiquaries. Similarly, governmental support could be enlisted to underwrite the cost and to provide a symbolic unity, without at the same time sacrificing 'the independence of the several branches'[72]. Few, he suggested, would argue against the desirability of such a scheme; it only awaited a full commitment on the part of all those concerned. Failure to act soon, however, would only invite failure, and he suggested the members of the British Association could take the first steps that summer. Even if nothing were done about it, at least Fox's plan had been presented; and the full scope of his views had been set out for others to see.

4. A New Edition of Notes and Queries

One suggestion of Fox's that summer which did have some effect was his proposal that a new edition of the British Association's long-standing series of questionnaires, known as Notes and Queries, be prepared for the use of anthropologists and ethnologists. The idea of such a project had been raised as early as 1868, and in 1869 Fox's scheme for the reorganization of the subject had implicitly called for a new edition of questionnaires for travellers as part of its total programme[73]. The impetus in 1872, however, came with the recent proposal by the President and Council of the Geographical Society that the Anthropological Institute and the Geographical Society combine efforts to provide a new questionnaire for Arctic explorers. With the Swedish Governments recent exploration of the Arctic Circle and the expedition then proposed the Royal Geographical Society under Sherard Osborn, it was obviously important that something new should be provided[74].

Fox, as a member of the Council and as past Secretary of the Ethnological Society, was drawn into discussions at an early date, probably due to the influence of Clements Markham at the Geographical Society. At the 1872 meeting he mentioned the proposal in the course of his address[75]. By the end of the meeting a resolution was adopted by the General Committee of the British Association, 'That Colonel Lane Fox, Dr. Beddoe, Mr. Franks, Mr. Francis Galton, Mr. E.W. Brabrook, Sir John Lubbock, Bart., Sir Walter Elliot, Mr. Clements Markham and Mr. E.B. Tyler (sic) be a committee for the purpose of preparing and publishing brief forms of instructions for travellers, ethnologists, and other anthropological observers'. Fox was to be the Secretary and contributed £25 out of his own pocket to cover expenses[76].

---

[72] Ibid, pp. 172-73.
[73] Fox, see above, p. 298.
[74] 'Report of Anthropology at the Meeting of the British Association in 1872', JAI, 2 (1872), 350-62; RAI, Council Minutes, Anthrop. Inst., 8 Apr 1872, 17 Jun 1872, A10. Also Roderick Impey Murchison, 'Presidential Address', PRGS, 9 (1865), 195-274; Sherard Osborn, 'On the Expedition to the North Polar Region', JRGS, 36 (1866), 279-95; 'On the Probable Existence of Unknown Lanes within the Artic Circle', PRGS, 17 (1873), 172-73; Meeting, 16 Dec 1872, PRGS, 17 (1872), 76-77.
[75] Fox, 'Report, Brighton, 1872', p. 360. See also, Fox, 'Principles of Classification', pp. 294-95
[76] RBAAS (1872), lv. Also, George Bush, 'Address to the Anthropological Institute', JAI, 2 (1875), 482-90.

Drawing upon the experience of others and adding contributions of their own, the committee produced the new edition by the end of the year. The latter was first printed as an appendix to the 'Report of the Arctic Committee of the Anthropological Institute' early the next year as 'Questions for Explorers (with Special Reference to Arctic Exploration)'[77]. Its organization again suggests Fox's influence. J. Barnard Davis offered a number of questions on 'Articles of dress and implements'. Tylor wrote on 'Religion, Mythology and Sociology'. Fox provided a separate set of questions entitled 'Enquiries Relating to Drawing, Carving and Ornamentation', a subject in which he had be interested for a number of years but had never addressed in any depth until that summer. For what it reveals of Fox's interests at the time, it deserves reprinting here:

> Have the natives a natural aptitude for drawing? Do they draw living animals in preference to other forms? Are the heads of men and animals usually represented larger in proportion than other parts of the body? Have they the least knowledge of perspective? Are the more distant objects drawn smaller than those nearer? Are the more important personages or objects drawn larger than the others? Do their drawings represent imaginary animals or animals now extinct? Do they show any tendency to represent irregular objects, such as branching trees symmetrically so as to produce a conventional pattern? Are the drawings generally historical, or merely drawn for amusement or for ornament? Are events of different periods depicted in the same drawing? Have they any conventional modes for representing certain objects? Do they draw from nature or copy each other's drawings? Do they in copying from one another vary the forms through negligence, inability, or to save trouble, so as to lose sight of the original object and produce conventional forms, the nature of which is otherwise inexplicable? If so, it would be of great interest to obtain several series of such drawings, shewing the gradual departure from the originals? Do they readily understand and appreciate European drawings? Do they shew any aptitude in copying European drawings? Do they draw with coloured earths besides the drawings engraved on bone? With what tools are these engravings made? Have they special artists to draw for the whole tribe or does each man ornament his own property? Do any of the natives show special talent for drawing, if so, in what direction does such talent shew itself? Is drawing more practised in some tribes than others, and if so, does this arise from inclination or from traditional custom? Do they draw plans or maps? Do they understand European maps? At what age do the children commence drawing? Are they encouraged a draw at an early age (a series of drawings of natives of different ages, from five or six upwards, would be interesting

[77] 'Questions for Explorers (with Special reference to Arctic Explorations) ', JAI, 4 (1872), 296-306. It was also printed in pamphlet form.

> as a means of comparison with the development of artistic skill in Europeans)? Do they use ornamental or geometrical patterns, such as zigzags, concentric circles, contiguous circles, coils, spirals, punchmarks, lozenges, patterns, herringbone patterns, etc.? Do they use the continuous looped coil pattern in ornamentation? Are such geometrical patterns in any case copies of mechanical contrivances, such as the finding of an arrowhead, the strings supporting a vessel, etc., represented by incised lines? Are there any ancient drawings upon rocks, etc.? And, if so, in what respects do they differ from those of the existing natives? Copies to scale of any drawings which cannot be brought away would be very desirable.[78]

Other subjects required Fox's point of view, a similar comprehensiveness. Franks provided a series of questions on technology, again suggesting that it was 'most desirable to make as complete a collection as possible of everything illustrating the Arctic tribes'. J. Barnard Davis called for the same in his questions on dress and implements[79]. It is interesting to note, in fact, how close in emphasis the first questionnaire approached to a collector's tastes and ambitions, serving as it did of a programme for collection. That Fox should have been the principal mover behind the effort was only to be expected.

Over the course of the next few months, the first edition of the British Association questionnaire was revised, also under Fox's guidance, to meet changing needs. Early in 1873 the questions were adapted for African explorers in anticipation of the African expeditions of W.J. Gandy and Lieutenant Cameron, and would be expanded for more general use[80]. Fox, in addition to his questions on ornament, provided further enquiries on the use of iron. Again copies of the questionnaire, with blank spaces for answers, were printed and sent to Her Majesty's consuls and to officers in the Royal Navy as well as to other potential sources of information. Costs were still covered through Fox's contribution, although his expenses were later made up by the Geographical Society, the Anthropological Institute and by a gift from Franks[81]. The

---

[78] Fox, 'Enquiries Relating to Drawing, Carving and Ornamentation', JAI, 2 (1872), 301-02.
[79] A. W. Franks, 'Enquiries as to Ethnology'; J. Barnard Davis wrote on physiological questions.
[80] Fox, 'Report of the Committee, consisting of Colonel Lane Fox, Dr. Beddoe, Mr. Franks, Mr. Francis Galton, Mr. E.W. Brabrook, Sir. J. Lubbock, Bart., Sir. Walter Elliot, Mr. Clements Markham, and Mr. E.B. Tylor, appointed for the purpose of preparing and publishing brief forms of Instuctions for Travellers, Ethnologists, and other Anthropological observes', RBAAS (1873), 482-88.
[81] See Notes and Queries on Anthropology, for the Use of Travellers and Residents in Uncivilized Lands (London: Edward Stanford, 1874). A second edition, edited by John George Garson and C. H. Read, was published for the Anthropological Institute in 1892. Other editions were as follows:

> 3rd ed. 1899; rpt. of 1892 ed.
> 4th ed. 1912; ed. by J.L. Myers and Barbara Freire-Marreco.
> 5th ed. 1929; ed. by a Committee of Section H, BAAS
> 6th ed. 1951; ed. by a Committee of the RAI.

British Association, under whose authority the questionnaires were officially produced, never had to pay for any part of them.

Fox's efforts on behalf of the first edition of what came to be known simply as Notes and Queries were matched by his growing involvement in field work, particularly his increasing commitment to a refinement of excavation techniques and recording principles. The initial impulse was probably the summer meeting of the British Association at Brighton where Greenwell had presented a paper 'On the Barrows of the Yorkshire Wolds'.[82] Delivered shortly after Fox's own address, Fox was apparently impressed by it, and consented to test a number of Greenwell's theories on sites close at hand, as Thompson has suggested[83]. As a result, before returning to London, Fox began work at a barrow on Dyke Road near Brighton, known locally as the Black Burgh Tumulus[84]. In it, Fox found a crouched skeleton together with a bronze dagger, bronze pin, food vessel, and necklace composed of shale beads—or all the standard ingredients of a Wessex burial site. There were also a number of secondary deposits as well as evidence from other holes in the chalk strata, comparable to those discussed by Greenwell in his recent lecture. The fact that section drawings and plans of a more detailed kind than any of those produced by Fox before were made also suggests Greenwell's influence, although the latter could be just as easily interpreted as an extension of his Thames-side work[85]. The important point, however, was that Greenwell's work, while only indirectly acknowledged as precedential, confronted Fox with new standards of workmanship and technique which, in turn, he felt compelled to match.

Fox's reintroduction to the field was short-lived, however, and with the beginning of meetings in the late autumn of 1872, Fox was once again drawn into the activities of the various societies, particularly the Anthropological Institute. The main issue at hand was a resurgence of the factionalism of which Fox had spoken the previous summer and which he had sought to avoid through his scheme for reorganization of the Ethnological and other societies. The conflict settled on the election of a new President, Lubbock's successor. The anthropologists were probably still the most organized group, even if, in Fox's estimation, they were the least scientific. In November, with elections approaching, they decided to back one of their own members rather than Evans, as had been previously, and probably unconstitutionally, agreed upon the year before. Also, they were able to combine their vote effectively in a way in which the more politically naive ethnologists had never considered[86]. The result was the election of Richard Charnock, a long-time friend of Hunt's,

---

The new edition was discussed throughout the Autumn of 1872. RAI Council Minutes, Anthrop. Inst., 19 Nov and 3 Dec 1872, A10. Arrangements for printing were made in Feb 1873. For the contribution of Notes and Queries to British Anthropology, see James Urry, 'Notes and Queries on Anthropology and the Development of Field Methods in British Anthropology, 1870-1920', Hocart Prize Essay, 1972, Proc. of the RAI (1972), 45-57.
[82] Greenwell, 'On the Barrows of the Yorkshire Wolds'.
[83] Thompson, General Pitt-Rivers, p. 51.
[84] Fox, 'Opening of the Dyke Road, or Black Burgh Tumulus, near Brighton, in 1872', JAI, (1876), 280-87.
[85] Fox, 'Discovery of Flint Implements'; 'Discovery of Palaeolithic Implements'. Cf. Thompson, General Pitt-Rivers, p. 51.
[86]RAI, Council Minutes, Anthrop. Inst. 17 Dec 1872, A10. See Stocking, 'What's in a Name? ', p. 383.

distinguished through his several papers on Arctic peoples and a leading member of what was known as the 'cannibal clique'[87].

Fox, Lubbock, Franks and other moderates within the society were obviously disappointed by the anthropologists' victory. As Fox wrote to Evans in late December, the opposing faction had 'voted against you to a man and elected Charnock instead'[88]. The moderates, however, were not to be put off, and a show of unity was called for at the next meeting in January. Many anthropologists were never notified, and the election took place without their notification. As a result, the previous election was overturned, and a new man, George Busk, a mild-mannered anatomist to whom many of the meeting members of the society, including Fox, had turned often for his specialist opinions, was elevated to the post.

Not surprisingly, the anthropological faction was outraged, calling the meeting unconstitutional and then gathering to elect their own president. Most of its members, including Richard Burton, seceded from the Institute forming their own society called the London Anthropological Society[89]. Despite the disruption, it was precisely what the moderates had hoped for. As a result, they were finally in a position to mold the Institute to their own needs and expectations. John Beddoe, J. Barnard Davis, John Evans and Fox were soon afterward elected as Vice-Presidents and the Council was reinforced with other like-thinking members[90]. Most, including Fox, were happy to have brought the long-standing controversy to an effective conclusion.

Throughout much of the winter of 1871-72 Fox was equally involved with activities at the Society of Antiquaries. Again the main object was a new exhibition, this second time Bronze Age tools and weapons. Once again Fox's role was a central one, and along with Greenwell, Franks and Evans, he contributed materials in a number of categories. Among his contributions were a number of pieces discovered during his work in the Thames Valley, as well as objects from Highdown in Sussex and his earlier Irish excavations[91]. In the 'Foreign' category he loaned a number of pieces from Cyprus, recently obtained from the Italian-American adventurer, and later first curator of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, General Luigi Palma di Cesnola (1832-1904)[92]. Evans was delegated to provide the keynote address; Fox merely offered a commentary. Again, he stressed his central theme, 'the continuous sequence of form from the early and simpler forms ... to the more advanced forms', arguing too, against the Phoenician origin of bronze as he had in his earlier lectures on primitive

---

[87] Stocking, 'What's in a Name? '. Interestingly, one of his contributions was 'On Cannibalism in Europe', RBAAS (1865), 117.
[88] Fox, Letter to John Evans, 18 Dec 1872, in Joan Evans, Time and Chance, p. 157.
[89] See RAI, Council Minutes. Anthrop. Inst., 7 and 21 Jan and 14 Feb 1873, A10. Also: Richard Burton, Letter to the London Anthropological Society, Anthropologia, 1 (1875), 2-3. Among Fox's acquaintances were Burton and Carter Blake, the latter one of his supporters at the Geological Society of London.
[90] RAI, List of Presidents, Officers, and Members of Council since 1871 (London: RAI, n.d.); RAI, Council Minutes, 7 Jan 1973, A10. Among the Council Members were E. B. Tylor and Francis Galton.
[91] List of Contributors to the Bronze Age Exhibition, PSAL, 2dS 5 (1873), 420-35.
[92] List of Contributions and Catalogue to the Bronze Age Exhibition, p. 421; BL, SSC. See also, Elizabeth MacFadden, The Glitter and the Gold (New York: Dial Press, 1971) pp. 134-36.

warfare[93]. To emphasize his point, he also brought a chart demonstrating the development of celt forms, leaving it on display for the two-week period during which the temporary exhibit remained on view[94].

Fox's own collection, in the meantime, had been changing less in general character than in total numbers. During 1871 and 1872 we know that he obtained his specimens of human hair from Palmyra from Burton, a number of flint implements and other materials from Consul Thomas Hutchinson in Brazil and several stone implements from India contributed to the collection by a Colonel Pearse. There were also materials from Tahiti and the Nicobar Islands, including a number of 'grotesque figurines' obtained by Captain Edge of the H.M.S. Satellite; G.M. Atchinson of the Institute was apparently Fox's source for a number of those[95]. In each case, materials were still acquired with the aim of filling out his existing series. By the mid-sixties, for example, he had already begun his collection of ornamental canoe paddles, scouring curiosity shops, as he explained in 1872, in search of ideal specimens[96]. Of a slightly different character were his purchases from antiquarian dealers, including the Cypriot antiquities of General Cesnola, whose collection was sold by Sotheby's in several separate sales between 1866 and 1872, as well as separate sales conducted privately. Most of Fox's purchases appear to have been through the latter[97].

Probably the most advantageous of the auction sales from Fox's point of view was that of the collection originally established by Samuel Rush Meyrick, long the main authority on medieval and other military arms and a collector of incomparable breadth. Inherited by his relative, Lieutenant Colonel Augustus Meyrick, soon after his death in 1848, Meyrick's collection had been displayed a number of times, most notably at the Art Treasures Exhibition at Manchester in 1857 and at South Kensington beginning in December 1868, where Fox would have been most familiar with it. Finally, in 1871, it was sold at a private sale at Goodrich Court and, as with Fox's collection at a later date, while offered to the government, was turned down as usual for lack of funds and lack of proper facilities. Most of the collection went to another dealer, M. Spitzer of Paris[98].

Fox's purchases were limited to the least expensive items, mostly halberds and pikes and other common objects rather than the elaborate suits of armour or swords for

---

93 Fox, Remarks following John Evans', 'Address on the Bronze Period', PSAL, 2dS 5 (1873), 412-13. See Evans' later The Ancient Bronze Implements, Weapons and Ornaments of Great Britain and Ireland (London: Longmans, Green, 1881).
94 SAL, Executive Committee Minutes, Jan 1873. The chart was that first presented in 'Primitive Warfare, III'.
95 SSW, PRP, p. 117; Fox, 'On a Series of about two hundred Flint and Chert Arrowheads, Flakes, Thumbflints and Borers, from the Rio Negro', JAI, 4 (1874), 311-12. G. M. Atchinson, 'Exhibition of Grotesque Figurines obtained by Captain Edge, R.N., from the Nicobar Islands', JESL, NS 2 (1870), 139-40. Fox, 'On Stone Celts from the grove and hill-top Temples of the Malayalis of the Shevaroy Hills, India', JAI, 2 (1872), 348-49. For Burton's contributions, see R. F. Burton, 'On Anthropological Collections from the Holyland'; and E, Carter Blake, 'Notes on Human Remains from Palmyra', JAI, 1 (1871), 300-12.
96 Fox, 'Address, Brighton', p. 168.
97 Fox, Catalogue; BL, SSC; McFadden, 134-40.
98 Planché, Recollections, II, 144-46.

which the collection was best known[99]. Still, the former probably conformed most closely to the general theme of his collection. All in all it must have been a satisfying accomplishment for Fox, Meyrick's collection standing, as it had for so many years, as the epitome of the well-organized arms collection.

While arms continued to play an important part in his collection, other materials were coming to assume a more prominent position. In fact, it was during the early 1870s that non-weapons first became as important as they did. Some of the new series might be said to have grown out of the earlier weapons collection, as in the case of jade and flint tools which Fox attempted to present as the prototypes of later weapons. The same was true of his series on ornamental canoe paddles, traced in that case back to earlier celt forms. His series on primitive navigation, however, while obviously related to that on canoe paddles, took on an entirely different set of connotations. No longer simply a demonstration of what Fox had long before identified as the 'combative principle', the series on primitive navigation as a commentary on that subject alone. Its aim was explicitly ethnological.

Fox's collection of canoes and canoe models probably began, as did his series on primitive shelter, with the purchase of a chance collection of model canoes, typical souvenirs for those returning from the South Pacific[100]. In general outline, however, his series followed that set out in Francis Steinitz's The Ship: its Origin and Progress, published in 1849[101]. And there is much to suggest, in fact, that Steinitz's relatively conventional portrayal of the rise of shipbuilding technology served directly as a model for Fox's work. Eventually Fox's own series, described in detail in his lecture on 'Early Modes of Navigation' of 1874, passed from the simple dugouts and birch-bark canoes through outriggers to models of more complex sailing ships, comparable to those in most other naval collections[102].

The principal interest of the series on primitive navigation, however, lay not so much in its portrayal of shipbuilding technology, as in its application as an historical tool, one comparable, from Fox's point of view, to the boomerang or throwing stick series. The principal influence on Fox's scheme was that of A. de Quatrefages, whose Les Polynésiens et leur Migrations had appeared only a few years before[103]. Discussed repeatedly at meetings of the Ethnological and Anthropological Societies during the sixties, Quatrefages's contention that the islands of the South Pacific had been populated through a series of oceangoing expeditions from the mainland South Asia had become fairly well accepted by that period[104]. Fox's series was formed to

---

[99] Fox, Catalogue.
[100] See, for example, A. C. Haddon, 'An Anomalous Form of Outrigger Attachment in Torres Straits and the Distribution', Man, 18 (1918), No. 68.
[101] Francis Steinitz, The Ship: its Origin and Progress (London: Wm. H. Allen, 1849). Another important reference, at least for a portion of Fox's collection, was John Hoag, 'On Vessels made of the Papyrus', Magazine of Natural History, 2 (1829), 324-32. See Fox, 'Early Modes of Navigation'; also, SSW, PRP, P67.
[102] A good example is the collection of ship models at the Admiralty House and later moved to South Kensington.
[103] A. De Quatrefages, Les Polynesiens et leur Migrations (Paris: L. Hachette, 1866).
[104] Rev. of M. De Quatrefages Les Polynesiens et leur Migrations AR, 5 (1867), 330-34; Alred Russel Wallace, 'On the Varieties or Men in the Malayas, 1 (1868), 81-82;

substantiate Quatrefages' argument, demonstrating, by means of distribution maps, he probable sequence of inter-island migration. Other connections were also hinted at in the same way, including the possibility of a connection with South America. Again, he anticipates the kinds of interest which have preoccupied German and Scandinavian ethnologists up to the present day, as well as suggesting the more ambitious outlines of his own programme[105].

5. The Degeneration of Ornament

Directly comparable to Fox's series on primitive navigation was his work on the derivation of ornaments. In part, it too was an outgrowth of an earlier series. Canoe paddles, for instance, and their similarities or dissimilarities, were used as further evidence of his migration theory as well as to plot migrations or interconnections of a more minute order. But in a more general way, Fox's work on ornaments could be seen as a reflection of a more basic interest, one tantamount to a Victorian obsession[106].

It is difficult for us now to fully understand the nineteenth century preoccupation with ornamental design. For architects, from Gothic Revivalists such as William Butterfield, to more eclectic practitioners such as Sir Gilbert Scott, ornament was what made their profession something more than mere building[107]. For furniture manufacturers pottery makers, silver workers and rug manufacturers, ornament was a means by which their products could be given a style or a sense of historical place. Pattern books, in use since the Renaissance, became the stock and trade of builders and manufacturers, especially so as the costs of publishing and printing were reduced[108]. Writers from the popularist Ralph Wornum, to the aesthetic prophet John Ruskin, preached upon the nature and necessity of ornamental design, offering at the same time, tenets of appropriateness through which selections might be made[109].

'Archipelago' JESL, 3 (1864), 197-215; NS, 1 (1869), 81-82; John Crawford, 'On the Malayan Races', JESL, 7 (1868), 119-33.

[105] The series on 'Early Modes of Navigation' directly anticipates Thor Heyerdahl's Kon-Tiki: Across the Pacific by Rafts, trans. F. H. Lyon (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1950).

[106] A point stressed by numerous commentators on the age. See Buckley, pp. 131-35; Stewart Durant, Victorian Design (London: Academy Editions, 1972); Gloag, Victorian Taste; Conrad, pp. 95-98; Pevsner, High Victorian Design.

[107] Pevsner, Sources of Modern Design, pp. 10-11. On Scott's views in particular: Gilbert Scott, Remarks on Secular and Domestic Architecture, Present and Future (London: John Murray, 1858); David Cole, 'Sir Gilbert Scott', in Peter Ferriday, ed., Victorian Architecture (London: Jonathan Cape, 1963), 175-84; and Martin S. Briggs, 'Sir Gilbert Scott, R.A.', Architectural Review, 24 (1908), 92-100, 146-56, 180-86, 290-93. On Butterfield: Paul Thompson, William Butterfield (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1971).

[108] Beginning among architects in England with works such as such as John and William Halfpenny, Chinese and Gothic Architecture Properly Ornamented (London: Robert Sayer, 1752). The best Victorian example is Owen Jones' influential The Grammar of Ornament (1856: rpt. London: Van Nostrand, 1972). For an overall discussion, particularly of the impact of inexpensive printing, see Klingender, pp. 148-50.

[109] Ralph N. Wornum, 'The Exhibition as a Lesson in Taste', appendix to the Art Journal Illustrated Catalogue of the Great Exhibition, i-xxii; Analysis of Ornament: The characteristics of Styles; an Introduction to the History of Ornamental Art (London: Chapman and Itall, 1859); John Ruskin, The Seven Lamps of Architecture (1849; rpt. London: Cassell, 1709) among other works. For further on Ruskin's ideas, see Kristina Offesen, Ruskin on

Periodicals, particularly those oriented to artisans or architects, such as The Art Journal, featured article after article on ornamental derivations, tracing the history of each design to its source in the ancient, or, increasingly by the sixties and seventies, the 'Celtic' worlds. Lectures on ornament were featured at the government-sponsored schools of design from the time of their foundation and formed a central part of the curriculum at South Kensington and at various working mens' colleges[110]. Debates over the proper use of embellishment, the advantages of 'flat' over 'three-dimensional' design, of 'abstract' versus 'representational' motifs, served as a point of reference and allegiance among artistic factions. For Fox, as well as many others, therefore, the attempt to untangle such a preoccupation was more than an academic exercise; it was an attempt to understand, in the most complete sense, the fundamentals of material life.

The origins of ornamental design had naturally been a topic of long-standing interest among antiquarians, and here Fox's own interests are even more telling. Papers on architectural embellishment, playing cards, ornamental armour, silver or other metalwork were a standard feature of antiquarian publications. As with Fox, most writers tended to treat ornamental design as part of a general continuity. Charles Newton, in a paper of 1851, compared the development of what he called artistic forms to the development of language, each undergoing periods of growth, decline or stagnation. Also, Newton argued, both arts and languages stood outside the immediate consciousness of individuals, and, as a result, were subject to laws of development of a more or less independent kind, as Fox himself had suggested. In a strikingly similar article, Edmund Oldfield, Fox's by-now colleague of some years' standing, had emphasized the important role of imitation in the development of ornamental forms, suggesting that designs were derived both from immediate examples in nature and from prior forms. Other members of the Anthropological and Ethnological Societies, including both Wallace and Tylor, had put forward similar arguments, as Fox was no doubt aware[111].

Of perhaps the most direct influence upon Fox was the work of J. O. Westwood. Best noted for his writings on Irish ornament and antiquities (in which context, as we have seen, Fox and he had first become acquainted), Westwood argued that the impulse to decorate 'appears to be usual among mankind, and to have been adopted in every age and by every nation[112]'. Westwood's basic theme was that ornament provided the key to what he referred to as 'mental cultivation' or, more precisely, the intellectual and moral 'condition of society'. Ornamental designs, he stressed, were typically derived from 'simple types, found most commonly in the natural world'. Those, in turn, were altered through successive copying to produce the distinctive styles associated with each era and with each civilization. Examples could be taken equally from ancient Egypt or present-day New Zealand. Most importantly, he argued, abstract designs,

---

Architecture: His Thought and Influence (Madison, Wisc.: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1973); and Joan Evans, John Ruskin, (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1954), 204-29.

[110] See notices in such journals as Building News, The Art Journal, etc.

[111] Charles Newton, 'The Study of Archaeology', Edmund Oldfield, 'Introductory Address, 1852', Wallace, 'Museums for the People'; Tylor, Researches.

[112] J.O. Westwood, 'The Distinctive Character of the Various Styles of Ornamentation', p. 275. Other similar contributions included: a short notice 'On Irish Ornamentation', AJ, 7 (1850), 83-85; 'Peculiarities, Miniatures and Ornamentation; 'On Various Drawings of Irish Antiquities', PSAL, 2 (1850), 53.

such as those found in Irish manuscripts, were the result of a long series of modifications of realistic forms. The Greek fret pattern derived from sections of ocean waves, other classical period geometrical forms, from foliage designs. The same could be shown for what he termed 'zoomorphic' designs; that is, designs based on human or other animal models. The implicit point, hinted at but never developed by Westwood, was that the continuities represented by such artistic traditions provided a means by which the influence of one race upon another could be judged or, even more precisely, the means by which the source of various motifs could be traced. As he left it: 'tempting as it is, I shall defer the consideration of that branch of the enquiry until a future occasion', a promise which, as Fox must have noted, he was to fulfill only in part[113].

Another influence upon Fox's work at the time was that of John Evans, particularly the latter's description of changes in representational and abstract impressions on coins. In that case too, the debt was frankly acknowledged. Referring to his own series on ornamental devices for canoe paddles, Fox explained: 'In this sequence we have an exact parallel to the transformations observed upon ancient British coins by Mr. Evans, by which a coin of Philip of Macedon, representing a chariot and horses, becomes converted by a succession of similar changes into a representation of a single horse and ultimately into fragments of a horse', or as he had explained even earlier, 'a head of Medusa, copied originally from a Greek coin, was made to pass through a series of apparently meaningless hieroglyphics, in which the Oriental head was quite lost, and was ultimately converted into a chariot and four'[114]. Given further support by Edward Thomas's Coins of Ancient India, published in 1872, and later by Schliemann's description of the transformation of pottery forms in ancient Troy, the understanding that abstract and representational forms were somehow related over time became, for Fox, an important supposition, and one which, in turn, defined the general scope of his collection of ornamental designs[115].

Fox’s own efforts tended to settle, particularly at first, on his ornamental canoe paddles. He first began to collect pieces for that series around 1865, obtaining examples both from shops and returning travellers. Emphasizing his lack of bias in selection, he suggested that 'these particular specimens [were] not selected to serve my purpose'; rather, he hinted, the series was built unconsciously[116]. He first touched upon his project in 1868, but 1872 at Brighton, he developed the theme in greater detail[117]. Basing his explanation on his series of ornaments from New Zealand he explained: 'In none of the productions of savage art is the tendency to continued variation within narrow limits more strongly shown than in these ornamental

[113] Westwood, ‘Distinctive Character of the Various Styles of Ornamentation', p. 301. His later work included: 'Illustrations of Celtic and Ancient Irish Ornamentation', AJ, 14 (1857), 84; 'Observations on an Inscribed Saxon Cross found at Carlisle', AJ, 5 (1858), 85, both of which touched upon ornamentation.
[114] Fox, 'Principles of Classification', p. 305; 'Primitive Warfare II', p. 405. He cites specifically Evans' Coins of the Ancient Britons.
[115] Edward Thomas, Marsden's Numismata Orientalia (London: Tubner, 1874); Henreih Schlieman, Troy and Its Remains (London: John Murray, 1875). For Schliemann's ideas on seriation, see Daniel, A Hundred and Fifty Years, 136-38.
[116] ‘Address, Brighton, 1872’; p. 168; Cf. Fox, ‘Early Modes of Navigation’.
[117] Fox, ‘Primitive Warfare II’; ‘Address, Brighton, 1872’, pp. 166-70.

patterns'[118]. A representation of a human head and body, he pointed out, could be shown to merge with more abstract versions of the same figure and finally to relate to what he considered the fully abstracted crescent shape. The importance of such a conclusion from Fox's point of view was not only that it further substantiated his series theme, but also that the series could be used to help determine the sequence of migrations, or the connection among the world's population groups—'the connecting links' to the less tangible evidence of 'myths, customs or languages' were less able to supply. As he explained, 'Whilst the form of a club or paddle appears to remain unchanged for many generations, the form of ornament upon it will be subject to variations, which, however, are not the less found to be continuous and connected when a sufficient number of specimens are collected, so as to enable their history to be traced'. The 'pattern', as he continued, 'may be traced in the migrations through distant regions'[119]. Just, then, as differences in form among excavated tools could be placed in a quasi-temporal sequence by reference to an overall chart, so too could the historical sequence of more recently manufactured materials be measured. The aim in each case was an implicitly historical one.

Fox's general argument tended to be born out by evidence in other, less related quarters. Most important were the discoveries of Palaeolithic cave art during the early sixties by archaeologists such as Lartet and Christy[120]. Disputed by many anthropologists and archaeologists, including Worsaae, as the creations of another era, the strikingly realistic representations of animal forms and hunting scenes were widely discussed throughout the decade. The Marquis de Sautola's demonstration at Altamira Cave near Santander, Spain of what were termed as degenerative patterns did much, however, to allay the doubts of many as to their authenticity, and by the early seventies, acceptance by the scientific community was more or less assured[121]. Fox apparently had little difficulty accepting the value of such work from the first, and as he explained later:

> I see nothing surprising in this, when we consider the power that is developed in many children of eight or nine years old of making drawings of animals and other objects, which, when allowance is made for the feeble hand of childhood, are often as truthful as those of the cave-period men, at a time when their minds had acquired but little power of reasoning or generalization, or even of taking care of themselves; all which goes to prove that this power of understanding, which is a very different thing from ideal art, is one of the most early developed faculties of the mind of man[122].

---

[118] Fox, 'Address, Brighton, 1872', p. 168.
[119] Ibid.
[120] Lartet and Christy, Religuiae Aquitanicae.
[121] Daniel, A Hundred and Fifty Years, pp. 130-32; Peter Ucko and Andre Rosenfeld, Palaeolithic Cave Art, World University Library (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1967), pp. 31-33.
[122] Fox, 'Evolution of Culture', p. 515. Also, SSW, PRP, P73.

As in the use of seriation techniques among archaeologists today[123], the development could take either direction, either upward or downward. The important point was, as Fox emphasized, that a continuity and sequence be accepted.

Fox's notion of the degeneration of forms was given further support by the contemporary debate over 'evolution' and 'degeneration '. In the latter case, it was the phraseology rather than the specific components of the argument which were appropriated to help prove his own theory. The key word, of course, was 'degeneration'. For Archbishop Whately, degeneration mean essentially that modern savages were the offspring of earlier 'higher' forms, or man closer to original creation. Presented through his various writings and lectures, and interpreted by J. Hannah for The Contemporary Review in 1869, Whateley's argument had sparked considerable opposition among the more progressive factions of the ethnological and anthropological communities, most importantly in the form of John Lubbock's several addresses before the British Association[124]. Characterized by Andrew Lang as merely 'a temporary diversion'[125], the argument, if only because of its symmetry, had seemed a crucial one during the late l860s and early seventies challenging, as it did, the basic assumptions of the new Anthropological Institute and its mostly evolutionist membership. In order to counter Whately's attack, most anthropologists tended, however inadvertently, to give a nod of recognition to Whately's phraseology, accepting degeneration as an implicit element of the overall evolutionist message. Clements Markham, for example, wrote of periods of stagnation or 'retrograde development'; and Tylor stressed the importance of accounting for period of 'degeneracy as well as progress'.[126] As a result of such an incorporation of his argument, Whatley's point had lost much of its force, and by the time Fox wrote of the 'degeneration of forms' the question had become more or less a platitude. Still, by referring to his series in such terms, he was assigning an added importance to it, and in effect, elevating it above Evans's earlier speculation of British and Roman coins. It was no longer merely a matter of images 'degenerating' but of the 'ideas' which formed them as well.

Fox's understanding of the concept of degeneration helps to underline the nature of his views of development and evolution. While Tylor and Lubbock were willing to admit to periods of relative stagnation or even retrogression, they saw it only within a much wider framework. In contrast, Fox embraced the term more readily, because, from his point of view, it was far less open to question. His concern, moreover, was not the overall degeneration of 'societies' or 'races', as others understood it, but with the degeneration of specific and isolated forms within those cultures. In part, however, he could not help but at least suggest a more general state of decay or decline by merely invoking the term. But in that regard too it becomes apparent how

---

[123] Joseph W. Michels, Dating Methods in Archaeology (New York: Seminar Press, 1973), pp. 66-82; Brian M. Fagan, In The Beginning: An Introduction to Archaeology, 3rd ed. (Boston: Little Brown, 1978), pp. 99-106. Fox's work was closely paralleled by that of Flinders Petrie. See Petrie, 'Sequences in Prehistoric Remains', JRAI, 29 (1889), 295-301.
[124] See above, p. 311.
[125] Lang, 'Tylor', p. 2.
[126] Clements Markham, 'On Crystal Quartz Cutting Instruments', p. lix; Tylor, Researches, pp.4 and 364; also Rev. of Prichard, Natural History of Man, p. 488. Rev. of James Fergusson's History of Modern Architecture, AR, 1 (1863), 216-18; and 'Thoughts and Facts Contributing to the History of Man', AR, 2 (1864), 173-91.

different his overall views of the idea of evolution were. 'By decay', he pointed out as late as 1875, 'I do not mean the decay of materials of the arts, but the decomposition of the mental ideas which produced them'[127]. Ideas, then, could be treated separately or as independent from other features in a race's history or organization. It was really in the latter context that Fox's emphasis on the parallels between his collection and the evidence of philology becomes most understandable. What he was interested in was historical sequence, not a generalized or holistic view of the evolution of man. His views remained tied very much to the material evidence.

6. Exhibition of Fox' s Collection at Bethnal Green

In the early part of 1873, Fox made the sudden decision to return to military service. The reasons for his choice are unclear. His mother, we knew, was ill at the time, but would live until nearly the end of the year, so it is unlikely that a change in her state of health alone could account for a decision taken at an earlier date in the year[128]. There is, however, the possibility of added financial burden; his mother's ill health would have contributed even more to his expenses. Also as the head of a household of some nine children, financial considerations must have become of paramount concern, particularly as a number of the children were just then reaching school age. Finally, the possibility of further promotion must be taken into account. He could still reach the rank of Lieutenant General if he returned to duty—and, in the end, receive a general’s retirement pay.

But while financial matters were probably Fox's main concern, professional considerations also played a part in his decision. For one, his new posting marked a basic shift in the scope of Fox's ambitions from anthropology, organized as it was around the Institute, to archaeology, focused, as it ultimately was, on the field. A country posting, despite the demands of his official duties, would provide for far greater opportunities for actual field work of the kind he had first carried out in Ireland. In accepting the position, therefore, Fox was giving voice to his changing priorities. At the same time, he was breaking from the inherent constraints imposed by the Anthropological Institute.

The position which Fox accepted was as the head of a Brigade Depot at Guildford, consisting of the 1st and 2nd Battalions of the West Surrey Regiment and the second Regiment of Militia and Volunteers[129]. It was a relatively recent command, having been established only a few years before as part of a general reorganization of home and militia regiments. The new red-brick barracks were still in the process of construction and were only completed three years later[130]. As a full colonel—his new post did not automatically carry a promotion with it—his salary would have been about £400 per annum[131]. Fox sold his London house soon afterward, moving to a typical suburban villa, called Uplands, on the outskirts of town near Merrow Downs[132].

---

[127] Fox, ‘The Evolution of Culture’, p. 514.
[128] LCA, LFP, LXI 4. Lady Caroline died on 7 Nov 1873.
[129] Hart’s Army List, 1873; Thompson, General Pitt-Rivers, p. 51.
[130] PRO, WO. A date of 1876 is inscribed over the main gate.
[131] Hart’s Army List, 1973; Hamilton, III.
[132] Guildford Post Office Directory, 1879, Guildford; SSW, PRP, Correspondence; AM, RP.

One of the first problems with which he had to deal was the fate of his London collection. Little is known of its full extent at the time. The only description comes from Tylor several years later, and even then it is unclear whether Tylor actually saw the collection itself or merely described what he knew it to have included by that date[133]. That it was continuing to grow, however, is documented by Fox's several references to acquisitions, such as the 'Stone Celts from the grove and hill-top temples of the Malayas, of the Shenorvoy Hills, India' or the collection of 'Implements, etc., from Saint-Bricue, Normandy' and displayed at the Anthropological Institute in 1872[134]. Also, the collection was made available to fellow anthropologists and others interested in the subject. There is an indication that Herbert Spencer, with whom Fox was apparently acquainted by this time, again probably through the Stanleys, visited the collection sometime prior to 1874, although in fact Spencer's description in his Principles of Sociology of 1876, could just as easily have been referred to the collection as it later appeared at Bethnal Green[135]. There is no doubt, however, about the collection's size, placed, as suggested above, at over 14,000 separate items by the close of the seventies. As such, it must have put considerable strain on Fox's domestic life, particularly the patience of his wife and family. The move to Surrey, therefore, and the new arrangements which that move necessitated came at a particularly opportune moment. Also, it is clear that Fox was eager to provide his collection with more exposure and, at the same time, to give expression to his own views on its purpose. The time had come, in short, for Fox to make good on the promise made at Brighton two years before.

There were a number of more or less external factors influencing his decision as well. One such factor was the recent decision of the Society of Antiquaries to provide new facilities for its own collection in anticipation of the transfer of the Society to newly refurbished apartments in Burlington House[136]. Most of the Society's collections were scheduled to be disbursed, the majority going to the British Museum. Others, however, were rearranged in new cases to provide a more coherent—and in the eyes of the organizers—a more educational display. Fox, who as a Council member, was instrumental in the Society's decision, no doubt applied the same reasoning to his own collection.

A second possible factor in Fox's choice was the decision of the executors of the well-known German collector, Gustav Klemm (1802-1867), finally to make his collection accessible to the public. Klemm, whose work had obviously influenced Fox's thinking as his references in his three papers on primitive warfare confirm, had died in 1869, leaving his collection in a state of limbo. Estimated at over 16,000 items, the collection was in many other ways directly comparable to that of Fox, again suggesting something of Klemm's influence. Following the outline in his well-known work, Werkzeuge und Waffen of 1843, Klemm's collection began with weapons,

---

[133] Tylor, 'Pitt-Rivers'.
[134] Fox, 'On Stone Celts from Malayalis'; 'Report on a Collection of Implements, etc., from Saint-Brieuc, Normandy', JAI, 69. Also see Fox, 'On a Series of Stone Implements from Patagonia', JAI, 4 (1874), 311-20.
[135] Herbert Spencer, Principles of Sociology in Collected Works, VI, 87. See St. George Gray, Index.
[136] Evans, Antiquities, p. 318.

eventually extending through clothing and household equipment, narcotics, musical instruments, religious objects and examples of primitive artwork[137]. Again, as with Fox's collection, each category, or Sachgruppen, was displayed separately, in order to stress the evolution or, more accurately, the history, of each area of human enterprise. Fox, who was apparently indebted to Tylor for his translations of Klemm, was obviously concerned throughout his writings that the latter would be seen as a rival or even possibly a precursor to himself[138]. He was, as a result, eager to bring his own collection before the public before Klemm's collection, then recently rearranged in Leipzig where it was intended to form the basis of a more ambitious anthropological program, became even better known. In Fox's view, there was room for only one typological museum.

Fox's final decision was slow in taking shape and it is not precisely clear how he went about making final provisions for his collection. There is no record that he ever approached the British Museum or any other major institution, as had many of his predecessors, and it is likely that he did not. It is obvious too, at least from his later comments on the subject, that he wanted to retain more control of his collection than such a step would have allowed. The nearby South Kensington Museum therefore, with its long-standing tradition of loan collections, was probably the most likely choice. The recent exhibition devoted to the Meyrick arms collection was an immediate prototype. Moreover, Fox had recently loaned a number of pieces of his own to a special exhibit on musical instruments and had become acquainted with officials there[139]. But despite the attractions at South Kensington, there were still a number of drawbacks, the most important being the fact that the museum was generally thought of, as Fox himself later explained, as more 'aesthetic' than 'scientific'[140]. Nonetheless, it met most of his requirements, particularly in that it could undertake to bear the burden and costs of maintenance for his collection while at the same time allowing Fox to continue to administer it. Also, with his previous contacts, it was a matter simply of convenience. Following a series of communications with the authorities of the South Kensington Commission, it was finally decided that Fox's collection should be put on display at the newly established branch of the museum at Bethnal Green[141].

The choice of Bethnal Green was a curious one. The establishment of the Bethnal Green Branch Museum had represented an attempt by the Commissioners at South

---

[137] Klemm, Werkzeuge und Waffen. For further on Klemm and his museum, see Bahnson: Lowie, pp. 11-16; Hudson, pp. 56-57; Penniman, A Hundred Years, pp. 61-62; Frese, pp. 43-44; and 'Gustav Klemm', in Brockhaus Enzyklopadie. Klemm's longer work provides a more detailed picture of his program. Klemm, Allgemeine Cultur-Geschichte der Menfchheit. Fox first refers to him in 1867 in 'Primitive Warfare I', mentioning him also in his article, 'New Zealand Mere' of 1870, pp. 106-09.
[138] *No footnote given.*
[139] South Kensington Museum, Catalogue of the Special Exhibition of Ancient Musical Instruments (London: For the Science and Art Department by John Strangeways, 1872), pp. 40-46.
[140] Fox, Letter to A.W. Franks, 1 Jul 1880, PRM, BP.
[141] Unfortunately, the first 'Day' or 'Van' book for the Bethnal Green Museums dates to the period from 1875-1884. The earlier book or books are missing. Personal Communication, Peter Glenn, 16 May 1980. My appreciation to Mr. Glenn for making these materials available to me.

Kensington to extend their influence to parts of the city which had never received the full benefits of an educational institution such as that at South Kensington. The facility was itself a South Kensington castoff, consisting of several prefabricated cast iron structures, popularly known as the Brompton Boilers, left over from the International Exhibition of 1862 and made obsolete by the new building programme in South Kensington. Sensing the opportunity for their reuse Henry Cole (1808-1882), for many years head of the Museum, had pressed for their re-erection at Bethnal Green. Other civic leaders, including Sir Antonio Brady (1811-1881) and the Reverend Septimus Howard had joined him on behalf of their re-use. From 1871, Major General Scott was induced to provide a new brick-front, which in turn was completed in the summer of 1872[142]. The first exhibition was Sir Richard Wallace's collection of paintings, pottery and porcelain figures, again displayed with an aim to conveying the history of art as well as to provide models for craftsmen, as the organizers originally envisaged. The second exhibit, held the following year, was a display of various animal and vegetable products, tracing their origin, evolution and in many cases their etymological derivation[143]. In terms of their general theme, therefore, both exhibits obviously approached closely to Fox's collection and almost could be interpreted as harbingers.

Fox made his final arrangements with the South Kensington authorities during the winter of 1873. The collection was finally set up during the late spring of the following year. Most of the work was apparently carried out by the curator at Bethnal Green, G.F. Duncombe, a figure with whom Fox exchanged occasional correspondence[144]. In its final arrangement, the collection exemplified many of the newest ideas in display and organization. New display cabinets were employed, both standing cabinets and desk cabinets, and modern descriptive labels were included for each display. Franks and Evans, both of whom earlier had been induced to provide materials from their own collections—Franks of ceramics and Evans of flint implements—were also consulted by Fox in the planning stages[145].

In overall appearance, Fox's collection probably resembled most closely the example of the Museum of Practical Geology, then considered perhaps the most modern example of an educational museum. Also, the building at Bethnal Green, with its two-tiered cast and wrought iron gallery, directly resembled that of the Geological Museum. Fox's collection, however, was relegated to the basement where it occupied the whole south end of the available display area. Table cabinets were placed at the centre of the room, standing cabinets and simple pegboards around the periphery, along with drawings. The whole was carefully arranged, with aisles and stopping places strategically set out and painted arrows providing the proper sequence for visitors[146].

---

[142] Also, Hare, I, 357; Henry B. Wheatly, London Past and Present (London: John Murray, 1891), I, 177; Nikolaus Pevsner, The Buildings of London (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1952), II, 68.
[143] Wheatly, I, 179-80. Also, J. Beavington Atkinson, 'Bethnal Green Museum', People's Magazine, April, 1873, pp. 208-11.
[144] G.F. Duncombe, Letter to Fox, 4 Sep 1874, SSW, PRP, P118.
[145] Wheatly, I, 180.
[146] Fox, Catalogue. The Museum of Practical Geology had long been used as a special meeting place and place of special exhibits for both ethnological and archaeological societies. See JESL, NS 1 (1869), ix.

Fox's catalogue for the collection, completed only after his move to Guildford, provides a fairly detailed picture of the collection and its extent. The first segment of the exhibit was devoted to skull types and other physical features including samples of skin and hair. Drawings, reminiscent of Prichard's gallery of ethnological types, supplemented actual specimens. Among the more interesting pieces were casts of the Neanderthal skull, presumably obtained through Huxley, along with a number of modern Australian and Irish skulls, brought together, as Fox emphasized, for comparative purposes. To emphasize his scientific allegiance, a number of primate skeletons and portions of skeletons were also on display, along with those of 'primitive' man.

The second part of the collection was 'weapons', beginning with his display of throwing sticks and parrying shields and proceeding through shields of more recent manufacture, including a number obtained from Meyrick or other sources, or illustrated in Meyrick's Ancient Armour. Body armour came next, augmented with actual examples from Meyrick's collection, as well as examples of Japanese and Chinese armour and more recent examples of chain mail. Included among the latter were examples manufactured by British founders for export to India and elsewhere in Southeast Asia. The next series was headdresses, followed by his more complete series of boomerangs and clubs, again accompanied by illustrations. Displays of blowguns, darts, bows and arrows, crossbows, flails, canoe paddles and finally halberd spikes, swords, daggers and bayonets completed the section.

The remainder of the collection remained uncatalogued. Only a summary was provided, although the latter conveys a fairly good idea of the collection as it existed at the time. 'Part 3', also treating essentially ethnographical materials, was perhaps the most diverse. Included were examples of pottery, tools, clothing, glassware, leather ornaments and items associated with religious practices. Reminiscent of the Great Exhibition and many subsequent exhibits, there were also practical demonstrations, such as looms to demonstrate weaving techniques and a step-by-step visual description of methods of hafting stone implements in various parts of the world, among other displays. Overall, the latter was the most heterogeneous segment of the collection but also the least coherent or integrated.

Probably the best documented of his displays was that dealing with 'early modes of navigation'. Never actually described in catalogue form, Fox nonetheless discussed that portion of his collection in a paper of the same title presented before the Anthropological Institute later that year. From the latter it is apparent that there were five major divisions: (1) dugout canoes, (2) simple rafts, (3) bark canoes, (4) vessels of skins or wickerwork, and (5) outrigger canoes. Outrigger canoes were, in turn, subdivided into categories based on various minor features, such as types of sails or rudders, keels and so on. Finally there was a display of modern vessels, in broad terms not unlike those on display at the Admiralty Office or more recently established at South Kensington[147]. The most important feature of the primitive navigation display, however, was the overall emphasis on the geographical distribution of canoe and ship types. In each case, distribution maps supplemented other displays, tracing,

---

[147] See above, p. 39. Also, South Kensington Museum, Catalogue of the Munitions of War (London: For the Science and Art Department by Eyre and Spotteswoode, HMSO, n.d.).

for example, the spread of the bark canoe over North America or the use of outriggers in the South Pacific. As with the series on the degeneration of art, Fox's aim was clearly to provide a picture of the diffusion of cultures and material traits, emphasizing the 'amount of intercourse that took place across the sea in prehistoric times'[148]. It is, in fact, through such a well developed and documented series of the kind recorded by his primitive navigation collection that Fox's fullest ambitions for his museum become most clear.

7. The Principles of Classification

While Fox's collection conformed in broad outline to other more general collections, including for example, any number of international exhibitions tracing man's evolution and the evolution of his arts, because of its emphasis on the comparative value of ethnographical materials it remained something or a novelty. Such was particularly true from the point of the inhabitants of Bethnal Green. The architectural historian, Nikolaus Pevsner refers to it as 'London's slum area par excellence', and, in fact, throughout the 1840s and 50s, it had become an experimental focus of a number of studies by Chadwick and Smith[149]. Most of the inhabitants were descendants of Huguenot silk-weavers, participants in an industry which had fallen off disastrously during the early part of the nineteenth century. Described 'on the verge of pauperism' by the Illustrated London News[150], many were eager to impress upon the minds of the population the basic truths of education and, in Victorian terms, the means by which they might improve their condition. Fox's collection, with its emphasis on the gradual nature of social and technological change fit the educational pattern perfectly.

As an ethnographical and archaeological collection Fox's exhibition was perhaps more unusual. While a few of the area's inhabitants may have ventured to the British Museum, most had probably never seen a collection of the kind represented Fox's exhibition. The only other comparable collection in the area was that of the London Missionary Society located at nearby Finsbury[151]. But again, while of some interest to a few—at least the more evangelically-minded inhabitants—the London Missionary Society collection was only rarely visited by the average resident. Interestingly, however, the Missionary Museum provided an inverse parallel to Fox's own display. Arranged in order to demonstrate the depraved state of modern savages, the Missionary Society had demonstrated the degradation of idolatry or the descent into opium addiction, suggesting the sequence of Whately's argument. Inadvertently, Fox's

---

[148] Fox, 'Navigation', p. 435.
[149] Pevsner, London, II, 65. See also Fry, p. 210. The Queen's London, p. 266. See Edwin Chadwick, Report of the Sanitary Conditions of the Labouring Population of Great Britain (Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 1915).
[150] London Illustrated News, 24 Oct 1863. Also see A.J. Robinson and D.H.B. Chesshyre, The Green (London: London Borough of Tower Hamlets, 1978). Interestingly, Bethnal Green also had the worst pattern of church attendance. See K.S. Inglis, 'Patterns of Religious Worship in 1851', The Journ. of Ecclesiastical Hist., 11 (1960), 74-86.
[151] Hughson, pp. 68-69; Timbs, p. 540; Hare, I, 343; Murray, I, 248; Fry, p. 179, for descriptions of the collection during the period. The collection was later transferred to the British Museum, E.B. Tylor, 'Presidential Address', JAI, 21 (1891), 396; and British Museum, Handbook to the Ethnographical Collections (London: For the Trustees by Oxford Univ. Press, 1910), p.v. Also see C.H. Read, 'On the Origin and Sacred Character of Certain Ornaments of the S.E. Pacific', JAI, 21 (1891), 139-40.

collection, with its emphasis on progress and evolution, offered the alternative view[152].

It is really through the exhibition at Bethnal Green that Fox 's popular aims for his collection become most clear—so too do his social and political motives. The latter were hinted at in other presentations of his, particularly his lecture before the Whitechapel Foundation School of 1875. The main point, as Fox stressed, was that the museum served as a foil to what he viewed as revolutionary impulses among the lower strata of society, a point of view later presented more completely before the British Association. 'Anything', he explained,

> which tends to impress the mind with the slow growth of stability of human institutions and industry 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 drastically with the past, and must help to inculcate conservative principles, which are urgently needed at the present time, if the civilization that we enjoy is to be preserved and to be permitted to develop itself[153].

His collection was obviously the first step in that direction.

Although of general interest, Fox 's collection was not, as Fox himself made clear, simply a popular display; part of its message was aimed at anthropologists, as his special lectures alone indicated. As Fox had explained, few at the time would have questioned the basic message of his collection: that man somehow was in a state of evolutionary progress. But with regard to what his particular message meant in terms of the advancement of the subject, little notice had been taken. Again, his aims become most clear through more detailed series, such as those treating the development of the boomerang or that on primitive navigation. What he was proposing in each case was a research tool, providing not only comparative materials for archaeological work, but also providing a means of tracing past connections among races. It is in that regard also that his adherence to the traditional questions of ethnology becomes most apparent. It was 'History' that he was interested in, not 'Evolution' in its most general sense. His collection simply provided a key to the sequence.

Fox' s collection was officially opened on 1 July l874, on the occasion of a special meeting of the Anthropological Institute. The event was well attended and most of the leading Anthropologists were present[154]. Evans and George Busk, the latter recently elected President of the Institute, played a part in the organizational activities. Fox provided the presentation speech and conducted members through the collection

---

[152] See, 'Address, Brighton, 1872'.
[153] Pitt-Rivers, 'Address, Bath, 1888', p. 828. The unpublished lecture delivered at the Whitechapel Foundation School on 2 Feb 1875 conveys the same message. SSW, PRP, P42 and P43. See also P139.
[154] JAI, 4 (1874), 293. RAI, Council Minutes, Anthrop. Inst., 9 Jun 1874. A card was printed for the occasion, 'to be issued to such visitors as Col. Lane Fox may think fit to indicate'.

afterwards, explaining various exhibits and demonstrating the use of a number of weapons and other implements. It was in many ways an anticipation of the teaching methods employed at Oxford, once the collection had been moved there after 1883.

Fox's lecture on the occasion, entitled 'Principles of Classification', was essentially a reiteration of his earlier ideas[155]. Pointing directly to his collection, he explained that it contained few 'unique specimens' and had been brought together with a 'view to instruction' rather than that of any aim to impress visitors or to emphasize the value of particular pieces. In contrast with other collections, therefore, his own was emphatically scientific, comparable, therefore, to natural history collections. Other collections organized along what he referred to as 'geographical' lines tended to lack a scientific basis from his point of view. A 'great National Anthropological Museum' however, should ideally include examples of both kinds of display: one to 'trace the succession of ideas'; the other to stress the relationship among particular components of material life among a specific culture of people[156].

Again, his understanding of evolution was presented in terms of man's mental development. That 'primitive man' and 'existing savages' were in some sense comparable was demonstrated, from Fox's viewpoint, by what he referred to as the 'common working of their minds'. The differences were merely a matter of degree: modern man relied increasingly upon his capacity for reason. It was the self-evident continuity of man's 'psychological' aspects which, in turn, made the earlier supposition of separate creation patently untrue. The same principle of continuity, he argued, could be brought to bear on recent discussions both of man's development or degeneration. While forms—representative, then, of ideas—could initially only be shown to have succeeded one another, the overall sequence could be said to have been a progressive one. The earliest forms derived from 'natural forms' not 'from higher and more complex forms'[157]. The same was true of later forms. Moreover, every society or people could be shown to possess a tangible record of their own material evolution among their existing catalogue of tools and weapons. As Fox phrased it, 'it is by means of these survivals and not by the links themselves, that we are able to trace out the sequence that has been spoken of'[158]. It was, then, still the series system which in Fox's terms held the key to man's history.

To make his pain clearer, Fox turned to the analogy of language, and it was through such analogy once again, that the full importance of his arguments, and of his allegiance to the older historical model, becomes most obvious. The study of language, he complained, despite the obvious similarities in forms of speech and forms of implements, had long enjoyed a greater prestige in its application. Why was this, he asked? 'Words cost nothing, are packed into folios, transmitted by post, and stored on the shelves of every private library. A million classified words may be carried in a coat pocket without any inconvenience, whilst a hundredth part of that number of material objects require a museum to contain them, and are accessible only

---

[155] A draft is among the papers at Salisbury, PRP P70 and P71.
[156] Fox, 'Principles of Classification', p. 296. The argument is roughly repeated in the introduction to his Catalogue.
[157] Fox, Principle of Classification', pp. 295, 301 and 302.
[158] Ibid, p. 302. Original emphasis.

to a few'[159]. That the study of material objects, therefore, despite their self-evident superiority to the written record, should have been neglected was hardly surprising. Moreover, until a greater commitment was made to fulfill such an obvious need, there could be little real hope of progress in anthropology as he understood it. It was only, as he explained, by forming a representative collection that 'the true sequence by which improvement has been effected' and 'the true order of development by which these more complex arrangements have been brought about' could be attested with any clarity. 'Progress is like a game of dominoes', he concluded; 'like fits onto like. In neither case can we tell beforehand what will be the ultimate figure produced by the adhesions; all we know is that the fundamental rule of the game is sequence'[160].

Throughout Fox's paper there is a growing sense of divergence from his central theme. On the one hand, Fox was propounding the standard evolutionist argument, founded on the common assumption of gradualism and organic growth and derived from sources as diverse as Lyell, Darwin or Comte. From that viewpoint, the mechanism of change, as suggested, lay in the concept of the development of ideas, and it is in that regard that Fox's debt to idealist philosophers such as Schelling or Comte—however indirect—becomes most evident. Fox's principal argument was one of 'utility', although that argument is treated in a less detailed way in his later papers than in his first. Forms change because their makers understood the greater advantage of one form over another or, as in his first paper, one weapon over another. But the idea that one form might actually win out over another in warfare, as hinted before, was by now barely touched upon. Overall, in fact, his view of the succession of forms was a surprisingly pacific one, compared to his earlier theme, and one which seems slightly out of place for an old soldier and outspoken 'realist', such as Fox. Fox's argument, in short, had been affected by a wider vision, one founded less on concerns of utility than on a grander type of trajectory, called 'progress'.

One of the main ingredients of Fox's revised viewpoint was the work of Herbert Spencer. Referred to at least indirectly as early as 1867 in his first paper on primitive warfare and probably known to Fox at least since the late 1850s, Spencer had become, by the mid-seventies, perhaps the principle influence on Fox's views[161]. While Thompson's suggestion that Spencer had in fact 'replaced' Darwin in Fox's mind is misleading—Darwin's viewpoint and indeed the general mode of Darwin's conception of species change still lay at the heart of Fox's scheme—there is, nonetheless, no doubt that reference to Spencer by now took precedent, if only through the frequency of citations[162].

Fox first began to refer to Spencer in detail in 1872 when a section entitled 'Sociology'—a term of Spencer's invention—was proposed for the projected edition of Notes and Queries[163]. With 'Principles of Classification', however, the reference

---

[159] Ibid, p. 303.
[160] Ibid, p. 307 and 308. Original emphasis.
[161] Fox, 'Primitive Warfare I', p. 163. Also see 'Primitive Warfare III', p. 515-17.
[162] Thompson, General Pitt-Rivers, p. 35.
[163] Fox, 'Report of the Committee appointed for the purpose of preparing and publishing brief forms of Instructions'. E.B. Tylor 'Religion, Mythology and Sociology' (my emphasis) in Notes and Queries, rept., JAI, 2 (1872), 297. The term was used frequently by Fox in later years. See 'Evolution of Culture'; 'Presidential Address', JAI 5 (1876), 468-88.

becomes even more explicit; even the title recalls Spencer's own series, beginning with Principles of Psychology[164]. Fox's outline of the evolution of forms follows directly upon Spencer's as well. Forms and ideas are referred to as proceeding 'from the simple to the complex and from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous'. The transition from instinctive behaviour to reasoned behaviour is one of accumulation. Efforts once requiring mental exertion became 'automatic', or quoting Spencer, 'the inner cohesions are adjusted to the outer persistencies by accumulated experience of those outer persistencies, ... '[165]. There are other less direct references as well. Spencer's concept of survivals, elaborated by this date by E.B. Tylor had become central to Fox 's argument[166]. Even more identifiable is the essentially Lamarkian—rather than Darwinian—understanding of progress or evolution entering into Fox's writings, almost a direct result of his reading of Spencer[167]. Unlike Darwin, Spencer saw evolution as a progression of ideas, translated by Fox as a progression of 'forms'. In drawing from Spencer, changes in form occurred not because of conquests, as suggested by Wallace and Darwin, but because of a kind of universal 'life force'. While retaining phrases such as 'the survival of the fittest' or the 'struggle for existence'—in many ways more Spencerian than Darwinian themselves[168]—Spencer's at once both grander and poetic understanding of evolution had begun to take precedent. If his series on primitive warfare was, therefore, an expression of Darwinian views, 'Principles of Classification' was an example of Fox's Spencerian phase. The overall message, however, remained the same—that progress and historical sequence were synonymous concepts.

While Spencer was an important influence on 'Principle of Classification', Fox’s main theme remained the superiority of the material record to that of philology. Referring again to preoccupations of anthropologists of the sixties, his main purpose was to suggest a means by which 'the connection that has existed in former times between distant countries, either by the spread of race, or culture or by means of communication' might be established[169]. For Fox, therefore, philology still offered an exact parallel. Discussing material remains, he explained, 'by studying their grammar, we may be able to conjugate their forms'[170]. Similarly, by fully classifying and then tracing the derivation of forms it would be possible to reconstruct man's history in its

---

[164] Herbert Spencer, Principles of Psychology. Later works in Spencer's program included: Principles of Biology, 2 vols. (1864-67); Principles of Sociology, 3 vols. (1876-96); and Principles of Ethics, 2 vols. (1879-83). Rpt. The Works of Herbert Spencer (1904: rpt. Osnabruck: Otto Zeller, 1966).
[165] Fox, Catalogue, p. xi; 'Principles of Classification', p. 298. On Spencer's concept of transformation: Spencer, Autobiography I, 176, 384; Duncan, pp. 541 and 546. Also, Burrow, Evolution, p. 188.
[166] See Fox, 'Primitive Warfare III', p. 515. 'Early Modes of Navigation', pp. 210-11; 'Principles of Classification', p. 302. On the background to Spencer's concept see Margaret T. Hodgen, The Doctrine of Survivals: A Chapter in the History of the Scientific Method of the Study of Man (London: Allenson, 1936).
[167] Edward B. Poulton, 'Fifty Years of Darwinism', in Fifty Years of Darwinism, p. 75, on Spencer's Lamarkian outlook.
[168] See Burrow, Evolution, p. 240. Spencer first employed the concept of ‘survival of the fittest’ in his ‘A Theory of Population deduced from the General Law of Animal Fertility', Westminster Review, NS 1 (1825); rpt. in Works.
[169] Fox, 'Principles of Classification', p. 305.
[170] Ibid.

fullest sense.

Fox's 'Principles of Classification' is the clearest presentation of his ambitions for his collection. While the evolutionist perspective had done much, he explained, to provide a sense of unity, it had failed to provide an answer to the main issues at hand. At the same time, as he argued, it tended to direct attention away from the valuable evidence provided by collections and museums. By postulating that like conditions were produced by like needs, the evolutionist perspective paradoxically relegated the artefact to a secondary position. As a result, rather than supporting his efforts, the evolutionist perspective tended to undermine them, masking the principle focus of his work. The change in emphasis of his activities in the next few years suggested, in turn, just how far Fox had diverged from what was by now commonly accepted arguments.

8. Further Excavations at Cissbury

Fox's display at Bethnal Green was, in contemporary terms, a popular success. Attendance figures, while they cannot be tied specifically to Fox's collection as opposed to other exhibits in the museum, suggest that as many as half a million visitors saw the collection over the course of the next year[171]. Over half of the visitors came during the evening hours, during which the museum was opened for the convenience of working men. Reviews by the press were few but were generally complimentary. Those by Fox's colleagues were even more so. Tylor, in the Academy, referred to the collection as 'one of the best contributions made by Englishmen to the study of culture'. George Busk, shortly afterward, credited 'the extent and value of Col. Lane Fox's collection', drawing attention too to Fox's concurrent and, in his mind, comparable efforts on behalf of the recent edition of Notes and Queries[172]. The only contretemps was the theft of some five darts from one of the wall screens, reported to Fox in September by G.F. Duncombe. 'It has…become evident that wire does not afford sufficient protection, and arrangements have therefore been made to place under glass, with as little delay as possible, the few small objects that are not now protected'[173].

For Fox, Duncombe's report was a technical problem and little else. By then his attentions were focused elsewhere, at least in part because of his new posting. Soon after his arrival at Guildford he began a new series of excavations of barrows based, in part, on those of Greenwell in Yorkshire. There is much to suggest too that he was beginning to contemplate a similarly ambitious program for Surrey to that undertaken by his sometime teacher in the north. But for inexplicable reasons, his initial work was never published, possibly because his interests took a slightly different turn[174].

In early April 1875, he reconvened his work at Cissbury, that time following a slightly different approach. Previously his work had been dominated, as Thompson

---

[171] Science and Art Department, South Kensington Museum, 22nd Annual Report, p. 443.
[172] E.B. Tylor, Rev. of The Catalogue of the Anthropological Collection of Colonel Lane Fox, The Academy, 6 (1875), 460; George Busk, 'Presidential Address', JAI, 4 (1874), 498.
[173] G.F. Duncombe, Letter to Fox, 4 Sep 1874, SSW, PRP, P118.
[174] Fox, 'On Some Saxon and British Tumuli, near Guildford', RBAAS, (1877), 116-17. Also, SSW, PRP, P20 and P2l . See Thompson, General Pitt-Rivers, p. 51.

has stressed, by the concern with the verification of his series system. Excavation was as much a means of getting at artefacts, both to fill out his collection or, correspondingly, a specific series within it, as to document a given site. But at Cissbury in 1875, his aim was more clearly a recording effort, comparable in Stratigraphic terms to his topographical recordings in Ireland. Another point of comparison is his early record of exposed sections in the Thames Valley and, again, the latter may have served as models for his sectional drawings at Cissbury[175]. There were some differences, however. For one, Fox's drawings at Cissbury bore little resemblance, in a stylistic sense, to those at Acton or those done elsewhere. Second, the site was decidedly different, that at Acton consisting essentially of fill and actually stopping where the natural or geological formations began. Finally, and most importantly, the sections excavated by Fox at Cissbury were not naturally exposed. While obviously suggested, at least in part, by the Acton sections as well as Greenwell's more recent work at Grime's Graves, Fox's decision to approach the work in this way was in many ways revolutionary. In the broadest sense, the beginnings of modern archaeology could be traced to his decision[176].

To help in the work, Fox enlisted five men, possibly volunteer servicemen from Guildford, to assist. George Rolleston, Fox's long-time friend from the Anthropological Institute, was called in for advice and apparently stood in for Fox when he could not be present on the site. Actual funds came from a variety of sources, mostly, however, from out of Fox's own pocket. After June, there was the additional support from the Anthropological Institute, and later from the Royal Society. A number of members of the Institute also participated in the work, including Park Harrison, and from Fox's earliest military days, Colonel Gordon[177]. As Thompson has emphasized, the whole undertaking had the spirit of comradery and boisterousness about it[178]. Friends frequently visited the site and debated on the best approach, often helping in the actual earth-moving process. Jokes and horseplay abounded. Members of the various parties constructed flint tools and helped prepare the scale model which Fox later exhibited before the Institute and later at Bethnal Green. For Fox, the whole operation was a successful one, far more enjoyable, it would appear than the administrative duties which occupied his time earlier in London.

The main conclusion of the second series of excavations at Cissbury was that there were in fact two different occupation periods involved at the site, not one as previously assumed. That point was demonstrated, as Fox stressed, by the stratigraphic record[179]. The Neolithic flint mines, overlooked in his earlier campaign of 1867-68 or dismissed as refuse piles, were clearly present; Greenwell's comparable discovery at Grime's Graves must have helped Fox to reassess the nature of the evidence. The later earth works, a fourth or fifth century addition to the site, could be shown, in turn, to have transected one of the earlier shafts, and it was really on the basis of that fact, revealed by the cross section, that a sequence was clearly

---

[175] Fox, 'Flint Implements of a Palaeolithic Type'.
[176] Forde-Johnston, p. 59; Wheeler, pp. 9-14; Piggott, Approach to Archaeology, p. 32.
[177] RAI, Council Minutes, Anthrop. Inst. 22 Jun 1875, 9 Nov 1875, Fox's work is described most completely in his 'Excavations in Cissbury Camp, Sussex', JAI, 5 (1875), 357-89. Also see RBAAS (1875), liv, 142-69.
[178] Thompson, General Pitt-Rivers, p. 51.
[179] Fox, 'Excavations in Cissbury Camp'.

established.

A second advantage of the section technique, as Fox revealed, was not only that major occupations could be dated relative to each other, but that individual artefacts could be called upon to provide an even more precise chronology for the site. All objects found within the rampart, for example, could be assumed to be older than the rampart itself. Those, in turn, could be compared to others found elsewhere, where dates were perhaps better known. Eventually, it was hoped, a general sequence could be reconstructed, a sequence, incidentally, in many ways comparable to that suggested by his series on ornamental design, but more strongly tied to the stratigraphic record. While, therefore, not an abandonment of his series system, Fox's increasing reliance on the evidence of his sections required a reassessment of priorities.

As a result of his work at Cissbury and as a more direct result of his presentation at Bethnal Green, Fox's stature within the scientific community had risen considerably. In the summer of 1875, a special committee was appointed to help in his work and, as suggested, shortly afterward, the Royal Society made a small grant to assist his work[180]. His position within the Anthropological Institute rose accordingly, and in May 1875, he was finally elected President. Meanwhile, at the Society of Antiquaries he continued to serve as Vice-President and at the Archaeological Institute as a member of the Council[181]. Perhaps the most distinguished award he was to receive, however, was his invitation to deliver a lecture at the Royal Institution, an association to which he had been first formally elected in 1871, but had attracted his attention since the early fifties. An invitation to speak at the Institution was obviously of considerable honour, and there is little doubt that Fox appreciated the fact. George Busk, of the Anthropological Institute, who was Treasurer and Vice-President of the Royal Society, was in the chair and probably had some part in the Institute's decision[182].

Fox chose for his lecture an obvious enough topic—'The Evolution of Culture'[183]. It was perhaps his most general treatment of the subject, tracing not only the concept of evolution as it applied to man's technology, but also as it applied to the progress of science itself. Every science, he explained, explicitly following Comte, passed through three distinct stages: the empirical, the classificatory and, finally, the theoretical. Anthropology, he suggested, was still in the classificatory stage, but was then approaching the theoretical, or as he rephrased it, 'the evolutionary phase'. Many doubted whether anthropology could ever be considered a science, aligned as it was to history rather the geology or botany. Max Müller, he pointed out, had argued that only linguistics or philology, among the so-called historical sciences, could be properly 'included among the physical sciences'. Fox disagreed. Both history and nature were subject to the same laws. 'Principles of variation and natural selection have established a bond of unity between the physical and culture sciences which can never be broken'[184]. It was only fitting, therefore, as he pointed out, that his own paper should have followed in the same context as Müller's series on the 'Science of

---

[180] Ibid. RBAAS (1875), liv.
[181] RAI, Council Minutes, Anthrop. Inst., A10; SAL, Council Minutes, AI.
[182] Proc. Royal Inst. Gt. Brit., 7 (1875), 357.
[183] See also, SSW, PRP, P44 for an earlier draft.
[184] Fox, 'The Evolution of Culture', p. 499.

Language', delivered at the Royal Institution over a decade and a half before[185].

Not unexpectedly, Fox then returned to the subject of language in greater depth. That neither arts nor words were in any sense inventions suggested at least one point of similarity. That fact that language and arts both 'degenerated' was another. Finally, the historical character of the study of language was comparable to that of the arts. Both, he emphasized, provided a means of doing so. It was the inconvenience and expense of collecting materials over words that precluded the more systematic study of the former. To further illustrate his point and the general principles behind his collection, he relied again on the phraseology of Spencer. The evolution of man's material repertoire was compared to the growth and generation of ideas. The development from the simple technology of the aborigines of Australia to that of the modern Western World was compared at the same time to an individual's intellectual development. Improvements in technology were, in turn, a natural expectation. Considerations of utility played no part at all. The final progression, in fact, was dictated by a teleological expectation, in Spencerian terms, a tendency toward a final product. Ultimately, however, Fox tended to deny the almost mystical basis of his argument.

> It is, I venture to think, by classifying and arranging in evolutionary order the actual facts of the manifestation of mind, as seen in the development of the arts, institutions, and languages of mankind, no less than by comparative anatomy, and far more than by metaphysical speculation, that we shall arrive at a solution of the question, to what extent the mental Ego has been, to use Professor Huxley's expression, a conscious spectator of what has passed[186].

The collection presented, then, the shadow in the cave, to use a platonic image, with which Fox was familiar.

But if, as Fox suggests, his collection offered the opportunity to appreciate the evolutionary process, it also provided the basic ingredients of a far more detailed history, as emphasized above. The boomerang, the bow, the series on outrigger canoes, the collection of flint and bronze tools could be referred to in order to illustrate and document their specific histories. Moreover, it was 'by studying the psychology of the materials arts alone that we can trace human culture to its germs'[187]. Just how important such an understanding was to his final conception to his museum cannot be overemphasized.

There was a certain discrepancy in Fox's arguments, particularly as presented in 'Evolution of Culture'. On the one hand, mankind was subject to the same external laws whatever the respective degree of 'progress' or 'civilisation', as he variously phrased it. On the other hand, the concept of a single path of evolution tended to

---

[185] Max Müller, Lectures on the Science of Language, 2 vols, new ed (London: Langmans, Green, 1882). The lectures were delivered at the Royal Institution between 1861 and 1863. See also Crick, 'Some Aspects of Social Anthropology', pp. 5-10.
[186] Fox, 'The Evolution of Culture', p. 504.
[187] Ibid, p. 520.

contradict or at least trivialize his more particular aims, as already emphasized. Fox reconciled the problem through periodic reference to the complementary laws of 'degeneration' or 'stagnation'. In fact, to Fox such concepts still played an important part in his total viewpoint. The Australian race was still representative of the primeval race of man first separated by geographical and geological changes. Celt forms still in use within more complex European societies provided the key to the history of their derivation. Overall, therefore, the holistic viewpoint of Spencer and other evolutionists was never fully accepted. What Fox was interested in, was a history of minutiae or specific traits within each society. Interestingly, the model again was Darwin's:

> The tree is the type of all evolution: all trees are seedless, but they differ in their mode of growth. Some, like the beech and oak, throw their branches upwards, and these are typical of the development of the material arts; others, like the straight-stemmed pine, throw off their branches downwards, and these are typical of the development of some other branches of culture.

Referring, in turn, to philology—and Müller in particular—he continued:

> It is quite true, as stated by mythologists, that the history of myths is one of continued degeneration in so far as it can be traced, and that the element of decay enters for more into their composition that that of growth. But the whole accessible history of these myths represent drooping branches from the upward growing stem of free thought out of which they sprang.

But while philology provided the general model, the answer still lay in the arts: 'what is the space of time which separates us from the Vedas as compared with the whole upward growth of humanity before and since'![188] The arts, on the other hand, stretched back to the beginning.

'The Evolution of Culture' was to be Fox's most complete exposition of his ideas. Each of his past papers were summarized, his understanding of the principles of evolution discussed and, finally, the value of his collection as an historical tool was presented in some detail. It was to be one of his last general discussions of the principles which lay behind his work, and, in fact, he did not return to the subject of his collection again until 1888, and by then his arguments had taken on a slightly different character[189]. His lecture on the 'Evolution of Culture' can be seen, then, as a turning point in Fox's work, one marking the break between his primary devotion to his collection on the one side and his growing involvement with field excavation. As we have seen, initially the choice had been influenced by his change of situation and the availability of archaeological remains. At the same time, however, something far more fundamental was revealed through his decision. Frustrated by the obvious difficulties of ever actually establishing a well organized and well endowed museum,

---

[188] Ibid, p. 520.
[189] Pitt-Rivers, 'Address, Bath, 1888'.

Fox was turning to something over which he had more direct control. In effect, he was substituting the particular record of archaeological evidence for the more general, and less obtainable, one of a universal cultural history, as represented by his museum ideal. His change of approach, then, was a reflection of his disillusionment.

Another possible reason for a shift of emphasis on Fox's part was an even more striking change in approach among other anthropologists of the time. For several years, the subject had been dominated by papers of a generally evolutionist kind, and by the mid-seventies, it was clear that the study of the concept of universal development had been more or less accepted. Throughout the same period, however, the archaeological record, so central, as have seen, to the first, fully evolutionist arguments, had been increasingly relegated to a lesser position. The preoccupation of the mid-1870s was religion, or more specifically, the development of religious ideas, and by the end of the decade the transition from 'animistic', as Tylor termed it, to modern organized religion was seen as the principle index of a society or people’s development[190].

At first, the subject of religion was considered mostly Tylor’s specialty, as indicated by Fox's selection of Tylor to prepare the section on 'Religion, Mythology and Sociology' in the new edition of Notes and Queries of 1872 and 1873[191]. Fox's own collection of votive statuettes from Greece, displayed at the Institute in 1876, again suggests an oblique recognition of the newer subject[192]. But increasingly, particularly for Tylor, questions touching upon religion and the development of religious ideas were becoming more than a subdivision of anthropology, but the whole of the subject. While the archaeological and material record had formed the principle basis of his earlier works, the latter had concentrated more on the development of thought and religion. By 1875, material culture was ignored by Tylor altogether. For Tylor, religion was becoming a replacement for material culture as the key to understanding man's history and his evolution. It is clear too that many anthropologists began to agree with him.

Fox clearly resented the change of emphasis and he argued as much in his papers of 1874-75. His main criticism, however, tended to centre on the short-lived interests of some members of the Anthropological Institute in the popular spiritualist movement of the times, a movement which Fox saw as both frivolous and dangerous to the progress of science. The main figures were Huxley and Wallace, both of whom began to attend séances during the mid-sixties mostly out of curiosity, but also, particularly in Wallace's case, as a means of providing some better explanation of the spiritualist phenomenon[193]. Tylor, as George Stocking has more recently revealed, also took an

---

[190] See also Lang, 'Tylor', p. 3; Marett, Tylor, pp. 202-03: Burrow, Evolution, pp. 235-41; and Tylor's own Primitive Culture, I, 58. Tylor's early shift in interest can be traced through the following articles: 'The Religion of Savages', Fortnightly Review, 6 (1866), 71-86; 'On Traces of the Early Mental Condition of Man', Proc. of the Royal lnst. of Gt. Britain, 5 (1869), 83-93; 'On the Survival of Savage Thought in Modern Civilisation' Proc. of the Royal lnst. of Gt. Britain, 5 (1869),522-35; 'The Philosophy of Religion Among the Lower Races of Mankind', JESL, NS 2 (1870), 369-81.

[191] Tylor, ‘Religion, Mythology and Sociology’, JAI, 2 (1872), 297-98.

[192] Fox, ‘Exhibition of Votive Statuettes found at Tanagra, Beotia’, JAI, 6 (1876), 310-15; SSW, PRP, P45.

[193] Huxley, Life and Letters, I, 45 2, II, 188; Alfred Russell Wallace, My Life: A Record of

interest in the movement, and although skeptical from the first, was influenced indirectly; the term 'spiritualism' first introduced in his earlier lecture was discarded in favour of the new term 'animism' as a result[194]. Therefore, although he rejected the truths of spiritualism, Tylor was tainted, if only by association.

Fox's attitudes toward spiritualism were first expressed in his Brighton address of 1872. Complaining of the often empty chambers at the Society of Antiquaries, he jibed: 'It is to be hoped that whenever the power of psychic force, or the influence of disembodied spirits in vivifying inanimistic bodies, comes to be more generally established among anthropologists than it is as present, these chairs and tables may proceed to deliberate and rap out communications to each other during the weary days and hours that the embodied spirits are absent'. In 'Evolution and Culture' he wrote of anthropologist 'losing their heads'; and, referring in that case to Evans's series of Roman coins, he explained that the charioteer 'became elevated, not elevated after the manner unfortunately but too common among London drivers, but elevated after the manner of Spiritualists, …'[195]. Innocent as they were, Fox's jibes suggest a resentment of a more serious kind. What Fox obviously feared was that the shift in attention to more 'elevated' or 'theoretical' subjects such as religion or intellectual development would mark a step backward in the progress of anthropology. The fact that for many such interests signaled a liberation from the constraints of both archaeology or philology by allowing for a more general appreciation of human development was never fully understood by him. Fox's own retreat into the particulars of field technique was in itself a refusal to recognize that change in orientation. More importantly, in Fox's case, it represented a rejection of the evolutionary perspective which made those interests possible.

Events and Opinions (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1906), II, 293-317; A Defence of Modern Spiritualism (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1874). For further background see A.C. Doyle, The History of Spiritualism (New York: G. H. Doran, 1926); K.H. Porter, Through a Glass Darkly: Spiritualism in the Browning Circle (Lawrence, Kansas: Univ. of Kansas Press, 1958).

[194] George W. Stocking, ‘Animism in Theory and Practice: E.B. Tylor’s Unpublished “Notes on Spiritualism”, Man, NS 6 (1971), 88-104.

[195] Fox, ‘Address, Brighton, 1872’, p. 172; ‘Evolution of Culture’, p. 515. See Also discussion following W.L. Distant, ‘On the term “Religion”, as used in Anthropology’, JAI, 6 (1876), p. 65.