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Abstract

The Society of Antiquaries, 1830-1870: Institution, Intellectual Questions, Community, and the Search for the Past
Christina DeCoursey
Department of History
University of Toronto

This thesis treats the Society of Antiquaries of London, 1830-1870. Chapter One applies contemporary models of intellectual fields to antiquarianism, and suggests a model comprised of three components: institution, shared intellectual questions and community. Features such as public image, funding, institutional culture, and mechanisms for directing research are also discussed.

Chapters Two, Three and Four each treat one component of the model proposed in Chapter One. Chapter Two treats the history of the Society, and its commitment to the collection of historical materials, despite its limited means. Chapter Three introduces the encyclopedic antiquarian intellectual domain, embracing manuscript study, philology, numismatics and archaeology, among others. The model for their integration is found in William Camden’s 1586 Britannia, which led to the formation of the Society. With the increase of information, later antiquaries specialised. To succeed at such a range of work, without the support of a wealthy society, antiquaries shared information and divided their labours, remaining united as an intellectual community by adhering to the pattern established by the Britannia. Chapter Four presents data on the 1,636 members of the Society, 1830-70. Most were lower middle class, few were peers, less than half were university educated, but many obtained better employment than their fathers had. Employment links, scholarly projects, and tensions within the community are discussed. The data set is presented in Appendix One. Lists of eminent antiquaries are presented in Appendix Two.

Chapter Five treats antiquarian archaeology. Despite the portrait of antiquaries as incompetent bumblers, comparison of their excavations with the Geological Society’s excavation of Brixham Cave shows they were competent. Evaluation of the Society’s journal, Archaeologia, shows antiquaries’ distinctively historical approach to interpreting sites and artefacts. Illustrations from excavation sites are provided in Appendix Three. Chapter Six treats antiquaries’ study of languages and texts. Their contributions to Anglo-Saxon studies and bibliography demonstrate the strengths of traditional antiquarian philology.

The final chapter accounts for the eclipse of antiquarianism late in the nineteenth century as the result of specialisation and the removal of intellectual work to the universities. It also indicates several areas in which contemporary models of fields might be improved.
CHAPTER ONE

For four centuries, a certain scholarly study held a place of distinction in British society, producing celebrated scholars, provoking satires, and organising the lifetime labours of a host of lesser-known men. A child of the Henrician Reformation, this study quickly led to royal censure, but it gained its enduring reputation for dullness. Among adherents, it flourished for three centuries, only to fragment into several specialised fields late in the nineteenth century. This study is known as antiquarianism, but despite its venerable tradition of scholarship, very little work has considered the history of this long-lived intellectual endeavour.

This thesis will consider the work of antiquaries between 1830 and 1870. In 1830, antiquarianism was viewed as the natural home for certain kinds of studies of ancient and medieval Britain. By 1870, antiquaries were realising the advantages of institutional reform, technological advances, participation by a large and committed membership, and public recognition. Yet at about this time, antiquarianism was eclipsed, and lost many of its fields and workers to other institutions. The causes of this decline are several, but the removal of intellectual work to the universities, the ascendancy of specialisation in scholarly work, and antiquaries’ inexperience at forging a public image and role, are chief among them.

While this scenario may seem unremarkable, it is not, in fact, common. The histories of most scholarly fields show much gradual change punctuated by occasional saltation, which usually retains connections with the past and delays somewhat in reforming the future. Few scholarly fields are fundamental and long-lived, and then deteriorate rapidly, generating a constellation of more narrowly defined fields, and existing alongside their energetic offspring as
a diminished remnant of the original. Antiquarianism, then, is worth considering for its unusual eminence, fertility and eclipse. This situation invites speculation. It is too simple to abandon antiquarianism as merely antiquated; a historical account of it must at least contribute vitally to an understanding of the generations who accepted its integrity as an intellectual project. And new fields do not emerge whole even from the most Jovian of scholarly studies; the histories of fields succeeding the eclipse of antiquarianism must demonstrate continuities with antecedent studies. The historian must ask what factors originally contributed to making antiquarianism the proper intellectual habitat for those studies, and what factors were important in the fragmentation of that traditional integrity. In the case of antiquarianism, such an analysis promises to be interesting because practitioners crossed boundaries between the sciences and humanities, because its institutional and scholarly health flowered at the moment of its demise, and because both its resilience and its eclipse highlight the ultimacy of organizational and social over conceptual factors in the persistence of a field.

This project must begin by considering what kind of thing antiquarianism was. Was there a way of seeing the world which was consistently and characteristically antiquarian? What made antiquarianism a coherent, unified study in the eyes of both practitioners and outsiders? Is there any description of it that will allow twentieth-century outsiders also to view it as a coherent intellectual domain? What factors account for its past credibility? What for its eclipse? Why did so many nineteenth-century antiquaries cross disciplinary boundaries in their work, and how did

---

1For example, theology, classical studies and natural philosophy can be placed in this class. Theology and natural philosophy persisted for centuries before their rather sudden discharge of a number of distinct subfields. Like antiquarianism, theology survived the eruption but occupied a smaller, less prestigious area of the total intellectual territory. Natural philosophy did not survive, but was split into a number of sciences. The eminence of intellectual territory attributed to classics was in time eclipsed by other fields, but its eclipse generated few subfields.
they understand their place in the complex and developing nineteenth-century gazette of studies? What alterations to current ideas about discipline-forming and discipline-bounding does a history of antiquarianism indicate?

The work of recent scholars on the histories of intellectual fields can provide a model for evaluating these questions, as they apply to antiquarianism. Most recent work has addressed fields within the sciences. This work will be drawn on in this chapter. It will be convenient to separate historical from theoretical questions and answers; those relevant to an historical thesis will be considered first, and then this material will be used to discuss the more theoretical question, what is a field? Several recent histories of fields will be used to determine the components commonly included in a model of an intellectual field. The model developed by Mary Jo Nye will, in particular, be applied to antiquarianism in some detail. In reviewing recent theoretical work on the notion "field," Nye's definition of "field" is chosen as the most suitable, but no current work adequately models the peculiarities of the intellectual domain and project of antiquarianism.

Current histories have treated nineteenth-century intellectual fields as hardly separable from features of their social and historical context. For example, histories of the biological sciences have explored their relation to styles of religious commitments, German university practices, and the nature of scientific organizations. The informal character of British scholarly

---


institutions has been discussed in histories of Royal Society, the Royal Institution, and the British Association for the Advancement of Science. Other works have traced the effects on fields of the emergence of the university as a force in education, the demise of the ideal of liberal education, and the growth of professionalisation. Features as diverse as physical plant, ideology, shared and competing paradigms, the circumstances of financial support, institutional structures for examination and certification, and the social relations of scholars, have all been shown to influence the historical path a given field takes. Current historical work, then, confirms that histories cannot easily treat an intellectual field in isolation from its context; the knowledge produced by a given intellectual community is too highly permeable to factors outside its intellectual domain.

The number of areas noticed as significant to intellectual fields has given a certain cast to recent field histories. Three broadly defined components are usually present: shared intellectual

---


problems, community and institution. Within these three, significant factors are enumerated, their role and effects discussed, and their interconnections within the life of the field detailed. The set of shared intellectual questions remains at the heart of the discussion, but is portrayed as embedded within the other components. Shared questions cannot exist incorporeally, without the community of individuals interested in them; and the story of those shared problems is not everywhere the same as the personal and work histories of the individuals that make up the community. In the same way, an intellectual community does not usually exist without some kind, more or less formal, of institutional support. This perspective has been adopted in this thesis. All three components will be treated separately in order to bring out the particular contours of their contribution to the field; they will then be integrated into a view of the field as a whole, in two case example, and in the conclusion.

These three components, then--the set of shared problems, the community and the institution--form the basis of the model used in this thesis, to analyse antiquarianism. They can be further articulated. Several current histories will now be considered for how their models of intellectual fields supply relevant factors for analysis, concluding with a detailed application of Nye's model. Maurice Crosland has stressed the vital role of the institution in producing and organizing new knowledge, promoting discussion and adjudication, educating and certifying new members, maintaining the boundary between members and outsiders, and brokering introductions, employment and fame.⁷ His work on the Paris Academy of Sciences demonstrates that, despite

some inhibiting effects of a "gerontocracy," or the almost priestly authority of the older members of the academy, this strong form of institutional framework was effective in supporting and directing intellectual work. Marie Boas Hall suggests the primary role of the institution in the fortunes of scientific fields, arguing that, for the Royal Society, the demise of the amateur tradition and of regard for privilege, and the rise of a reform-minded executive which administered the society by and for scientific men, were the conditions that drove its intellectual achievements in the nineteenth century. Jack Morrell and Arnold Thackery have described the ways an inner circle of educated scientists controlled the direction of research within, and the funds raised by, the British Association for the Advancement of Science, using both to enhance the social and political image of the sciences.

The institutional circumstances of the Society of Antiquaries differ significantly from both these institutions. First, for the Academy, the RS and the BAAS, reliable and substantial funding was a prerequisite for the institution's ability to prosper in their activities. Unlike these institutions, the SA received no government funding. However, the production of antiquarian knowledge was similarly related to adequate funding. Thus the private nature of SA funding may be expected to affect the institutional character of the SA and antiquarian work. Second, the institutional culture within the SA differed from that of the RS and the BAAS. The SA retained

---


9Jack Morrell and Arnold Thackery, *Gentlemen of Science: The Early Years of the British Association for the Advancement of Science*, Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1982. For the sake of brevity, the British Association for the Advancement of Science will hereafter be referred to as the BAAS.

10The Society of Antiquaries will be referred to hereafter as the SA. Similarly, the Royal Society will be referred to as the RS, the British Association for the Advancement of Science as the BAAS, and the Royal Institution as the RI.
amateur values longer than the RS.\textsuperscript{11} From its origins in Elizabethan times, the SA had never been able to command the prestige the RS enjoyed, and so had taken its leadership from men of ordinary classes. It could not aspire to eminent leadership like that of the Duke of Sussex. But nor did it embrace the competitive model of scholarship advocated by practical men such as those of the BAAS.\textsuperscript{12} Thus, it did not achieve a prestigious public image, as did the RS and the BAAS, in their different ways. In the relation between institutional culture and the production of knowledge, the SA occupies a middle ground between the two institutional styles--the amateur and the competitive--set out by Boas-Hall. Third, unlike the Academy and the BAAS, the processes by which the SA produced and adjudicated new knowledge, and trained and certified members, remained informal. These processes, and the boundary they created between members and non-members, were often cause for concern among antiquaries, as the major source of funding for the SA was membership fees. Increased membership could seem to hold an inverse relationship to the standards of antiquarian scholarship. And yet the list of eminent antiquaries can rival that of either the Academy or the RS. These three features, then--funding, institutional culture, and the definition of expertise--will be important factors in analysing antiquarianism.

Numerous scholars have identified informal interpersonal networks as distinctive of how nineteenth-century British science was done, and as fulfilling many of the supporting functions usually provided by institutions. For example, R.M. McLeod has identified the casual but robust

\footnote{Certain problems arise in referring to these values as “amateur.” These are discussed in Chapter Four and the conclusion.}

nature of the personal networks of scientists, and their role in coordinating joint scientific labours and the production of scientific knowledge.\textsuperscript{13} Gerald Geison has detailed the links between work undertaken over the long term and this interpersonal network, such as the introduction of younger to established scholars, joint travels and joint projects, and the setting of research goals for the scientific community.\textsuperscript{14} Martin Rudwick has mapped the dynamics of participants' interactions in working on a shared intellectual problem, and identified a gradient of competence attributed by community members as constitutive of how various opinions fared.\textsuperscript{15} Susan Faye Cannon has emphasised the hybrid nature of network members and their intellectual commitments, and the difficulty of separating clergyman from scientist, compromiser from positivist, and so on.

These works begin to describe the profusion of antiquarian intellectual commitments, the avenues which mediated antiquarian scholarly links, and the means by which the antiquarian community produced and evaluated knowledge. The principal media used to gain and communicate antiquarian knowledge were periodical publications and personal friendships. This is one of the most theoretically challenging results of this thesis: can periodicals, friendships, cooperative research strategies and widely shared genres of writing be understood as kinds of institutions? Certainly, they fulfilled the functions usually assigned to institutions, such as educating and certifying members, and providing structures for coordinating and directing


research. Informal yet effective, they mediated the work of collecting, communicating and evaluating antiquarian knowledge just as the more formal means developed by the structured processes of wealthier groups such as the RS and the BAAS did.

Many histories of science have considered the role of shared intellectual problems in defining a field. Robert Bud and Gerrylyn Robert have argued that chemistry did not conform to conventional British nineteenth-century norms for sciences. Fitting neither a Baconian nor a mathematico-physical model, and falling short of the nineteenth-century ideological zeal for law and synthesis, it was nevertheless endorsed as a science by scientists who were members of governmental bodies considering science education and curriculum. In their view, the credibility of chemistry as a science was based in its evident utility in industry, and the implicit presence of a set of scientific principles, to be found in its practice rather than in a mathematically structured and philosophically articulated body of axioms. Bud and Robert argue that the debates over education show that scientific adjudication recognised the validity of practical demonstration, even if theoretical demonstration was preferred.\(^{16}\) Crosland sees chemistry as loosely distinguished from natural history and mineralogy because, in its early stages, the objects and processes chemistry investigated were shared by other fields. Therefore basic chemical questions were determined as much by territory which was not claimed by physics as by any coherent

understanding of the chemical problematic. A similar argument is made about eighteenth-century physics by J.L. Heilbron. He argues that the intellectual territory of physics was not structured, lacked accepted paradigms and was poorly demarcated from biology and chemistry. But in the face of this, he argues, physics can still be seen as sufficiently coherent to be identified as a field. In what does its unity consist? "[P]recisely what makes it most difficult to grasp: in its process of redefinition, in its changing scope and technique." These historians suggest that a field can experience incoherence in its core set of shared problems, or even their complete transformation into a new set of problems, without destroying the integrity of the field.

Antiquarianism was in an analogous situation. Like chemistry, its intellectual domain could seem to lack coherence because it embraced so broad a range of loosely connected topics, though in fact no-one questioned its unity at the time. Chemistry pursued classification as a method of bringing structure and definition to the field. Antiquaries used classification also, but in a more desultory manner. As for eighteenth-century physics, there were many classifications in use at any given time, which decreased the value of classification in structuring and defining

---


19 For a more theoretical discussion of this point, see Nye, From Chemical Philosophy. Introduction. Nye argues that the longevity of particular questions, or their continuity in a particular form, is not necessary to unite the community. Over time the community's work turns up new problems in elaborating or evaluating its knowledge. This provides momentum; over time older questions are replaced by newer ones, which keep the community and the field going. It is the sharing of a set of questions, rather than the specific questions themselves, then, which unites a community over time.
the field. For antiquarianism, the wealth of particular instances available for analysis far exceeded the axiomatic material available to achieve the synthetic, theoretical project. Nonetheless, it did possess a rudimentary framework to set them into: most antiquarian work was fitted into basic, language-based periods of British history—Celtic, Roman, Saxon, Norman and late medieval, and was organised regionally, using counties. While this temporal and systematic cultural framework lent structure and definition to the set of shared antiquarian problems, it was so general as to be of little immediate import to most antiquaries' work, as antiquaries tended to specialise. Further, antiquaries could not depend on access to all the information they needed. Unlike chemists, they had to be involved in collection and preservation, as Saxon manuscripts could not be generated for examination in the way, for example, fixed air could. So the production of antiquarian knowledge, and the ongoing reconstruction of shared antiquarian problems, were unusually mutable. Like chemistry, antiquarianism possessed a practical epistemology which can be demonstrated more through antiquaries' practice than in any articulated set of axioms. Finally, if antiquaries were more fortunate than chemists in possessing a coherent if remote schema to integrate their disparate studies, they, too, suffered from a lack of recognition. Their development of manuscript research, for example, was ignored by historians until the late eighteenth century, who failed to recognise or credit antiquaries' methods and problems, and thus re-invented or repeated work that had already been done, often with less precision. This lack of recognition was due in part to the low social prestige of antiquarianism.

---

20 As Mary Douglas and David Hull point out, "Classification is usually treated as an outcome of an ordering process as if the organization of thoughts comes first, and a more or less fixed classification follows as its outcome. But the ordering process itself is embedded in prior and subsequent social action." See Douglas and Hull, *How Classification Works: Nelson Goodman among the Social Sciences*, Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh 1992. Introduction, p. 2.
and in part to the fact that, like chemists, antiquaries did not write well for the public. Thus they had not the social force to resist raids on their intellectual territory.

A very thorough model of intellectual field has been constructed by Mary Jo Nye, in her history of chemistry. She describes the relations of six factors within that field: shared problems, genealogy, external recognition, homeland, archetypal language, and ritual practices. Except for shared problems, Nye’s factors often cut across the three major components articulated above (institution, community, shared problems). Genealogies, articulated by the institution, engender cohesion in the community. External recognition can be manipulated somewhat by the institution, and can affect, and be affected by, the community. Homeland reflects the institutional culture and provides a focus for the community’s sense of identity. Archetypal language and ritual practices are administered by the institution but change with changes in the shared problems, and rehearse members in the community’s identifying shared problems.

Nye argues that the shared problems are what define a field and unite a scholarly community. However powerful an institution, it disappears if its field of inquiry fragments, or its problematic is taken over by other fields. Communities are exclusive, colonising, or open in different phases of their evolution, but their disciplinary boundary must remain permeable to outsiders with new ideas, who are the sources of innovation in the shared problematic of that field. Without such innovation, neither the field nor the community can persist. Therefore one must view the sharing of the questions as the force which unites the community over time.\footnote{Nye also argues for the importance of shared values in maintaining unity and solving questions, such as a commitment to peer review and judgement by rational consensus, the definition of proof, and conventions within the representations which are the means of explanation. The specific problems presented by intellectual workers recording their impressions in writing can be found in Mary Louise Pratt, “Fieldwork in Common Places” in Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography, University of California Press: Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1986, pp. 27-50.}
Antiquaries saw less revolutionary change in the conceptual core of their shared problems than did chemists. In part, this is because their objects of study were more easily identifiable. The kind of inquiries to be undertaken, the materials required to pursue them, and many basic avenues of approach to a comprehensive historical knowledge of early Britain were more evident than were analogous problems in chemistry. Where for chemists the objects of study were in a continual process of redefinition, sometimes radical, most antiquarian objects were, at least in basic form, already understood. Some antiquarian objects did undergo radical redefinition, but this was rare. For example, the objects of philological study underwent radical redefinition late in the eighteenth century. Where the study of words had during the latter half of the eighteenth century been viewed as a guide to the workings of the human mind, and the study of foreign languages as a path back to the Adamic language, nineteenth-century philologists increasingly undertook language studies that aimed at the functional understanding of a language necessary to doing accurate textual work before printing an edition. This redefinition led to changes within Anglo-Saxon scholarship, for example, but did not have the potential to alter the objects of antiquarian study in the majority of its fields. Antiquaries’ struggle was with the dimensions of the subject to be known rather than, as for chemists, objects that eluded basic description.

By genealogy, Nye means the stories shared within the community about their intellectual ancestors and the paths of their intellectual descent. Genealogy includes heroes who paved the way to new intellectual territory, scholarly villains that had to be slain before progress could be

---

22 On the other hand, achieving an accurate portrait of the past depended on being able to recuperate sufficient and representative materials, a thing antiquaries could not have certainty about in the same way chemists, working in a field organised by systematic relations, could hope to achieve.
made, and heroic episodes that moved the community into new intellectual terrain. For antiquaries, villains were few. And for the first century of the SA’s existence it was not wise to draw attention to their efforts to preserve what was left of the Catholic past. Accusations of recusancy lent antiquaries prudence about presenting their community’s genealogy or battling their critics, and the need to collect, combined with the minutely demanding nature of their work, left little time for castigating villains. Of more importance to antiquaries was intellectual continuity.

Nye argues that the authority of intellectual continuity is compelling to members of the community; they construct histories of their field, marshall links to earlier figures, and praise precursors who fought battles of intelligence. By propagating these histories, and by making students learn them, they promote their identity and longevity, within and without the community. Antiquaries were not much concerned to patrol their intellectual territory; they had remained in it unchallenged for centuries, and (wrongly) believed that their control of it was not threatened. They did not use SA history in an effort to attract adherents away from competing fields; the SA continued to grow because some people were genuinely interested in antiquarian scholarship. There were few competitors; most of the reading public viewed antiquarian interests as foolish. And while various histories of the Society were undertaken, these were scholarly

---

23 This should not be taken to suggest that internal battles are not found among antiquaries: some will be discussed in Chapter Two. For the major eighteenth and nineteenth-century genealogies and battles, see Joan Evans. A History of the Society of Antiquaries, Oxford University Press: Oxford. 1956: 134-224.

according to the canons of antiquarian work, and were not intended to function as self-promotion outside the group. However, the antiquarian commitment to preserving the materials of the past, and the specific genres in which they undertook their work, did function as Nye describes within the antiquarian community, creating an authoritative and compelling intellectual continuity, linking earlier to later figures, and creating and promoting their identity. Thus, long-lived textual traditions and a commitment to preservation must be understood as the unifying force within the antiquarian community. Their status within the community was more definitive of the development of antiquarianism than the promotion of a genealogy or other vision across that boundary. Yet the failure of antiquaries to communicate their historiographical vision across that boundary accounts in large part for the eclipse of an entire intellectual domain.

Nye considers external recognition a major component of providing a field and a community with identity and legitimacy. Fields exist and persist because they are recognised by others, and this recognition motivates new recruits to join the field. Both insiders and outsiders identify the community in terms of its differences from other fields in methods, theories and goals. Antiquaries were in a very odd position in this matter. While antiquarianism was indeed recognised by outsiders, this recognition most often took the form of ridicule. Yet the community continued to gain recruits. However, ultimately, the lack of strong, positive public recognition also contributed to the eclipse of antiquarianism in the late nineteenth century. Recognition, or more accurately, the lack of it, proved to be crucial to the fortune of antiquarianism.

As will be discussed in Chapter Three, two views of antiquarianism co-existed in British society. That generated from outside the antiquarian community satirised antiquarian activities, and was widely held until late in the eighteenth century. When the antiquarian self-understanding began to be better appreciated.
Another component of Nye’s model is homeland, including the rights and responsibilities of members, codified entrance criteria and differentiated relationships as articulated by the institution, as well as the physical residence of the institution. These provide an identity and sense of permanence to anchor fluctuations within the discipline. Antiquaries sought a homeland from the late sixteenth century, but achieved one only in the eighteenth. This delay led to a culture of reliance on individuals to fund, educate and differentiate themselves, and so the defining role of the institution, and the rights and responsibilities of members, once established, were minimal. Early criticisms of the SA reflect members’ dis-ease with this lack of direction and articulation. This thesis will consider the increasing demand for the SA to redefine its role in this regard, in order to be able to play a coordinating role internally among antiquarian fields, and to provide political leadership and a lobbying force outside the community. For the SA, this redefinition was fundamental and hard-won.

The community’s archetypal language and imagery play a crucial role in Nye’s history of eighteenth-century chemistry. In that field, physical models and visual images played a critical role in understanding chemical behaviour. By contrast, the role of visual aids in antiquarian publications was to illustrate the subject material of various fields. The lavish illustrations typical of SA publications is discussed in Chapters Two and Five. But while publications were unusually luxurious in their visual aids, these were not crucial to the development of antiquarian understanding in the way they were to chemistry. The same thing can be said of the role of precise terminology. Nye concentrates on terminology because of the way it promoted rapid development of chemical knowledge. Terminology reflects the ways a field sections and defines its problematic. Most antiquarian fields did not need metaphorical models, visual or conceptual,
to understand objects whose basic place within history was relatively easily located. However, most antiquarian works shared several textual features which provided them with similar kinds of structure. In this sense, antiquaries' language-based chronology, and their regional and evidential categories, functioned as widely shared historical terms. These features of antiquaries' texts will be discussed in Chapter Three. This does not mean antiquaries were insensitive to finer analyses. However, these tended to be field-specific. An example of this will be considered in Chapter Five, in discussing the ways in which terms shared between geology and archaeology reflected different concepts of early human history, and gave rise to differing interpretations of excavated objects. Chapter Six considers differences of opinions within the antiquarian community about the visual depiction of Anglo-Saxon texts. But for the most part, antiquaries tended to specialise, and thus used conventions which had been developed in their subfield of work rather than across all fields.

The final component of Nye’s model is ritual practice. Standardised practices constitute a codified and tacit form of knowledge, disseminated in lectures, seminars, examinations, research procedures, conferences, and so on. These constitute rites of passage for the apprentice, affirm the legitimacy of the discipline, reenact traditions, and rehearse unsolved intellectual problems. Nye likens this aspect of an intellectual community to a family dinner, where tensions as well as community affirmation help to construct the community’s intellectual identity within the broader network of economic and political relations surrounding them. There were, of course, conventions and tensions within the antiquarian community. But as the institutional circumstances

---

26 For example, the languages and methods used to describe documents would not be those used to describe coins or archaeological sites. This would have been a much greater problem for chemistry than it was for a field united by historical rather than systematic relations.
of the SA were minimalist, apprenticeship was mainly served outside the community, and admission to the SA was based on work already accomplished. Thus it has no equivalent to the articulated social apparatus Nye describes, and had to turn elsewhere to affirm its legitimacy and rehearse its shared problems. The latter was mainly accomplished through informal means: publications, smaller societies which formed as splinter groups from the SA main body, and interpersonal links. Identifying conventions within antiquarian writings is a substantial task, given the number of fields it would be necessary to consider, and should follow the more basic work of articulating what antiquarianism was; this thesis can address that primary task alone. Some tensions are indicated in Chapter Two, which treats the history of the SA, and Chapter Four, which treats the prosopographical data. The following chapters will consider in more detail the relations between such tensions and the production of antiquarian scholarship in two case studies.

These, then, are the results afforded by a review of current histories of intellectual fields. Most identify three components of fields in their analyses: shared problems, institution, and community. Within these three components many other factors, such as those identified by Nye and the other historians reviewed, are embedded in different ways. Tracing the specific roles these components and factors play within the life of the field, and detailing how they interact, are considered to provide an articulate and accurate account of that field. This will be the model used within this thesis. Because no work has yet treated antiquarianism as a field, the simple model of three components—institution, shared problems and community—will be used. The next three chapters will each treat one of these components. This will provide a basis for the discussion in Chapter Five of the ways in which various factors, those identified by Nye and others, are embedded in these components. Factors to be considered include: the SA's
institutional culture, the peculiarities of antiquaries’ public image, the location of antiquaries’ intellectual continuity in shared methods and genres as much as shared questions, the ways the antiquarian institution directed and did not direct research, the primacy of collecting in the production of antiquarian knowledge, and the interpersonal networks and other kinds of various links found in the antiquarian community.

This review brings us to the theoretical question of defining the term "field." This thesis will employ field and related terms at various levels of analysis, to characterise an intellectual domain, detail relations between various fields within that domain, and portray the emergence of subfields, and their development into fields over time. While a systematic articulation of these terms and relations is not a central aim of this thesis, it is necessary to be able to refer to them with clarity. Further, they require some careful comment because they interact with one of the three components of the model articulated above—that of shared problems.

Field histories written to educate newcomers, like those written within intellectual history, have tended to conflate the history of the field with that of its "thought." Such works concentrate on the power of conceptual content to organise groups and drive change, equating field mainly with the set of shared problems. This approach will not suffice for the theoretical

---

issue any more than it did for the historical. Conceptual material must be as permeable to extra-intellectual factors as the community of practitioners is formed by the social realities surrounding them. And if shared conceptual material is the basis for defining an intellectual field, antiquarianism must be rejected as candidate. Most antiquaries were specialised, so the amount of material actually shared was small and highly segmented. Constructivist accounts have emphasised growth at the expense of issues such as policing and conformity, and have tended to characterise change as gradual. While Elizabethan antiquarian texts established conceptual paths which lasted into the nineteenth century, the shared structures which brought antiquarianism coherence were genres, and the deferred goal of writing the definitive British history, rather than any conceptual order perceived to inhabit shared conceptual material. Many antiquarian studies lay outside these early conceptual paths but were not rejected by other antiquaries as outside antiquarianism. Over time, some antiquarian questions, and thus the areas of research, changed. Conformity seems to have been unimportant to antiquaries. The growth of antiquarianism may be viewed as gradual, but its eclipse was abrupt, and this part of its history needs discussion equally with its long period of growth.

More recent work has tended to pursue the task of definition at a greater distance from
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28Nye argues that despite the existence of different research schools and differing national approaches, the generation of a synthesis, of a new level of explanation, or of a widely accepted paradigm, tends to unite members and their work. The shared questions can be transformed utterly without the field losing its continuity. Therefore the sharing of values and problems must be used as the primary criteria for determining intellectual domain. See Nye, From Chemical Philosophy, Introduction. David Hull argues the same thing in The Metaphysics of Evolution, State University of New York Press: Albany, New York, 1989, Chapter 10, "Cladistic Theory: Hypotheses that Blur and Grow," 162-178.

the historical material it is meant to define. Geison’s and J.B. Morrell’s use of research schools to chart the course of a field’s development is limited to laboratory-based research groups with rigorously local and enumerable membership. In this case, data was available for about 80% of SA members, but there were 1,636 of them, and they did not pursue their research cohesively. Some distinguish research schools and research traditions, using "school" for a specific locale and group which may transcend its idiosyncrasy, and "tradition" for conceptual and methodological themes found across many times and places.30 But antiquarianism was a more diffuse phenomenon even than "tradition" used in this way. Some groups of antiquaries sharing research interests functioned like schools, but the majority were specialised, and did not share such themes. And while the Society had foreign fellows, the subject of this thesis is limited to British antiquarianism. The use of terms that fix fields and schools as parts of disciplines or traditions, arranged either systematically or temporally, would not suffice. Antiquarianism lacked the funding and prestige to become highly organised at the institutional level, and this reality both reflected and contributed to the development of the field as a large set of loosely connected and highly segmented shared questions. Thus this definition would obscure the real character of antiquarianism, and would tend to portray it as an unsuccessful field. Similarly, antiquarianism cannot be called a discipline, as that term presumes the historical continuity of the core conceptual material. Antiquarianism did not so much integrate core conceptual material as coordinate a widely varying set of fields, and attempt to find, collect and authenticate the basic materials for constructing core conceptual matter.

Pierre Bourdieu’s notion of field is most flexible, but is mainly used to describe artistic

rather than scholarly fields. Bourdieu argues for an almost mechanistic correspondence between changes in societal conventions and changes within fields. But this conception of field and its correspondence to social conventions cannot explain the way many antiquarian fields persisted in the same forms over long periods of time, in the face of social conventions which gave rise to very different forms of writing, and which usually heaped scorn on antiquarian work.\footnote{Bourdieu recognises the different situation of academic cultural capital from that of writers or artists in \textit{Homo Academicus}. Chapter 2, "The Conflict of the Faculties" p. 36-37. See Peter Collier, tr., Pierre Bourdieu, \textit{Homo Academicus} Stanford University Press: Stanford, California, 1988. However, he is treating a situation in which the institution provides both financial support as well as social prestige to its members. His analyses all concern French institutions, and therefore he does not address the situation of institutional and even intellectual exclusion, except as matters of conflicting paradigms within and between faculties; nor does he model the production of knowledge except within a strong institutional framework.}

And while Bourdieu’s notion of field describes the role of ideological factors in framing shared problems, it leaves untouched most of the area covered by the components of the model to be used here.\footnote{See for example Pierre Bourdieu, "Intellectual Field and Creative Project" in \textit{Social Science Information}, 8/2 (April 1969); 89-120. More recently Bourdieu has analysed the evolution of faculties within French academic institutions. In this work he discusses factors such as education, certification and adjudication within scholarly fields. His study applies quantitative sociology to the production of knowledge in several fields, and employs prosopography to assist him in characterising their development. However, the situation of the French universities is analogous to that of the Academy in Maurice Crosland’s study: their funding, imposition of rights, responsibilities and rituals, and prestige are substantial, lending the institution and fields a degree of definition which antiquarianism never enjoyed. Thus an application of Bourdieu’s later work would fail to describe the avenues which mediated antiquarian work and the structures which gave it institutional and intellectual integrity.}

There are still other definitions to consider. The requirements of this project differ from those of Foucault and others who have concentrated on demarcation of types of knowledge, discursive ruptures, and the coercion that disciplinary discourses exert on their practitioners.\footnote{See Simon Schaffer, "Natural Philosophy," eds., G.S. Rousseau and Roy Porter. \textit{The Ferment of Knowledge: Studies in the Historiography of Eighteenth Century Science}, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1980; 55-92.}

This thesis considers a field and a set of practitioners insufficiently funded or structured to compel with any success, and whose minimalist institutional culture hindered them from taking
such action even when it would have benefitted the organization. Further, the collaborative nature of much antiquarian work, antiquaries’ rejection of competition as valuable to the progress of their field, and the deferral of the synthetic project which would integrate and organize antiquarian fields, are among the more unusual features which our definition of field must accommodate. These features have no clear place within the stream of works which have sprung from Foucaultian criticism - and are the more interesting for it.

David Hull’s account of scientific fields regards their evolution as speciation. Progress is possible in science, being an intentional activity, where it is a matter of chance and perspective when seen in, for example, the fossil record. But the struggle of research groups for funds, students and journal space over-interprets informally organized institutions such as the SA. The SA might be described as fulfilling a niche for some generations before succumbing to new fields better-adapted to compete, but Hull’s theory does not model circumstances like those of the eclipse of antiquarianism, which broke into subfields which continue successfully to this day. Hull argues that fields’ survival and reproduction are affected by their fitness, but this cannot explain a species whose culture permits extinction of the group before defence of its niche.

He is careful to reject a stage theory of science, allowing that fields may stultify, degenerate and

---

4In The Metaphysics of Evolution, pp. 129-180, Hull argues for treating fields as taxa and their histories as those of individuals, based in their spatio-temporal continuity rather than any persistent conceptual core. This does allow for the radical transformation of fields, but is confusing: groups, not individuals, show evolution of this sort. In Science as a Process, Hull replaces the individual-field with a species-field equation, which is better able to model evolution of a field over time, but resists allowing that fields, like species, can become extinct. Whichever equation is accepted, Hull’s discussion fails to provide more than a general description of the actual processes by which fields, like species, develop.

sustain losses as well as gains, and that progress along one line of reasoning may be local only and may cut off progress along another. But Hull describes a benevolent universe in which the possibility of the disappearance of the fit field does not occur. While there must be an upper limit to progress, in highly variable environments, fields, like species, simply show much variation. Individual concepts can die or fail to reproduce because they are false or poorly adapted to their environment. Hull does not consider the possibility of a Great Dying in human knowledge.

The definition of field most suitable to the needs of this thesis is offered by Mary Jo Nye. Since her project treats a field which was historically continuous but conceptually changeable, and went through various kinds of relations with cognate fields, it cannot employ terms too rigidly. Nye argues that "field," "subfield," and "field" and "discipline" may be used to describe the same entity in different epochs, because field-like relationships can exist in subfields, subfields can occupy large field-like territory, both can occupy larger, discipline-like territory at various stages in their development, and all can have various relationships with cognate fields, depending on historical circumstances. This perspective will be adopted in this thesis.

Three particulars should be noted about how terms are to be defined and employed in this thesis. First, though the preceding discussion has attempted to set this analysis of antiquarianism into the approaches found in current historical and theoretical work, very little scholarly work has considered antiquarianism after its Renaissance phase. This thesis is among the first

---

36Mary Jo Nye, From Chemical Philosophy, Introduction.

37As will be discussed in Chapter Three, the work of Italian historiographer Arnaldo Momigliano on antiquarianism concentrated on linking classical with Renaissance and post-Renaissance scholarship, treated continental more than British writers, and was more concerned to show the contribution of antiquarianism to historiography than to explore antiquarianism itself.
attempts to place antiquarianism into nineteenth-century British history as well as into current historiographical practice. Therefore the terms employed here are based more on the author’s perceptions than is usually necessary in historical work, and all judgements made must be regarded as provisional.

Second, judgements about the names and conceptual area of various fields reflect nineteenth-century antiquarian practice. Some may appear arcane, and their scholarly value may not be evident. For example, genealogy and heraldry were fields of study for nineteenth-century antiquaries, the value of which appears much reduced in our own century. But this approach has the merit of allowing the perspective of antiquaries to come through as clearly as possible, providing a basic understanding of antiquarianism with relatively little interpretive material intervening. Thus, "field" will be used to describe the various areas of study identified by antiquaries as antiquarian by the year 1830: such as genealogy, archaeology, philology and so on. Fields are not conceived as conceptually independent of each other; many share territory, as for example church history with palaeography, architectural history with archaeology, and so on. "Subfield" will be used to describe an emerging area of study which shares much conceptual area with another field, which may not at first be identified by antiquaries as distinct from that field, and which later succeeds in being recognised by antiquaries as distinct. As an antiquarian subfield, bibliography arose in the seventeenth century, and diverged from literary and historical studies in the late eighteenth century. A widespread interest in glossaries of provincial words arose among antiquaries in the late eighteenth century, and inhabited two fields--literary studies and philology--before a practical consensus emerged which placed it with philology in the

---

nineteenth. "Intellectual domain" will be used for the total intellectual area occupied by all antiquarian fields put together, those sparsely occupied by workers and poorly defined, as well as the more popular and better understood fields.

Third, the main goal of employing these terms carefully is to highlight an unusual feature of how antiquarianism was structured as an intellectual domain. Antiquarianism behaved like an umbrella which united and coordinated many diverse, specialised fields. In Elizabethan times, these fields were viewed as supplying data useful in clarifying the characteristics of the total antiquarian intellectual domain; most antiquaries worked with several fields when generating historical narratives; these narratives were of the same breadth as the total antiquarian intellectual domain. For example, Elizabethan antiquary William Camden used numismatics, Anglo-Saxon language and literature and manuscript records to refute the medieval myth of the Trojan founding of Britain, and to provide a new and accurate synoptic history of Britain.\[^{39}\] However, such encyclopedic knowledge could not be sustained for many generations of scholars. Antiquarianism split relatively quickly into two streams: those who studied and wrote about physical remains--coins, architecture and so on--and those who studied and wrote about textual remains. The many antiquarian fields were distributed between them. In the decades following Camden, the number of remains and the scope of their labours became more apparent. Antiquaries began to use Camden's periodisation and county organisation to limit the area of their own studies, thus coordinating and making possible basic progress in many fields.

\[^{39}\]This had of course also been done by Polydore Vergil. But his work had been received with a "tide of wrath" in Britain. Polydore was Italian and sixteenth-century British histories were profoundly nationalistic: it was Camden who was able to get Polydore's ideas a hearing. Camden's knowledge of classical texts enabled him to present material from early Roman accounts of Britain which was convincing to his contemporaries. See T.D. Kendrick, *British Antiquity*, Methuen: London. 1950, Chapter VI "The Battle Over The British History," pp. 78-97.
Synoptic narratives of the kinds Camden wrote, and of the kind antiquaries envisioned as their ultimate product, require much data. Antiquarian work came to be organised as much by the search for data as the nature of its fields. The tasks of collecting and authenticating data rapidly came to monopolise generations of antiquaries' time and resources. As fields became more complex, narratives began to treat issues within fields rather than subordinating subfields within a view of the entire antiquarian intellectual domain. Over time, individual fields came to demand an antiquary's full attention; by the eighteenth century, most antiquaries no longer wrote synoptic works. An antiquary who studied coins, for instance, would write about problems in numismatics, and might rarely write about how Roman or Saxon coins correctly identified the reigns of kings or fixed an article of chronology. In this way the work of antiquaries came to be dispersed over a wide set of related fields, with any one antiquary spending much more time on the demands of a single field than on its corrective relation or contribution to British history as a whole. Antiquaries, accustomed to specialisation, viewed the job of relating the finds of their field to the projected synoptic history as a task to be fulfilled once the data was fully collected and analysed.

The task of constructing that detailed, definitive history was thus constantly deferred. The collection and authentication of evidence was viewed as necessary to confirm the accuracy of any narrative. But the more research was done in each field, the more evident it became just how much work there was to do before antiquaries would be able to begin work on their
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40 By the eighteenth century, papers presented at meetings often omitted the import of subfield work to the synoptic narrative project. See examples in Evans, A History, pp. 61-76.

41 Some antiquaries did write histories. As will be discussed in Chapter Three, many more wrote narratives composed of a bare chronological and interpretive thread filled comprehensively with source materials, within a small temporal period or regional area rather than for Britain as a whole.
projected super-history. Thus, while the project of a fully accurate and comprehensive super-history never disappeared from antiquaries’ discussions about their goals, it tended to recede into the future. However, this projected super-history possessed a coordinating merit. It functioned conjecturally as the source of antiquaries’ belief in the integration of all the fields actually being worked on in the evidentiary stream. This gave antiquarianism a certain flexibility. Its many disparate fields were not of a fixed number or character; antiquarian writings show that the boundaries of fields were permeable to other fields, new fields arose, older fields became extinct or merged with others, and so on.42 Nevertheless, this same flexibility and ability to encompass numerous fields contributed to the eclipse of antiquarianism, in competing with smaller intellectual fields and groups who pursued more delimited scholarly aims, perhaps more effectively.

By the year 1830, then, the beginning of the four decades covered by this thesis, the antiquarian intellectual domain was comprised of a set of fields which could appear relatively disparate unless the viewer understood the coordinating role of the postponed super-history project. There existed a mutually evolving relationship between the deferred narrative project, the antiquarian intellectual domain, and its fields. The growth of fields could increase the area or alter the character of the intellectual domain, when fields mutated. For example, excavation of tumuli and barrows increased greatly in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century. Although

42 An example of a field which became extinct was the copying of funerary monuments. In the century following Camden, this had been an essential antiquarian field, and foundational antiquarian reference works were produced, such as John Weever’s 1631 Ancient Funerall Monuments Within the United Monarchie of Great Britaine, Ireland and the Islands Adjacent. These works were meant to establish, complement and/or confirm the articles of genealogy of county notables found in the documents of the College of Arms, which could be both incomplete and erroneous. However, there came a point when the extant remains of the great majority of abbeys and cathedrals had been described, and these articles of county history had been authenticated to the satisfaction of antiquaries working in those areas. With so much other work to do, this field lost workers, and became extinct.
accounts of their makers were often erroneous, they changed and increased the topics requiring explanation in the projected super-history. Where Druids would formerly have been given brief mention, from the late eighteenth century the projected super-history would have significantly enlarged this subject, possibly halting the ascendancy of classicisers, and diminishing the relative significance of Roman British remains. The enlargement of archaeology as a field caused the projected super-history to evolve in a certain direction, increased the total intellectual domain of antiquarianism, and within that domain caused some re-adjustment of relations between fields to accommodate changes and newcomers. In the same way, fields could decrease in importance, as did genealogy and heraldry over the period 1830 to 1870. Such changes caused adjustments to the overall intellectual domain and the projected super-historical narrative. Thus antiquarian fields were partly defined by the narrative project, but the narrative project could also be redefined by changes in the fields. The antiquarian intellectual domain was defined by its constitutive fields, but changes in either could take place and cause a corresponding set of adjustments in the narrative project. As will be discussed in the concluding chapter, the unity of antiquarianism began to crumble when antiquaries’ own powerful pursuit of specialised knowledge in the nineteenth century, coupled with their decreasing ability to devote the time to study that their predecessors had, led them to abandon work on the deferred super-history.

These considerations demonstrate the delicate nature of the task of relating the three components of our model of a field: shared intellectual problems, the community of scholars, and

---

43That is, the consensus among antiquaries about the specific contents and their relative importance in the projected super-history changed from time to time in relation to changes in their work on various fields. Though the nature of the antiquarian consensus at any given time is conjectural, such changes are visible over long periods in the contents of antiquarian publications. And it is the changeability, rather than the exact consensus or its development over time, that is of interest in describing the coordinating role of the super-history in the antiquarian intellectual domain.
the institution. Privileging one factor in the description of the others could distort the accuracy of the historical account, as, for example, if institutional features of the SA were used to structure an account of the problems antiquaries shared, or if those problems, only more or less shared between antiquaries, were used as the basis for portraying the vagaries of the SA’s institutional development. In this way, the historical situation of antiquarianism must dictate how to organise their relations. Fortunately, one of the three components seems to hold primacy both in terms of the circumstances of nineteenth-century British antiquarianism, as well as for the direction of argument in this thesis. This is the final issue which must be considered before turning to the analysis itself.

Geison has observed that "neither scientific ideas nor scientific institutions float in ethereal isolation from the men and women who give them life."^44 Nye describes a field as "the practice of an articulate, identifiable...community."^45 In the case of antiquarianism, neither institution nor shared problems can easily be used to organise the other components. While antiquaries showed remarkable determination, over centuries and against considerable odds, to achieve institutional support for their studies, their institution did not provide many structures to coordinate or support work, or exercise a high degree of control over the directions in which antiquarian studies developed. This circumstance was less a failure of the Council to execute its role, than a reflection of a culture and a set of values developed over centuries, and shared by most antiquaries, which viewed such control as unnecessary, practically impossible, and possibly undesirable. With respect to shared problems, antiquaries were not in the position of chemists or

^44Geison, Michael Foster, Introduction, p. xiii.

^45Mary Jo Nye, From Chemical Philosophy, 1993, p. 2.
geologists; the basic configuration of the antiquarian intellectual terrain was fairly well established, but it was not provide an organic intellectual unity which might organise the other two components of this field. Different explanatory paradigms competed within, rarely between the multiplicity of antiquarian fields, and few generated enough heat to involve the community as a whole. Antiquarian problems are best described as segmentally shared; that is, antiquaries cannibalised adjacent fields that contained material of relevance to their own work, but ignored fields which contributed nothing to their own. But there were also many fields which did not share territory with many others, for example, numismatics and architectural history, palaeography and archaeology, and so on. Antiquaries, then, unlike chemists, had no set of fundamental questions bounded within one basic arena of inquiry, to which the work of community members was meant to contribute. Neither the intellectual field nor the institution could organise decisions on the direction of scholarship, then. Instead, these emerged among individuals working in the same field. It is the community that provides the possibility of coordinating an understanding of antiquarian problems and the antiquarian institution. Therefore, for a preliminary work such as this thesis, it seems practical to allow the community of individuals and their work primacy in defining antiquarianism, its fortune and its eclipse.

For this reason, and because little scholarly work has treated antiquarianism, the prosopographical data presented in Chapter Four has been used to organise the material presented in all chapters. Although this data is not presented until Chapter Four, it was the first work to

46 Relations between antiquarian fields might be represented as a Venn diagram composed of a set of overlapping circles arranged serially as a chain, in which adjacent circles shared territory but did not share territory with circles farther along the chain. Thus a palaeographer would share intellectual territory with a historian of his epoch; that historian would share territory with a numismatist of coins of that period; that numismatist would share territory with archaeologists in questions of dating and identification; archaeologists with architectural historians; architectural historians with art historians, and so on.
be completed, and its analysis was used to evaluate the practical and definitional questions presented above, and to generate the definition of antiquarianism as an umbrella domain functioning to coordinate many fields. While a historical overview of the institution and intellectual domain of antiquarianism are presented in the first chapters of this thesis, this is meant to provide a platform on which to build the more detailed and exacting analysis of the final chapters. The direction of argument in the final chapters runs from an analysis of practitioners and their works to conclusions about fields and institutions.

A brief review of the structure of this thesis will relate the main points of this chapter to the project that has been set out. This chapter has introduced a model for analysing intellectual fields, and indicated how antiquarianism may be located with respect to the components and features of that model. Chapter Two presents an overview of the institution supporting antiquarianism--the Society of Antiquaries of London--from Elizabethan times to 1870. Little work has been done on the SA. It is not possible to refer to other works which establish the character of its structure and practices. Therefore, almost every aspect of its institutional support for antiquarianism requires investigation. However, the historical development of antiquarianism as an intellectual domain depended at least as much on long-lived, regularly
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27The only history is Evans, A History of the Society of Antiquaries, 1956. This is a conventional institutional history of that period, covering the SA from the sixteenth to the twentieth century. It contains much useful material, but lacks any discussion of the community and intellectual domain. Central aspects of antiquarianism are often omitted or misunderstood. Levine's The Amateur and The Professional discusses antiquaries' contribution to the development of archaeology. But she has left out antiquaries working with textual remains. Stuart Piggott. Ancient Britons and the Antiquarian Imagination. Thames and Hudson: London, 1989, treats antiquarian work in a few particular areas, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Since no-one has yet articulated what made antiquarianism a coherent intellectual project, all these works to some degree misunderstand the work of the antiquaries they consider. Finally, they are all afflicted by a tendency to review antiquaries' accomplishments in light of the consensus of understanding which emerged in later, more knowledgeable times, using a modified form of Whig ridicule to mask a historical understanding of antiquaries' sense of their intellectual project, and their significance to the intellectual history of their time.
occurring features of antiquarian writings as it did on the SA. The antiquarian textual tradition is discussed as a formative influence on antiquaries' shared questions and problems, in Chapter Three.\textsuperscript{48} Chapter Four presents the prosopographical data. Chapters Five and Six consider the ways antiquaries worked together and the problems they shared, in two different areas: geology/archaeology and philology/textual study. The concluding chapter will discuss the causes of the eclipse of this venerable intellectual project, and suggest how current histories of scholarly fields might be adapted to permit a more refined analysis. In particular, I argue that scholars' emotional states and genre theory must be integrated into current field models in order to provide a complete analysis of the history of intellectual fields.

Finally, it should be noted that a certain answer to the question of the distinction between the sciences and the humanities underlies the issues of model and theory discussed here. Few field histories have treated the humanities, although they also flourished in the nineteenth century. Histories treating both the sciences and the humanities often consider their divergence and the criteria defining their differences. Such approaches have led to some bias in the models that have been articulated for the analysis of fields. While loath to be spotted by any Whig heresy, many works present a mild form of claim for the \textit{sui generis} nature of science as a way of knowing.\textsuperscript{49}

\textsuperscript{48}Chapter Three treats issues related to the development of historiography in Britain over the period 1600-1870. Any treatment of a subject as complex as historiography, and over such a span of centuries, must be incomplete. Certainly, much has been omitted, and some simplifications introduced, in order to facilitate a discussion of antiquarian work, as it related to the mainstream of British historical work. However, it should be noted that Chapter Three is not intended to be a comprehensive study, or even a survey of British historiography, but rather an investigation of the contribution to one current of historical work, which at times flowed with, but more often flowed apart from, the mainstream of British historical writing.

\textsuperscript{49}Thomas Kuhn, for example, whose theoretical work has been the basis of much historical work in the humanities, has written of his "unease" with historiography which fails to distinguish between science and art. See Kuhn, \textit{The Essential Tension: Selected Studies in Scientific Tradition and Change}, University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 1977, especially Chapter 6 "The Relations Between History and the History of Science," 127-161 and Chapter 14 "Comment on the Relations of Science and Art," 340-351. For a description of the entanglement of field
While the persistent increase of contextual features deemed significant to accounts of scientific fields has made a historiographical prolegomenon a set piece in contemporary histories of science, most urge the necessity for the historian of science to be adequately scientifically educated.50 A few voices can be heard questioning these assumptions. Geison writes: "it is often ahistorical to pretend that purely 'scientific' issues can be teased out of their 'nonscientific' context."51 This thesis takes the position that many of the components and factors which model scientific fields will also model fields within the humanities. Given that the distinction cannot be found to operate in the lives of hundreds of nineteenth-century British scholars, it is an appropriate stance.52 Using the same model for fields in both areas is also a potential corrective to twentieth-century ideas; the distinctions between sciences and humanities which twentieth-century scholars employ emerged in the scholarly community in Britain late in the decades under historians with the ideology of their specialisation, see Allen G. Debus, "The History of Chemistry and the History of Science," Ambix 18 No 3 (November 1971): 169-177 and Charles Rosenberg, "Toward an Ecology of Knowledge: On Discipline, Context, and History," eds., Alexandra Oleson and John Voss, The Organization of Knowledge in Modern America, 1860-1920, Johns Hopkins University Press: Baltimore and London, 1976: 440-455. Larry Laudan presents a defence of a modified Whig history in L. Laudan "The Rational Weight of the Scientific Past: Forging Fundamental Change in a Conservative Discipline," Michael Ruse, ed., What The Philosophy of Biology Is; 209-220.


51Geison, Michael Foster, p. xii. For an excellent example of the integration of various kinds of factors in a history of a particular science, see Martin J.S. Rudwick, The Great Devonian Controversy, especially Chapter 1 "Scientific Research under a Historical Microscope," 3-16.

52This thesis does not engage with epistemological questions such as whether science and literature are distinct ways of knowing. However, it should be noted that the discussion in Chapter Seven, of genre traits as forming antiquaries' written work, might readily be applied to this thorny problem. Transforming this philosophical question into a question of literary conventions would allow historians to reformulate the boundary as a problem of texts, and of individuals' competence in recognising the features used to construct different kinds of texts. This would make the boundary between the sciences and the humanities more easy to investigate, at least initially.
consideration, and nineteenth-century scholars held various views about the nature and relations of these two parts of knowledge. This study presents an articulate description of the ways in which the two domains were integrated in the lives and work of a large group of scholars, on the eve of the era in which they came to be seen as fundamentally distinct scholarly precincts, requiring an education and an intellectual stance which excluded the possibility of any professional crossing of the boundary. The work presented here indicates that social and ideological factors account for a field’s location within the changing map of human knowledge, and, ultimately, for its success, or failure.
CHAPTER TWO

This chapter treats the institution: the first of the three components of the model articulated in the Introduction. The Society of Antiquaries of London is the oldest British learned society. Begun under Elizabeth I, it did not receive its royal charter until 1751. It flourished in the nineteenth century, and moved with the Linnaean and Geological Societies to Burlington House, London in 1857, where it still holds monthly lectures, supports archaeological projects and publishes. This chapter presents a history of the Society until the year 1870, in four epochs. First, the informal institution of the early centuries is considered up to the time of the Charter. Since the main features and problems of the early nineteenth-century institution began to appear late in the eighteenth century, these are dealt with systematically in the second section: the Council, the library and collections, financial health, projects, and relationship with other institutions. Third, the reforms of the 1840s and 1850s are discussed. Fourth, the changes these reforms effected in the Society's efficiency, policies, projects, and public role are considered. These four sections enable a concluding analysis of the institutional dimension of the SA.

Scholars have argued that the impetus for the spate of sixteenth-century English antiquarian works arose from the slighting of the monasteries and cathedrals, which created numerous historical monuments to the British past.¹ All sought to "restore antiquitie to Britaine,

and Britaine to his antiquitie.”² Some remained influential into the nineteenth century.³ In particular, the Britannia, a scholarly history of Celtic, Roman, Saxon, Norman and late Medieval Britain, and its author William Camden, brought together scholarly men interested in all aspects of early British history and culture.⁴ Sometime between 1572 and 1585:

divers Gentlemen in London, studious of Antiquities, fram’d themselves into a College or Society of Antiquaries, appointing to meet every Friday weekly...[T]wo Questions were propounded at every Meeting to be handled at the next that followed...That which seem’d most material, was by one of the Company (chosen for the purpose) to be enter’d in a Book; that so it might remain unto Posterity. The Society increased daily; many Persons of great Worth, as well noble as other learned, joined themselves unto it.⁵

In 1603 this group petitioned Elizabeth I for the incorporation of a library and society to support English historical scholarship and to recognise the "Collegium Antiquariorum" formally.⁶ The petition failed, but the antiquaries continued to meet. In 1614 they were the object of royal disapproval: James I, intent on establishing his own line, censured their histories of Plantagenets


⁴In particular, John Leland’s 1546 New Year’s Gift to King Henry the VIII and 1550 itinerary provided histories of the abbeys; William Lambarde’s 1570 Perambulation of Kent combined topography with Anglo-Saxon remains; and William Camden’s Britannia, treated numismatics, manuscript collections, and Anglo-Saxon language and literature. The work of John Spelman, James Lee, John Doderidge, Matthew Parker and others was also very influential. See T.D. Kendrick, British Antiquity, Methuen: London, 1950.

⁵That antiquaries were aware of themselves as a research group is shown by Thomas Tanner’s 1695 Notitia Monastica, which subsumed history as a subfield of antiquarian study, and Dr. Thomas Smith’s introduction to the Catalogue of the Cotton Manuscripts, which gave the first history of the SA.


⁷Camden had good reason to think she might agree to this. He had the reputation of the most learned Latinist in Britain, was a close friend of the younger Lord Burghley, had been her appointee to the College of Arms, had dedicated the Britannia to her, and had published works on the monuments at Westminster and on medieval chronicles, which were well-received in Britain and on the continent, just months before the petition. Elizabeth had also been requesting, through her courtiers, that Camden write a history of her reign. See “Vita” in Richard Chiswell, ed., Epistolae de Guilielmo Camdeni, Richard Chiswelli: London, 1691.
and Tudors. The SA vanished, though seventeenth-century accounts suggest its members held clandestine meetings.\(^7\)

The foundation of the Académie des inscriptions et belles lettres in France in 1663, to study inscriptions, medals and devices for the King’s use, archaeology and antiquities, brought calls for a like institution in England. Twelve attempts were made to gain a charter for a Royal Academy with a similar mandate. The proposed charter was modelled on the SA: its three objects were the translation and publication of historical books, production of a comprehensive history of England, and a register of public facts. None of the attempts was successful. Lacking institutional support, the social networks which are evident through the nineteenth century began to form. For example, Augustine Vincent, who was Windsor Herald in the College of Arms, befriended John Weever, and gave him access to the documents stored in the Herald’s office. Weever, working with Spelman, John Selden and Robert Cotton, acquired comprehensive information, which he used in his county and diocesan histories.\(^8\) Antiquaries realised the strength that lay in their informal collective; the only way to achieve a comprehensive set of county surveys was by "joining our pennes and conferring our labours."\(^9\) In 1638 Sir Edward Dering, William Dugdale, Sir Christopher Hatton and Sir Thomas Shirley produced a sixteen-part accord aimed at collaborative work. They agreed to spend time and resources in collecting, studying and writing, to share notes on antiquarian topics, to share and catalogue their collections towards a central list, to circulate all these among fellows, and to divide the work according to

---

\(^7\)Spelman mentions an attempt at reviving open meetings in 1614 in his *Discourse on the Law Terms*. See Evans, *A History*, pp. 14ff for manuscript sources.

\(^8\)See Evans, *A History*, pp. 30ff, for a sketch of the main marriages, joint projects, and other connections between leading antiquaries of the seventeenth century. See Kendrick, *British Antiquity*, pp. 142ff on "the Camden method" of note-taking and note-sharing.

their own interests. Scholarly results of this agreement included Dugdale’s *Monasticon*, a work which remained influential into the nineteenth century; Dugdale had used the notebooks of antiquary Roger Dodsworth, which covered Exchequer and Tower records. Antiquaries’ first institutional constructs, then, were informal and emphasised cooperative labour.

Because of their lack of formal institutional support, many antiquaries had to collect printed books and manuscripts in order to be able to work on them. As owners of libraries of such historical material, they faced political risks. Early antiquaries were accused of recusancy.

The library of Robert Cotton, student and friend of Camden, was sequestered on suspicion of promoting treasonous writings. Robert Harley was removed from office under Queen Anne on charges of treason, and consequently the work of his librarian, renowned antiquary Humphrey Wanley, came to an end. Though Harley was acquitted, many of his antiquarian colleagues appreciated the implications for their own collections. Therefore early antiquaries were not sanguine about gaining official support for their work, which reinforced their disposition towards informal institutional arrangements and cooperative endeavour.

In the seventeenth century, antiquarian topics had often been pursued by members of the Royal Society, and the membership and investigations of the two societies were not clearly delimited. Under Isaac Newton, early in the eighteenth century, antiquities were excluded from RS discussions, which action led to renewed calls for a library and foundation to support

---

10 A complete text of this agreement can be found in Evans, *A History*, pp. 22-23.

11 The accusation was not unfounded: John Leland, John Dee and William Lambarde were suspected, antiquaries can be found in the recusant rolls, and Camden is known to have corresponded freely with them. The Inns of Court were home both to a large number of recusants and a large number of antiquaries. See Kendrick, *British Antiquity*, pp. 37ff and William Raleigh Trimble, *The Catholic Laity in Elizabethan England 1558-1603*, Belknap Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts. 1964.

antiquarian research. Humphrey Wanley wrote numerous draft charters for these. Concerned for the fate of the Cottonian collection, then languishing in ruinous, damp and crowded housing, Wanley proposed a systematised collection and publication of manuscripts and of secondary materials. None of his efforts succeeded.

In 1707, Wanley and other antiquaries began meeting at a succession of London taverns. Despite the fact that refreshments were substantial, continuous minutes date from this phase of the SA, and show an articulate structure for membership, fees, and publication of books by subscription. Under Wanley, the SA declared its purpose to be the study of antiquities such as would illustrate the history of Britain before James I. In 1717 the SA drew up its constitution, formalising membership, publications, fees, election procedures and executive positions. Discussion and response were actively required: any fellow who could add anything to a particular paper, or had reason to doubt a particular claim, was required to make this known to the others.

---

13 See Evans, A History, pp. 33-44.

14 Cotton had died in 1631, having tried unsuccessfully to have his library returned to him, and to give the collection to the nation as the basis of a historical library. His son Thomas had petitioned successfully for its return. Thomas' son John died in 1702, two years after the nation grudgingly accepted the gift, and enacted the first of a series of acts establishing a national library, but providing very little for its keep. See Edward Miller, That Noble Cabinet: A History of the British Museum, Ohio University Press: Athens, Ohio 1974, pp. 19-41. See also Seymour De Ricci, English Collectors of Books and Manuscripts (1530-1930) and Their Marks of Ownership, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1930, especially Chapter IV, p. 33ff. On Wanley's own account of his collecting and preserving work see C.E. Wright and Ruth C. Wright, eds., The Diary of Humphrey Wanley, The Bibliographical Society: London, 1966, 2 volumes.

15 Meetings were held in rented rooms above a series of taverns—the Bull's Head, the Bear, the Young Devils, the Fountain, and the Mitre. SA documents after the Charter use these to refer to important study groups of this period, such as the Fountain Group, after the important work done at that tavern. More generally, the Society at this time is referred to as the Tavern Society. See Evans (1956) pp. 61-76.

16 The eleven Articles describe the duties and goals of the SA and its collections. The SA was headed by a President who chaired meetings, directed the SA's business, and nominated a Vice-President to assist him. Secretaries kept minutes, registered members, recorded gifts to the collections, read papers and kept accounts of them. The Director superintended the collections and library, and oversaw voting procedures. The Treasurer handled dues and expenditures on publications. See Evans, A History, pp. 33-99.
The constitution provided the first official statement of the objectives of the society. Describing their work as "good" and "useful," they noted that little was known, but much could be retrieved, of the past:

[W]hereas our own Country abounds with valuable Relicks of former Ages...[these] are at present in the Custody of private Gentlemen, or lying in Obscurity, and more are daily discovered by chance or the diligence of such as tread in the commendable footsteps of those who revived the Spirit of this kind of learning among us.17

The Constitution stated the need for "preserving the Venerable Remains of our Ancestors," so that "the knowledge of them may become more Universal, be preserved and transmitted to futurity." These objectives required antiquaries "to collect, print [descriptions and accounts of], and keep an exact Register under proper heads" of the different kinds of remains which defined the many antiquarian fields. Antiquarian work was intended to organise antiquarian knowledge about them towards "the History of BRITTISH ANTIQUITYS." They were confident about their society and its aims. The summary prefixed to SA publications from 1717 noted: "there are so many excellent scholars in England, and...when they are joined in any work, nothing hath proved too difficult for them." From its earliest formal stage, then, the SA's sense of urgency in its pursuit of the disappearing remains of early Britain, combined with its fragile political status, formed the ways in which antiquaries approached their scholarly goals. Preferring to collect and describe remains as a method of working towards a definitive history, antiquaries articulated no method of courting favourable public relations.18

From the time of the Tavern Society, the antiquarian institution developed rapidly. It faced

---

17Evans, A History, p. 58. The complete text is reproduced in Evans, A History, p. 58-60.

18By comparison, the RS had been acting as intermediaries between the Astronomer Royal and the Ordnance Board since 1710. it had established the Copley medal in 1736 to the author of an important scientific contribution, its Philosophical Transactions were influential on the continent as well as in England, and it could attract fashionable scientific men for their Presidents. In these ways, the RS had a much more prestigious national profile than did the RS.
its first period of reform in 1730, addressing low attendance, the dullness of meetings, the loss of direction due to the death of eminent members, definition of the positions of Director and Treasurer, non-payment of fees, and the lack of public respect for antiquarian research. To improve their society they began abstracting books for members’ use, kept an inventory of donations, restricted borrowing of library books, indexed their statutes and laws, and, to increase the dignity of the society, began holding an annual feast and admitting foreign Honourary Fellows. Membership was limited to 100 in 1738, and the SA received many more requests than it could accommodate by mid-century.

While payment of fees was a recurrent problem, the SA was wealthy in scholarly capital. The Constitution had formally mandated the SA to collect books and antiquities, to establish a national compilation all antiquaries could use. The collections grew, as remains of both kinds were regularly donated. In 1721 it purchased portfolios for papers and manuscripts, in 1736 a coin cabinet. As the collection grew to include armour, Roman urns, charters, broadsheets and proclamations, larger and more secure premises were needed, and the SA moved premises several times. (One move was made because members felt a location in the Temple area was remote.) The collections increased the SA’s need for financial and institutional stability. In the 1740s the SA received an endowment of a collection worth £4,000, and £7,000 towards building a library, as well as important collections of paintings. Antiquaries doubted that the expense of pursuing a charter would prove worthwhile, but feared suggestions of collapsing the SA into the RS. Pursuing a Charter in the hope of retaining financial independence and gaining social recognition, their pessimism was increased when a series of noble members, through whom the Society might have presented a petition for a charter, died. In March, 1751, the Prince of Wales, to whom they intended to present their petition, died. Martin Folkes, the President who had carried the work for the Charter forward, suffered a stroke. However, on November 22, 1751, the SA received its
Royal Charter.

Pursuit of the Charter had depleted the Society’s accounts to £8. But incorporation and investment of fees brought stability; in 1752 the SA acquired a house in Chancery Lane, tables and chairs for fellows’ use, shelves and cabinets for its collections, and a fire insurance policy with The Sun and Life. Lists of Fellows and Council members were printed yearly. Presidential addresses were given yearly on the Anniversary of the Charter from 1755.19 Two secretaries were hired to take minutes and keep the collections in order; the first, 1754 catalogue already needed enlarging. The greater part of the fees went to funding SA publications. Since SA sets of engravings were popular beyond the membership, from 1756 a bookseller was commissioned to handle sales to the public, which remained a source of profit well into the nineteenth century. While it was still hard to collect dues, investments and revenues increased considerably during the second half of the eighteenth century. In 1763, regulations were first tightened to deal with arrears.

The Society was not without problems; the thieving of books and manuscripts by Fellows from its library was remarked upon in the London Post.20 Henry Rawlinson, inflamed against Secretary Alexander Gordon, transferred his bequest from the SA to found the Chair of Anglo-Saxon at Oxford when Gordon was not removed from Council. The catalytic presence of archaeologist William Stukeley was eclipsed for several years when the Council, motivated by complaints from Fellows, compelled him to share Society Minute books, a rich resource full of synopses of Fellows’ papers and comments. A number of members who had played important

---

19The date of the Charter was November 2, 1751. The full text is given in Evans, A History, Appendix A, pp. 442-4. The Anniversary Dinner commemorated this event, but it was held on April 23, St. George’s Day, on which the Presidential Address was given, accounts presented, and elections for office were held. St. George’s Day constitutes the year’s end for Society documents: thus Council documents refer to years as “1834/35” and so on.

20London Post, December 14, 1754.
parts in the Society from its Tavern phase died, including Wanley.

Nevertheless, from mid to late eighteenth century the SA enjoyed a period of (moderate) popularity. A new attitude to the history of the English church made it fashionable to show the faithfulness of the Saxon to the true doctrine of the original church, from which antiquarian research profited. The SA began exhibiting collections. The French Revolution assisted the rediscovery of the marvels of British landscape, architecture and history. The excellence of the engravings in the Archaeologia and other SA publications, combined with increasing numbers of articles on the history of British architecture, attracted many new members. By 1784 the SA had 376 members; by 1807 membership had risen to 849, with many guests attending meetings. But aside from the exhibitions, SA activities were little affected by its new public status: publications, meetings and work continued unaltered.

The main features and problems of the nineteenth-century SA can be seen in the late eighteenth century. These include: Council functions, the library and collections, financial health, publications, the funding of restorations and excavations, and the SA’s relationship with other institutions. Their character in the late eighteenth century motivated their development, or stasis, in the early decades of the nineteenth century, prior to the reforms of the 1840s.

The functioning of Council received increasing scrutiny from the time of the Charter. Some problems were raised by fellows; others arose internally between Council members. In 1786 the election statutes were first reformed in response to Fellows’ perception that Council controlled access to its positions. The reforms required Council to recommend eleven of its members for yearly re-election, and name ten new candidates; any Fellow could cross any of

---

21 Addison, for example, noted that many preferred "the polite Studies of antiquity" to the classics. Spectator No. 447. See also David Charles Douglas English Scholars, 1660-1730, Eyre & Spottiswoode: London, 1951, pp. 19.

these out and nominate his own choice. This remained the practice throughout the nineteenth century. In 1789 the first blackballing of a candidate for scholarly weakness occurred; Council began giving notice of the candidates who would be standing for membership at the next meeting; and the number of signatories required to support candidature was increased. The problem of dull meetings had arisen again in the 1770s: the Secretary's minutes were read at each meeting, recapitulating the previous week's proceedings thoroughly. The Secretary also read fellows' papers, which tended to decrease the liveliness and clarity of meetings. Further, while fellows provided the Secretary with sufficient papers, the dispersion of these throughout the year was poorly managed: several papers were read at each meeting early in the year, leaving little for later meetings, which were filled up with less interesting offerings. Little was done about these problems at this time.

Council members were the source of both problems and solutions in the late eighteenth century. The expertise of Richard Gough, Director 1771-1798, in medieval archaeology and architecture, epigraphy and dating of illuminated manuscripts provided the SA with abundant material and prestige during his twenty-six years in office. The Archaeologia included papers read before the SA which were considered exceptional in their areas, solving a problem which had been raised under earlier administrations, of the need for reporting on work in progress.23 But his 1776 foundation of the Research Fund, and his suggestion to bring Fellows' material together to form a working historical memoir, progressed little. Jeremiah Milles, President 1768-84, was distinguished for his publications, collections, and encouragement of other antiquaries, though the Society was also embarrassed by his support for the counterfeit medieval poems of

---

23 This suggestion was made as early as 1755, as this Memorial to the Council, SA Correspondence, January 10, 1755 shows. But little was done about it until Richard Gough's Directorship. See Evans, A History, p. 139.
Thomas Chatterton. Edward King, PSA 1784, appointed a draughtsman to attend meetings for the immediate production of engravings of objects to accompany papers published in the *Archaeologia*, was moderately successful in getting arrears paid, and oversaw the SA’s move to apartments in Somerset House in 1780. Thus the SA’s leadership was effective in identifying, and in many cases meeting, its changing needs.

But Council business was not always smooth. Jeremiah Miles criticised Secretary William Norris as difficult to work with. Norris, perhaps protesting Miles’ increasing absenteeism in the last years of his tenure, sent no accounts to Miles when he was out of town. Richard Gough found fault with Norris’ insertion of critical remarks about Miles into the minute books, which Gough crossed out. After Gough’s resignation, new Director Samuel Lysons expressed impatience with absentee President Lord Townshend. The Presidency was so hotly contested in 1811, by Scotsman William Hamilton and Catholic Sir Henry Englefield, that Council asked Lord Aberdeen to stand for President. This avoided conflict, but Aberdeen was an absentee President for three decades. William Hamilton, now Director, was openly critical of Aberdeen, and absenteeism among SA officers became the subject of comment in the periodical press. Aberdeen’s absenteeism was compensated for by an industrious set of Council members. Samuel Lysons, Matthew Raper, Hudson Gurney, William Hamilton, Henry Hallam and Henry Ellis were all energetic in furthering the Society’s ends despite quarrels between Hamilton and Resident Secretary Nicholas Carlisle, and between Ellis and Samuel Rush Meyrick, not a Council member but an active Fellow.

---

24 The position of President will hereafter be referred to as PSA, in the same manner as the position President of the Royal Society is usually abbreviated as PRS.

25 See *The Gentleman’s Magazine* 73(1803): 124. Hereafter, *The Gentleman’s Magazine* will be abbreviated to *GM*. To compensate for Aberdeen’s feeble leadership, from 1813 Council required the Secretary to attend all meetings, and began paying £100 per year for this position.
Council had also to cope with disputes within, and problems raised by, the membership: Milles had to arbitrate on the priority of competing scholarly claims, and on whether the Society owned the papers it printed. Horace Walpole, whose work was critically reviewed by the SA, carried on an extended and vitriolic denunciation of the SA in some very public letters. During the restoration of Salisbury Cathedral, the architect James Wyatt stood for election and was blackballed by Gough’s supporters who were critical of the restoration, who were in turn criticised by Lysons, Wyatt’s defender. Wyatt was elected on his second attempt, at which Gough resigned as Director and from the SA. This controversy led to correspondence in the press. The controversy divided the membership and Council, but it also led to greater awareness of candidates’ commitments and scholarly work; blackballing of insubstantial candidates increased, and elected positions were usually contested from this time.

In the late 1820s, the irascible Nicholas Harris Nicolas accused Council of influencing elections so as to gain election of their friends, and embarked on a course of printed invective against the Council for exclusivity, financial impropriety, disregard of talent, and frivolous publications. His accusations were proven wrong by the publications of SA accounts, included yearly thereafter in Archaeologia. However, he spoke for a broad discontent with Council functions, which remained until the reforms of the 1840s. Intermittent complaints still were heard that meetings were dull. Attendance dwindled. In 1829 Fellows petitioned Council to change

---

26 See a letter from Richard Gough in GM 67(1796), p. 811; and also GM 71(1801), p. 1000.

27 See Retrospective Review, Second Series, I, p. 156. In fact Nicolas had been nominated for Council but at meetings had been so argumentative that his name had not been placed on the election list. Nicolas resigned in 1828, but the discussion was continued in Westminster Review (October, 1829), the GM 99(1829), and in Nicolas’ 1830 Observations on the State of Historical Literature, and on the Society of Antiquaries, and other Institutions for its advancement in England: With remarks on Record Offices, and on the Proceedings for the Record Commission, W. Pickering: London, 1830.

28 See Nicolas’ remarks in the Retrospective Review for 1827.
the meeting hour and night so it did not conflict with the RS, and asked that the SA hold
conversaziones to enliven the exchange of opinions. Council kept the traditional day and hour,
but began serving tea and coffee after meetings. But this improvement did not compensate for
the unevenness of papers and materials for discussion. By the first decades of the nineteenth
century, then, Council functions were imperfectly suited to the social needs and the scholarly
efficiency of the institution.

However, the SA did have its successes in this period; in particular, the library and
collections. The care the SA took to ensure completeness of and access to the library and
collections shows that it viewed them as their primary scholarly resource. Both grew constantly,
and were the object of perpetual changes in arrangement and regulation. In 1752 opening hours
had first been increased and loans regulated (manuscripts were loaned out only after the deposit
of a bond; by 1800 that bond was £100). In 1770 the SA began buying books and manuscripts,
and insured its collections for £1500, considerably less than their actual worth. In 1780, with
the move to Somerset House, books were re-organised, catalogued and shelf-marked; inventory
was checked against the catalogue and found to be complete with few exceptions; and a

29These were social gatherings, held periodically, which provided exceptional food and drink, got a higher
attendance than regular meetings, and at which the level of discussion was expected to be the highest. The RS held
them, and the extended, city-wide celebrations of learning put on by the BAAS were modelled on them.

30Problems included Nicholas Carlisle’s indifferent administration of the papers he received, and Henry Ellis’
tendency to read documents he had come across at the British Museum, or even papers heard at other scholarly
societies, when he had insufficient materials. Ellis’ actions were undertaken out of an active desire for SA meetings
not to be cancelled, but they tended to produce dull meetings.

31Among the SA’s special collections were coins, which many Fellows and historians used for dating purposes.
In 1721 a committee had been set up to study numismatics, to catalogue their collections accurately, and to publish
on British chronology. In 1772 Swiss Honourary Fellow Rudolph de Valtravers donated a set of medals. In 1776
the Directors of the East India Company donated a Bengali coin collection. See Evans, A History, pp. 162ff.

32Evans argues that the library functioned as a research centre from the time of the move to Somerset House. See Evans, A History, p. 178.

33In 1784 some thefts were detected by GM editor John Gough Nichols, which the Society had to buy back from
Library Committee was authorised to select and buy books. In 1787 an alphabetic catalogue of authors was undertaken. From 1799, gifts to the SA were listed in the *Archaeologia*. In 1795 borrowing regulations were tightened to cover all parts of the collection, and borrowing now required the written permission of Council as well as a bond. In 1815 Council decided no books could be loaned out of the library.

This commitment to providing members with a good collection in which to do their research cost the SA considerable funds and efforts. By 1800 the library was overflowing; basement rooms and the kitchen were renovated into library space. The Secretary had until this time acted also as Librarian. In 1804 this was made a separate position, and William Martin was hired as Librarian at £60 per year, to attend the collection, bring books to Fellows, shelve and catalogue. By 1829 the library was again overfull for convenient study; the SA’s stocks of its own publications were moved to a warehouse to make room.

Eventually the sheer size of its collections forced the SA to set priorities. In 1814 it first gave some of its collections to the British Museum. By this time the SA, viewing itself primarily as a learned society, needed a library more than a museum. The British Museum had had a substantial acquisitions budget from 1800; the SA could not hope to compete with it.34 There was considerable overlap between SA officers and Museum employees (see Appendix 2.A.1), and SA members and Museum patrons. The SA collections were transferred in a spirit of pursuing the scholarly good combined with a pragmatic view that the Museum would be better able to provide for those scholarly needs. Council reaffirmed that its budget must be directed towards

research and publications.\textsuperscript{35}

In the matter of its collections, then, the SA remained active and effective throughout the late eighteenth century and early nineteenth centuries. Council successfully addressed recurring problems, and determined the direction in which the relationship between the SA’s resources and its many fields of interest would develop. A related issue to both Council functions and to the cost of supporting the collections was the SA’s financial health. While the SA was solvent by late eighteenth century, its stability in the early nineteenth was adversely affected by poor Treasurers, a lack of oversight of finances by Council, and a lavish publications program. Investments continued to pay a stable income, but collection of dues remained a problem. An attempt had been made to deal with fellows in arrears after the move to Somerset House in 1780: a day-book and ledger were purchased and an Accounts Committee appointed to pursue arrears. Fellows were required to deposit a bond upon entrance, the bond of anyone more than two years in arrears being executed. But Treasurers let these rules lapse, and fees were raised in 1802 and 1807 to cover losses.\textsuperscript{36} William Bray, Treasurer 1804-23, solved the problem of arrears and rising publication costs by the sale of investments, concealing and postponing the dilemma. His successor Thomas Amyot took no action on arrears at all, and kept his personal accounts with those of the SA.

Council did not audit the Treasurer’s work, and as sales and investments more or less balanced expenses, no Council member of the first four decades of the nineteenth century seems

\textsuperscript{35}Its possessions still increased: Thomas Kerrich, Principal Librarian of the University Library of Cambridge, bequeathed twenty-six important historical paintings in 1828, causing the SA to undertake production of a comprehensive catalogue of the SA’s paintings, a task which took until 1831. A letter to addressed Director J.H. Markland in the \textit{GM} 98(1828), p. 61 urged the SA to found a museum of antiquities despite competition from the Department of British Antiquities opened in the British Museum, but Council had already decided the cost was prohibitive.

\textsuperscript{36}There was almost £1000 owing in 1807 and over £1300 by 1810. This was offset by the sale of £1500 worth of investments to make up the shortfall, which had been replaced by 1812. See Evans, \textit{A History}, p. 215.
to have thought regular financial reports necessary. Neither the constitution nor the job descriptions of officers provided any directed financial policy, so a laissez-faire practice operated by default. Publications, acquisitions and the Anniversary dinner constituted the SA’s major expenses; fees and interest from its investments constituted its income. New publication ventures were usually voted on, usually received an easy majority, and were usually partly funded by subscription. Thus Council was unaware of the dimension of the problem throughout the first decades of the nineteenth century, and nothing was done to clarify the SA’s financial situation until the period of reform in the 1840s. 37

Contentious issues among members were often entwined with funding issues, especially in matters of preservation and restoration. This problem had been raised in the time of the Tavern Society, and had proved Gough’s downfall in the late eighteenth century. From the early nineteenth century, members became critical of the fashion for restoring ancient buildings, which often involved removing their older portions, thereby destroying the physical evidence of history. While the SA was interested in preservation, its financial situation permitted it only to record things before they were destroyed. 38 Nothing was done in the early decades of the century either to address fund-raising or to realise any kind of policy regarding the problem, despite increasing complaint from members. 39 In part, the cause of this failure was that the SA lacked the resources to fund historically meticulous restoration or preservation projects. The equitable

37 Statements of the SA’s accounts were appended to Archaeologia from 1832, but these were later discovered to be in error. See Evans, A History, p. 244.

38 For example, in 1721 the Mitre Tavern group had recorded the inscriptions of a London church, St. Martin’s, which was then being pulled down. In the 1790s Richard Gough objected to the renovation of Salisbury Cathedral, but there were antiquaries on the other side as well: Lord Bagot, patron of the offending architect James Wyatt, argued that very little of historical import would be lost. See GM 59(1789), p. 873-75. Gough proposed a committee for the preservation of monuments, but the cost was prohibitive.

39 For example, in the 1820s John Rokewode Gage fought the destruction of the screen at York and the Lady Chapel at Southwark, and the rebuilding of the northwest tower at Canterbury. See Evans, A History, p. 226.
allocation of funds among members' many fields had been satisfactorily addressed by the SA's publications, which allowed the many antiquarian fields to be equally promoted within the community. This practice was well established by the time of the Charter. Moreover, publications were the major material benefit of joining the SA, and fellows saw a direct relationship between their yearly membership fees and receipt of SA publications which covered areas equitably.

Besides publications, the SA had not used fees for any other enterprise than the purchase and upkeep of premises, and the employment of librarians and officers. In this, they were acting conventionally: in most learned organisations, these were the standard uses of fees. In contemplating restorations, the SA could rely on no previous model for funding and carrying out such projects. No administrative machinery existed for determining which projects would receive disproportionate funding. Such a change would create friction within the membership: members not interested in the history of architecture would be sure to raise an outcry at the imbalance of financial priorities. Therefore the early nineteenth-century SA remained in the course set by the earlier Society.

The same was true for fellows wanting the SA to fund archaeological excavations. This work was indeed basic to many antiquarian fields, but the cost of such expeditions was greater than the SA could support. As the importance of field work was not yet fully appreciated, the SA policy of funding publications only could be viewed as reasonable since it continued to provide scholarly support to all fields equally. Given that the SA was at this time mainly run by

---

40The RS and the Royal Institution needed expensive equipment, but received government funding for it throughout this period. The BAAS received government funding, but also used its members' fees to purchase equipment and support experiments.

41In the 1760s and 1770s the Society of Dilettantes had financed archaeological and marble-buying expeditions to Greece. Thirty-two Italianisers were elected between 1762 and 1772, and agitated for similar expeditions. Council attempted to mediate the conflict between classicisers and the majority whose interests were in early Britain. The Gothic interest prevailed among members by early nineteenth century, but this led to demands for excavation funds for sites in Britain.
its more energetic but junior Council officers, this decision also reflects a desire to avoid a conflict the SA could not afford to solve. But naturally, many fellows were dissatisfied. This choice established the direction of settlement of this recurrent problem until the reforms of mid-century. It also created various responses among antiquaries. Some, dissatisfied with the SA’s institutional support for archaeology, formed the British Archaeological Society in 1843. But antiquaries had long been used to funding their own scholarly activities: collecting, researching, writing, publishing. In the same way, many pursued archaeological work with what resources they personally could muster.

This pre-reform resolution of the problem of funding for large projects failed to grapple with the major fault-line in the membership, between members who studied objects, and those who studied texts. Evans dates the emergence of this fault-line to the 1720s. This division among members and their scholarly priorities had grown since the time of the Charter. The Charter had provided for the institutional stability which the SA had achieved in the last decades of the eighteenth century. This very stability permitted the rapid development, early in the nineteenth century, of antiquarian fields, and thus, of this divide between fellows. The two visions of the SA defined by this fault-line were in open conflict by the 1830s. Elizabethan antiquaries had provided a rationale for preservation of the objects of antiquarian study; nineteenth-century archaeological fellows simply applied it to larger and costlier objects. But fellows working in text-based areas were in the majority, and the primacy of the definitive British

\[\text{See discussion in } \text{GM 58(1788), p. 689.}\]

\[\text{For example, Architect James Bunstone Bunning preserved the Roman building he discovered while excavating for the London Coal Exchange. John Newman, Surveyor to the Kent, Surrey and Southwark Sewer Commissions, collected Roman antiquities turned up in his own work. He attended other work sites, and Thames dredging crews, sorting through the refuse and rubble, collecting Roman antiquities. These now form an important part of the British Museum’s Roman Britain collection.}\]

\[\text{See Evans, } \text{A History, p. 57.}\]
history as the goal of antiquarian studies tended to diminish the overall importance of archaeology in relation to the many other antiquarian fields. So publications retained funding priority until after reform.

The Society's publications make it possible to see what intellectual projects antiquaries did support. In 1755 the SA had begun an edition of the complete Domesday Book, which had not been previously published.\textsuperscript{45} Publication did not take place until 1783, because of the work required to retrieve scattered documents and reconstitute the text from fragmentary remains. The engraving series \textit{Vetusta Monumenta}, begun in 1745, concentrated on Roman British remains, medieval art, archaeology and architecture.\textsuperscript{46} After the move to Somerset House in 1780, this series was accompanied by articles. The 1785 series of plates of, and articles on, Westminster were financially successful and popular. By comparison the 1791 publication of Major-General Roy’s work on Roman military camps was a financial loss, but was viewed as a significant scholarly achievement. The 1792 Cathedral Series, comprised of engravings of cathedrals and religious houses, was also financially successful and popular.\textsuperscript{47} From late eighteenth century, then, SA publications became a major source of its public prestige, and many men joined in order to receive them.

The \textit{Archaeologia} comprised the best papers read to the Society. Early volumes had been

\textsuperscript{45}In consultation with the House of Lords a facsimile edition was favoured over typescript: Lords voted the SA £10,000 for the costs of the copperplate engraving. By early in the nineteenth century, the SA was in fairly constant communication with legislative committees dealing with preserving and ordering the country’s collections. In this case, the SA having drawn attention to the ruinous state of many official collections of documents, Lords also set up a Select Committee to inquire into lost its own records and rolls.

\textsuperscript{46}In the late 1770s Council experimented with a new paper size in order to be able to display engravings of the "Field of the Cloth of Gold" series. Their decisions were the subject of a series of stormy but well-attended meetings over the SA's engraving policy. The new paper size was called "Antiquarian" in the book trades. See Evans, \textit{A History}, p. 161.

\textsuperscript{47}Some viewed it as extravagant: see \textit{GM} 71(1802), p. 1180.
sporadic, but settled into a pattern of biennial publication by 1800. In the early nineteenth century, *Archaeologia* attempted to represent and balance the various antiquarian fields, including articles on excavations in Pompeii and Egypt, "druidical" and Celtic remains in Britain and Denmark, Gothic and Romanesque architecture, Roman and medieval Britain, and much publication of the texts of previously unpublished early British manuscripts. Volumes were well indexed, lavishly illustrated, and contained a brief section of summaries of other significant papers and communications. In 1826 the SA began a series of Anglo-Saxon texts. In 1831, a subcommittee was established to consider publishing a more comprehensive series of Anglo-Saxon and Early English literature. Its proposals received a favourable vote, resulting in several more volumes. These were a scholarly success, but were undersubscribed and expensive. The series of historical rolls was both a financial and a popular success. Council used the SA’s popular publications to underwrite its more scholarly projects. In its publications, then, as with its collections, the SA was active and effective throughout the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Council successfully determined the direction in which the relationship between the SA’s resources and its many fields would develop. In this, it realised financial success, popularity outside the membership, and works of scholarly merit, though Council’s lack of awareness of Treasurers’ financial practices endangered its publishing success in the 1840s.

In its relations with other societies, and its participation in nineteenth-century intellectual work and life, the early nineteenth-century SA was active but conservative. The Society had been electing foreign Fellows since 1730. The French Revolution brought many French scholars to

---

*These included Caedmon’s *Metrical Paraphrase* edited by Benjamin Thorpe in 1832; Layamon’s *Brut* (3 volumes) translated and edited by Sir Frederic Madden in 1847; the *Codex Oxoniensis* edited by Benjamin Thorpe in 1842; the *Exeter Book* and others. Scholarly debates about these and other works, and the SA’s role in publishing Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, will be discussed in Chapter Six.

*This was partly due to a sudden rise in printer’s costs. Between 1831 and 1844, £1135 was spent on it, where sales generated £712 only.*
England; the SA elected oriental linguist Sylvestre de Sacy in 1815 and medievalist Alexandre Lenoir in 1816. In 1819 a limit of fifty was set on Honourary Fellows. The wars brought the Rosetta Stone to the SA in 1801. SA fellow Henry Rawlinson obtained an agreement that the Stone could be studied by the SA before being handed over to the British Museum in 1803. Peace allowed the formation of many European learned societies. Following the foundation of the Royal Society of Northern Antiquaries in 1825, Council established a committee to consider which foreign societies to exchange publications with. Their work was among the many causes of the library’s expansion.

In the early decades of the nineteenth century, numerous scholarly institutions emerged which both aided antiquarian work and competed with it. The British Museum was growing in importance to all fields of study in the humanities, and its collections of antiquities also grew substantially during this period. The donation of the King’s Library in 1823 had swelled the National Library. The gift of George III’s Egyptian antiquities and the purchase of the collections of antiquaries Charles Towneley and William Hamilton led to the establishment of the Department of Antiquities in 1807. In 1826 that Department was subdivided into three: Oriental Antiquities, Greek and Roman Antiquities, and Coins and Medals. In 1837 the Department of Prints and Drawings was created. Antiquaries staffed the various departments of the British Library and Museum, and gifts from their collections motivated the formation of these departments. They were the unrecognised force driving the development of the Museum and Library in the first half of the nineteenth century. By the 1840s the Museum was financing

See Edward Edwards, *Lives of the Founders of the British Museum, with Notices of its Chief Augmentors and Other Benefactors, 1570-1870*, Truebner & Co: London, 1870, 2 volumes, especially pp. 362-412. The SA had the three texts of the stone copied for engraving, and read papers about two of the three faces, but were unable to decipher the hieroglyphic face.

See Appendix 2.A.1 for a list of fellows working in the British Museum and Library. See Appendix 2.B.5 for a list of eminent antiquarian collectors and the destinations of their collections.
marble-buying and archaeological expeditions. The SA could not compete financially with the resources of the British Museum.

Many learned societies which treated antiquarian topics were founded in the early nineteenth century. Most were founded by antiquaries, who also filled their executive positions. In 1838 the Numismatic Society was founded by John Yonge Akerman. In 1845 the British Archaeological Association was founded by antiquaries Thomas Wright, Charles Roach Smith, Thomas Joseph Pettigrew, William Bromet and Albert Way. In 1846, Albert Way and Richard Westmacott broke from the BAA and established the Royal Archaeological Institute. Publishing societies, provincial architectural and archaeological societies, and other groups which addressed antiquarian topics were also formed. While the SA prospered in these areas, in others, it missed opportunities. In 1819 the President of the Société royale des antiquaires de France (before 1804 the Académie celtique) proposed undertaking joint studies; the SA refused. It was only after the establishment of the École des chartes in 1821, the Société française d'archéologie in 1831 and the Commission des monuments in 1837 that the SA, in 1838, began corresponding with cognate French institutions.

In the first three decades of the nineteenth century, then, the SA was stable, but had troubles brewing. Finances were solid and income was steady. But inept Treasurers and a lack of oversight by Council permitted arrears and the sale of investments, which began to corrode that stability. The SA suffered from an absentee President, but was supported by energetic junior officers. These clung conservatively to policies long established in the SA, in order to mediate

---

52 For the sake of brevity, the British Archaeological Association will hereafter be referred to as the BAA.

conflicts within the membership, maintain equal representation of all antiquarian fields in SA projects, and provide what they still viewed as the product of greatest use to all antiquaries: publications. But the major fault-line in the membership, between those who studied texts and those who studied objects, could only be exacerbated by rapidly changing times and expectations. Antiquaries who founded and ran the more specialised societies of the 1830s were those complaining of a lack of SA leadership and an outdated institutional culture. While their interests were specialised, they still recognised the relation of their area of work to the macro-historical project, and wanted a coordinating institution.

The institutional changes required to meet such demands were extensive. At first Council resisted, and the SA suffered a period of decline. By the early 1840s, Council was meeting only a few times a year. Attendance at meetings dropped, and members' participation increasingly took the form of complaint. By the 1840s, despite the odium of the word "reform," Council and fellows sought change. Their problems included a few indolent but importantly placed Council members, and a very imperfect fit between the SA's structure and its new circumstances. Council had no constitutional means of moderating the actions of officers, and their personal reticence about intervening weakened the efficiency of the institution and annoyed members. Both the constitution and the culture had to be changed to deal with these problems.

The SA's institutional culture was well established by the time of the Charter. Its main components can be seen in several areas of the SA's affairs in the early nineteenth century. Antiquaries' long development without a formal institutional home had created a dependence on individuals sharing resources and carrying on discussion about their specific fields among

---

54While Council had energetic members, their labours could not compensate for the inactivity of Resident Secretary Nicolas Carlisle. "[O]ne of the Society's most gifted exponents of the art of inactivity," Carlisle worked at the British Museum, and viewed the SA as a source of further income and lodgings. He did little, and what little he did he requested payment for. See Evans, A History, pp. 245ff.
themselves, a predilection for individually organised rather than institutionally mandated projects and funding, a high degree of activism among ordinary members, and a correspondingly low expectation that Council would take charge of such matters. In the early nineteenth century, these values led to a laissez-faire administration: fellows expected Council to perform what supervision was required, and Council expected members to continue with their own labours. This unexamined and uncoordinated division of labour, and the assumption of the efficacy of good faith, had until this time been sufficient to keep the SA functioning well. Council did not view itself as responsible for providing policy or direction in areas other than publications and collections. Since fellows organised their own projects in everything beyond these two institutional foci, they shared the view that it was unnecessary for Council to generate policy other than in matters of publication and collections. Thus the SA neither possessed nor produced any explicit method for overseeing its business or directing work towards new goals.

The values produced by this institutional culture may explain Council's reticence to deal with the problems facing it. The SA might be described as partaking in what some historians of nineteenth-century learned societies have called "amateurism." Morris Berman has presented one of the most nuanced analyses of the terms "amateur" and "professional." He contrasts the eighteenth-century amateur view of research as co-operative, commercially disinterested, and an avocation which fitted gentlemen for conversation but not competition, with a newly emergent "entrepreneurial attitude," which the professional classes directed towards "controlling research."55 The distaste for competition was widespread in the SA, and viewed as destructive

55See Morris Berman, Social Change and Scientific Organization: The Royal Institution, 1799-1844, Cornell University Press: Ithaca, New York, 1988; Morris Berman, "'Hegemony' and the Amateur Tradition in British Science" Journal of Social History, 8 (Winter, 1975): 30-50 and Robert K. Merton, Science, Technology and Society in Seventeenth Century England, Harper and Row: New York, 1970. However, Berman's analysis does not apply very easily to SA members. As will be seen in Chapter Four, most antiquaries were not upper, or even upper middle class. These men had upper class, or amateur values, but belonged to the entrepreneurial classes.
of its scholarly character. But other components of the SA's institutional culture are not present in Berman's amateur paradigm. First, the SA was characterised by over-courteous restraint in enquiring into financial matters, which explains its reluctance to deal with incompetent officers. For example, while the auditors' reports had been available for examination at the Anniversary dinner since the time of the Charter, they were routinely passed without being opened, read or commented upon. Second, the membership was accustomed to rewarding Council members' service, often beyond financial reason. Third, the SA resisted acknowledging its problems. The trouble with the accounts of Treasurer Carlisle, who had kept SA funds in the same account with his personal savings and seems to have embezzled some, was formally attributed to the position rather than the man. When the Library Clerk was shown to have been cheating the SA for years he was not removed, but his salary increased and a few new rules made (which he ignored). An important aspect of SA institutional culture, then, was the endowment of a good character on officers, and a reluctance to inquire into or take action on the smallest, or largest, suggestion to the contrary. These components of the SA's institutional culture were products of centuries of success in cooperative effort, which diminished the apparent need for a more activist and forensic institutional practice. They were products of a membership accustomed to getting on with their own work. Their assumption that others, including Council, got on with theirs was not generally inaccurate. Finally, they were products of a membership

[56] In 1828, for example, the King asked for the return of three pictures formerly given to the SA, offering two gold medals annually, valued at fifty guineas each in their place. A storm erupted amongst fellows. Francis Douce threatened to resign, as medals would "totally alter the very nature of the society--into one of Competition--instead of being as before, for the receiving and spreading of Antiquarian Information." Quoted in Evans, A History, pp. 246-47. Council returned the pictures and let the offer lapse.

[57] SA Council members served for long periods because relatively few fellows wanted to do this work. It became pro forma to spend a considerable sum retiring officers, even unsatisfactory ones. For example, in 1790 Secretary William Norris retired. Widely viewed as indolent, Council retired him with an annuity of £100 for life. When Carlisle retired in 1845, despite a Finance Committee report which censured his financial irresponsibility, Council gave him an annuity of £150 for life, and despite an urgent need for space, allowed him to live in the SA apartments until he died.
attuned to specialisation in their various fields, with little willingness to envision a new corporate forms of supporting antiquarian scholarship.\textsuperscript{58}

By the 1840s, these values began to fail the institution. The SA's disregard for public prestige, disinclination to fund new kinds of projects, tolerance of indifferent officers, and neglect of administrative control over finances led to major reforms in 1845-54. Reforms were introduced and carried through by a small group of industrious officers: John Yonge Akerman, Secretary 1848-53, Senior Secretary, 1853-58; Henry Ellis, Senior Secretary 1813-53, Director 1853-57; and Philip Henry Stanhope, President 1846-76. All had gained experience in the years before reform. Stanhope, a Council member and Vice-President during Aberdeen's Presidency, had practice running the SA because of Aberdeen's absenteeism. Stanhope, as the political force behind the founding of the National Portrait Gallery in 1856 and the Historical Manuscript Commission in 1869, brought the SA prestige. Though he refused to be described as reforming, reform began immediately with his election in 1845.\textsuperscript{59}

Major changes were made to the SA's finances. The Treasurer's job was abolished. Council appointed a Finance Committee to produce yearly reports, made available to fellows the week before the annual elections and read at the Anniversary. The 1846 report showed that

\textsuperscript{58}The distinction between amateur and professional could also be framed in the terms of German scholarship. In the late eighteenth century, \textit{naturphilosophie}, a reaction to the rationalising mechanism of a previous generation of scientists, postulated parallels between the realities found in nature and the forms of human thought, which gave rise to schools of inquiry across a very broad spectrum from philology to natural science. \textit{Naturphilosophie} encouraged the building of complex philosophical systems rather than empirical or experimental work. In the early nineteenth century, in reaction to \textit{naturphilosophie}, there arose another approach to scholarship, \textit{wissenschaft}, which embraced a similarly encyclopedic range of knowledge, but through careful research and criticism. See D.M. Knight, "German Science in the Romantic Period," Maurice Crosland, ed., \textit{The Emergence of Science in Europe} MacMillan: UK, 1975, pp. 161-78 and W.V. Farrar, "Science and the German University System, 1790-1850," in the same publication, pp. 179-92. Antiquaries' scholarship resembles \textit{wissenschaft} rather than \textit{naturphilosophie}. These terms could be used to frame a parallel distinction to that Berman makes between amateur and professional. But while some antiquaries were trained in Germany in universities where the \textit{wissenschaft} approach was used, their traditional orientation to careful research and criticism is best viewed as arising independently from the German tradition.

\textsuperscript{59}See Evans, \textit{A History}, pp. 253-54 on fellows' correspondence describing Stanhope as reforming, and Stanhope's efforts to distance himself from that description.
expenditures exceeded income; stock was sold for more than £5000 to settle debts. The Finance Committee jointly administered SA accounts, and required its Chair to present his own and the SA pass books at meetings. Numerous economies were practised. Defaulters were expelled. By 1849 the SA began to show a profit again.

The most volatile reform issue arose in 1846. Council proposed reducing the annual subscription from 4 to 2 guineas, and the entrance fee from 8 to 5. A drop in total membership had created concern for the institution's long-term financial stability; reducing fees would open the SA to many more potential fellows. Ellis described the reaction as "Anarchy." Many believed it would diminish the scholarly nature of the SA. Contentious fellows spent the summer circulating letters and writing to the newspapers. Some defended the proposal, but even Council members worried whether "real Antiquaries" would be overwhelmed by peers and the "plebs contribuens." Some urged "rendering the ordeal for admission more searching" so the status of the SA might parallel that of the RS, which had set limits of fifteen new fellows per year. Many rejected the fee reduction because it would involve changing the 1751 Statutes, which had until this time functioned as an authoritative boundary past which no Council had ventured.

---

60 In particular, from 1847 arrears were collected seriously, and Council refused entrance to removed fellows brought as guests. The expensive Anniversary dinner and yearly livery for the porter were discontinued. In 1851 they undertook smaller print runs, bought their own copying machine, sought competitive printing cost estimates, and reduced the number of offprints given to authors to fifty and the number of lithographs in Archaeologia. Lists and publications were no longer mailed out but had to be picked up by Fellows at meetings.

61 This was even with Council and staff salary increases, which reflected the increased workload. By 1850, the Director made £157 per year, the Editor £50 per year, the library clerk £100 per year, the library assistant £80 per year, and the porter £30 per year. See Evans, A History, pp. 260ff.


63 Thomas Joseph Pettigrew accused Council of diminishing the SA's respectability and being the real cause of the lack of funds; his two motions against the proposal were both voted down. Sir Fortunatus Dwarris, who researched the administration of French scholarly societies, suggested compromise. Charles Roach Smith, himself a local chemist, argued that antiquaries should run the SA for antiquaries only. The debate spilled into the Literary Gazette, the Athenaeum, Notes & Queries, and the GM. See Evans, A History, p. 267ff.
Fearing accusations of manipulating the processes of change, Council agreed to a joint Committee on the Statutes, whose revised Constitution was successfully voted in on December 1, 1853. The changes went further than reduced fees. Candidates now needed a four-fifths rather than a simple majority; the Senior Vice-President became a one-year post; Council met biweekly during session and monthly in the recess; job descriptions were formalised; the Finance, Library and Executive committees were made Standing Committees, each to be comprised of five fellows with clearly defined duties; and Local Secretaries were appointed to cultivate provincial membership.

The gamble was successful. Many new fellows were admitted, with little apparent decrease in the scholarly standards of the SA.64 Some rejections of candidates occurred in the years following reform, and the possible candidature of women and adolescents was rejected. Membership levels and financial stability improved.65 From 1857, the new cohesion and members’ participation were reinforced by the move to Burlington House, which prevented fellows slipping between RS and SA meetings. The late 1860s saw a slight drop in numbers, attendance and revenues, whereupon Council began inviting non-fellows whose work coincided with paper topics to meetings, advertised in the Athenaeum, and held conversaziones.

Reform was successful in stabilising the SA’s finances and revitalising the membership. It also benefited their administration of their scholarly territory. From 1846 Council directed the chair to call to order any Fellow whose remarks were off topic. In 1849 the Annual Presidential Address was revived (Aberdeen had not been present to give one in his thirty-one years in office). Like the RS address, this speech reviewed the year’s progress in various fields. From

64For a defense of this assertion, see Chapter Four.

65The cost of publications and salaries increased 1852-57 but was offset by the sale of investments, growing membership, and a legacy in 1852 for £65,000, though the will went to Chancery and the SA had to settle for less. However, the SA was out of financial trouble by 1866. See Evans, A History, p. 297.
1852 a committee of fellows expert in various fields determined which papers would be published. Another was established to obtain papers from local secretaries. Fellows, rather than the Secretary, read their own papers, ensuring clearer communication and the presence of the author for questioning. From 1846 the topic of the next meeting had been announced; from 1853 announcement cards were sent out for this purpose. Stanhope’s work was advanced in the 1860s by another active Council, including Augustus Wollaston Franks, Captain Henry Smyth, Charles Perceval Spencer and Christopher Knight Watson.

The library and collections benefitted from reform. In 1845 a second library clerk was hired; in 1847 library hours were extended. The Library Committee spent £300 on repairs and rebounding, and moved the clerk out of his basement rooms to gain space. Under the supervision of archivist Robert Lemon the classification system was revised in 1847, in 1851 a catalogue of printed books was prepared, and in 1852 a catalogue of manuscripts was produced and the special collections of broadsheets, proclamations and ballads arranged, catalogued and bound. From 1853 the Library Committee increased subscriptions to other societies’ publications. By 1860 the library had 10,000 printed books. The 1847 Catalogue of SA collections revealed that some thieving still went on; collections were re-evaluated for insurance in 1852, at £7,200.

The SA settled rapidly into its new incarnation. Publications still took up most of Council’s time, though less of the budget. The number of illustrations, which had been cut back for a while as an economy measure, returned to former standards; new techniques were tried to improve the quality of the image. The new *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries*, a

---

66 The figure for the SA is given in Evans, *A History*, p. 303, taken from a report by C. Knight Watson.

67 Photography was now commonly used in archaeological and architectural articles. See correspondence in *Notes & Queries* Series 2 VI(1852) 160, IX(1854) 181-82 between SA photographer Hugh Welch Diamond, and antiquaries W.J. Thoms and Lord Rosse. Diamond photographed SA exhibits from 1854. His pictures prompted the SA to request the Lieutenant-General of Ordnance to the Crimean War forces to photograph any antiquities they might come across; these photos were exhibited in 1854-57. See Evans, *A History*, p. 292.
response to criticism of the lack of information about work in progress, presented minutes and
short notes in a format like that of Notes and Queries. The first issue, which included numerous
illustrations by SA engraver James Basire, was so handsome it induced several artists, sculptors
and architects to join the SA.68 Archaeologia came out every three years, with about thirty
papers, half of which were illustrated. Articles by non-members and women were accepted.69
The format of the Proceedings was revised and a second series begun in 1859.

Revitalisation allowed Council to expand SA activities. For the first time the problem of
policy on restorations and excavations was addressed. In 1851 Council wrote to the
Commissioner of Works regarding the restoration of the Royal tombs at Westminster, and similar
projects at the Temple, Canterbury and Salisbury. In 1852 Council formally protested the
destruction of a London crypt for road works. In 1854 it protested railway companies’ rights to
churchyards, asking Home Secretary Palmerston for provisions to record inscriptions before they
were destroyed (those of St. Clement-Danes and Threadneedle Street had already been destroyed
without trace). When they were not successful, Council printed their memorial to Palmerston for
public circulation. They protested the removal of Guesten Hall at Worcester Cathedral in 1862,
and crude restorations at Westminster Chapter House in 1862.

Revitalisation allowed the SA to increase its public prestige at the same time as pursuing
new kinds of antiquarian projects. Public exhibitions of antiquities such as illuminated
manuscripts and prehistoric tools were begun in 1860, bringing the SA’s work to the attention

68These included sculptor Francis Chantrey, draughtsman C.A. Stothing, architect and artist Edward Blore.
Fellows had been attracted by the Society’s publications earlier in the century, including architects Anthony Salvin,
John Nash, C.R. Cockerell and Decimus Burton, and painters Samuel Prout and C.L. Eastlake. Literary men were
attracted by SA publications on early English literature, including Isaac Disraeli, Joseph Bosworth, and novelists John

69See for example, Mrs. M.A. Everett Green, Archaeologia, 38(1861), No. XXII, “Petitions to Charles II from
Elizabeth Cromwell, Widow of the Protector, and from Henry Cromwell.”
of the general public. In 1859 it agitated for access to the records of Probate Court, and in 1862 for access to and the right to photograph wills prior to 1760, in which it was successful. In 1865 it became involved in arguments about the authenticity of the Paston letters, which were under consideration for purchase by the British Museum. Council arranged the meeting at which experts and detractors met and the letters were declared genuine. SA Fellows were the experts involved, and they recommended purchase, even offering to assist the Museum with costs. The Museum bought the letters.

Archaeology began to flourish within the SA. The first SA-funded excavation, of an Anglo-Saxon cemetery at Harnham Hill, came in 1854. In 1858 a committee was formed to procure inscriptions from churchyards around the country, though questionnaires sent to Local Secretaries produced little. In response to the increasing number of unskilled amateurs opening up archaeological sites in Britain, John Yonge Akerman published a short pamphlet providing elementary instructions for amateurs uncovering tumuli or other remains. The problem of reliable and substantial funding for archaeological projects arose again. In 1850-52 the SA had been formally invited to participate in excavations at Verulamium (now St. Alban’s) and of Hadrian’s Wall in the north of England. These were concurrent with the period of reform. The Council’s chagrin at being financially unable to participate at that time was acute, but its inaction was later rectified. In 1855 the SA, jointly with John Ruskin, sponsored a subscription Conservation

70Archaeology of the ancient world was widely popular in Britain at this time. The British Museum’s classical excavations in the 1850s, the 1865 establishment of the Palestine Exploration Fund, and Schliemann’s excavations at Troy 1868-71 all generated widespread interest. Some antiquaries worked on European and mediterranean sites, as will be discussed in Chapter Five. But most SA archaeological work was done on British sites. Antiquaries were involved in Roman British excavations at Little Wilbraham (1851), Housesteads (1854), Caerleon (1855), Bath (1855), and Silchester (1865) and in Anglo-Saxon excavations at Salisbury (1851), Brighthampton (1857), Long Wittenham (1857), Stowting (1867), and others. The SA provided financial support for excavations at Wingham, Stodmarsh, Gilton in Kent, Woodborough, Old Sarum and Wroxeter in the 1850s, and in 1867 it gave a small grant to the Palestine Exploration Fund. See Evans, A History. pp. 288ff and 305ff.

71See Charles Roach Smith, Retrospections: Social and Archaeological, G. Bell: London, 1883, 3 volumes, vol., 1, p. 81 for an account of the reception of these invitations.
Fund, for the preservation of medieval buildings, and to report on monuments parish by parish. Council found Ruskin’s original plan too extensive and expensive, modified it, and affirmed that "the Conservation of ancient monuments is strictly within the scope of this Society." The SA administered the fund, and were assisted with information by their Local Secretaries. The Fund grew slowly, and supported only a small number of projects during the period under consideration. In 1889 a second fund, the Research Fund was started to assist archaeological excavations.

The reforms of 1845-54, then, revised SA structure and functions, allowing it to prosper after mid-century. SA activism continued through the 1870s. Council articulated a restoration policy, arguing that the only justifiable restoration was "preservation from further injuries by time or negligence." This policy began to be effective only at the end of the period under consideration. It protested destructive restorations at Tenby in 1867 and 1873, Exeter Cathedral in 1870 and Wakefield in 1871, and made concerted efforts at the preservation of Glastonbury Abbey, the owner of which had observed "they are ruins now, and if they fall they will be ruins still." In 1866 the SA became involved in international efforts in this area, successfully preserving the monastery of Monte Cassino in northern Italy after the political suppression of

72Quoted in Evans, A History, p. 310.

73William Morris’ Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings, established 1877 without the assistance of the SA, was more successful.

74This policy brought Council into conflict with the clergy. One wrote to them: "If your Lordship’s house...stood in need of extensive repairs, would you hesitate about adopting such means as a prudent architect might suggest to alter it to the requirements of the age, so as your Lordship might be enabled to live in it, notwithstanding a gable here or an old stack of chimneys there might have to be removed?...Our churches are not set apart for the collection of antiquities or merely the preservation of the records of past ages, but for the worship of Almighty God....Men doing what, under God, they trust to be a good work do not like to be shown up in the public papers...what is the preservation of a few antiquated relics to the general welfare of the public?" SA Correspondence, May 26 1855, quoted in Evans, A History, pp. 311-12.

75SA Correspondence, from Reverend J.A. Bennett. 1889, quoted in Evans, A History, p. 333.
ecclesiastical corporations there, and (unsuccessfully) protesting the removal of the ancient walls of Constantinople in 1870.

From the time of reform, the expertise shown by individual fellows began to be reflected in their institution's official role in public life. SA fellows had individually advised British institutions about purchases of antiquities throughout the period under consideration in this thesis. The SA now began doing this officially, as a body. Antiquaries' work increased their public prestige; government began seeking their advice in matters of preservation. In 1869 the Commissioner of Works asked the SA to catalogue monuments which should be preserved by the government. Council advised caution in withdrawing protections traditionally administered by Deans and Chapters but confirmed that they were "prepared to enter with alacrity into the matter brought before them by the First Commissioner, and they entertain a confident belief that the nature and composition of this Society provide available machinery for arriving at the results aimed at in the present inquiry."76 A Sepulchral Monuments Committee was formed, Local Secretaries reported district by district, resulting in an 1872 report of important monuments by county. At this point, a new Commissioner declared that no official action could be taken. Council had poured resources into this project in the hopes of seeing a clear national policy emerge on preservation; for the next decade, the SA pursued this project with an unwilling government. It obtained agreement to present reports in both Houses of Parliament, but this effort failed to produce any legislative action. It urged an archaeological survey of Britain in 1872, which was partially carried out. It was consulted during the 1870s about a Commission for Ancient Monuments, for which it worked diligently. Only after the failure of several bills, and disappointments with another Commissioner of Works, was the Ancient Monuments Protection

76 Quoted in Evans, A History, p. 308.
Act passed in 1882.

The preceding material enables a summary analysis of the SA, that is, of the institutional component of antiquarianism, using the model articulated in Chapter One. Crosland, Nye and other historians of fields described the ways in which institutions function to support the production of knowledge. Their analysis can now be applied to the antiquarian institution. In the 1830s and 1840s, the SA employed few of its resources to produce or organise knowledge, relying on traditions of cooperation to effect the necessary introductions and organise shared projects. Because the SA lacked decisive leadership to help it address new concerns arising from the membership, decisions taken by Council remained conservative. Thus major projects such as excavations and restorations were not addressed until after reform. Council continued to view publications as sufficient for establishing scholarly direction in the community, and communicating and promoting knowledge in all areas of work. To some degree at least, this was successful, as the SA at least published articles on the new kinds of work being done. Further, selection for publication functioned to adjudicate between better and worse offerings, although SA publications were not the sole selection agent for determining the best new antiquarian work within the community, as members often published elsewhere. Publications provided a basic but effective coordination of a diverse set of fields, then. They also promoted cohesion within the community. However, before the period of reform the SA seems to have thought its institutional responsibilities ended there. This changed after Reform. Funds to support archaeological projects were established. Council provided for the careful oversight of its own work and for members to participate in that work. And Council took a more active role in setting directions for the community’s work as well as in creating a public role for antiquaries’ expertise.

In the nineteenth century as in preceding centuries, antiquaries’ scholarly projects suffered from a lack of funding. Because funding was minimal, executive positions poorly paid, and
reliance on members' initiative relatively great, the SA could not provide apprenticeship or education in antiquarian fields--and there seems to have been no demand for such a thing from members. On the other hand, from the time of the Charter the SA consistently responded to concerns about members' standards of scholarship by reframing entrance criteria. As the opening of the SA to a larger membership in the mid-nineteenth century was accompanied by the strictest controls on entrance in the SA's history, it cannot be said that they relinquished their concern for certifying qualified candidates. While insufficiently organised and funded to educate candidates, then, they still functioned effectively in certifying them. Standards for certification interacted with the problem of funding. Demanding a very high level of scholarship limited the number of members, and thus the prestige and influence of the society, at a time when public recognition might have benefitted the society more. The BAAS, for example, was successful in enhancing the public prestige of science, which led to increased funding and a public demand for science in the universities. Had the SA been concerned to acquire similar prestige and influence, they may have been able to secure greater public recognition for their work, both in seeking the legislation they wanted for the preservation of monuments, and also when intellectual work moved into the universities.

The SA was effective in providing a physical homeland from the time of the Charter. In particular, it continued improving its collections and responding to varying needs that arose over time. While its physical location changed frequently in the century following the Charter, and while the rights and responsibilities of members were minimal, it nevertheless provided members with stability and a sense of identity.

The SA shows some imbalance between its internal, field-related functions and its relations outside the community. Until late in the decades under consideration, it was much more concerned with, and effective at, the former. In the matter of brokering introductions and fame,
it is clear that antiquaries were individually effective in introducing younger scholars to more established scholars and in forming working relationships within the community. But their failure at the institutional level to pursue self-promotion outside the community affected their ability to achieve goals such as excavations and preservation. The SA established a place for itself in the perception of the British government only in the 1860s.

Funding was an ongoing problem for antiquaries, and one which interacted with other features of the SA. The informality of the institutional culture, established by the time of the Charter, meant that more ambitious institutional goals, though occasionally articulated, were not seriously considered for most of the period under consideration. Nineteenth-century members criticised the SA for its failure to address archaeological and preservation problems. But such projects would have required aggressive financial policies. And the membership had rejected the kinds of changes necessary to making such projects possible. It had expressed reservations about a more open admission policy, and about the SA becoming a competitive kind of institution like the BAAS, even though this could have moved the SA towards the greater public recognition and improved fundraising capability that would have enabled the SA to undertake the desired careful excavations and restorations.

The practice of the early years had been to fund publications: these were the most effective means of communicating antiquarian work among a dispersed membership. After the Charter, the only funds collected were membership dues, supplemented by occasional legacies. The SA view was that its greater wealth lay in collections, to which all members had access. Members expected that most of the SA's funds would be used to provide them with scholarly publications vital to their research. The culture of reliance on members' voluntary effort reinforced this division of labour: it created an expectation that members would carry research forward individually, whereas SA funds would be used to support vehicles of communication.
Anything further, or more expensive, was up to the individuals who shared that particular concern. Given the number of fields, any undue funding or publishing of one field would have been obvious and would have provoked an outcry from those working in others, as for example in the competition between classicising and Gothicising archaeologists, late in the eighteenth century. Thus, no fundraising activities were carried out by the institution, either regularly or for special projects.

The position of nineteenth-century antiquaries was not so different from their predecessors: while they did not need to fear accusations of recusancy, public indifference to preservation and to their work led them to expect little, and thus a conservative attitude was reinforced. SA publications had also been, in the main, very successful, as financial ventures and scholarly productions, and often as their only public relations efforts as well. By the nineteenth century, then, a reluctance to fund projects other than publishing was firmly established in the institution, and the SA’s financial habits reinforced this as the only practicable course of action. When calls for institutional change arose, there was no tradition of undertaking other kinds of projects with which to oppose the force of habit, and even after reform the necessary political and financial expertise was only slowly built up. Projects such as restorations and archaeological digs only became financially possible late in the period under consideration; and even then funding was not reliable and substantial. However, the SA became proficient in addressing the need for funding, lobbying, and establishing their recognised public role as arbiters of antiquarian issues.

These issues of funding and institutional culture reflect traditional antiquarian commitments which became problematic for the SA during the nineteenth century. Those commitments included: cooperation rather than competition as the best means of fostering progress in scholarship; the retention of traditional SA practice in many areas; and the 1751
Constitution as the best guide in settling problems and directing institutional development. These values had served the eighteenth-century SA effectively, but became increasingly unable to provide the kind of scholarly services desired by nineteenth-century members. Prior to the period of reform, destructive products of these values included the attribution of a gentlemanly character to executive officers and a reluctance to discover evidence to the contrary, resistance both to opening executive operations to the scrutiny of members and to assuming a greater degree of administrative control over its officers and operations, and failure to embrace the self-promotional dimension of the emerging institutional model that other societies were using so successfully. The SA, like the RS, went through a time of reform during which these issues were addressed. This was done without losing any significant portion of the membership or causing any perceived damage to the legitimacy of the process. The SA was quick to regain its financial health, revise its constitution and establish a more effective and open institutional structure.

While reform was effective when it came, it did not come early enough to prevent the formation of splinter groups such as the BAA and the AI, who were disenchanted with the SA's tardiness in meeting the demands of new circumstances. They, however, were even less effective than the SA, in their early years, at satisfying dissenting members, creating accord within the executive and mediating between conflicting scholarly goals. And not all of the competition from new groups reflected inadequacy on the SA's part: the SA now had to compete with provincial archaeological and literary-philosophical societies, societies which specialised in a more narrowly defined area of interest, and printing clubs which catered to a similarly focused membership. Its failings were not, therefore, the sole cause of its problems in attracting and retaining members.
CHAPTER THREE

The institutional history of the SA introduced some of the shared questions and problems of antiquarianism, and illustrated one of the most striking things about the antiquarian intellectual domain: its apparently miscellaneous character. Archaeology, Anglo-Saxon and architecture, for example, were all fields in which many antiquaries worked. The antiquarian domain encompassed a lavish profusion of fields, variously interrelated, or unrelated. For antiquaries working in different fields, then, sharing questions with colleagues could mean sharing data, sharing some data, or not sharing anything at all. This situation invites explanation. To the historian employing contemporary models of fields, it creates the suspicion that antiquarianism was incoherent as an intellectual project. It suggests that the antiquarian community may at best have been divided into research cliques. Above all, it challenges the historian to articulate in what the integrity of this long-lived scholarly tradition could have consisted. That question is the subject of this chapter.

It has a peculiar and provocative answer. As an intellectual domain, the many fields of antiquarianism were united by its method, genres and ways of organising work, more than by its primary shared question. That is, antiquarianism was a textual tradition, founded upon a work which became authoritative for the community of scholars it drew together, and which united antiquaries for generations after its author had died.\(^1\) This work was William Camden’s *Britannia*, a history first published in 1586, and re-issued repeatedly by antiquaries into the nineteenth century. This history defined a subject and elaborated a method. From these, later antiquaries developed genres, tasks and research strategies which were meant to move the community towards the fulfilment of Camden’s historiographic program. All of these

---

\(^1\)By textual tradition I mean that the antiquarian community was a community of readers and writers whose reading and writing practices were highly stable over time, were integrated with other antiquaries’ written work, and were directed towards a shared goal. It will become clear in this chapter to what degree antiquaries’ work was structured and directed according to the pattern set by William Camden’s *Britannia*. The discussion of genre theory presented in Chapter Seven will elaborate on this aspect of antiquarianism.
developments reflected that authoritative program and were mutually defining. Shared antiquarian questions, then, must be described in relation to and understood as creatures of that source text and the traditions which arose from it. It was these features of the textual tradition that were widely shared in the antiquarian community.

Taken together, the features of this textual tradition could be called a historiographic program. Indeed, antiquarian historiography has been much discussed, as a distinct entity from mainstream European historiography between the Renaissance and the eighteenth century. Arnaldo Momigliano has explored the separate sources and forms of the two traditions. Mainstream historians, whose historiographic tradition had its roots in classical Greek and Roman historians, produced narratives defined by political concerns. Viewing their work as actively engaged with the political realities that were their subject, historians embraced the techniques of

---


3 Therefore, while it is argued that antiquarianism was a kind of historiography, where the word “historian” is used, it does not refer to antiquaries. Much primary source material cited indicates that the two were viewed as distinct well into the nineteenth century. While the phrase “mainstream historiography” is also unavoidable at times, this should be taken to refer to the many and varied kinds of historical writing which were more popular and prevalent than antiquarian writing, rather than to any uniformity characterising such works either contemporaneously or over time.
rhetoric in order to persuade their reader to a political perspective. Antiquaries, whose historiographic tradition stemmed from erudite classical research into the ethnographic past, produced systematic works. Attempting to produce accurate accounts, they approached records and witnesses more sceptically, and became skilled with the scholarly tools useful for excavating past events. This duality within classical historiography, of the political and the erudite kinds of historiography, never resolved in classical times, underlay the confusion of the antiquary and the historian in post-Renaissance Europe.

For Momigliano, tracing the lineage of modern historical method, the eighteenth century was the era in which the two historiographical streams were united, to produce modern historiography. A similar project can be seen in the work of Joseph Levine. Momigliano wrote more about continental than British historiography. Levine applies Momigliano's paradigm to the British context, and to the season and processes of change. Exploring the predicament of Augustan historians trying to apply the example of classical antiquity to narratives of British political life, Levine demonstrates their discomfort with the unresolved duality within classical learning. As they began to perceive the differences between antiquity as they imagined it, and the realities of their times, historians began to appreciate the less imaginatively fulfilling, but materially promising methods of modernists. Antiquaries were modernists. This dilemma motivated the gradual absorption of antiquarian research into mainstream British historiography in the eighteenth century.

---


5 In *Battle of the Books*, Levine distinguishes historians and antiquaries by the rigour of their method, and by subject, with historians writing politically oriented narratives and antiquaries writing politically disinterested reconstructions. Chapter 9, "History and Theory" (pp. 267-90), uses historian William Temple as an example of the differences. As "moderns," antiquaries had a scientific kind of historiography. In *Dr. Woodward's Shield*, Levine explores the scientific character of this historiography more fully. See also Denys Hay on "the steady penetration of erudition into histories designed for a wide audience," (p. 174) in *Annalists and Historians: Western Historiography from the Eighth to the Eighteenth Centuries*, Methuen: London and New York, 1977.
This perspective is not wrong: mainstream eighteenth-century British historiography did begin to embrace the antiquarian concern for research and documentation, and the confluence of these two traditions did do much to establish the character and concerns of modern historiography. And yet, there is a part of this story that has gone untold, and it holds the potential to rework Momigliano’s paradigm considerably. It is simply this: antiquarianism survived the alleged convergence. It neither merged with, nor was submerged within, the mainstream of British historiography, but remained a vital intellectual force a century after the supposed convergence. This circumstance raises a number of intriguing questions. What accounts for antiquaries’ persistence after convergence? Did the two communities and perspectives remain distinct? How did antiquaries understand their work? And what accounts for their demise late in the nineteenth century? Some answers are investigated in this chapter. In brief, antiquaries retained their historiography because their textual traditions, that is the antiquarian subject, method, genres, tasks and strategies, still organised their way of working, and the kinds of work they undertook. Individually, all the features of the antiquarian textual tradition have been noticed by historians working on one or another aspect of British history or historiography. Yet they were mutually defining. As an integrated collection they had unity. But the ways in which these textual features functioned as a system, organising generations of antiquaries’ work across many different fields, has not been noticed, perhaps because mainstream historiography, with its political and rhetorical attractions, has stolen the limelight. The antiquarian community remained distinct from mainstream historians for the same reasons it had always been distinct: others thought it dull and a bit ridiculous. Within the community, though, Camden’s historiographic vision remained vital, and antiquaries reached the peak of their scholarly productivity in the nineteenth century. Ironically, their sudden eclipse was the product of their success in persuading others to the very erudition for which they had always been advocates. Taken up by a multitude of industrious
Victorians, the sheer growth and speciation of knowledge overwhelmed the antiquarian institution. The SA might have weathered this difficulty, but could not adapt to the profound changes in the social context of learning created by legislators concerned with the provision of education. By moving scholarship of all kinds into the universities, legislators removed it from the hands of the learned societies. By late in the nineteenth century, antiquaries had lost custody of antiquity.

Of necessity, much material is presented in this chapter. For the sake of clarity, it is divided into three sections. The first treats the antiquarian subject, method, genres, tasks, fields and research strategies, from the time of Camden’s *Britannia* through the seventeenth century. Accounting for their genesis, development, and interactions will require both conceptual and historical analysis. Coordinating these can be difficult; as antiquaries themselves discovered, pursuing a simple chronological thread does not always suffice. To accommodate both, systematic elements have been placed within a chronological framework, but an occasional regress to an earlier period, or advance into a later one, will be necessary to consider pertinent material. The second section treats antiquarianism in the eighteenth century, when historians adopted antiquarian methods and inhabited traditionally antiquarian fields. Antiquaries’ estrangement from mainstream historical discourse and reticence to court public interest was counterbalanced late in the century by *The Gentleman’s Magazine*, which created widespread appreciation for their work. The third section treats nineteenth-century antiquaries’ productivity, and the ways they fostered public sympathy for preserving the remains of the past. It should be noted that presenting antiquarianism as a systematically organised tradition has involved treating it rather schematically, simplifying and perhaps misrepresenting some antiquaries and their works. While it is one of the objects of this thesis to communicate the diversity of antiquarian work, the needs of this chapter tend to obscure that reality. Chapter Four, however, illustrates the rich and
complex work of nineteenth-century antiquaries copiously.

The fundamental question of this chapter is, what was British antiquarianism? To answer, that it was a study of the archaeological past invented by Flavio Biondo in Italy in the fifteenth century, and recast as a kind of history by William Camden in the sixteenth, does not explain the enigma of a widely shared intellectual project, its vitality and endurance. But antiquarianism is an enigmatic subject to define. The difficulty of identifying its intellectual domain has led many twentieth-century historians to use the term without defining it. SA historian Joan Evans viewed it as a nostalgic historiography based in the techniques of textual criticism and archaeology.6 Many writers recognize one or the other of these parts of antiquarian work, depending on their own field of interest.7 No-one has yet explored what made it a coherent intellectual domain.8

Momigliano is credited with the definitive statement, that an antiquary is:

a student of the past who is not quite a historian because: (1) historians write in chronological order; antiquarians write in a systematic order: (2) historians produce those facts which serve to illustrate or explain a certain situation; antiquaries collect all the items that are connected with a certain subject, whether they help to solve a problem or not.9

Antiquarianism, then, was "not quite history," but this does not clarify the nature of the

---


8Momigliano traced the history of the contributions of antiquarian research, Europe-wide, to historiography. See especially Classical Foundations and Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography. But despite the prominence of antiquarianism in his work, Momigliano was less concerned to investigate the antiquarian intellectual project itself.

9Arnaldo Momigliano, "Ancient History and the Antiquarian," Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes Vol. 13, (1950)3-4 July-Dec: 285-315, p. 286. His description is often, but not fully, true. Some antiquaries through the nineteenth century also wrote conventional histories. The causes of antiquaries' systematic orientation will be explained below.
antiquarian domain. While in Europe, antiquarianism was more clearly associated with a set of archaeological, ethnographic and philological inquiries into the classical and national past, in Britain antiquarianism was given its conceptual configuration by Camden’s *Britannia*. A departure from previous histories, its subject was the islands of Britain, severed from traditional attempts to claim a classical patrimony; it did not give preference to political over social realities; and it was constructed from all available bodies of evidence, no matter how awkward the result. Momigliano’s "not quite history" is an acute description of the works which sprang from this source. Many inventoried the remains of the past in various ways, and so failed to be historiographic in the most basic sense. But this reality was more the product of their participation in Camden’s historiographic vision than their appreciation of the classical tradition. That classical tradition was reincarnated in Camden’s work, but passed into the antiquarian community via the *Britannia*. Thus the antiquarian intellectual domain was uniquely shaped and directed by the *Britannia* rather than directly by the systematic *Antiquitates* of Varro, the ethnographic *Histories* of Herodotus, or the work of the *philologoi*. 

In order to understand the antiquarian intellectual domain, then, it is necessary to understand Camden’s historiography. This was complex. It was a vivid evocation of a nation, with its many pasts, peoples and landscapes, and yet it shirked nothing in its pursuit of documentation. Much historical writing of Camden’s time was geographically organised. By

---

10William Camden, *Britannia, sive Florentissimum regnorum Angliae, Scotiae, Hiberniae, at Insularum adiacentum ex intima antiquitate, Chorographica descriptio: Nunc postremo recognita, plurimis locis magna accessione adaucta & Chartis chorographicis illustrata* Georgii Bishop & Ioannis Norton, 1586. The second edition came out in 1587; the third in 1590, the fourth in 1594, and the fifth, dedicated to Elizabeth, in 1600. The sixth, the last in Camden’s lifetime, was published in 1607. All editions are enlarged with further material, making the sixth his most complete statement as an antiquary. The first Frankfurt edition was issued in 1590, and again in 1616. The first translation into English, by Philemon Holland, of the sixth edition, came out in 1610 and was reissued in 1637.

11Stan Mendyk argues that before 1700, many writers organised their work geographically, and viewed the entire body of physical and literary remains as a unitary and irreducible mass of "historical" remains. Those who used geography to organise discussion of civil entities produced conventional political histories. Others, called
describing the *Britannia* as a chorography, Camden meant a work encompassing Britain geographically and in character rather than a summation of notable times and places, a work describing the whole arrangement of the social order rather than a conventional narrative constructed from the political and dynastic figures his readers knew well, and a work meant to surprise and educate by its vivid clarity rather than to elicit agreement by its familiarity. In his own words:

I would illustrate this Ile of BRITAINe...I would restore antiquity to Britaine, and Britain to his antiquity...I would renew ancientrie, enlighten obscuritie, cleare doubts, and recall home Veritie by way of recoverie, which the negligence of writers and credulitie of the common sort had in manner proscribed and utterly banished from amongst us. A painful matter I assure you, and more than difficult; wherein what toyle is to be taken, as no man thinketh, so no man beleeveth but hee that hath made the triall. 

The intellectual domain identified by Camden, then, was the entire conceptual area required to produce a vivid, clear account of the geographical, cultural and social history of Britain. Camden’s pursuit of knowledge in this domain was rigorous. His historiography can be described as continental, inductive, systematic and collaborative. It was continental in the scholars and works which provided Camden with models, methods, and emphases. He adopted the

chorographers, used geographical regions to organise their pursuit of information on the history of any and all features, civil and geographical, of that region. Antiquaries were chorographers. Mendyck attributes the antiquarian commitment to observation in the Baconism sense, as many were RAS members, and dates antiquarian involvement in geology from this time. See Mendyck, *Speculum Britanniae*.

Being learned in classical and contemporary scholarship, Camden would have been familiar with the Greek words *topos* and *choros*. Both meant "place," but *topos* was local in reference, and could mean an occasion or opportunity. Metaphorically, it referred to "the topic," as it is used for a conversation or a book. It passed into Renaissance rhetoric as the "topics." conventional formulations that a readership or audience were familiar with, and that an author or orator could use to persuade. *Choros* was distinct from *topos*. Herodotus established its usage as "country," encompassing both geographical place and a unique societal character or ethnic identity. Its metaphorical sense was that of social position: one’s station in life, a soldier’s post, and so on. *Choros* also came into Renaissance rhetoric, as a part of *enargeia*, meaning the vividness and distinctness with which a verbal picture was painted. These two words underlay two kinds of writing.


Camden’s friendships with continental scholars, and his library of their works, were extensive. His friendships included Dutch cartographer Ortelius, French philologist Jean Hotman, librarian of the Elector Palatine James Gruter, and Casaubon, Peter Sweerts, Pierese, Jacques de Thou, and Brisson. His library included works by grammarian and
reconstructive archaeological history of Italian antiquary Flavio Biondo, and applied the philology and numismatics of Guillaume Budé to problems in establishing British chronology and historical events. From Swiss bibliographer Konrad Gesner he took the encyclopedic, documentary approach to knowledge. Camden, "familiar with the latest and best in European scholarship," was perceived by his contemporaries as writing in a European style and for a European audience.

metallurgist Georgius Agricola, philologist Joachim Camerarius, encyclopedic educator, book collector and historian Willibald Pirckheimer, and systematic theologian and educator Georg Witzel among Germans; by humanist Petrus Carmelianus and historiographer Paolo Emilio, and jurist and numismatist Leonardus de Portis among Italians; by the Inquisitor-General to France, historian and Royal Librarian to Francis I Guillaume Petit, Paris professor and grammarian Julius Caesar Scaliger and rhetorician Petrus Ramus among Frenchmen, by Spanish philologist Lorenzo Valla, and many others. Works by English authors often show a Continental connection, as for example those include those by classicist and historian Roger Ascham, translator of French historians Edward Aggas, Scottish Catholic translator of Italian monumental inscriptions and writer on Italian politics William Barker, traveller and writer on European libraries and manuscripts Robert Ashley, papal historian Robert Barnes, historiographers George Buchanan. Thomas Blundeville and Richard Braithwaite, philologist Edward Brerewood and Hebrew scholar Hugh Broughton.

Biondo’s 1558 *Italia Illustrata* used the ruins of Rome to reconstruct early Italian history. It circulated in manuscript in Italy between 1465 and 1500, but was not published in northern countries until much later. Guillaume Budé’s *De Asse et partibus eius. libri quinque* Ioan[n]is Soteris: Coloniae, 1528. used coins to reconstruct chronology. For a discussion of continental historical scholarship of this kind, concentrating on Budé’s numismatics and philology, see Donald R. Kelley, *Foundations of Modern Historical Scholarship: Language, Law and History in the French Renaissance*, Columbia University Press; New York, 1970. pp. 53-86. Kelley views Camden as part of a Europe-wide “unchartered Society of Antiquaries,” p. 246.

Konrad Gesner’s *Bibliotheca Universalis* was published in Zurich in 1545. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, a booklist was referred to as a *catalogus, elenchus, index or nomenclator*. In Gesner’s usage, *bibliographia* meant the arrangement of each branch of *historia litteratura*, the history of learned writing in its fullest sense, within a systematic, philosophical system of knowledge, and the critical analysis and location of each specific work within disciplinary and chronological outlines. Gesner’s use of the term indicated a documentary-based approach to all available cultural information. To obtain this information, he travelled to dozens of European libraries, digesting tens of thousands of works by the end of his lifetime. Among the best works on the development of this tradition are Matilde V. Rovelstad, tr., Rudolf Blum, *Bibliographia: An Inquiry into its Definition and Designations*, American Library Association: Dawson, 1980 and Pettas. tr., Balsamo, *Bibliography*. For Camden’s citations, and criticisms of Gesner, see R.D. Dunn. ed., *William Camden, Remains Concerning Britain*. University of Toronto Press: Toronto, Buffalo. London, 1984.


That is, he wrote in learned Latin for a Europe-wide audience, shunned the vernacular, and exhibited the exacting knowledge and accuracy of the *grammaticus*. Camden disparaged the fashion among “our Sparkefull Youth” for “sonnetting,” entitling the condensed English version of the *Britannia*, which he resisted producing for years, “Remains of a Greater Work,” calling its contents “rude rubble and out-cast rubbish” and signing it only “M.N.” the last initials of his names. Fourteen of the fifteen writers cited as great English poets wrote in Latin, and the essay
Camden’s historiography was inductive. Giving preference to evidence over tradition, he attempted to build an historical account from the remaining mass of textual and physical evidence alone. The Britannia continually discussed and defended the direction of argument, advocating moving from the evidence to the construction of chronology, events and narrative foci. Camden’s own statement about his work shows his exhaustive, inductive method:

[T]aking INDUSTRY for my consort, I adventured upon it, and with all my studie, care, cogitation, continuall meditation, paine, & travaile I employed my selfe thereunto when I had any spare time...I have in no wise neglected such things as are most material to search, and sift out the Truth. I have attained to some skill of the most ancient, British and English-Saxon tongues: I have travailed over all England for the most part, I have conferred with most skillfull observers in each country, I have studiously read over our owne countrie writers, old and new, all Greeke and Latine authors which have once made mention of Britaine. I have had conference with learned men in other parts of Christendome: I have been diligent in the Records of this Realme. I have looked into most Libraries, registers, and memorialis of Churches, Cities, and Corporations, I have pored upon many an old Rowle, and Evidence: and produced their testimonies (as beyond all exception) when the cause required, in their very owne words (although barbarous they be) that the honour of veritie might in no wise be impeached...[U]pon fables I have in no wise relied, and that I might not digresse extravagantly, I have had often recourse to the title of my booke (as Pliny adviseth) and eftsoones demanded of my selfe why I tooke penne in hand...To accomplish this worke the whole maine of my Industrie hath been employed for many yeares with a firme setled study of the truth.19

Camden was concerned throughout the Britannia with the ways evidence determined the historical account constructed.20 He rejected medieval historians’ casual documentary habits.21


20In his Preface, Camden wrote: "the edge of our understanding is so blunt that we are of necessitie enforced to prosecute many matters in all professing conjecturally." And: "In searching and seeking after [historical verity], I have been cauteously forecasting in my conjectures...An other age and other may daily find out more. It is enough for me to have begun ...As for obscurities, fables, extravagant digressions, I trust there is no cause to sue out my pardon." " Holland tr., Camden, Britannia, Preface, n.p.
but was uncertain about recovering historical truth from a record devastated by Dissolution.\footnote{For example: “they supplied these defects; and when they could not declare the truth indeed, yet at leastway for delectation, they laboured to bring forth narrations, devised of purpose, with a certaine pleasant varietie to give contentment, and delivered their severall opinions, ech one after his own conceit and capacitie, touching the originall of Nations and their names. Unto which, as, there were many, who neglecting further search into the truth. quickly yielded connivance; so, the most sort delighted with the sweetness of the Deviser, as readily gave credence.” Holland, tr., Camden. Britannia, p. 4.}

His awareness of the faulty evidential ground on which he stood led him to invest his confidence in method.\footnote{Many examples of his sense of uncertainty can be found in his Britannia. For example, he wrote: “I feare greatly, that no man is able to fetch out the truth, so deeply plunged within the winding revolutions of so many ages.” Holland, tr., Camden. Britannia, p. 9. See also “drowned under the waves of oblivion” p. 17, “certainty” p. 4, “dark mists of fatall ignorance” p. 7, “I fear greatly” p. 9, “albeit they lie so hidden” p. 9, “so far remote” p. 25, “altogether overcast with darkenesse” p. 97, “not exact and absolute” p. 107, “overcast with so darke a mist” p. 154. Camden was not alone among learned authors in these feelings. Balsamo notes the trauma Gesner received on seeing the library of King Matthias I Corvinus at Buda burned by the Turks. The Bibliotheca Universalis, foundational to the Britannia in its documentary method, repeatedly stressed the need for state and institutional support, to “safeguard the cultural patrimony of the past” for the future. Pettas, tr., Balsamo, Bibliography, pp. 33-35.}

He used both textual and physical evidence in his attempt to confirm individual articles of history. The search for materials to fuel his method highlighted their scarcity, and identified collection and preservation as an essential antiquarian task. From the start, then, antiquarian questions were entangled with questions of method, and these were so time-consuming that, even in Camden’s lifetime, they tended to delay the realization of written answers.

Camden’s historiography also established much about the kind of narrative produced.\footnote{Of philology, he wrote: “if all the histories that ever were had miscarried and perished; if no writer had recorded, that we Englishmen are descended from Germanes, the most true and naturall Scots from the Irish, the Britons of Armorica in France from our Britans; the Society of their tongues would easily confirm the same: yea, and much more easily than the authority of most sufficient Historiographers. If therfore I shall proove, that the ancient Gauls and our Britans used one and the selfe same language, then the very truth will of force drive us to confesse. that they had also the same beginning.” Holland tr., Britannia, p. 16. Camden argued that his method qualified him to judge controverted points of history. See Britannia (1607) “Ad Lectorem” p. 4. Momigliano asserts that antiquaries invented the distinction between original and derivative documents, and the use of non-literary to confirm literary sources, with an accuracy that founded modern historical method. Momigliano, “Ancient History,” pp. 285-315.}

\begin{quote}
Some there may be who may object the silly web of my stile, and rough hewed forme of my writing...[but] neither have I weighed every word in Goldsmith’s scales...neither purpose I to picke flowres out of the gardens of Eloquence.” Holland, tr., Camden. Britannia, “The Author to the Reader” p. 5.
\end{quote}
His style was a product of the systematic character of his historiography. Encyclopedic in scope and representational in aim, it attempted to articulate an entire physical and social world from the phenomenal and chronological constituents extracted from the total evidential mass. The product of "this intricate and obscure study of Antiquity" resembled an evidential gazette more than a narrative, outlining a taxonomy of material remains rather than following an interpretive thread. Traditional narrative foci such as kings and dynasties were reduced in importance, and no longer structured the choice and placing of other material. Camden's practice was to assemble his historical accounts "in compendious manner," however awkward to read, rather than to discard any evidentiary material. His work can be described as representational, in that the sectioning of chronology and societal elements reflected the various bodies of remains. Language determined epochs, coins determined dynasties and kings, the departments of state determined the social structures discussed, provincialisms structured the discussion of common folk's beliefs and customs, and so on.

Finally, Camden's notion of history was collaborative. The Britannia laid out a program for more work: "An other age, and other men may daily find out more. It is enough for me to have begun, and I have gained as much as I looke for, if I shall draw others into this argument.

---

25 In this, Camden was a part of a Europe-wide style of "documentary" scholarship. Balsamo writes of the "universal dimension of [Gesner's] research. The product of his research is recorded in a catalogue which is meant to be a summary not only of one period, but of the encyclopedia of the trilingual culture on which western and Christian civilisation is based." Pettas, tr., Balsamo, Bibliography, p. 33. Italian bibliographer Possevino wrote: "to be truly literate leads to a kind of encyclopedia through which the workings of the intellect, even though they concern different sciences and distinct arts, require a degree of interdependency among themselves, and so join hands and complement each other." In Pettas, tr., Balsamo, Bibliography, p. 102. Levy, Tudor Historical Thought, argues that Camden's method was unique in its use of "several lines of reasoning bearing on the same point," p. 149. and credits antiquaries with inventing "the weapons of source criticism" p. x.

26 Holland, tr., Camden, Britannia, p. 28.

27 "This much have I set downe summarily, and in compendious maner gathered out of the ancient monuments of Antiquitie, rejecting all fabulous fictions." Holland, tr., Camden, Britannia, p. 88.
whether they undertake a new worke, or amend this."28 Scholarship of this kind required a community, showing that Camden had a more medieval than humanist notion of authorship and of narrative product, tying both to work achieved in the past, and to ongoing work.29 Bibliographic sources were as constitutive of the historical narrative as the author himself, and citations and critical discussions of scholarly sources made up a large part of the text of such histories.30

The product of thirty years' labour, this peculiar history, with its totalising definition of the historical subject and its effort to produce an encyclopedic account of the past, became widely recognised as a work of great learning.31 Due to its inductive and representational commitments, the narrative at times lurched clumsily between the temporal and the systematic.32 Yet the


30Kelley, Foundations, describes Camden as one of the "lonely pioneers" of "collaborative scholarship," p. 247. Levy, Tudor Historical Thought, credits Camden with articulating the importance of citing sources, and explaining how scholars must build on each others' work. p. 129ff. See also McKisack, Medieval History in the Tudor Age, pp. 50-74 on "antiquarian expertise." T.D. Kendrick refers to "the directive power of the Britannia" for later histories of Britain and notes that the arguments it set off among antiquaries reveal a culture of learned criticism. See British Antiquity Methuen: London. 1950, p. 148. Some evaluations were negative. Camden’s method was attacked by Ralph Brooke in A Discoverie of Certaine Erroors Published in Print in the Much-Commended Britannia, 1594. [Thomas Judson and William White: London, 1598]. This volume was published without printer or date. I am grateful to Peter W.M. Blayney for allowing me to use his STC 3834 and confirming publication details. A response defending Camden’s method can be found in Augustine Vincent, A Discoverie of Erroors in the First Edition of the Catalogue of Nobility Published by Ralph Brooke, Yorke Herald, 1619, William Iaggard: London, 1622. See also Levy, Tudor Historical Thought, pp. 149ff and 161ff.


32Camden’s repeated rejection of eloquence in his Preface was more than a statement of the kind of humanist writing his work was not. It functioned as a Protestant claim for the honesty of the plain style, and it was a necessary part of preparing his reader for the arduous narrative that was to follow.
Britannia "gave all future research a starting point and base of reference." It was Camden's awkward historical vision that drew to him a community of like-minded researchers, and became the authoritative influence on the development of the intellectual domain of antiquarianism. Camden had identified a spacious intellectual domain for antiquarianism: all that relates to the study of the British past. This domain corresponded to the most fundamental antiquarian question: what happened in Britain in the past? Camden raised questions about a subject that had not previously been seen as a problem, defined unusual means by which an answer could be obtained to evidential bodies, and pursued that answer rigorously, helping to generate the lavish and miscellaneous profusion of antiquarian fields. While this may appear unremarkable when compared to contemporary historiography, it was revolutionary in a time when patriotic accounts of dynasties, diplomatics and international conflicts were standard historical fare, and were written from a partisan rather than an evidential position.

A deceptively simple formulation, Camden's handling of this question established the methods, genres, objects and fields of antiquarian interest. If Camden's subject was entangled with questions of method, both rapidly became entangled with questions of genre: if history could

---

33Parry, Trophies of Time, p. 3.

34It should be noted that Camden was not the first antiquary in sixteenth-century Britain. In 1548, John Bale had published his Illustrium majoris Britanniae Scriptorum hoc est Angliae, Cambriae, Scotiae Summarium, Johann Overton: Wesel, Germany. It argued the need to preserve documents. Bale was a friend to, and had worked with John Leland, the first Briton to refer to himself as antiquarius. His 1546 New Yeare's Gyfte to King Henry VIII in the XXXVI Yeare of his Rayne, Bale: London, inventoried remains to be found around the country, and outlined a historical program. But his projected Itinerary was never published as he went mad. It was commonly said that Camden had fulfilled Leland's program in his Britannia, and it was the Britannia that organised the group of scholars in the 1590s which became the SA. Balsamo traces a historiographic line from Gesner's documentary approach to historia literatura, through the work of his student Josias Simler, to the Index Britanniae (1559) of Bale. In that work, Bale describes Leland's work as similar to Gesner's, indicating a methodological line through to Camden. See Pettas, tr., Balsamo, Bibliography, pp. 52-53. The passages in Bale and Leland are cited in Theodore Besterman, The Beginnings of Systematic Bibliography, Oxford University Press: Oxford, London, 1935; 2nd edition, revised by Humphrey Milford, 1936, pp. 21-25.

35As Levine notes, "[t]he antiquarian empire was circumscribed only by the necessity of dealing with the objects and events of the past." Levine, The Amateur, pp. 16-17.
only be teased out of various bodies of evidence with difficulty, and the method of achieving this resembled a painstaking reconstruction, these realities had to be reflected in their manner of presentation. Antiquaries rejected the patriotic narrative style of sixteenth-century histories. Nor were they content to limit their subject to court or dynastic concerns. 36 Fitting their evidential concerns into the complex narrative form of medieval local histories, they rooted out the medievals' fabulous content, producing the "rational" histories of the sixteenth century. 37 From Renaissance scholarship, they took humanist philological expertise and the emphasis on secondary rather than primary causality. 38 By the seventeenth century, patriotic historiographers had lost the battle to find Britain's origins in a Trojan foundation. Antiquaries were the effective cause


38 Geoffrey of Monmouth had started the interest in the vetustissimus liber; the humanist return ad fontes launched the scholarly concern with original languages and documents. On the relation of these to English historical writing of this period, see Levine, Humanism and History, and Gransden, Historical Writing, vol. 2, pp. 308-341. Levy argues that antiquarian historiography participated in the search for a translatio imperii, their concentration on Saxon language and history being directed towards establishing the primacy of England against the usurpation of Rome. See Tudor Historical Thought, pp. 124ff and 138ff. Camden knew both the medieval curriculum and the newer humanist scholarship well. A protege of humanist lexicographer Thomas Cooper at Oxford, he became headmaster of Westminster school. The Greek grammar he wrote for Westminster School, Institutio Graecae Grammatices, Scholar: Menston, 1969, reprint of the first, 1595 edition, was still in use in the late eighteenth century, and shows his appreciation of the medieval stress on syntax rather than the humanist concern with figurae and the apparatus of eloquence.
of the demise of mythic British histories.  

The method and genres that sprang from the fundamental antiquarian question were meticulous with respect to evidence. Essential supporting competencies were languages, and document-related skills such as epigraphy and palaeography. Antiquaries’ industry in collecting, evaluating and publishing confirmatory evidence for specific articles of British history succeeded in changing the character and foci of British historical writing. But their approach was more commended than emulated. Most historians appreciated the authority of facts, but were uninterested in "the dark industry" of acquiring them. Even with the growth of an ideal of secular, non-partisan historiography, many historians "wanted certainty but they neither cared for

---

39Polydore Vergil was first to demonstrate the lack of historical warrant for the Trojan foundation, but his work was received with hostility. Antiquaries championed Vergil’s perspective, and turned their cautious historiographic to debunking other favoured British historical myths also. Henry Spelman destroyed the myth of the founding of Glastonbury by Joseph of Aramathea, by a careful evaluation of the textual evidence. Antiquaries, by articulating a different historical vision, had made mythical histories seem jejune. “The most important cause of the weakening of interest in the [mythical] British History was that the British antiquary was changing into a new kind of person with much more important things to do than bother about unverifiable legends.” Kendrick, British Antiquity, p. 114. Parry writes: “the type is easier to describe than define, for the spread of scholarship they engaged in was so broad and variegated that it defies definition...A great deal of intellectual energy was expended in dispersing the accumulated legends generally known as the British History....And what was one to put in their place? That was the task of the Antiquary.” Parry, Trophies of Time, p. 9.

40May McKisack argues that Tudor antiquaries pioneered the use of original sources to generate regional histories. See Medieval History, especially Chapter IV, “Archivists and Record-Searchers,” pp. 75-94.

41Hale argues that British historiography is built on five foundational texts: Camden’s 1615 History of Elizabeth. John Stow’s 1598 Survey of London, John Selden’s 1621 History of Tithes, Walter Raleigh’s 1614 History of the World, and Francis Bacon’s 1622 History of the Reign of King Henry VIII. See J.R. Hale, The Evolution of British Historiography: From Bacon to Namier. Macmillan: London and Melbourne, 1967, p. 9ff. Camden, Stow and Selden were antiquaries. Two historiographic schools stemmed from the five: a synthetic and an evidentiary, or antiquarian school. The synthetic school became mainstream. Following Bacon, it produced systematic overviews based on inductive principles. While writers of these histories advocated the collection of evidence, they concentrated on the inductive to the near exclusion of the evidentiary task. Hale sees a historiographic line through Clarendon to the Scottish conjectural historians in this school. While such genealogies are always somewhat artificial, most works tracing the development of historiography highlight antiquaries’ separation from the many paths of conventional, and even eccentric histories.

42For example, Bacon described original historical research as "beneath the dignity of an undertaking like mine." Much later, Hume referred to it as "the dark industry." Quoted in Hale, The Evolution, p. 18 and p. 27. Similar expressions can be found in many historians’ works. See also David Sandler Berkowitz, John Selden’s Formative Years: Politics and Society in Early Seventeenth-Century England, Folger Shakespeare Library, Associated University Presses: Washington, D.C., 1988.
detail nor defined the nature of a fact.\textsuperscript{43} Seventeenth-century antiquaries remained concerned to collect and authenticate the multitude of articles constitutive of the historical record, and so produced far fewer and less readable narratives, which masked their value in the estimation of their non-antiquarian peers.\textsuperscript{44} As their success with the minutiae of history increased, their ability to convey the importance of their historiography to a broad public diminished. "[T]he rich efflorescence in antiquarian scholarship during the post-Revolution period" diverged from the mainstream of British historiography.\textsuperscript{45} Antiquaries' public image suffered as a result.\textsuperscript{46}

Camden had produced a history of Britain. But even his work could barely contain the disparate bodies of evidence used, over the large temporal and geographic range Britain offered.\textsuperscript{47} As will be seen, antiquaries' ultimate goal was the production of an accurate,

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Hale, \textit{The Evolution}. p. 24. Levine, discussing the differences between the historiography of historians like William Temple, and that of antiquaries, describes William Temple as "indifferent to [antiquaries'] labours, and it did not embarrass him that he did not have the languages or any of the other skills that might have helped to unlock the early history of the nation." \textit{Battle of the Books}. p. 298.
\item In part, this was because antiquaries retained European rather than British models of scholarly work. On the "[l]ines of friendship [which] extended across the sea to European antiquaries" (p. 7) in the seventeenth century, see Parry, \textit{The Trophies of Time}.
\item Antiquaries were reticent about drawing attention to themselves. Many had been accused of recusancy and treason, including Thomas Babington, whose brother was hung for his part in the 1586 Babington Plot. Both were involved, and their house was intended as a haven for Henry Garnett. Lambarde's \textit{Perambulations of Kent} had been suspected. The author of the notorious \textit{Rites of Durham} (1593) chose to publish anonymously. John Stow's \textit{Survey of London} was suspect, and he twice had his library raided and books by Catholic authors confiscated. See Richard J. Schoeck, "The Elizabethan Society of Antiquaries and Men of Law" Notes and Queries, NS 1, 1954, 417-21 and "Early Anglo-Saxon Studies and Legal Scholarship in the Renaissance" Studies in the Renaissance, 5(1958); 102-110; and William Raleigh Trimble, \textit{The Catholic Laity in Elizabethan England 1558-1603}. Belknap Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts. 1964. Camden had defended himself against the same charge in 1600 (see note 14), and owned books by recusant British authors such as John Barclay, William Barker, and Edmund Bolton and by numerous continental Catholic authors. See Richard L. DeMolen, \textit{The Library of William Camden}, Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society Vol. 128/4 (1984); 327-409.
\item Camden's \textit{Britannia} had used genealogy, heraldry, palaeography, epigraphy, numismatics, archaeology, architecture, topography, etymology and, most centrally, philology. Though few antiquaries attempted the kind of synthesis Camden had, the fact of his achievement rendered the eventual achievement of antiquaries' greatest objective, a definitive history of Britain, plausible. And Camden's work provided a framework for coordinating these different bodies of knowledge.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
complete, encyclopedic British history. But their concern for a meticulous historiography began to redefine how antiquaries treated their historical subject. They did not lose sight of "Britain" in Camden's complete sense. But in order to be productive at all, individual antiquaries had to limit their work to a tractable mass. Many specialised, working in one of a number of distinct antiquarian fields which were defined by their objects of analysis.48

Specialisation was an obvious sequela of Camden's vision, of a method which emphasised employing disparate bodies of evidence, and linked the consummate realization of methodological technique to the achievement of the ultimate historiographical goal.49 But specialisation within the large domain defined by the primary antiquarian question meant that various fields rather than their coordination within the totality of British history quickly became the object of antiquaries' attention. These fields may be grouped into seven areas: history, the documents and literature of all British languages; archaeology of all sorts and ages; the study of the fine arts; the study of architecture; language studies of all kinds (philology, etymology, the production of grammars, glossaries and lexicons, and studies of local usage); and works concerned with the tools of scholarship such as bibliographies, catalogues and registers of collections.50 To twentieth-century

---

48 Levy writes: "the age of specialization begins in the seventeenth century with the antiquaries." Tudor Historical Thought, p. 293.

49 Rudolf Blum traces the development in the seventeenth century of the separation of historia litteratura into specialties within the scholarly tradition of bibliography. See Bibliographia, pp. 14ff. Balsamo sees Gesner's scholarship as creating specialisation, and specialisation "intensified the demand for information set in clear historical perspective." See Pettas, tr., Balsamo, Bibliography, p. 30-31.

50 Momigliano identifies five areas of study coming from the Hellenic tradition: editing and commenting on texts, the collection of folk customs and traditions, the description of monuments, learned biographies, and chronology. These show the continuity of British with the Hellenic tradition, but also the distance between British antiquarianism and its antecedents. See Momigliano, Classical Foundations, pp. 71ff. The first antiquarian bibliography, William Nicholson's 1696 English Historical Library, established the use of bibliographic apparatus, which grew constantly in size and articulation. For an introduction to the relations of collections to British and American historiography, see Jesse Hauk Shera, Historians, Books and Libraries: A Survey of Historical Scholarship in Relation to Library Resources, Organization and Services, Western Reserve University Press; Cleveland, 1953, pp. 26-57 and Albert Predeek, tr., Lawrence S. Thompson, A History of Libraries in Great Britain and North America, American Library Association: Chicago, 1947, pp. 5-48.
sensibilities, this miscellany seems vague, impractical, ambitious and over-generalised. Its coherence lay in the fact that each of these studies could illuminate some part of the domain identified by the primary antiquarian question. Antiquaries' possession of these many fields was sustained over centuries because most researchers in them were antiquaries. The differences between two kinds of work tended to keep antiquaries within their own community, where their "dark industry" was understood. Therefore these fields remained antiquarian concerns.

51While antiquaries were often also members of the RS, and some RS members undertook historical and archaeological projects, the overlap in areas of research had mainly ceased when Isaac Newton became President of the RS. in 1703. See Mendyk, SpeculumBrittaniae.

52The distinction is between writing about, and researching in a field. Historians were interested in the upshot of evidential fields for political, religious and dynastic features of their histories; antiquaries viewed this as premature, waiting to allow the results of research to shape and produce a narrative. See Nicholas Von Maltzahn, Milton's History of Britain: Republican Historiography in the English Revolution, Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1991.

53The split mentioned in the previous chapter, between antiquaries who treated texts and those who treated physical remains, was developing in the eighteenth century, but did not lead to any confrontation between groups within the antiquarian community until the middle of the nineteenth century, and even then was not serious enough to split the SA.

Seventeenth-century antiquaries' specialisation interacted with the demands of the antiquarian method, establishing four distinct antiquarian genres. Specialisation meant that many antiquarian works listed, transcribed, or evaluated textual or physical remains rather than relating them to a chronological or interpretive thread. The systematic orientation of such works required organising principles which would facilitate discussion and evaluation across the many bodies of evidence antiquarian fields treated. Without widely shared organising principles, the task of coordinating accumulated data towards a definitive history would have been very difficult.

The antiquarian county history was the most enduring genre. Its value in organising data was established by Camden: the *Britannia* had synopsised the remains constitutive of the history of every county. But the persistence of this genre cannot be explained by his authority alone: it was the close fit between antiquarian county histories and the antiquarian orientation towards bodies of evidence that ensured its longevity. For antiquaries, the most intelligible means of arranging data reflected the organisation of textual and physical remains. Antiquarian county histories reflected the regional organisation of state paper collections and concentrations of civic

---


56 For example, Weever’s 1631 *Funerall Monuments* was a study of tombs and effigies dating from before Dissolution. Dugdale’s 1655-73 *Monasticon* treated those manuscripts which would contribute to a monastic history. See Parry, *Trophies of Time* for a careful, extensive evaluation of antiquaries’ work at this time.

57 Notable among seventeenth-century antiquarian county histories are William Burton’s *Description of Leicestershire* (1622), William Dugdale’s *The Antiquities of Warwickshire* (1656) and Robert Thoroton’s *Antiquities of Nottinghamshire* (1677). T. Fuller notes this utility of the county classification in his *History of the Worthies of England* (1622). Use of the term “history” introduces some confusion: these were often called histories and so it would introduce other kinds of confusions to refer to them by another term. However, the contents of antiquarian county histories distinguish them from works by non-antiquaries. The same remarks can be applied to the term “local history,” as used in the antiquarian context.
and religious buildings going back centuries before Dissolution.\textsuperscript{58} While variations of size, accessibility, and contents presented some problems even to such devoted researchers as antiquaries were, the county contributed appropriate structure to both systematic and historical accounts. And because the county was a widely shared organising principle, antiquaries writing either systematic works in a single field or general histories of Britain could relatively easily use others’ works on bodies of evidence or counties they were unfamiliar with.

The other three successful methods of organising bodies of data across antiquarian fields included the periodised list, antiquarian local histories, and itineraries. For the periodised list, there is as yet no term widely in use.\textsuperscript{59} Many antiquaries’ works catalogued evidence of a particular kind by period. Camden had articulated basic language epochs, and had fit primary work in several fields into this periodisation, county by county. Later antiquaries fitted their work on various bodies of evidence to his framework, facilitating understanding about their field among the many antiquaries who worked in other fields, and optimising the community’s future chance of structuring a definitive British history.\textsuperscript{60} The antiquarian local history was modelled

\textsuperscript{58}McKisack, \textit{Medieval History}, pp. 50-74.

\textsuperscript{59}These included works such as John Weever’s \textit{Ancient Funerall Monuments} (1631), Robert Vaughan’s \textit{British Antiquities Revived} (1662), Walter Charleton, \textit{Chorea Gigantum} (1663) and Dugdale et al., \textit{Monasticon Anglicanum} (1661-1673).

\textsuperscript{60}Reprints of the \textit{Britannia} were used for this purpose, with editions getting larger and more copiously annotated. John Ogilby put out one volume of a new, but very changed, edition in 1675; a facsimile reprint exists by Duckham: London, 1939. Oxford-based antiquaries Awnshawn Churchill, Arthur Charlett, Edmund Gibson put out an edition in 1691. See Parry, \textit{Battle of the Books}, pp. 327-36. A proposal for a reprint of Ogilby’s volume was issued in 1718 by printer Thomas Bowles in London, but came to nothing. Ninian Wallis issued his \textit{Britannia Liber: A True Narrative of the Antiquity, Independency, Purity and Uniformity of the British Churches: wherein...these...Heads are...Demonstrated: I. That the Christian Faith was...planted in Great Britain...by St. Paul in Person....}, S. Powell: Dublin, 1710, showing at least the influence of Camden’s work, if not of his historiography. Three editions came out in the eighteenth century, of which Gibbons’ was one. See J.G. Nichols tr. and ed., \textit{Britannia, or a Chorographcall Description of the Flourishing Kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and the Islands Adjacent, from the Earliest Antiquity}. By William Camden, Translated from the Edition Published by the Author in MDCVII. Enlarged by the Latest Discoveries, W. Hersee: London, 1806, 3 volumes, Preface, vii. Nichols put out an edition in 1789 as well as one in 1806. Daniel and Samuel Lysons also put out an edition in the nineteenth century: \textit{Magna Britannia: Being a Concise Topographical Account of the Several Counties of Great Britain}. T. Cadell and W. Davies: London, 1806-22, 7 volumes. Nichols’ second edition will be discussed at the end of this
on Camden’s totalising vision, and integrated evidential material into a narrative which covered a large temporal span and political, ethnographic and other elements. This was possible because it was limited to a small area.\(^1\) The last genre, the itinerary, grouped data from one or more related fields by a series of important places, on a scale from local to regional but rarely larger.\(^2\) Antiquarian genres, then, used place to define political and social structures and thus the relations of specific bodies of evidence to historical accounts.\(^3\)

Antiquaries’ subject, method and genres were mutually defining, reflecting and reinforcing a tendency to specialise. Specialisation affected the way antiquarian fields developed over time. The combination of the generous intellectual horizons set by the primary question, and the highly specialised way antiquaries functioned within their many fields, gave the intellectual domain of antiquarianism a peculiar internal structure. By specialising, antiquaries introduced into their domain a large number of questions which were subordinate to the primary antiquarian question.


\(^1\) Examples include William Somner’s *Antiquities of Canterburie* (1640), William Dugdale’s *History of St. Paul’s* (1668) and William Southouse’s *Monasticon Fevershamense* (1671).

\(^2\) For example, the route taken by Roman forces in conquering southeast England established locations where archaeological remains might be found; these locations were basic to an account of municipal development. See Evans, *A History*, p. 47. The itinerary, as a genre, was still used in the nineteenth century. For example, N.H. Nicholas used remains identified as those of the army of King Richard II to establish the scope of their travels and success in Scotland, and Richard Colt Hoare used evidence from state documents to establish the movements of the Court of King John from his Coronation to the end of his Reign. See N.H. Nicolas, No. II, Henry Ellis, No. XI, and Richard Colt Hoare, No. VI in *Archaeologia*, Volume 22 for 1829. The itinerary was represented by James Storer, ed., *The Antiquarian Itinerary, Comprising Specimens of Architecture, Monastic, Castellated, and Domestic, with Other Vestiges of Antiquity in Great Britain, accompanied with Description*, London: William Clarke, 1815-17, 7 volumes. Many works of this last sort were published. On the medieval genres, see John H. Harvey, ed., *William Worcestre’s Itineraries; Edited from the Unique Manuscript, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*. 210. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1969. On seventeenth-century antiquaries’ use of this genre, see Parry, *Trophies of Time*, pp. 23-25 and 249-274.

\(^3\) Nineteenth-century antiquaries also published county histories, of which R.C. Hoare’s many volumes on Wiltshire were the most influential beyond the SA. See Evans, *A History*, p. 21ff.
but functioned within fields as primary, organising highly articulate structures of scholarship. Ties between fields were variously articulated. For example, the complementary nature of numismatics and archaeology was early appreciated.\textsuperscript{64} Into the nineteenth century, antiquaries working in cognate fields shared similar scholarly competence, and used works, material and data from both fields though for different purposes. A coin, for example, could be "the enlightenment of archaeology," or of philology.\textsuperscript{65} But it was just as true, that many fields shared little common ground. An antiquary working on Saxon religious texts such as Gundulf’s Bible or the Exeter Missal, might never share anything with one working on Roman coins.

Ties between fields, then, were variously articulated. But ties between any particular field and the primary question organising the intellectual domain were much simpler. That is, the relations between numismatics and British history, or archaeology and British history, were relatively less developed in the written works of antiquaries than ties between numismatics and archaeology. While possible connections were there, they were not often followed up in antiquaries’ works, because of their tendency to specialise. Thus, antiquarianism was successful


in achieving advanced levels of knowledge about subordinate shared problems in many of its fields, but progress on the primary question was much slower.

A second peculiarity of the structure of the antiquarian intellectual domain was that primary field questions were related to the primary antiquarian shared question not by any necessary connections of British history or by any philosophical structure seen to organise fields within the domain, but by task and within time. All antiquarian fields shared three tasks, organised pyramid-style. At the bottom, the collection of evidence remained the largest consumer of antiquaries' time and resources, from Camden's time through the nineteenth century. The need to collect and preserve antiquities and texts was widely understood in the antiquarian community, and the history of the great British collections shows that antiquaries were instrumental in their existence and persistence, as well as in establishing a national institution to support the preservation and study of such materials. The Renaissance promoted the growth of libraries in Europe.\(^66\) But Britain did not provide well for its scholars.\(^67\) As governmental support was


\(^{67}\)The Royal Library, founded by Edward IV in 1471, was substantial, but the political valence of its contents in the years after Dissolution encouraged authorities to make access to the collection difficult. It was expanded under Henry VIII by John Leland, but much medieval material was purged by Edward VI. See Edward Miller, *That Noble Cabinet*, Ohio University Press: Athens, Ohio, 1974, p. 22. Collections of art and antiquities were amassed by Charles I. Thomas Howard Earl Arundel, and Henry Howard Duke of Norfolk; these were added to the Royal Library. James I donated Cranmer's collection of books and manuscripts. But, as Dissolution had encouraged violence towards the monuments of the past, censorship and book burning, Commonwealth concerns for orthodoxy encouraged purges and suspicion of learned collections, which contained materials suggesting that the continuity of the Saxon church did not conform to the ideological requirements of the Elizabethan Settlement. See A.N.L. Munby,
equivocal, seventeenth-century antiquaries had little choice but to buy books and antiquities if they wanted to study them.\(^6\) They tried repeatedly to establish a national institution from their own collections.\(^6\) and began to succeed in 1702, when the Harleian and Cottonian collections were made the core of the new British Library.\(^7\)

Antiquaries, then, were devoted to their first task, collection, as it provided the foundation for their pyramidally organised tasks. As the next two tasks depended on recovering all they could of what was lost, antiquaries concentrated on acquiring new evidence, fitting this into skeletal chronological and other arrangements of their field, comparing notes with others, and then returning to scavenging among libraries and graveyards. The antiquarian commitment to


\(^\text{7}^\text{The collection of Elias Ashmole was bequeathed to Oxford university in 1677. Sir Hans Sloane's collection was bequeathed to the nation on terms which were at first refused by parliament. For Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford, Humphrey Wanley had built up a collection that included 20,000 manuscripts, cartularies and rolls. Under his son Edward, the collection grew to 500,000 items. Robert Cotton's collection of English and Scottish historical and literary documents, cartularies, state papers and manuscripts included Beowulf, the Lindisfarne Gospels, middle-English poems such as Gawaine and the Green Knight, and the Magna Carta. This was grudgingly accepted by Parliament after much difficulty. See Raymond Irwin, The Heritage of the English Library. George Allen & Unwin: London, 1964.}

\(^\text{8}^\text{Left in ruinous housing, it burned in 1731. The Royal Library had been housed with Cotton's: much was "burned to a Crust." Report from the Committee appointed to view the Cottonian Library, in Commons Reports, Series I, Vol. 1, p. 452. The remains were removed to the attics of Westminster school, where they remained until late eighteenth-century antiquaries began attempting to clean smoke- and water-damaged manuscripts. Finally, in 1753, Parliament united the collections of Cotton, Soane and Harley with the Royal Library in the newly created British Museum, housed at Montagu House from 1754. See Arundell James Kennedy Esdaile, The British Museum Library: A Short History and Survey, G. Allen & Unwin: London, 1946.}
collecting evidence reflected its definitive role in the construction of the most definitive history, and was also the reason why such a history was not attempted until the evidence was felt to be fully accumulated. In the seventeenth century, there were only a few dozens of antiquaries prosecuting the dark industry. Antiquarian genres and specialisation, then, show an accurate evaluation of the provisional quality of their work, and the need to defer writing histories.\(^{71}\)

Once collected, evidence had to be authenticated, a task which also required much time and work. By this is meant the meticulous matching of evidences to articles of history. Specialisation aided the development of the expertise required for this task. Levine described antiquaries' use of numismatics in authenticating details of chronology and dynasties:

> criticism depends upon comparison...By collecting, comparing, and classifying the various objects of their scrutiny, they were furnishing an indispensable groundwork for advance. Only through the systematic accumulation of evidence, scrupulously arranged and compared...only through the discrimination of the evidence could the legends that passed for history be distinguished finally from the truth...But everything depended upon the availability of useful objects; and this was why the science of numismatics advanced, with all its hazards, more rapidly than the rest.\(^{72}\)

Further examples will be discussed below, in the section on the antiquarian intellectual domain in the eighteenth century.

Without collection and authentication, the final task, construction of a definitive British history, could not be achieved. The last task tended to take up fewer resources than the first two, as work on collecting and authenticating took the better part of antiquaries' time and reflected

---

\(^{71}\) This perspective remained in the community into the nineteenth century. See for example, "It is difficult to estimate the greatness of the obligations of British history to these [collections]. They have dug up, cleansed, & put in order for immediate inspection & use, a multitude of written monuments bearing on the greatest events." John Hill Burton, *The Book Hunter Etc.*, William Blackwood & Sons: Edinburgh and London, 1862, pp. 297-98.

\(^{72}\) Levine, *Dr. Woodward's Shield*, pp. 274-75.
their personal interests. But even after centuries, there remained large gaps in antiquaries' knowledge of the British past. These gaps partly explain the weak ties between specific fields and the primary antiquarian question. The construction of the definitive history had seemed ambitious even to Camden, whose Britannia was the product of thirty years' research. The difficulty of achieving the third task could only increase with the successful pursuit of the first two. "Working then on many fronts, antiquaries tried to piece together the past of Britain, a task that became more daunting as the years went by and scholars realised how deep the past was."

The three antiquarian tasks helped to define much about antiquarian scholarly interactions. In pursuing their own speciality, antiquaries came across material of note to others, and so held exhibitions and shared collections and notebooks. By sharing the information individual fellows amassed, other fellows could authenticate portions of the historical record they were working on. Authentication often depended on personal observation, creating a need to travel. This was expensive and difficult, reinforcing the trend to regional organisation and cooperation, as many could only collect and describe the remains of their own region. This also gave rise to the use of questionnaires, which allowed antiquaries to gather information from parts of the

---

73This trend can be seen in the work of seventeenth-century antiquaries. For example, Camden's method was championed by herald Augustine Vincent in his A Discoverie of 1619. Robert Vaughan was assisted in his studies by Vincent, who gave him access to the library of the College of Arms in London. Vaughan's 1662 British Antiquities Revived dealt exclusively with genealogical and heraldic material, and was the product of many years' research. See Levy, Tudor Historical Thought.

74Parry, Trophies of Time, p. 13.

75Camden had used Leland's notebooks. Camden's books were dispersed at his death among the community, possibly not as he had intended, as they were highly desirable to other antiquaries. See "Vita" in Richard Chiswell, Epistolae de Gulielmo Camdeni Richard Chiswell: London. 1691. I am grateful to Richard DeMolen, S.J., for indicating to me current locations of parts of Camden's library. See Richard L. DeMolen, The Library of William Camden, Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, Vol. 128/4 (1984); 327-409. The sharing of antiquarian notebooks throughout the seventeenth century is discussed in Evans, A History, pp. 14-32. See also Parry, "Deathbed scenes like Anthony Wood's, where he allocated his manuscript collections to trusted friends, were probably not uncommon." In Trophies of Time, p. 17.
country they could not otherwise get to.\textsuperscript{76}

Antiquaries, then, worked cooperatively. Camden had used the notebooks of others who had collected, observed, and died before him. In 1574, William Larnbarde had described this way of working, as "joining our penes and conferring our labours."\textsuperscript{77} Cooperation is visible as a widespread strategy in the antiquarian community within a few years of Camden's death in 1623. In 1637, several antiquaries working in the London area signed an Accord, the articles of which allow us to examine the cooperative practice of seventeenth-century antiquaries:

1. \textit{Imprimis}, That every one do helpe and further each others studyes and endeavours, by imparting and communicating...all such bookes, notes, deedes, rolles etc, as he hath; for the expediting whereof, and that each may knowe what to borrow of other for his best use and behoofe, itt is first concluded and promised eache to send unto other a perfect inventory and catalogue of all such notes, bookes, collections, etc. as they now have...

3. Item, that every one do severally gather all observable collections w'h he can, concerning the foundation of any religious house, of castle, or publicke worke and all memorabe notes for historical illustration of the Kingdome or the genealogicall honour of any family therein...to communicate unto each of this Society who is most interested therein...

5. Item, That everyone do endeavour to borrowe of other strangers, with whom he hath interest, all such books, notes, rolles, deedes, etc., as he can obteyne, as well for any of his partners as for himself...

8. Item, That care be providently had, not to lende, much lesse part with, any other ppeece, treatise, booke, roll, deed, etc, unto any stranger, but to such p'sons, from whom some reasonable exchange probably be had or borrowed...

10. Item, For the better expediting of these studyes by dividing the greate burden

\textsuperscript{76}Edward Lluyd's 1707 \textit{Archaeologia Britannica} was based on his travels and on his "Parochial Queries," sent to parish priests, to gain information on coins, public buildings, country houses, barrows, Roman remains, crosses, beacons, pre-Tudor inscriptions, weapons, and vases. These Queries established the questionnaire as a means of obtaining meticulous, parish-by-parish information on local history and antiquities. See Evans, p. 47. Results are in Bodleian MS 1820 a, fol. 76. This was still being used in the nineteenth century: in 1865, a questionnaire was sent to SA Local Secretaries soliciting information on "inscribed monuments, manuscripts, monastic cartularies, coins or other antiquities, Celtic, Roman or Saxon," and about endangered monuments, excavations and collectors in their area. Evans, p. 303-04. See also Piggott, \textit{Stukeley}, pp. 11 and 22-23.

which through infinite variety of particulars would arise, to the discouragement, and oppressing of any one man's industry, it is concluded and agreed to part and divide these labours...

This Accord shows that specialisation and cooperation were the means by which antiquaries attempted to achieve their scholarly goals. Information and collections were shared. The exchange of inventories was meant to help fellows get at the parts of colleague's collections relevant to their own work. A conception of the antiquarian institution is implicit, showing that it was meant to foster the development of libraries and museums, and to function as a communications centre and information clearing house. The tasks are also visible. The concern to preserve antiquities is specifically noted in its own Item. Other Items described how these cooperative strategies were meant to assist the process of authentication, by fellows specialised in different areas. Item 9, for example, enjoined fellows: "That every of the rest doe send unto S' Christopher Hatton a p'fect transcript of all such heires femall of note as he can find, with the probates of every one of them to be methodized by him." Other Items identified who would record and work on monastic deeds, armor, city arms and mayoral emblems. In this way, antiquaries built up a network for sharing information, and channelling it to the appropriate expert. That this activity was directed at the third task, the construction of a definitive history, can be seen in other documents from the SA's early years. Humphrey Wanley's 1707 draft

---

78 As noted in the previous chapter, the SA's collections grew constantly from donations, reflecting the fact that this commitment to preservation was widely shared throughout the antiquarian community over three centuries.

79 Evans, A History, p. 22. Probates were certified copies of wills which named heirs and contained much genealogical information. Male heirs tended to be better recorded than female, so probates treating female heirs held the potential to complete or confirm entire family lines. Occasionally, titles or privileges descended through the female. Such cases were complex and, as they affected land ownership and the rights and ranks of the male children of inheriting females within the peerage, much contested. The correct attribution of rights, ranks, titles and lands in these cases could determine much about the social and political structure of whole counties. Therefore, they had to be "methodised" according to College of Arms rules and documents. See Wagner, Heralds of England.
Charter lists what the Society might achieve with governmental support. The first heading is "A Compleat History of Great Britain and Ireland," and is followed by an exhaustive catalogue and arrangement of the works necessary to such a history.

These documents reveal that "[antiquarianism was, for the most part a co-operative endeavour." Cooperation reflected the medieval rather than humanist notion of authorship. Cooperative strategies helped antiquaries work towards fulfilling their three tasks and their ultimate project. Strategies and tasks grew out of and reflect the specialisation which antiquaries embraced as a way of achieving an answer to their primary question. Thus, the mutual definition of antiquaries' methods, genres, fields, tasks and strategies may be seen. Wanley’s draft also shows the vitality of Camden’s historiographic vision. The historical subject remained

---


82 Parry, Trophies of Time, p. 6.

83 Many of their projects were immensely ambitious, requiring, one might imagine, several lifetimes or numerous assistants for their accomplishment." Parry, Trophies of Time, p. 15. Antiquaries still credited or rejected work on the basis of its use of sources. Parry uses the commitment to documentation as distinguishing antiquaries from virtuosi.

84 Wanley’s project does not resemble other historiographic visions of its time. It was not motivated by any aim to propagandise for a political perspective: generations of antiquaries worked towards this goal, but died without seeing the definitive history begun. It was not intended to be an exercise in eloquence or moral suasion, following one Renaissance model of authorship: antiquaries’ histories were most often criticised for being dry. On distinguishing Wanley’s antiquarian work from that of Oxford palaeographers and Anglo-Saxonists, see David C. Douglas, English Scholars, Johnathon Cape: London, 1939, pp. 134ff.
encyclopedic and totalising.\textsuperscript{85} The awkward cohabitation of system and chronology in Camden's \textit{Britannia} had been smoothed somewhat, in favour of system.\textsuperscript{86} But the vision was still that of a narrative precisely constructed from many bodies of data, and organised according to the compositive parts of British social and political life, as a truly representative and comprehensive report of the past.\textsuperscript{87}

In their first century or more, then, antiquaries articulated methods, genres, tasks, and research strategies, all of which helped to coordinate their work towards their ultimate goal. By the eighteenth century, these had moved antiquarian work a considerable distance from historical writing, creating problems for its reception. At the same time historians, seeking an evidential foundation for their often derivative and partisan histories, began to take up antiquarian methods and reproduce antiquarian research. The complex relations of antiquaries and eighteenth-century British historians have been much analysed by Momigliano and others.\textsuperscript{88} To twentieth-century


\textsuperscript{86}Subsidiary fields and their relations are set cursorily within a temporal framework. Subsidiary fields were divided into sections and subsections which reflected the two kinds of antiquarian remains--physical and written--and were organised according to the existing structures of political and social life. For example, the material of political history was divided among governmental department and bodies of writings: laws, rights and jurisdictions were written, but departments such as the admiralty, the army, the church, or the county were organised by physical realities such as lands, buildings, staffs, disbursements, and so on. Systematic accounts were projected for all these items singly, but the super-history was the most important project.

\textsuperscript{87}“From documents, and by observation, comparison and deduction, the many pasts of Britain were partially reconstructed.” Parry, \textit{Trophies of Time}, p. 13. How this ever increasing body of knowledge could be coordinated towards the complete British history is unspecified in both the Accord and in Wanley’s draft Charters. Both seem to assume that the SA’s leading members would direct this work, and that the final product would be a compendium of work by many men. The impracticability of the vision suggests that it had never been realistically planned or attempted.

historians, antiquaries can appear either vigorous or superfluous, depending on whether they are evaluated in their own terms, or located with respect to what Momigliano identifies as the lineage of modern historiography. By his account, in the latter half of the century these two historiographic streams converged. While this may describe what happened for historians, the event has not been seen from the perspective of antiquaries, whose scholarly community and distinctive historiographic vision survived the alleged convergence. Antiquaries neither merged with, nor were submerged within the mainstream of British historical writing. Their encyclopedic vision and traditional projects persisted. Evidence continued to determine the written works they produced. Thus, while antiquarian fields were invaded and their works raided for data, antiquaries maintained their traditional historiographic identity. Their work could have brought

\[\text{Momigliano is not unaware that historians' usage of antiquarian research differs from antiquaries' own. Historians remained "unaware of the evidence collected and of the problems formulated by the antiquarians. Much of the past work was lost on them." Momigliano, "Ancient History," p. 310. However, his analysis concentrates on the contribution of antiquarian material to the creation of modern historiography, and his argument, that these two streams had their sources in Herodotus' ethnographic and Tacitus' political interests, suits continental historiography better than the British. Momigliano recognises, but does not account sufficiently for, Camden's reception in Britain as a break with previous historiography, as an originator of a new historiographic tradition. The roots of British historiography, in the previous classical and medieval traditions, were precisely what Camden scrutinised sceptically, favouring indigenous material equally. And Camden's definition of the historical subject brought together both ancient streams.}

\[\text{Specialisation continued to interact with the work antiquaries produced. In the eighteenth century, as fields developed, they became the subject of narratives in themselves. Numismatist Martin Folkes, for example, found it a struggle to construct a complete history of English coins. See Evans, A History, p. 95. Antiquaries' papers concentrated more on problems within the field than the contribution of field information to British history. For example, papers given to the Tavern Society on brass implements led to debate about their dating and use. But their designation as Roman or Celtic, which would identify social customs of one period or another, received much less comment. See Evans, A History, pp. 93-96. On eighteenth-century antiquaries' work in literary fields, see James E. Person Jr., ed., Literature Criticism from 1400 to 1800, Gale Research: Detroit, 1992, vol. 17.}

\[\text{Laird Okie argues that eighteenth-century antiquarian works were indeed a form of historical writing, but only just, as they continued to thread multiple documents on a bare strand of commentary. Some antiquaries wrote conventional histories: Thomas Hearne's 1714 System of Universal History, for example, presented history as a moral and practical guide to statecraft. But this does not represent the mainstream of antiquarian work. See Okie, Augustan Historical Writing. Introduction. By giving evidence primacy in determining narrative foci, antiquaries "denied [themselves] the role of historian in the modern sense of interpreter." Thus antiquarian histories were: "documentary sources with a supporting historical narrative." See O'Day, The Debate on the English Reformation, p. 47. Using John Strype's Annals of the Reformation and Ecclesiastical Memorials (1721-29) as her example, she argues that he "wished to write a true account of the sixteenth century Reformation, based upon an exhaustive use of the original sources. He wanted to protect the past against abuse by contemporary authorities," p. 52.}
them recognition when their methods and materials began to be appreciated. But their past had produced a culture of caution: they did not court public attention.92

A metaphor of cohabitation probably better describes the way eighteenth-century antiquaries experienced the intersection of these two historiographical streams.93 The SA's 1717 Constitution affirmed traditional antiquarian goals, to "preserve[e] the Venerable Remains of our Ancestors," and to preserve knowledge of the past for the future.94 Richard Gough's 1770 Introduction to Volume 1 of the Archaeologia affirmed their commitment to "better methods of preserving facts,"95 to collecting the evidential bodies that founded the possibility of writing history,96 and to the cautious antiquarian historiography.97 As he saw it, any convergence of the two streams of history would have to take place in the antiquarian domain: good history was

92The more the erudits "accepted the antiquarian's method of checking literary by non-literary evidence, the less the antiquarians could claim numismatics, diplomatics, and epigraphy as their own subjects." Mornigiano, "Ancient History," p. 310.

93When narrative historians took up research themselves, or what was easier, used antiquarian research in their own work, antiquaries did not contest it. This had been happening on a minor scale in the seventeenth century. Civil War soldiers had used their travels to make notes on local antiquities, as seen in Richard Symonds's Diary of the Marches of the Royal Army during the Great Civil War. Similar works were published by non-antiquaries on churches and heraldry. At the other end of the social scale, royalist supporters of kingship and Whig defenders of liberty alike had used antiquarian Old English and legal scholarship, subordinating the appropriate pieces of evidence to their partisan ideological argument.


95Gough distinguished between veneration and historical accuracy, and between tradition, "probability" and "evidence," aiming to "explode what rested only on the vanity of inventors." Gough, Introduction, Archaeologia Vol. 1 (1770): i.

96He wrote: "The most indistinct collection has this merit, that it supplies materials to those who have sagacity or leisure to extract from the common mass whatever may answer useful purposes. Here begins the province of the ANTIQUARY." Gough, ii.

97"[T]he arrangement and proper use of facts...For want of these, how large a portion of history, from the Creation of the world to the present age, remains yet to be sifted by the sagacity of modern Criticism!" Gough, ii. He was sceptical about the value of histories written without an informed approach to evidence: "To this neglect is owing, that we have no more certainty about the first ages of Rome than of Mexico." Gough, iii. Antiquaries' continental connections were continued also. Balsamo identifies antiquaries Joseph Ames, author of the Typographical Antiquities, London, 1749, and James Douglas as the bibliographic authorities in eighteenth-century England. Pettas. tr., Balsamo, Bibliography, pp. 135 and 107ff.
"not a mere narrative taken up at random and embellished with poetic diction, but a regular and elaborate inquiry into every ancient record or proof, that can elucidate or establish them."98

As the two historiographic streams began to converge, then, the view within differed greatly from that without the community. Twentieth-century historians are plagued by two related problems in evaluating antiquarian work in this critical century: its traditionally poor reception, and the failure of antiquaries to promote their historiographic vision beyond their community.99 While Camden’s work was greatly respected, his hundreds of pages of dense, scholarly Latin were little understood. Later antiquaries took his methods and vision even further, and so their work began to provoke ridicule rather than respect. A brief return over the chronological ground already covered in this chapter will be necessary to explain how this situation arose. Antiquaries were always few and unfashionable. Because of their connection to the Catholic past, two different definitions of antiquarianism existed in British society from Elizabethan times, one generated from within and the other from without the antiquarian community.100 The widely-

98Gough, Introduction, Archaeologia Vol. I (1770); ii. The encyclopedic vision can be seen in James Douglas’ 1793 Nenia Britannica, or Sepulchral History of Great Britain: from the earliest period to its general conversion to Christianity...with the contents of several hundred burial places, opened under a careful Inspection of the Author. His Preface distinguished historians and antiquaries. noted the ridicule cast on antiquarian research, and urged completion of the third task: "If the study of Antiquity be undertaken in the cause of History, it will rescue itself from a reproach indiscriminately and fastidiously bestowed on works which have been deemed frivolous."

99An Item in their 1637 Accord, for example, had stated: "That no p’son of this Society do shewe or otherwise make known this or any the like future agreement, nor call in, nor promise to call in, any other person of this Society w’out a particular consent first had of all this present Society.” Antiquaries knew the reputation of their work rose and fell with the political times. Sometimes the public smiled on them, as when the Restoration revived interest in the monarchy and peerage, and the Great Fire reinforced the impermanence of the physical manifestations of society, leading many to want to record them. During these times antiquarian works sold well, as for example Roger Gale’s 1709 commentary on the Antonine Itinerary of Britain. Bodleian librarian Thomas Hearne’s 1710-12 publication of Leland’s Itinerary, which previously had circulated in manuscript form only, and Robert Sanderson’s publications of Thomas Rymer’s incomplete volumes of chronicles, the Foedera. However, the vast majority of antiquaries’ works did not claim any public attention. See Kendrick, British Antiquity.

100'Antiquaries’ association with recusancy, and the fact that both crown and parliament “feared those antiquaries who were busy inquiring into parliamentary and prerogative rights,” contributed to the ridicule and corresponding antiquarian caution. Camden had mentioned those “who cry down the study of Antiquity with much contempt.” Camden had noted that "some there be who wholly contemne and avile this study of Antiquity," but dismissed them as “strangers in their owne soile, and forrainers in their owne City.” Holland, tr., Britannia, “The Author to the
known definition was that generated from without. In 1628 John Earle, Bishop of Salisbury, had caricatured the Antiquary as: "one that hath that unnatural disease to be enamoured of old age and wrinkles, and loves all things (as Dutchmen do cheese,) the better for being mouldy and worm-eaten." Earle saw no value in being "strangely thrifty of time past," interested in "the rust of old monuments," or reading only those [books] where Time has eaten out the letters." He valued other kinds of learning, as they contributed to public life. But antiquarianism, never conceived as contributing to Christian polity, could offer no such wisdom, and so was widely viewed as having none at all.

This ridicule deflected historians from exploring antiquarianism, which contributed to the divergence of the two streams over the seventeenth century, and amplified their differences.

Antiquaries' caution about promoting their work reinforced the public image and prevented

---

101 Earle's work was a collection of unflattering caricatures. The autograph manuscript is Bodleian Ms.Eng. miss.f. 89. It was edited for publication in 1811 by antiquary Philip Bliss with the assistance of antiquary Edward Blount. See Bliss, ed., Earle, Microcosmographie. White and Cochrane: London, 1811 pp. 22-24. Earle may have generated the specific features which are ridiculed in the antiquary, or he may have been reflecting a common opinion, but his is the earliest articulation of a remarkably uniform portrait thereafter. The features of Earle's caricature can be found in Shackerly Mermion's play and in Scott's ironic characterisation of his main character in The Antiquary (1815). See Mermion, The Antiquary. The Crane, St. Paul's Churchyard: London, 1641. The best account of the history of public perceptions about antiquarianism is Nicolas Barker, ed., A.N.L. Munby, Essays and Papers. London: Scolar Press. 1977. Munby covers early material, including Lucian of Samosata (200 BCE), and Sebastian Brant's Narrenschiff (1494, Basel), which included Durer's engraving of "The Book Fool." His discussion of the reception of antiquarianism from the eighteenth century treats both artistic and written material. The best illustrated version of Munby's is Some Caricatures of Book-Collectors: An Essay, Privately by W.H. Robinson: London, 1948. See also F. Somner Merryweather, Bibliomania in the Middle Ages. Woodstock Press: London, 1933, revised by H.B. Copinger from the first, 1844 edition.

102 Earle criticises the "scholar-mountebank...oftener in his study than at his book" and the university student who drank more than he studied, comparing them unfavourably with the Scholar and Critic, who "spelled over a great many books...the surgeon of old authors [who] heals the wounds of dust and ignorance...He tastes stiles as some discreeter palates do wines." Bliss, ed., A Set of Portraits, pp. 127-130. Earle modelled the Scholar and Critic on humanists like Erasmus and Colet, whose Christian rhetoric underlay political philosophy into the seventeenth century, and whose learning held a kernel of political and ethical utility. For the interaction of this tradition of ridicule with historians' contempt for antiquaries' "dark industry," see Levine, "The Antiquaries and their Critics," in Battle of the Books, pp. 327-308.
communication of their historiographic vision, increasing the gap between the streams and ensuring the continuance of ridicule and separation. The contradictions between antiquaries’ self-image and their public image were determinative of their fortunes throughout the eighteenth century. As a community, they both desired and distrusted public attention. They pursued a Royal Charter fitfully but, having gained it, did not employ it for the public recognition and prestige it could bring. Happily, this perverse situation was alleviated in the later eighteenth century.

The traditional antiquarian vision flourished in the eighteenth-century community, then. The problem was, others did not know it. Mid-century, Tobias Smollett complained of antiquaries’ "dry, tedious fatiguing collections of public acts and statutes," preferring "a well-connected detail of historical events." Effective advertisement of antiquarian work only began to occur through The Gentleman’s Magazine, which introduced the reading public to the complexities and significance of antiquarian research. For the first time, an antidote was

---

103 Before mid-century, most eighteenth-century antiquarian work cannot be described as popular. After that time, the achievements of Gibbon, Stukeley and Hearne cannot be taken as typical.

104 Most antiquaries preferred their dark industry to working on the SA committees that might have addressed their situation. Members and Council persisted in viewing publications as the SA’s raison d’être. Even SA presidents were equivocal advertisements for antiquarian works. A woman friend of President Browne Willis complained: “with one of the honestest hearts in the world, he has one of the oddest heads that ever dropped out of the moon. Extremely well-versed in coins, he knows hardly anything of mankind.” Quoted in John Nichols, Literary Anecdotes. Nichols: London. 1828. p. 204.


106 The Gentleman’s Magazine will hereafter to be referred to as GM. "The part played by journals in spreading information about books and promoting the dissemination of ideas...is without parallel. They became a basic aspect of the creative dynamic which characterised this felicitous period in cultural history." Pettas, tr., Balsamo. Bibliography. p. 107. Balsamo writes mainly about Italy, but the same is true of the GM in Britain, which made the study of British history fashionable. Fifteen years into his editorship, in 1745, Cave wrote: “The method which we have taken of digesting accounts of the best authority, and carefully settling facts, we find, by the frequent demand for complete sets, has made our work regarded as an exact and impartial history of the times.” Cave, ed., GM Cave: St. John’s Gate, London. 15(1745) n.p. GM published throughout the period covered by this thesis, but was joined by many other periodicals covering antiquarian topics. Even in the 1880s, other antiquarian publications referred to GM as "the organ of all students of antiquity." Preface, The Antiquary: A Magazine Devoted to the Study of the Past, 1/1(1880) January, n.p. For an introduction to eighteenth- and nineteenth-century printing houses, and to “the most
found for "the prevalent idea that it is a dry, if not unprofitable study."\textsuperscript{107}

Founded in 1731, the \textit{GM} found many occasions to praise "the most learned and ingenious antiquary."\textsuperscript{108} It was a popular publication. Editorial remarks were made in the person of a fictional character, Mr. Urban, whose witty reflections on the antics of politicians gained a wide following.\textsuperscript{109} Conceived as a historical reference tool,\textsuperscript{110} it pioneered techniques for presenting distinctively antiquarian problems, such as the intricacies of authenticating textual and physical remains. Over its first few decades, the letter section became a forum for the exchange of antiquarian information.\textsuperscript{111} Readers submitting or requesting information on various topics

\footnotesize
\begin{enumerate}
  \item The writer continues: "as to usefulness, a study can hardly be deemed deficient in that respect, which serves to throw so strong a light upon history itself." This suggests that this nineteenth-century writer distinguished between antiquaries and historians. See anon, \textit{The Book-Collectors Handbook: A Modern Library Companion}, E. Churton: London. 1845. p. 15.
  \item Preface. \textit{GM} 54(1784); n.p.
  \item Mr. Urban claimed to abstain from remarks "which owe their existence to party spirit, or their interest to the bitterness of controversy." But his remarks about the affairs of the world often functioned as just such a commentary. \textit{GM}. Preface. 100(1830), N.S.23. p. vi.
  \item "Magazine" at this time meant "storehouse." Cave wrote: "it often happens that many things deserving attention...are only seen by accident, and others not sufficiently published or preserved for universal benefit and information. This consideration has induced several Gentlemen to promote a monthly collection, to treasure up, as in a Magazine, the most remarkable pieces." Quoted in John Nichols, \textit{The Rise and Progress of the Gentleman's Magazine}, Nichols: London, 1821, pp. vi-vii. Nichols is restating remarks made in the Preface to Volume 1 No. 1. The \textit{GM} was cumulatively indexed from volume 1, editors kept article summaries by category over many decades. and references to articles on related topics in previous volumes were printed at the bottom of articles so that readers could look them up. See Carl Lennart Carlson, \textit{The First Magazine: A History of the Gentleman's Magazine}, Brown University: Providence, Rhode Island, 1938, Volume 3 of Brown University Studies and Pettas, tr., Balsamo, \textit{Bibliography}, Chapter VI, "The Bibliography of Journalists, Academics, and Booksellers in the Eighteenth Century." p. 98-142.
  \item For example, one subscriber sent in a Roman funerary inscription, which was engraved in facsimile and accompanied by a discussion of problems in interpreting Roman script. \textit{GM} 14(1744), pp. 368-69. Another sent the manuscript letter of a apostate priest, which was printed in Latin in full. While a concern for orthodoxy is evident, questions of orthodoxy were not dealt with in the manner of many periodicals of the time, in an essay on doctrine. The subscriber's antiquarian concern for the preservation of a manuscript related to an incident in British history is visible in his concern: "to preserve this letter." \textit{GM}, 10(1740), p. 165. That he was understood to have this antiquarian concern is clear from Mr. Urban's note about errors and solecisms in the Latin: "We have left these words...as they stand in the Original." \textit{GM}, 10(1740), p. 166.
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{107}The writer continues: "as to usefulness, a study can hardly be deemed deficient in that respect, which serves to throw so strong a light upon history itself." This suggests that this nineteenth-century writer distinguished between antiquaries and historians. See anon, \textit{The Book-Collectors Handbook: A Modern Library Companion}, E. Churton: London. 1845. p. 15.

\textsuperscript{108}Preface. \textit{GM} 54(1784); n.p.

\textsuperscript{109}Mr. Urban claimed to abstain from remarks "which owe their existence to party spirit, or their interest to the bitterness of controversy." But his remarks about the affairs of the world often functioned as just such a commentary. \textit{GM}. Preface. 100(1830), N.S.23. p. vi.

\textsuperscript{110}"Magazine" at this time meant "storehouse." Cave wrote: "it often happens that many things deserving attention...are only seen by accident, and others not sufficiently published or preserved for universal benefit and information. This consideration has induced several Gentlemen to promote a monthly collection, to treasure up, as in a Magazine, the most remarkable pieces." Quoted in John Nichols, \textit{The Rise and Progress of the Gentleman's Magazine}, Nichols: London, 1821, pp. vi-vii. Nichols is restating remarks made in the Preface to Volume 1 No. 1. The \textit{GM} was cumulatively indexed from volume 1, editors kept article summaries by category over many decades. and references to articles on related topics in previous volumes were printed at the bottom of articles so that readers could look them up. See Carl Lennart Carlson, \textit{The First Magazine: A History of the Gentleman's Magazine}, Brown University: Providence, Rhode Island, 1938, Volume 3 of Brown University Studies and Pettas, tr., Balsamo, \textit{Bibliography}, Chapter VI, "The Bibliography of Journalists, Academics, and Booksellers in the Eighteenth Century." p. 98-142.

\textsuperscript{111}For example, one subscriber sent in a Roman funerary inscription, which was engraved in facsimile and accompanied by a discussion of problems in interpreting Roman script. \textit{GM} 14(1744), pp. 368-69. Another sent the manuscript letter of a apostate priest, which was printed in Latin in full. While a concern for orthodoxy is evident, questions of orthodoxy were not dealt with in the manner of many periodicals of the time, in an essay on doctrine. The subscriber's antiquarian concern for the preservation of a manuscript related to an incident in British history is visible in his concern: "to preserve this letter." \textit{GM}, 10(1740), p. 165. That he was understood to have this antiquarian concern is clear from Mr. Urban's note about errors and solecisms in the Latin: "We have left these words...as they stand in the Original." \textit{GM}, 10(1740), p. 166.
received replies in a subsequent volume, either from Mr. Urban in print, or privately from a knowledgeable subscriber. Antiquarian content increased over the decades. Reports on SA meetings were included from 1752. Under the editorship of John Nichols (1780-1826), lists of SA fellows and articles on the history of the SA appeared. In 1783 Nichols expanded the antiquarian content even further.

By late eighteenth century, the GM offices were functioning as a communications centre and clearing house for many kinds of antiquarian information, matching readers with particular data or expertise to others seeking information of that kind. These were the same functions

---

112 From the first decade, topics of discussion were antiquarian, as for example numismatics, the history of municipal government based in Magna Carta, the history of the English Church Calendar, early Tithe law, and biography of literary figures. Contributors from several counties wrote in with information about Roman British altarstones, a discussion which continued over several pages and a few numbers. These are found in GM 10(1740) and 11(1741), but any volume would furnish similar examples. Cave was conscious of the role of these exchanges in the growth of scholarship: "the Reputation of our Work has procured...Correspondents eminent in all Parts of Knowledge." Preface. Vol. 13. No. 1. 1743. n.p. See similar remarks in the Preface, GM 14(1744). "Mr. Urban gratefully acknowledges the assistance of his ingenious, learned and skilful correspondents." Preface. 16(1746). n.p. References could be multiplied. See also James M. Kuist, The Nichols File of the Gentleman's Magazine: Attributions of Authorship and other Documentation in Editorial Papers at the Folger Library. University of Wisconsin Press: Madison, Wisconsin, 1982.

113 Volume 1 Number 1 begins with an article on Elizabeth I's government, and reviews five books on British history.

114 Lists of fellows appear irregularly from 1781. The antiquaries appear in the following notes and articles: 21(1751) 474, 570; 24(1754) 24, 338; 40(1770) 234; 41(1771) 258; 43(1773) 200; 45(1775) 250; 46(1776) 138; 50(1780) 101, 17; 51(1781) 192, 222, 261; and 53(1783), 362, 440. After the new program, they appeared in 54(1784) 147, 314, 379, 504; 55(1785) 318; 56(1786) 350; 57(1787) 49; 58(1788) 361, 690-91; 59(1789) 227, 364; 60(1790) 290, 470; 61(1791) 158, 377; 62(1792) 380; 64(1794) 476; 65(1795) 523, 832; 66(1796) 431; 67(1797) 811; 68(1798) 476, 554. 1108; 69(1799) 343; 68(1798) 30, 351; 71(1801) 1094; 77(1807) 545, 942; 72(1802) 466, 1180; 73(1803) 101, 105, 123, 125, 208, 316; 79(1809) 196, 318; 80(1810) i. 220; 82(1812) 529; and 83(1813) i. 317.

115 GM published scientific articles. Readers interested in mathematics were so responsive that by 1749/50 Cave began publishing these items separately in book form. When Franklin's Experiments and Observations in Electricity got a cold reception at the RS, Cave tested a lightning rod on his own premises, and thereafter published Franklin often. He illustrated foreign affairs articles with maps and astronomical articles with star charts. Though crude, these were innovations in what periodicals had to offer, and were praised for clarifying obscure topics. See Carlson, The First Magazine, p. 20ff. Nichols' 1783 program also expanded publications of scientific material. Nichols, The Rise and Progress, pp. lx-lxxi.

116 Nichols coordinated readers' requests with likely sources of information among his regular contributors, even when they were not printed. His children and grandchildren all had employment answering his mail. He also received prospectuses and other material which contributed to many antiquarian publications other than those his firm published. See Kuist, The Nichols File. The Nichols family's hand-annotated complete run of the magazine.
the 1637 Accord had identified as desirable for the growth of antiquarian knowledge, but the periodical format allowed them to happen with greater speed and flexibility. This activity accounts for much of the vitality of the antiquarian community in the second half of this century, and gave a new impetus to the distinctive antiquarian vision. In 1784, Mr. Urban reported on a proposal he had received from an antiquary, who wrote:

we are approaching very near to something which hath been much wanted in this country, A REPOSITORY, to which may be sent, and in which may be collected, for public reference and use, all the scattered accounts of facts, and of observations of facts, respecting the history and antiquities of our country. There are many notices which have been repeatedly given and made, and again lost and forgotten; many which lie in obscurity out of which they can never emerge, for want of some such Register or Repository, wherein to place them. I think...that the part of the Gentleman's Magazine which the editors have allotted to this subject is approaching to something near to this...A publication of this nature, and in this form, might, in time, become one of the most respectable as well as the most useful collections which the Antiquary or Historian could have to refer to.

This is a formulation of the traditional antiquarian vision, in which the periodical became a vehicle for the three antiquarian tasks. The author argues that the Repository would gather inventories of remains held privately or previously unpublished, and arrange material "scientifically." into fields and subfields. Through the combined expertise of the GM's editors, correspondents and contributors, all items submitted could be authenticated (or rejected), and

interleaved with correspondence and other notes and papers is in the possession of the Folger Shakespeare Library. A guide to the collection can be found in Penelope Peoples, "The Folger Nichols Manuscript Collection: A Description and Analysis." Ph.D. Thesis, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, May, 1980. Three generations of Nichols--John. John Bowyer and John Gough Nichols--were GM editors, and antiquaries who were active in the Society.

117Balsamo writes that bibliographic journals sped the dissemination of information, reached a wider public, and functioned as "a 'public memory' which ensured the preservation of information about books and authors of the past, most of which would otherwise have been forgotten." Pettas, tr., Balsamo, Bibliography, p. 98.

118Preface, GM 54(1784). The author's distinction between antiquaries and historians supports the view that antiquaries viewed their work as distinct from that of historians at this time. The author identifies himself as FSA, and both criticises the SA for its failure to achieve a similar point of definition, and excuses it, noting the value of its emphasis on producing publications, and remarking that it does not have the personnel to undertake a project of this sort.
could then be applied to the writing of history. The notion that this might be accomplished
informally, through the readership of a periodical, demonstrates antiquaries' continued faith in
cooperative research strategies. Despite the invasion of their fields by historians, it is clear
that late eighteenth-century antiquaries had not relinquished their ultimate intellectual goal to the
Whig historians who were beginning to produce well-researched political histories, and the
philosophic historians producing histories of art, religion, customs, trade, and institutions.

By late in the eighteenth century, the GM had generated widespread appreciation for
antiquarianism, balancing if not eradicating the Bishop of Salisbury's seventeenth-century
caricature. Promoted in the press, antiquaries enjoyed the period of their greatest prestige. Their
public image benefited from the renewed nationalism and the rediscovery of the British heritage
that the Napoleonic wars produced. Antiquarian work gained respect as a part of the effort to find
answers for industrial ills in the past. The attribution of this kind of value to antiquarian

---

119 Similar projects were proposed within specific fields of antiquarian study. In 1781 Daines Barrington started
an Archaeological News Letter to coordinate work on Roman Britain. In 1787 John Gough had proposed systematic
research into Roman Britain. Horace Walpole, who viewed Roman British remains as rubble, and was pursuing a
vendetta against certain Gothicisers in the SA, argued against it successfully. Gothicisers won out over Classicisers
by about 1800. The GM supported the Gothic taste with multiple articles, starting in 1783. See, for example, GM
58(1778) Supplement, p. 1149. Many such projects were long-lived. In the nineteenth century, Peter Frederick
Robinson revived the project of eighteenth century antiquaries Colin Campbell and continued later by George
Richardson to publish a "Vitruvius Britannicus," an historical encyclopedia of British architecture. Even Robinson,
a Vice-President of the Royal Institute for British Architects and an indefatigable researcher into the history of
architecture published just five volumes towards this end. 1827-42.

120 In Walter Scott's third novel, the antiquary is the hero. The Antiquary (1815) is described by critics as
discussing "the real human significance of the past for men living in the modern age." David Brown, Walter Scott
the errors of the present by putting it into a sound relationship with the past." Jane Millgate, Walter Scott: The
Making of the Novelist, University of Toronto Press: Toronto, Buffalo and London, 1984, p. 88. See also Robin
Mayhead, "The Problem of Coherence in The Antiquary" in Alan Bell, editor, Scott Bicentenary Essays, Barnes and
Noble: London 1973, pp. 134-146, p. 139. The novel treats the verbal battles of Johnathon Oldbuck, descendant of
an anti-Jacobite book printer, with Sir Arthur Wardour, an impoverished aristocrat and descendant of the Jacobites
who had been imprisoned by Oldbuck's ancestors. These turn on differing interpretations of Scottish history. The
Antiquary was not the success Waverley had been, but Scott saw it as one of his greatest successes. See Brown,
Walter Scott and the Historical Imagination and David Douglas Daiches, Walter Scott: Modern Judgements, Aurora
Publishers Incorporated: Nashville and London, 1969. The qualities with which Earle reproached the antiquary are
present, but they facilitate resolution of the novel's subplots, making them appear valuable. The relation between
Scott's self-image and the character Oldbuck are discussed in Jane Millgate, Walter Scott, Chapter 5, pp. 85-105,
subjects became commonplace.121

It was a mark of antiquaries' growing confidence in the nineteenth century, that they began defending their vision, and championing the features of Earle's caricature.122 Bibliographer Thomas Frognall Dibdin was particularly talented at this. His periodical Bibliomania reinvented Mr. Urban's voice for nineteenth-century readers.123 Relating a story especially p. 88ff.

121 In Sybil, Disraeli uses fictional antiquarian studies of the genealogy of various noble families to identify what made the England of the past great. George Eliot's Mr. Casaubon in Middlemarch pursues antiquarian studies. In Woolf's To The Lighthouse, a character declares Scott's The Antiquary to be his favourite novel. In the Preface to Volume 1 of The Antiquarian: A Fortnightly Medium of Intercommunication for Archaeologists, Antiquarians, Numismatists, the Virtuosi, and Collectors of Articles of Virtu and Curiosities, the author argued that: "without a knowledge of the Past most of the facts of Present life are incomprehensible; nay, all power of regulating the Future comes from the knowledge of the Present state of things. gained by the knowledge of the Past. The Antiquarian is not, therefore, the useless person he is sometimes thoughtlessly portrayed, but a valuable contributor to the world's progress." anonymous, The Antiquarian Volume 1, 1870, n.p. (After Volume 1 the Journal changed its name to The Antiquary, ran for four years to No. 95, and was absorbed into Long Ago.) See also The Antiquary: A Magazine Devoted to the Study of the Past, which paid its respects to "the laced coat and ruffles of Sylvanus Urban." Preface, Vol. 1, No. 1, January 1880, n.p. and the article by G.C. Swayne, "The Value and Charm of Antiquarian Study," Vol. 1, No. 1, January 1880, pp. 3-5.

122 William Beloe defended antiquarian bibliography thus: "I would say something, not by way of excuse for the nature of the work, for that is not necessary, but by way of remonstrance to those, and such there are, who deprecate the subjects of these volumes. as unworthy of a man of letters, as requiring none but the most ordinary qualifications. and as incompatible with real genius. taste. or science...[H]e who is properly qualified for this honourable office, must have read much, and thought more; must be familiarly acquainted with various languages; with history, ancient and modern, and with all the Department of the Belles Lettres. He not only knows the various editions of books, but in what particulars of importance, the one differs from the other...In a word, he conducts the student by the easiest and the pleasantest path to the end of his journey, and thus, not in one solitary region, but round the whole orbit of literature." Beloe. Anecdotes of Literary and Scarce Books. F.C. and J. Rivington: London, 1807-1812, 6 volumes. Vol. 6, pp. xii-xiii.

about a famous book collector who was ill, Dibdin mimicked the deathbed stories that were commonly vehicles for declaring the articles of faith. In this case, the collector was miraculously restored to health by "the mere sight of just one volume of the Pinelli copy of the Complutensian Polyglot Bible on vellum," giving Dibdin the chance to declare a number of bibliographic truths.\footnote{Munby, Some Caricatures of Book-Sellers, pp. 18-19. In the same vein, Dibdin advised young men not to marry: "if the thought should occur, take down a book and begin to read until it vanishes." Dibdin, Bibliomania. Dibdin's Bibliography: A Poem in Six Books, which began "Of Books I sing," was a poem comprising an account of important book auctions. The purchase of the Maffei Pinelli collection by James Edwards in Italy in 1787, and other European connections of antiquarian booksellers, are discussed in Archer Taylor, Book Catalogues: Their Varieties and Uses. St. Paul's Bibliographies: London, 1986, 2nd revised edition, William P. Barker (1st edition 1957), p. 92ff.}

Under absurd pseudonyms, as doctors and patients, they discussed their obsession in print.\footnote{An 1810 publication "By an Aspirant," or James Beresford, entitled Bibliosophia or Book-wisdom. Containing Some Account Of The Pride, Pleasure, & Privileges Of That Glorious Vocation, Book-Collecting. William Miller: London, 1810, was "a feeling remonstrance" to another publication critical of collecting. There were two works with the title Bibliomania: one by Dr. Ferriars satirising book-collecting, which elicited this response, and another by T.F. Dibdin which was a tongue-in-cheek defense of book-collecting as health-improving. On the history of bibliophilia, collectors and social class, and Dibdin, see Robin Myers and Michael Harris, eds., Property of a Gentleman: The Formation, Organisation and Dispersal of the Private Library, 1620-1920, St. Paul's Bibliographies: Winchester. 1991. Centre for Extra-Mural Studies, Birkbeck College, London.}


The dinner inaugurating the Roxburghe Club, named to honour the Duke and his ways, and to set up a publishing Club for editions of manuscripts never before printed, toasted "The Cause Of Bibliomania All Over The World." Some, noting that "it was easier to get into the peerage or the Privy Council than into 'The Roxburghe'.”
Their new willingness to forge a public image helped antiquaries' expertise to become visible outside their community. They were benefactors to the British Museum and Library.\(^{128}\) They gave their name to the knowledgeable sector of the book trades.\(^{129}\) Antiquarian printers produced scholarly editions of important early literary and historical works.\(^{130}\) The many publishing clubs founded and run by antiquaries also produced editions of previously unpublished or rare manuscripts.\(^{131}\)

\(^{128}\) Among many others, antiquaries' bequests included the Lansdowne English manuscripts in 1807, the Hargrave legal collection in 1813, the Croker collection in 1817 and 1831, and the Grenville collection of 20,000 volumes in 1810.


\(^{130}\) John Nichols was a leading member of the "Literary Club of Booksellers" until its demise in 1774. In 1806 the London Society was formed from London booksellers engaged in the production of trade editions of historically important manuscripts and printed books. Sir Thomas Phillipps had a hand in its formation, and antiquaries such as publisher John Murray were among its founder members. They formed a body of expertise which could advise members on particular editions. See E. Marston, *Sketches of Some Booksellers of the Time of Dr. Johnson,* Sampson Low, Marston & Co.: London, 1902, pp. 88-90 and Chapter 7, "The Friends of Literature" pp. 87-93. Both societies terminated because its members aged and died, the second in 1811. While members' editions would not meet our own standards, their actions show they were aware of the importance of careful editing to scholarly work.

\(^{131}\) Even in the nineteenth century, this was recognised: "the value of the services of book clubs [lay] in immensely widening the arena of the historian's immediate materials. To him their volumes are as new tools to the mechanic, or new machinery to the manufacturer. They economise, as it is termed, his labour: more correctly speaking, they increase its productiveness." Burton, *The Book Collector,* p. 299. For antiquaries' involvement in publishing clubs, see Appendix 2.B.1.
Antiquarian expertise was further publicised by the spectacle of their pursuit of the
remains of the past. Sales of antiquarian books became celebrity events.132 Evans' 1812 sale
of the Roxburghe collection was a public sensation because three aristocratic antiquaries
competed for portions of it. Before this sale, a four-figure price for a single book or manuscript
was unknown.133 Antiquaries did the same thing with antiquities. Sotheby's sold antiquary
Henry Salt's collection of Egyptian antiquities in 1835. As British Consul in Egypt, Salt's
excavations had provided the British Museum with many sculptures and marbles. Sotheby's hired
rooms in the Strand for the public to view Salt's collection. Antiquaries were among the vendors,
buyers and cognoscenti at these events.134 Their mania brought original materials into public

132 From about 1770, interest in buying early English and Elizabethan manuscripts increased. Until 1780 prices
remained under £20 per item, after which time they began to rise. Much information about the book trades comes
from auction house catalogues. A fire in 1865 destroyed most of Sotheby's own house records, but the 2300
catalogues collected by Thomas Phillipps, FSA, now in the British Library, have established much of the history of
the book trades of this period. FSA Richard Gough's biography of Sotheby is another important source of
information on antiquaries in this section of the book market. See Herman, Sotheby's, p. 15. Numbers of sales
increased also. Between 1784 and 1800, the number rose from 4 to 23 per year. In 1800 they had nearly 10,000
items in their fixed-price catalogue. In 1828 Sotheby's sold 408 collections of antiquarian books, 142 collections of
coins and medals, 65 collections of pictures, and 42 collections of catalogues, which were among the few methods
available for tracing the history of a particular book or manuscript, and so were prized scholarly tools among
antiquaries. See Nicholas Faith, Sold: The Rise and Fall of the House of Sotheby, Macmillan Publishing Company:

133 See Bernard Quartich, Contributions Towards a Dictionary of English Book-Collectors, as also of Some
Foreign Collectors Whose Libraries were Incorporated in English Collections or Whose Books are Chiefly Met With
in England, Quartich: London, 1892-1921. It took eight years to catalogue Roxburghe's books, completed 1804-12
by FSA brothers George and William Nicols. The sale of the 30,000 volumes took 42 days. It "ushered in a new
era of book collecting...It is almost impossible for us today, accustomed to £1 million objects, to imagine the impact
such events made. It was certainly the competition between Lord Blandford, the Duke of Devonshire and a third
bibliophile aristocrat, Lord Spencer, that made the Roxburghe sale so successful. Of the three it was ultimately Lord
Spencer who built up the greatest library at Althorp with the help of the Reverend Thomas Frognall Dibdin...whom
he had made his librarian." Herman, 1980, pp. 21-22. The Boccacios were bought by Marquis Blandford for £4,260,
and the sale grossed £23,341; both sums were records. The Duke of Devonshire bought Caxton's History of Troy
for £1,600. For the role of antiquaries Humfrey Wanley, Dawson Turner, Thomas Phillipps, J.G. Nichols, William
Tite, Joseph Mayer, publisher John Murray, Phillip Bliss, Francis Egerton and others in making auctions of rare books

134 Joseph Haslewood, a Sotheby's employee, wrote a manual instructing trade members on correct cataloguing
methods for auctions. His bibliographic expertise made catalogues more useful to antiquaries wanting better
information about sale lots and book histories. When Sotheby's sold a portion of Frankfurt collector Dr. Georg
Kloss's books in 1854, including 5,000 volumes of sixteenth-century medical and Reformation books, they asked
FSA William Young Ottley to evaluate them, as "we knew had made this subject his particular study," Herman,
perception as the objects of discriminating taste, and elevated antiquaries' image as experts in these forms of knowledge. The spectacle of antiquaries' pursuit of the remains of the past was the means by which collection and preservation rose in public estimation, from the interest of foolish enthusiasts to a respectable scholarly concern. This was becoming clear even to the reluctant British parliament.

---


135 Sotheby's sales to the British Museum of coins, medals and books was often through the many antiquaries who worked there. The collections of many of the early keepers of British Museum departments also passed through Sotheby's hands, for example FSA William Young Ottley's manuscripts. The 28 day sale, 1801-02, of FSA Samuel Tyssen's early prints enhanced interest in prints as historically valuable. In 1830, Sotheby's handled the estate of FSA Sir Thomas Lawrence, former President of the Royal Academy; Christie's sold his art collection, Sotheby's his library. In 1819 a major sale of historical autograph letters inaugurated a fashion for collecting them: FSA Dawson Turnor became Sotheby's most regular customer for these, and sold his collection through them again in 1853. Sotheby's also handled the most important auction of natural history specimens of the century, the 50,000 specimens that comprised the herbarium of FSA Aylmer Bourke Lambert, vice-president of the Linnaean Society, on June 1842. See Munby, *The Cult*; E.G. Allingham *Romance of the Rosstrum* (H.F. & G. Witherby: London) 1924; and Henry B. Wheatley, *Prices of Books: An Inquiry into the Changes in the Price of Books which have Occurred in England at Different Periods*, George Allen: London, 1898, chapter 6, on eighteenth-century auctions, pp. 126-146 and chapter 7, on nineteenth-century auctions, pp. 147-178. See also Appendix 2.B.5 for notable SA collectors.

136 That these efforts were broadly successful in bringing antiquaries recognition, if not understanding, can be seen from the sale catalogue of the estate of James Orchard Halliwell-Phillipps. The 1889 sale brochure described the attributes of his villa, including, of "The Spacious Study:" "It was in this room that Shakespeare's loving biographer spent so many of those hours of labour that have so greatly enriched our knowledge of the work and life of our great National Poet; and it was here that Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps' wonderful Collection of Shakespeare Rarities was preserved." The estate agents seem not to have known that Halliwell-Phillipps was a pariah in the antiquarian community, for having stolen manuscripts from Trinity College Library, Cambridge. Farebrother, Ellis, Clark & Co., *Particulars, Views and Conditions of Sale of the Compact and Desirable Freehold Estate known as Hollingbury Copse, in the Parish of Patcham, in the County of Sussex, for Many Years the Residence of the Late Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps, the Distinguished Antiquary...* Dryden Press: London, 1889. Halliwell took the name of Phillipps during his wife's final illness. She was daughter of manuscript collector Thomas Phillipps, who disowned her after her marriage.

137 For example, FSA P.C. Webb purchased much of the Marquis of Lansdowne's books, charts, maps, prints, manuscripts and state papers; much of Webb's collection was in turn bought by the British Museum in 1807, by order of and with funds supplied by parliament, despite the fact that the auction catalogue had already been printed. After the Roxburghe sale, auction houses began paying agents, many of whom were antiquaries, to buy books on
By late in the nineteenth century, then, antiquarianism had achieved recognition of a sort. It was still the butt of much contempt. John Yonge Akermann was premature in declaring: "the ridicule which once attended the prosecution of this study is hushed; and the mute but eloquent relics of Antiquity are now regarded with interest by all." But antiquaries' activities were resilient as ever. And the mutually defining elements of the antiquarian textual tradition still animated and integrated the nineteenth-century community. Collection was clearly still a widely pursued antiquarian task. Camden's method, meticulous in its attention to bodies of evidence, combined with the antiquarian tendency to specialise, had produced expertise in many areas, capable of authenticating the many particular articles of a systematic British history. Many fellows treated physical remains. About 30% of nineteenth-century fellows worked on archaeology. Henry Crabb Rawlinson's work on inscriptions, cuneiform and Old Persian attained widespread distinction. Antiquaries were involved as geology and archaeology confronted the issue of human antiquity. Rasmus Nyerup, Danish originator of the classification of implements by era into stone, bronze and iron, communicated an account of his system to the SA

---


140 See Henry Rawlinson, "Notes on some Paper Casts of Cuneiform Inscriptions upon the Sculptured Rocks at Behistun, exhibited to the Society of Antiquaries," 34(1852), no. X.
in 1828. Thomas Wright criticised it, but Lord Ellesmere translated Nyerup's work into English. W.J. Thorns was translator of Danish archaeologist J.J.A. Worsaae's "prehistoric" theory, which dated human implements earlier than the biblical chronology would allow. John Mitchell Kemble published against it, but Augustus Wollaston Franks, Keeper of the Department of British and Medieval Antiquities at the British Museum, used it in classifying antiquities in his care. Antiquaries were also involved in important fieldwork: Thomas Northmore and Walter Calverley Trevelyan assisted Father J. MacEnery at Kent's Cavern, where evidence was found dating humans before the biblical account, and John Evans helped with excavations at Brixham cave, which finally established human antiquity. Evans and John Lubbock translated important geological works, and popularised terms such as "Old Stone Age," "New Stone Age," "palaeolithic," and "neolithic."

Other antiquaries worked on textual remains. About 15% of contributions to Archaeologia were transcripts of documents never before published. Many antiquaries published similar

---

141See SA Correspondence, 20 November 1828; See also Evans, A History, p. 229.

142French geologist Jacques Boucher de Perthes' discovery of early human implements in the Somme valley got a poor reception among British geologists. He sent samples to Charles Roach Smith, who exhibited them at the British Archaeological Association. The Exhibit took place on April 25, 1849 but were not included in the journal.

143An abstract of Evans' paper was printed before it came out in Archaeologia for fellows to read. Archaeological antiquaries and their involvement in these questions will be considered in depth in Chapter Six.

144For example, Thomas Phillipps, "Three inedited Saxon Charters, from the Cartulary of Cirenecester Abbey," 26(1836), no. VII; John Bruce, "Inedited Documents relating to the Imprisonment and Condemnation of Sir Thomas More," 27(1838), no. XXIV; Thomas Wright, "Inedited Letters of Queen Henrietta Maria and Thomas Cromwell," 32(1844), no. III; Benjamin Williams, "Satirical Poems on the defeat of the Flemings before Calais in 1436; from a MS in the Archiepiscopal Library at Lambeth," 33(1849), no. VIII; and Edward Peacock, "A Mutilated Roll of Instruments relating to the Hospital of St. Edmund, at Sprotborough, near Doncaster, with Prefatory Remarks," 42/2(1870), no. XIX. SA historian Joan Evans is not entirely fair in dismissing the number of papers which contained transcripts of manuscripts in the British Library and other collections: most of these had been collected by antiquaries who had donated them to the nation, and most were at this unpublished. Only about 3% of papers commented upon literary material without presenting manuscript material. For example, Thomas Wright, "On the Legend of Weland Smith," 32(1847), no. XXIV, and two other papers by Wright in this volume on Weland Smith and Arthur.
material through the printing societies they founded and ran.\textsuperscript{145} Robert Surtees, John Gough Nichols, and others founded the Surtees Society in 1834, for publishing works associated with the county of Northumberland. Charging two Guineas annually (one Guinea after 1850), the Surtees Society reached 1200 members in a few years, with waiting lists. It was so successful that Nichols, Thomas Amyot, Philip Bliss, Charles Purton Cooper, and Lord Braybrooke founded the Camden Society in 1838, charging £1 annually, "to perpetuate, and render accessible, whatever is valuable, but at present little known, amongst the materials for the Civil, Ecclesiastical, or Literary History of the United Kingdom."\textsuperscript{146} "The popularity of the Camden Society led the way to the formation of the Aelfric, the Shakespeare, the Percy, the Parker, and Several other Printing Societies, which it has now for many years survived."\textsuperscript{147} It is understandable, that text-editing\textsuperscript{148} and philological issues\textsuperscript{149} were volatile.\textsuperscript{150} Many

\begin{itemize}
  \item Of these, the Roxburghe Club was the first and most exclusive. See Edward Edwards, \textit{Lives of the Founders of the British Museum, with Notices of its Chief Augmentors and Other Benefactors}, 1570-1870 Truebner & Co: London, 1865, 1870, 2 volumes, pp. 424-26. Roxburghe editions were uneven, but the criticism of them in the antiquarian community led to much more careful standards. For other printing societies, see Appendix 2.B.3.
  \item See John Gough Nichols' account of the genesis of these societies in Nichols, \textit{A Descriptive Catalogue of the Works of the Camden Society...}. J.B. Nichols: Westminster, 1862, Preface, n.p.
  \item Nichols, \textit{A Descriptive Catalogue}, Preface, n.p. Of the Society's first 80 publications, 65 were edited by antiquaries.
  \item In the \textit{Archaeologia}, see John Bruce, "The Identification of the Compiler of a Manuscript in the possession of the Earl of Verulam, relating to a Treaty between King Charles I and the Parliament in 1648," 42/2(1870) no. XI; John Bruce, "Observations upon certain inaccuracies in the Published Letters of Sir Thomas More." 30(1844), no. XV; George Stephens, "The King of Birds; or, the Lay of the Poenix: An Anglo-Saxon Song of the Tenth or Eleventh Century. Now First Translated into the Metre and Alliteration of the original," 30(1844), no. XXII; and four articles in volume 41 for 1867 on the authenticity of the Paston letters. See also Dawson Turner, \textit{Guide to the Historian, the Biographer, the Antiquary, the Man of Literary Curiosity, and the Collector of Autographs, towards the Verification of Manuscripts, by Reference to Engraved Fac-Similes of Hand-Writing}, Charles Sloman: Yarmouth, 1848. Turner distinguishes between the antiquary's and historian's interests in manuscript materials.
  \item Only about 3\% of \textit{Archaeologia} papers were philological. See for example, Samuel Birch, "The Annals of Thothmes III, as derived from the Hieroglyphical Inscriptions," 35(1853), no. XII; J.S. Stuart-Glennie, "Account of Three Coptic Papyri, and other Manuscripts, brought from the East." 392(1863), no. XXIII; and Reginald Stuart Poole, "On the Method of interpreting Egyptian Hieroglyphs by Young and Champollion, with a vindication of its correctness from the strictures of Sir George Cornewall Lewis," 392(1863), no. XXVI. But the work of many antiquaries involved philology, as will be seen in a later chapter.
\end{itemize}
antiquaries also produced scholarly aids such as dictionaries, lexicons, and glossaries.\textsuperscript{151} George Laurence Gomme indexed the *GM* under topical headings, in 26 volumes.\textsuperscript{152} Antiquaries were pioneers in the emerging study of cataloguing.\textsuperscript{153} Many wrote works of bibliography, in the expanded sense traditional among antiquaries.\textsuperscript{154} S.R. Maitland, Librarian and Keeper of the Manuscripts at Lambeth Palace, wrote:

Perhaps I use the word bibliography improperly, for I do not mean the technical knowledge of degrees of rarity, and better or worse editions, and copies on pink papers


and the like... Nor do I mean that knowledge of books (valuable as it is) which may be gained from literary history. I mean such a knowledge of books as, if it may not aspire to be called learning, is one of learning's best helps... what I may perhaps be allowed to call a personal acquaintance with books--being conversant with the books themselves, so as to give each some sort of personal identity, and not to conceive that every reference at the bottom of the page is of equal authority.  

Antiquary Thomas Hartwell Horne, assistant librarian at the British Library, was the principal bibliographical authority in nineteenth-century British bibliography. Dibdin also was a force to be reckoned with.

The traditional antiquarian genres still organised how these diverse areas of work and bodies of evidences were calibrated within a historical framework. Of the many antiquarian

---


156 His major work was Horne, An Introduction to the Study of Bibliography, to which is Prefixed a Memoir on the Public Libraries of the Ancients, G. Woodfall: London, 1814, 2 vols. Horne's list of the European bibliographers whose methods he used included M.M. Brunet, Callieux, DeBure, Santander, and especially Gabriel Peignot's Répertoire Bibliographique Universel, Antoine-Augustin Renouard: Paris, 1812. Peignot referred to bibliography as "the most comprehensive and most universal of all human knowledge." Peignot, Manuel Bibliographique, Paris (1800), quoted in Blum, p. 99. See T.A. Birrell, "Anthony Wood, John Bagford, and Thomas Horne as Bibliographers," p. 22-39, in Robin Birrell, Anthony Wood. John Bagford, and Thomas Horne as Bibliographers, in Pioneers in Bibliography. St. Paul's Bibliographies: London. 1988. That the antiquarian community still functioned as such can be seen in the thanks of antiquarian writers to other antiquaries in their Prefaces. Most also include a section on library history. and deplore the history of the destruction of books.

157 Dibdin's Bibliotheca Spenceriana; or, A Descriptive Catalogue of the... Library of George John, Earl Spencer..., For the Author. W. Bulmer & Co., Shakespeare Press and Layman, Hurst, Rees & Co: London, 1814-23, was a foundational work of nineteenth-century bibliography. Most antiquaries viewed Dibdin as an authority. William Beloe wrote: "I should expatiate further on this subject, but that I have been most ingeniously anticipated by Mr. Dibdin, in his truly entertaining, as well as useful volume, to which he has given the title BIBLIOMANIA. This will be found to supersede and render unnecessary all that I could produce in vindication of Bibliography, and is altogether one of the most agreeable works which modern times have produced." Beloe. Anecdotes of Literature, Vol. 6. Preface, p. xiii-xiv. Edward Edwards, assistant librarian at the British Library, was more grudging. See Edwards. Libraries and Founders of Libraries, pp. 418-423. Twentieth-century scholars acknowledge Dibdin's productivity, but have not been uniformly positive about the quality of his work. Archer Taylor notes that "Thomas Frogshall Dibdin set the pattern for the modern bibliophile's catalogue." Taylor. Book Catalogues: Their Varieties and Uses, p. 9. See also pp. 1-91, on the history of bibliophilism. But Blum, Bibliographia, p. 169ff, views the Dibdin's work as deleterious.

158 Among local histories, Robert Surtees' work on Durham led colleagues to form one of the many publishing society antiquaries organised. Among specialist works, John Caley, Henry Ellis and Bulkeley Bandinel produced an edition of Dugdale's Monasticon Anglicanum, and Charles Roach Smith one of Bryan Faussett's Inventorium Sepulchrale. The same kind of analysis can be done even for nested genres, or genres that fitted into subsections of Camden's temporal, regional and evidential schema. For example, Thomas Fuller's 1662 biographical work sparked its own tradition. See Fuller, A History of the Worthies of England, T. Tegg: London, 1840, 3 volumes, reprinted from the first, 1662 edition, see also the Allen and Unwin: London, 1952 edition in a single volume. Nineteenth-
county histories produced in the nineteenth century, Richard Colt Hoare’s work on Wiltshire, John Nichols’ on Leicestershire, George Ormerod’s on Cheshire, and Robert Clutterbuck’s on Hertfordshire were considered major contributions to historical knowledge.159 Camden’s historiography shaped these works. They began with a historical review, then reviewed important bodies of evidence, and then, dividing the county into parishes, hundreds or rapes, presented a historical survey of each. Other aspects of the antiquarian textual tradition are also visible in their works. Clutterbuck affirmed his belief in the cautious, inductive use of evidence:

It was my first intention, to have published a corrected edition of [non-antiquary Nathaniel Salmon’s 1728 Historical Antiquities of Hertfordshire], with a continuation of the descent of Manors, & to the present time, but, the frequent digressions of its author into matter foreign from the subject of a provincial history; his total omission of many important particulars...the defectiveness of his genealogies; and his numerous errors in tracing the descent of property; have induced me to apply immediately to the more century antiquaries replicated this format. See Mark Antony Lower, The Worthies of Sussex: Biographical Sketches of the Most Eminent Natives or Inhabitants of the County, From the Earliest Period to the Present Time, with Incidental Notices. Illustrative of Sussex History. George P. Bacon: Lewes, 1865. He characterises his work as “an installment towards” a county history. Preface, n.p. See also John Prince, Danmonii orientales illustres: or, The Worthies of Devon. A Work wherein the Lives and Fortunes of the Most Famous Divines, Statesmen, Swordsmen, Physicians, Writers, and Other Eminent Persons, Natives of the most Noble Province, from Before the Norman Conquest, Down to the Present Age, are Memorized...out of the Most Approved Authors, both in Print and Manuscript. Rees & Curtis: Plymouth, 1810 and George Atkinson, The Worthies of Westmorland, or Notable Persons Born in that County Since the Reformation, J. Robinson: London, 1849-50, 2 volumes.

159Richard Colt Hoare, History of Modern Wiltshire J. Nichols: London, 1822-37, 6 volumes; Robert Clutterbuck, The History and Antiquities of the County of Hertford: Compiled from the Best Printed Authorities and Original Records, Preserved in Public Repositories and Private Collections..., Nichols, Son and Bentley: London. 1815-27, 5 volumes; George Ormerod, The History of the County Palatine and City of Chester: Compiled from Original Evidences in Public Offices, the Harleian and Cottonian Mss., Parochial Registers, private muniments, unpublished ms. collections of successive Cheshire antiquaries, and a personal survey of every township in the county; incorporated with a replication of King’s Vale Royal, and Leicester’s Cheshire Antiquities, Lackington, Hughes, Harding, Mavor and Jones: London, 1819; John Rokewode Gage, The History and Antiquities of Suffolk: Thingoe Hundred, S. Bentley: London and J. Deck: Bury St. Edmunds, 1838. As will be seen in the next chapter, 35% to 43% of fellows, or 600 to 700 men, published in some area of history. Nearly a third of contributions to the Archaeologia were historical. Some were narratives, for example Henry Ellis, "A Narrative of the principal Naval Expeditions of English Fleets, beginning with that against the Spanish Armada in 1588, down to 1603," 34(1852), no. XXV. Most used manuscript or other evidence to contribute to some part of British history, for example three papers in volume 34 for 1852 (nos. XIV, XV and XVI) and two in volume 35 for 1853 (nos. XVII and XXVIII) discussed new materials relevant to the life of Walter Raleigh. Others evaluated evidence for its ability to contribute to some part of British history, for example David Jardine, "Observations on the historical evidence respecting the Implication of Lord Mounteagle as a Conspirator in the Gunpowder Treason," 29(1842), no. VIII.
authentick and original sources of historical and genealogical information.\footnote{160}{Clutterbuck, History and Antiquities of the County of Hertford, Preface, n.p.}

George Ormerod noted his reliance on sources, citation, observation and criticism:

After the termination of the labours attendant on the compilation of the following History, one duty yet remains to be performed by its author—to lay before the public an account of the various sources from which he has derived his information, and to enumerate, not only the evidences on which the work has been founded, but the places where those evidences may be resorted to, if it is on any occasion required to verify the contents of the work, or to pursue researches beyond its limits.\footnote{161}{Ormerod, The History of the County Palatine and City of Chester, Preface, ix.}

Nichols noted the role of other antiquaries in finding and authenticating evidence.\footnote{162}{"[S]ome merit might be claimed, if it were only for bringing to light the profound researches of my coadjutors, and [I] am also conscious that in all cases endeavours have been used to obtain correctness, and to guard against misrepresentation." John Nichols, The History and Antiquities of the County of Leicester. Compiled from the Best and Most Antient Historians; inquisitiones post mortem, and other valuable records. Including also Mr. Burton’s Description of the County, published in 1622; and the later collections of Mr. Staveley, Mr. Carte, Mr. Peck, and Sir Thomas Cave, J. Nichols: London, 1795-1815, 3 volumes, Preface, n.p. See also Thomas Hordern Walker’s The History, Antiquities, and Topography of the County of Sussex, Sussex Press: Lewes and Nichols and Son; London. 1835. Walker says of his work, compiled from "every scrap of matter he could collect," that he "used his utmost diligence in comparing statement with statement, and fact with fact, to ensure accuracy of detail," and this "would have been impossible...had [I] not been able to avail himself of...the able assistance of several gentlemen." Preface, n.p.}

James Dallaway criticised work with "imperfections and want of regular deductions," distinguishing on this basis between the work of antiquaries and that of "County historians [who] have often been capricious in the division of their materials. Easiness of references, and an uniform arrangement, are objects too important to be overlooked, for the sake of novelty."\footnote{163}{James Dallaway. A History of the Western Division of the County of Sussex: Including the Rapes of Chichester, Arundel, and Bramber, with the City and Diocese of Chichester. T. Bensley: London, 1815-32, 5 volumes, vol. 1. "To The Reader." v.}

\footnote{164}{See Hoare, The History of Modern Wiltshire, Vol. 1, Preface, v. Hoare’s work will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.}
of ongoing destruction.\textsuperscript{165}

But the vitality of Camden’s historiographic vision is best seen in the two nineteenth-century editions of the \textit{Britannia}. The first of these was published in 1806, by SA Director Richard Gough. The Oxford antiquaries who had produced the 1695 edition had viewed the \textit{Britannia} as “in nearly every respect the perfect embodiment of the modernist commitment to the collaborative advancement of learning...Naturally, it was still imperfect; for the moderns the future always promised improvement...Nor is it surprising that Gibson was soon at work again on a new enlarged version of the \textit{Britannia}.”\textsuperscript{166} Gough was in the same situation. He had issued the 1789 edition, but in 1806 he noted that “the want of an improved edition of the Britannia has been long complained of.”\textsuperscript{167} The demand from the antiquarian community reflected the fact that antiquaries’ dark industry was perpetually bringing new material to light, and this put earlier editions out of date. Like his predecessors, Gough thought the new material should be arranged within the structure Camden had first elaborated:

if Camden were living, he could enlarge his work to another volume from new discoveries. In the present additions...I have endeavoured to confine myself to the most

\textsuperscript{165}"Every year witnesses the gradual decay or the total destruction of those monuments of ancient wealth and splendour, and those curious remains of art, which, so long as they continue to exist, are the documents both of general and social history. These events are to be regretted, especially as the lapse of such evidences often sheds an obscurity over the facts and hypotheses, which they were well calculated to illustrate. The accidents to which Collections of Drawings and Papers kept in MS. are liable, have also proved very inauspicious to the science of History and Antiquities. Of these, so many instances are recorded...as...can hardly fail of exciting in the mind of any person possessed of such materials, a desire to place beyond the reach of accidental destruction or dispersion, some part, at least, of what has been obtained by means of considerable labour and expense. The foregoing considerations have been thought sufficient to justify the publication of the present Work.” Thomas Fisher, \textit{Collections Historical, Genealogical, and Topographical for Bedfordshire}, J.B. Nichols: London, 1812-36, 6 volumes, "Advertisement." n.p.

\textsuperscript{166}Levine, \textit{Battle of the Books}, p. 336.

striking circumstances of each place, and if I have given way to disquisitions, it is only where I thought my great master would have done the same. Without entering into the details of a county history, or adopting the mode of a modern writer of a description of England, I have endeavoured to do that for Mr. Camden, which Mr. Camden, in the same circumstances, would have done for himself.  

Camden’s text was printed section by section and county by county. Gough reproduced Camden’s text and structure entire, but after each section appended "Additions" containing the new material. These are frequently longer than Camden’s original text.

Gough’s edition shows many features of the antiquarian textual tradition. He distinguished antiquarian work from other work defined by place. He asserted that "the description of a kingdom" was "a less intricate task than its history, because materials are more at hand, and impartiality is less violated" but there was "merit in uniting [them] in one comprehensive view" if it was cautiously done. Gough proclaimed: "I will not blush to acknowledge the secret satisfaction I feel in having attempted" that work. Nevertheless, he viewed his edition as changeable based on collection and subject to authentication:

After all that has been, or can be collected towards forming a complete edition of the BRITANNIA, much has been left to be corrected and supplied by attentive inspection of judicious travellers... Others may trace out many things barely hinted at here.

The collaborative sense of authorship can be seen in Gough’s description of the edition as "the work of many hands," and he linked this to the ongoing critical discussion within the antiquarian

168 Gough, Britannia..., vii.

169 "I will not offer such an insult to [the Reader's] discernment, as to intrude on him the rude observations of every rambler, now the rage of travelling about Britain is become so contagious, that every man who could read or write makes a Pocket Britannia for himself." Gough, Britannia..., viii.

170 Gough, Britannia..., ix.

171 Gough, Britannia..., ix.

172 Gough, Britannia..., x. Gough also describes the past destruction of manuscripts and collections in times of religious fervour: “the rapidity of Reformation, however favourable to religion, gave a fatal wound to such kind of knowledge as Leland and Camden pursued,” viii.
Finally, something can be sensed about the power of the antiquarian textual tradition in the way Gough writes. His identity as an antiquary is indicated by the date of his Preface: April 23, 1789, St. George's Day, the day on which antiquaries celebrated the Anniversary of their Charter. The edition is full of references to "the great Author" who "still shines as the great luminary of our antiquities." Gough, then, consciously viewed his edition as a part of a tradition of working and writing, formed by, and continuing over time from, Camden's *Britannia*.

1806 was the year that Gough published his edition, and antiquarian brothers Daniel and Samuel Lysons began their own edition of the *Britannia*. This reached its seventh volume in 1822, but was never completed owing to the death of Samuel Lysons. In this work, "the great mass of unpublished materials...which we have had occasion to examine" were so great as to explode Camden's text, but not his structure. Each volume treats a single county. A general historical survey of 100 to 200 pages preceded a thorough review of various bodies of evidences,
of a similar length.\textsuperscript{176} Parochial histories follow, and then additions, corrections and indices. Camden's text, quoted in small pieces within this schema, very nearly disappears. But the Lysons note that they could not "be satisfied with more cursory inquiries than would be consistent with the plan of our Work, and the accuracy we are anxious to attain."\textsuperscript{177} Nevertheless, Camden's historiography and the antiquarian textual tradition are visible in their aims and efforts:

With the utmost attention some errors are unavoidable, where so great a number of facts are to be stated. Though we have left no source of enquiry untried, whence it appeared to us probable, that we should obtain accurate information, yet no doubt there may be individuals, who are more particularly acquainted with the details of several matters here stated, than those to whom we have applied: if any such should discover material errors or omissions in our Work, we should feel much obliged, if they will favour us with notices of them, as it is our intention to insert corrections and additions at the end of each volume.\textsuperscript{178}

Nineteenth-century antiquaries, then, still retained the sense earlier antiquaries had of working and writing within a framework articulated by Camden.\textsuperscript{179} They show a sense of antiquarian writing as a kind of construction: Gough and others use the term "superstructure" for the additional material they collected and shaped for publication in the manner of Camden's \textit{Britannia}. They were conscious of using editions of the \textit{Britannia} and of other antiquarian genres as efforts towards an ongoing, improving construction. James Dallaway described antiquarian

\textsuperscript{176}Topics covered in separate sections include: etymology; ancient inhabitants; civil divisions; ecclesiastical jurisdictions: parishes; chapels; ancient monasteries, colleges and hospitals; Borough and Town Markets; Disused Markets: Fairs and Great Markets; Population; Chief Landed Property at Various Periods; Nobility; Gentry; Forests and Deer Parks; Geographical and Geological Description of the County, including situation, boundaries, extent, soils, strata, surface and scenery, rivers, navigable rivers, creeks, canals, roads, rail-roads; Natural History including minerals, meteoric stones, organic remains, indigenous plants, birds, mineral springs; produce; trade; manufactures; Antiquities including British and Roman, Circular Enclosures, Sepulchral Stones, Cromlechs. Crosses, Celts: and many more.


\textsuperscript{179}Levine noted of seventeenth-century antiquaries, "If the history of England could not be perfectly represented as narrative, then perhaps it could be reconstructed as a body of antiquities. In that case, there was a model already in place: William Camden's famous \textit{Britannia}. It remained only to see whether that familiar work could be brought up to date as a collaborative new enterprise in scholarship," Levine, \textit{Battle of the Books}, p. 327.
genres as nested superstructures, county works building on previous county works, and set within national works which built upon previous national works:

Hitherto, the COUNTY OF SUSSEX had no particular history. Camden had given an accurate outline of it in his Britannia, which about a century afterward, was considerably dilated...Upon this superstructure, the late Sir William Burrell, Bart., after having filled his own copy with marginal notes, was induced to erect a superstructure, which remains an honourable monument to his erudition, and of his perseverance as a provincial antiquary.  

The continuity of these features of antiquaries' texts, from Camden's time into the nineteenth century, is an important and unusual characteristic of the antiquarian tradition.

Nineteenth-century antiquaries, then, continued to participate in their distinct textual tradition, using the Britannia as their core text, setting it within an ongoing framework of respected commentators, and viewing their own relationship with past work as continuing a highly defined investigative program. The antiquarian community was comprised of men working in many and diverse antiquarian fields, who were united by a vision of the ultimate historical structure that might be built collaboratively from their many and diverse efforts. Antiquaries flourished during the middle decades of the nineteenth century. Pursuing their fields and tasks

---

190 James Dallaway. A History of the Western Division of the County of Sussex. ii.

191 In the history of British historiography, such a long period of continuity of form is unusual. History, as a genre, has been transformed over time, as authors have experimented with different subjects and methods. For example, what Momigliano and others have called British mainstream historiography was, in the eighteenth century alone, several historiographic streams. Classicising, philosophical and romantic histories were among them, and took different approaches to their subject material. All included the new subject of the history of commerce, but treated it in different ways. Further, they experimented with introducing some features of literary forms into historical writing, particularly by attending to issues of customs, emotions and manners. While antiquaries' work also participated in these trends, it did so to a very minimal extent. They introduced the history of commerce, but actively resisted the narrative techniques seen in historians like Robertson or Burke which were designed to bring the reader close to an experience of the past. Also, at least in their description of their work, antiquaries rejected any changes to their traditional program, preferring to present themselves as utterly conservative in this matter. See Mark Salber Philips, "Reconsiderations on History and Antiquarianism: Arnaldo Momigliano and the Historiography of Eighteenth-Century Britain." Journal of the History of Ideas, 57(2)1996: 297-316. Antiquaries could be said to have participated more in the developments in German historical and critical scholarship than in developments in British historical writings. They maintained their continental links, and their critical tradition had common roots with that of the Germans. See Peter G. Bietenholz. Historia and Fabula: Myths and Legends in Historical Thought from Antiquity to the Modern Age. E.J. Brill: Leiden, The Netherlands, 1994.
with their traditional caution and expertise, they began to claim recognition for it. Chapter Two showed that the SA's period of reform succeeded in addressing members' dissatisfaction with its support for excavations and restorations: during the 1860s, the SA began to build a public role for itself in these areas. The next chapter will show the extraordinary productivity of antiquaries in the nineteenth century. Yet at the height of its career, antiquarianism was eclipsed, and by the year 1900 antiquaries had narrowed their intellectual area to an archaeological fragment of its former domain. The causes of the eclipse are explored in Chapter Five. But certain features of the intellectual domain of antiquarianism deserve particular comment, as they suggest some deficiencies in the contemporary models of intellectual fields discussed in Chapter One.

First, the material presented in this chapter highlights the need for theories treating discipline formation and demarcation to model the social context of scholarly fields. Like the RS, the SA was an ancient learned society. Certainly the proceedings of the SA could seem obscure, but those of the RS were not uncomplicated. Before the ascent of the sciences within industrial society, it was their differing social status which lent one body prestige and brought the other one ridicule. This indicates a role for reception studies in tracing the fortunes of various fields, and the highlights the need to attend to failed, competing, and closely related fields in contributing to the development of a given study.

Second, the case of antiquarianism indicates the difficulty of conceptualising an intellectual field, domain or discipline. In this case, if antiquarianism is viewed as the composite of its many shared questions and problems, field-specific problems are emphasised but their ultimate project disappears. This results in a domain which appears as a collection of diverse fields, which might be serially arranged to represent the relations of cognate fields as contiguous,
and the conceptual distance between dissimilar fields as non-contiguous. Yet generations of antiquaries viewed all these fields as integrated within their intellectual domain. If, on the other hand, their ultimate project is emphasised as bringing coherence to work undertaken in many different fields, there arises the peculiarity of an intellectual area defined by a very hypothetical enterprise, on which very few practitioners had ever actually worked. In fact, the antiquarian intellectual domain was distinctively configured by a paradoxical subject and by methodological concerns. Camden’s "Britain" was structurally and temporally transposed. Modern history still works with this problem, but Camden’s historiography put a premium on the historical subject as unknown. Structurally, "history" was the projected, deferred, ultimate and perfect product of generations of careful reconstructions. Temporally, it motivated and underlay these fabrications as a set of provisional historical and local judgements. And yet it was also a distant goal at which all current reconstruction aimed, but which they might not resemble at all.

Camden’s subject was not incoherent. But unity was created in the antiquarian intellectual domain more by antiquaries’ textual tradition than by their subject. Shared questions might be expected to gain some definition from the bodies of material the community was working on. And yet in this case, the community was working on many differing kinds of evidences. In the antiquarian domain, conceptual unity lay in the ways these were integrated within research and writing. The several parts of the antiquarian textual tradition were the conceptual matter the entire community shared, raising the problem, that many fields in the past, and perhaps in the present day also, are found to lack a coherent central problematic, and yet can be seen to be distinct, creative and productive. Both David Hull and Mary Jo Nye argued that it was the sharing

\[182\] See Chapter One, Note 46.

\[183\] In the terms of Mary Jo Nye’s analysis, discussed in Chapter One, the legitimacy of antiquarianism as a field might be logico-historical, pedagogical, or attained through its participation in a disciplinary strategy. The interesting thing about antiquarianism, however, is that it can claim none of these things.
of the problems by practitioners, rather than the specific nature of the problems, which united a field over time. Their insight provides an avenue for exploring this problem. The case of antiquarianism indicates the need for models of fields to include a wider range, and different kinds of, factors that may be shared within an intellectual group. These might include religious identity, patriotism, factionalism, disaffection, alienation, collective ambition, and many others. Conceptually shared material might be held and reproduced within structures other than institutional ones. The case of antiquarianism suggests that it might be the properties of the community's research habits or written products that sustain shared conceptual material over time.

But the possibility that an intellectual domain might be integrated through its written products is the third point in which the case of antiquarianism might refine current models of fields. If antiquaries' method and genres were the means of conceptual integration of their domain, the formal characteristics of the written products of fields could be a fourth component of a model of fields, sharing ground with both intellectual questions and with the institution. Nye's discussion of the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century history of chemistry indicates how this might work. Like chemists, antiquaries had difficulty developing a complex, integrated theory of the identity and constitution of their subject. Chemists' object of study—molecular processes—seemed intractably enigmatic. They could not achieve the ultimately desired mathematical explanations of the processes they studied. Similarly, antiquaries worked on a subject which they perceived as largely unknown and perhaps unknowable. But the antiquarian textual tradition provided a way of interlocking a complex set of evidentially defined fields, just as conventional metaphors and practices integrated chemists' large and varying set of molecular theories.

---

184The integration of the formal features of a field's written or research products into a model of field also indicates that textual analysis would be an effective way of tracing the interactions of cognate fields, for example, history, geography, archaeology and geology.
Chemists integrated these with precision in a descriptive rather than an axiomatic manner, producing a practical rather than theoretical epistemology. Similarly, antiquaries integrated their disparate fields through method, genres and tasks, producing a practical expertise that was well in advance of that of the historians. Contemporary critical theory could provide models for investigating the ways in which the formal characteristics of textual and research products structure the intellectual domain of fields.

This chapter has attempted to argue that, from late in the sixteenth century, the characteristics of Camden’s large and learned Britannia had structured the work of a multitude of antiquaries spread across a miscellaneous set of fields. From the outside, these fields delineated a rather incoherent intellectual area. And so, it was not always obvious to outsiders what antiquaries were sharing with their colleagues. But they persisted, even when they had to share intellectual territory with a powerful rival. And they consistently outlived the obituaries that were written for their efforts, learning eventually to transform ridicule into recognition. The eclipse of this long-lived scholarly tradition late in the nineteenth century was caused by rapid changes in its environment, as legislators removed learned work from learned societies, institutionalising erudition within the universities. Even at the beginning of that century, the SA was already an institution under fire, needing reform, and finding itself less and less able to coordinate its members prodigious output. But the nineteenth-century community was, nevertheless, vital and productive. The composition, character and products of that community are the subjects of the next chapter.

---

185 This makes sense of the remarks of the many twentieth-century historians who have described antiquaries as having a practical or scientific historiography. Further parallels are possible. For example, chemists and antiquaries shared an "underdog" identity. Chemists shared some territory with physics, as antiquaries did with historians. Similarly, antiquaries worked on a subject in a manner which emphasised all they did not know, and yet shunned the political and rhetorical concerns of historians.
CHAPTER FOUR

Two previous chapters have discussed the institution of the SA and the intellectual domain antiquaries inhabited. In this chapter, the character of the antiquarian community will be discussed. In particular, two questions are asked: who were antiquaries, and how did they interact as a community? In order to answer the first, information was sought for six variables in the lives of the 1636 men who were SA fellows between 1830 and 1870. These were: fathers' occupation, education, career, scholarly associations, scholarly work, and personal profile (marital status, religion, political views and so on). Membership lists for the years 1830, 1840, 1850, 1860 and 1870 created the total SA population used in this thesis, and provided five moments with which to outline trends and changes over this period. But trends, taken alone, would tend to conceal the heterogeneity and liveliness of this community. Therefore, biographical material is used to complement the quantitative material, and this helps to depict the antiquarian community more fully. The complete data set and a discussion of problems in its interpretation can be found in

---

¹For a discussion of biographical sources, the availability of data, and choices of variables, see Appendix One. Briefly, information on university education, career and publications was most available, where fathers' occupations, schooling, and personal information was scanty. Information was completely lacking for 315 or 19.25% of fellows, but was available for at least one variable for the other 1321 or 80.75% of fellows.

²Preliminary analysis suggested that yearly or five-yearly rather than decadal analysis would not alter resultant values greatly. New members made up 32.5% per decade on average, and deaths of fellows 37.5% per decade on average, producing something like 35% overall membership change per decade. The main error introduced by using ten-year intervals is the potential loss of members who were FSA for nine years or less, not in any of the years chosen. These men will not appear this data. Although a study of membership lists at 5-yearly intervals indicates that these men comprise less than 1% of membership per year, they do represent missing data. However, to limit the already considerable work of calculating values for variables, decadal intervals were chosen. See Appendix One. Figure 1.3.

³As so many fellows are used as examples of different features of this community, biographical sources are not cited every time. Biographical information can be found in one of three sources. The Dictionary of National Biography (DNB) provided the longest entries. Further information came from Frederick Boase's Modern English Biography, and the microfilmed British Biographical Archive (BBA) supplemented these. Instead of compiling synopses, the BBA presents all original source material found: while there is much repetition, no details have been edited out. For a small number of men who still remained obscure, the following works were searched: John Alexander Hammerton, Concise Universal Biography, Amalgamated Press: London, 1934-35, 2 volumes; Katherine P. Wormeley and George Burnham Ives, trs., C.A. Saint-Beuve, Portraits of the Eighteenth Century, Historic and Literary, G.P. Putnam's Sons: London and New York, 1905, 2 volumes; Lawrence B. Phillips, The Dictionary of
Appendix One.

The attempt to answer these two basic questions—who were antiquaries, and how did they interact in their community—has resulted in a distinct picture of this community. That picture is of a group of highly talented men from lower middle class backgrounds, who were more often self-educated than university graduates, who were successful at obtaining better employment than their fathers had, and who participated extensively in Victorian scholarship through publishing and memberships in scholarly associations. Antiquaries had extensive employment links within their community. But while the community brought many members employment, work across the boundary between humanities and the sciences, and trends within the election of new members, suggest that the antiquarian community was defined more by a variety of scholarly skills than by class, background, employment or religion. In the conclusion, it is noted, that antiquaries' participation in learned societies, the sciences, and other forms of scholarship is so distinguished as to provoke important historiographic questions: does the conventional terminology of amateur

---


4It should be noted that the word "data" is treated throughout this thesis as a singular noun, despite its derivation from the Latin plural, a practice consonant with contemporary usage in discussion of quantitative matter, and with one definition provided by the *Concise Oxford Dictionary*. This is necessary, in order to avoid awkward compound sentences. See J.B. Sykes, ed., *The Concise Oxford Dictionary*, Clarendon: Oxford, 1976, 6th edition.
and professional really fit the Victorians? In what ways might humanistic and scientific fields be interconnected in the lives and work of the men who participated in both? Was the clerisy upper middle class? Most importantly, this data shows that, through prosopographical research, historians might describe, very fully and precisely, the network of work and leisure relations that existed in Victorian England, across class and religious boundaries.

The first question to be considered is: who were antiquaries? The first of six variables which comprise an answer to this question is antiquaries' father's employment.\textsuperscript{5} Data was unavailable for 57\% to 68\% of the population, so results must be viewed as provisional.\textsuperscript{6} However, some particulars may be ascertained. The number of peers' sons is an accurate representation of their presence in the community.\textsuperscript{7} At most they were 11\% of membership, and their presence declined steadily throughout these decades, to 3.73\% in 1870, showing that the image of an institution and community weighed down by a great ballast of inert noble amateurs is wrong. About 90\% of fellows were sons of commoners. Of the sons of upper middle class fathers, there is no dominant group. Sons of clergy, lawyers, and bankers/ manufacturers are all about equally represented. But while values for sons of upper middle class men appear larger

\textsuperscript{5}See Appendix One. Figures 1.4 and 1.5. These six variables were chosen because they encompass major components of determining social class and evaluating intellectual achievements. Other information was also collected, to create a picture of antiquaries' personal lives, and is presented in this chapter.

\textsuperscript{6}Except where otherwise noted, data is presented as percentages of the yearly membership. For example, these figures refer to 57\% of the membership for 1840, the lowest figure for the five decades, and 68\% of the membership for 1860, the highest figure for the five decades. Little information was available on antiquaries' mothers, though they may have been equally important in determining antiquaries' social class.

\textsuperscript{7}Since peers' and peers' sons' names were printed in SA membership lists in block capitals, with full titles or in the case of younger sons "Hon.," they are highly identifiable. The numerous biographical compilations on the peerage have allowed data for this segment of the SA population to be complete. Noble fathers are not included in the figure for "fathers' occupation unknown." While "peer" does not constitute an occupation in the same way as the other descriptors describe employment, the point of considering fathers' occupation is to delineate the class structure of this community. Though SA peers tended to be recently established, it is still useful to make this segment of the antiquarian population evident as such. Had these fellows' fathers employment been tallied in other rows, they would mainly have been placed in politics, the military, clergy and law. However, in the third variable, noble antiquaries are listed under their various occupations, as few were independently wealthy, but many worked.
than those for sons of lower middle class men such as teachers, clerks, tradesmen, and artists/architects, it is probable that there were more sons of lower middle and working class than sons of professional men among the fellows for whom this information is unknown. As fellows for whom background data is unknown plus fellows of non-professional fathers are the majority of fellows, it is clear that throughout the period, the demographic profile of the SA was skewed towards the middle and working classes.

Categories chosen to group fathers' occupations may create a false impression of the character or experience of men who are placed in them. This is especially true of peers' sons. As might be expected from the distribution of the peerage, most noble antiquaries were from the lower levels of the peerage: Barons rather than Dukes, Marquises, Earls and Viscounts. However, most SA peers were from recently ennobled families. Typical of antiquarian peers was Thomas Pakenham, 3 Earl Longford, the grandson of a naval store keeper and surveyor who rose to Master-General of Ordnance and Earl. Pakenham entered the navy at 14 and saw military service lifelong. George Kenyon, 2 Baron Kenyon was son of an illegitimate Cheshire law-clerk who rose to become Attorney-General and 1 Baron Kenyon. Thus, most antiquarian peers would not have presented to their SA fellows the character of ancient, established privilege. Similarly, some sons of commoners came from well-connected families. Fellows' fathers' occupations, then, must be taken only as a partial guide to their social status. The heterogeneity of fellows'...
experiences within every category remains an important feature of their interpretation throughout this chapter.

The sons of working men reveal the diversity of backgrounds from which antiquarian interests arose. Architect and architectural historian John Newman was son of a Snow Hill leather wholesaler. Joseph Hunter, Sub-commissioner and editor for the Records Commission, was son of a Sheffield cutlery merchant. Justice of the Peace and Manx historian William Harrison was son of a Lancashire hat maker. Sir Benjamin Hawes, Reform Bill advocate, patron of Babbage's calculating machine, and Under-secretary for War during the Crimean War, was son of a Lambeth soap-boiler who was himself FSA. Bookseller and literary historian Samuel Weller Singer was son of a London artificial feather and flower maker. Charles Roach Smith, whose collections of Roman-British antiquities later formed the nucleus of the British Museum's collection, was tenth son of a farmer in the Isle of Wight. Charles Abbott, the notable classical scholar who rose to become Chief Justice and 1 Lord Tenterden, was son of a London wigmaker and hairdresser. Little can be determined about the motivation these sons of working class men felt to engage in antiquarian fields of study.¹⁰

The second variable is fellows' education, including schooling, university and travels.¹¹ Data for schooling is very incomplete, but some particulars can be established. Since the number of fellows who attended public schools is likely to be nearly accurate, the number of fellows for whom information is unknown probably represents men who attended local or undistinguished

---

¹⁰Some fellows are known to have conflicted with their fathers over their choice of occupation. For example, Henry Petrie, son of a Surrey dancing teacher, did not wish to take his father's line of work, obtained work in the Tower Records Office, and eventually became keeper of the Tower Records.

¹¹See Appendix One, Figures 1.6 through 1.9.
residential schools at best. Only about 12% of fellows attended public schools. The combined figure for public and good schools peaks at 22% of membership in 1850, and falls again in the last two decades to about 15%. Thus the number attending undistinguished schools or none must be around 80%. This is consonant with data for fathers' employment: most antiquaries were from lower middle and working class rather than upper and upper middle class backgrounds.

Antiquaries had diverse experiences with schooling. While most fellows who attended public schools were of wealthy families, some were scholarship boys. At the other end of the public school spectrum were antiquaries like Oxford classics professor Arthur Penrhyn Staney, on whom the sensitive, religious and scholarly Arthur of antiquary Thomas Hughes' Tom Brown's School Days was modelled. William Whewell, son of a master carpenter, attended the Lancaster blue school. Poet and banker Samuel Rogers attended a London dissenters' academy. Legal historian Charles Butler attended a Catholic school in Hammersmith, and George

---


14For example, Henry Kaye Bonney, son of a poor clergyman, was sponsored at Charterhouse by Lord Westmoreland. Music historian Richard Clark was grandson of a clerk at Eton and St. George's Chapel, Windsor, entered Eton as a chorister, and later took his grandfather's position.

15Other examples include John Russell, gold medallist and later Head-Master at Charterhouse, and translator Charles Augustus Tulk, school captain at Westminster.
Butler, later Head-Master of Harrow, his clergyman father's Chelsea school. Of those who were educated privately, many were taught by clergymen of their denomination. George Gwilt, architect to the West India Docks, "was indebted for his general education mainly to his own exertions." Oriental traveller George Thomas Keppel (4 Earl Albemarle) was schooled by his grandmother, the Dowager Lady de Clifford, who was governess to Princess Charlotte. These differences must have been reflected in curriculum and attainments. Yet, as will be seen, by the time antiquaries were of an electable age, the differing circumstances in which they were schooled made little difference to their scholarly achievements.

Many antiquaries showed an early interest in antiquarian areas of study, especially language learning, manuscript study and bibliography. Where data on fellows' schooling might suggest they had little learning, biographical material suggests that men who became antiquaries were studiously inclined, despite their class background.

Data for university attendance suggests that antiquaries were men whose fathers invested in them. Data for this variable is complete and is probably nearly accurate, as university registers

16 Legal historian Charles Butler, book collector Michael Jones, diplomat Henry Howard and actor Charles Kemble were sent to Catholic schools at Douay. John Cooke, instructed by the local dissenting minister in whose footsteps he was to follow, had a distinguished medical career. Archaeologist Alfred John Kempe was indifferently educated by 2 French refugees, and historian Francis Cohen (later Palgrave) by an Italian tutor. Edward Foss, editor for the records Commission, and topographer Hudson Gurney were taught by male relatives and by Egyptologists Thomas Young and John Hodgkin.

17 See the British Biographical Archive. Fiche 496, frames 99-111, the entry from C. Knight, Biography. also known as The English Cyclopaedia Div. III, 7 vols, 1856.

can establish who attended and who did not.\textsuperscript{19} In all decades except 1840, non-university-educated men outnumbered university-educated men two to one. The number of university-educated fellows peaked in 1840, at 43%. This fits with antiquaries’ working and lower middle class backgrounds. However, a far greater number attended university than might be expected from their fathers’ class and income profile. Only 12-25\% of fellows came from noble and upper middle class homes, which had incomes capable of sustaining the costs of university education. But 33\%-42\% of antiquaries attended university. At the beginning of this period fees were at least £100, the costs of living in hall and of sociability brought the figure to three times that much, and costs rose during the period 1830-70. These sums would have been difficult to save for, and support on an income of less than £300 per year.\textsuperscript{20} Such sacrifices probably indicate lower middle class fathers’ desires that their sons improve their social standing more than their scholarship, as social contacts led to employment. Antiquaries succeeded in both.\textsuperscript{21}

A similar imbalance between income or class and education is suggested by data on antiquaries travelling. Between 12\% and 15\% of fellows travelled outside Britain.\textsuperscript{22} The number


\textsuperscript{20}See Sheldon Rothblatt, \textit{Traditional and Change in English Liberal Education}, Faber and Faber: London, 1976, pp. 102-16.

\textsuperscript{21}Sheldon Rothblatt discusses the relation between liberal education and preferment, and the problems of poor students at Oxford and Cambridge in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century. See Rothblatt, \textit{Tradition and Change in English Liberal Education} Faber and Faber: London 1976, pp. 59-74, 94-98, 119-32, 139-45. For a synopsis of antiquaries’ university distinctions, see Appendix 2.B.1: "University Scholarship."

\textsuperscript{22}These figures probably under-represent the reality, as biographical works usually record travels which are related to an occupation (diplomacy, the military), a course of study, or grand tour or notable project such as archaeology. The increase of 3\%, 1830-50, may represent the greater opportunities that followed the end of the wars. The average age of fellows at entrance in 1840 was 37 and in 1850 was 39, so many of these men would have travelled in the 1820s and 1830s, in their twenties. The decrease 1860-70 is less easy to interpret. Average age at
of antiquaries travelling is close to that for men of noble and professional backgrounds, but sons of peers and upper class men make up only 41.76% of travellers. Son of lower middle and working class men are 70-80% of fellows but a disproportionate 58.24% of travellers. Antiquaries of poorer backgrounds, then, appear to have valued travel more than their wealthier counterparts.

Biographical data shows antiquaries valued travel because it brought them into contact with antiquities, archaeological sites and libraries. Poor antiquaries were often successful in finding ways to travel despite limited funds. Most travelled for scholarly pursuits rather than polite pleasure, and combined employment opportunities with antiquarian research. James Millingen’s merchant family moved to Paris in 1790, hoping to benefit from the new government. Their fortunes were mixed. While in prison as a British subject 1792-94, Millingen met other antiquaries. When released, he remained in France lifelong, writing on antiquities and purchasing for European museums including the British. John Galt, hired to explore "how far British goods could be exported in defiance of the Berlin and Milan decrees," travelled through Europe, the admission, 1850-70, was 40-45 years. Aside from military men and antiquaries who lived abroad, these men are likely to have travelled in their twenties, or in the 1850s. An increased attention to building a career, from mid-century on, and a decreased emphasis on the Grand Tour as a part of education may have affected these figures.

Baxter’s estimated incomes of various classes, and the fraction of the population they constituted, suggests only upper and middle class men, about 2% of the total British population, had the means to travel. Many more travelling antiquaries came from the third of Baxter’s categories, but cannot have had financial support from parents, or, if they had moved into the lower middle class employment category, still cannot have had great means to travel. Thus it seems that many antiquaries put a high value on travel.

Fathers’ occupational data is available for 191 of the 321 fellows who travelled, and was estimated for a further 82 fellows based on their attendance at public schools. Of these 273 men, 41.76% came from noble or professional backgrounds (lawyers, clergymen, bankers, manufacturers, wealthy merchants), 45.05% came from lower middle class backgrounds (teachers, authors, book printers and sellers, clerks, artists, architects, small merchants, doctors, military men) and 13.19% from working class backgrounds (labourers, tradesmen, poor farmers). This classification introduces some error as many clergy were poor, many nobles were not wealthy, a few military men were wealthy, and some professions such as medicine and engineering became professionalised over this period, causing their earnings to increase (the latter would potentially affect about 30 men, or 2% of the SA population).

See the DNB. Volume 7, pp. 828-32, p. 829.
Middle East and Asia Minor, recording the antiquities he saw as he explored trade possibilities. Henry Crabb Robinson received an income of £100 in 1798. Despite military inconveniences, he toured Germany and Bohemia, and attended University at Jena. Hired as foreign correspondent for *The Times*, he made architectural casts in the towns he passed through reporting on battles. John Gillies, Thomas Smart Hughes and William Roberts went to Europe as tutors accompanying their charges. Edward Cresy and George Ledwell Taylor, having little money, walked through France, Switzerland, Italy, Greece, Malta and Sicily, 1817-1820, later publishing on the antiquities they had seen.\(^{26}\)

Statistical and biographical material suggests, then, that antiquaries placed a high value on travel. For wealthy and poor antiquaries alike, travels were undertaken in pursuit of an antiquarian interest and often resulted in publications. In both education and travel, antiquaries used employment to further their intellectual interests, not to pursue polite pleasures. While scholarly pursuits may have interacted with attempts at social advancement in various ways, in travel as in university education, improving their social status does not seem to have been antiquaries' chief concern, and pursuing their chosen area of study appears to have been an active concern.

The third variable is fellows' employment.\(^{27}\) Figure 4.1 presents data for fellows' class,
as determined by occupation.\textsuperscript{28}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>1830</th>
<th>1840</th>
<th>1850</th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1870</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Class</td>
<td>6.54%</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>2.16%</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Middle Class</td>
<td>53.46%</td>
<td>53.97%</td>
<td>52.82%</td>
<td>41.89%</td>
<td>44.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Middle Class</td>
<td>35.09%</td>
<td>32.47%</td>
<td>34.27%</td>
<td>31.38%</td>
<td>30.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Class</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.31%</td>
<td>1.41%</td>
<td>1.24%</td>
<td>0.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation Unknown</td>
<td>13.21%</td>
<td>15.01%</td>
<td>15.12%</td>
<td>30.29%</td>
<td>16.72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.1: SA Fellows' Class Profile

This data shows that about 53\% of fellows worked in upper middle class occupations in 1830, this declined to 42\% over the period 1830-70, and about a third remained lower middle class.\textsuperscript{29}

It will be useful to have a description of the class structure of British society with which to compare this data. Figure 4.2 presents data for class, by income and portion of the population, for Britain, 1860.\textsuperscript{30} Class, more than income, is of use in interpreting antiquaries' lives. Income levels, however, indicate the context in which antiquaries travelled, worked, studied and wrote.

\textsuperscript{28}In this thesis, class has been defined by occupation rather than by parents' background. Briefly, occupation is a more appropriate guide in the case of antiquaries, as many of them improved on their fathers' social class and occupation. In one case below, it has been useful to note the different picture which emerges when parents' occupation is used to define class. For the complete data by occupation, and a discussion of the relation between background, occupation and class, see Appendix One, Figure 1.10.

\textsuperscript{29}See Appendix One, Figures 1.10 and 1.11. Biographical data suggest that only about 5\% of fellows served apprenticeships, but this figure is likely to be low, as fellows for whom little or no information is available were probably from the lower middle class. Fellows served apprenticeships to surgeons, solicitors, apothecaries, hatters, brewers and builders, engravers, painters, and in the merchant marine. Apprenticeships served to architects and in the book trades most often turned into life-long employment. John Soane started as an errand boy in George Dance's office. William Hosking was apprenticed in Sydney, New South Wales to a builder and surveyor, and later in London to an architect. William Hampar, apprenticed in his father's brassfounding works, developed a taste for architectural history from visiting churches for trade. Church historian and bookseller Thomas Rees went into his father's Welsh bookshop. Richard Taylor, John Holmes and George Woodfall became sellers and/or printers after apprenticing to book-sellers or printers.

\textsuperscript{30}John Burnett, Plenty and Want: A Social History of Diet in England from 1815 to the Present Day, Scolar Press: London 1979, p. 124. Burnett is using Dudley Baxter's 1867 statistical study of class and income, National Income. Statistical portraits of social and economic realities are approximations. Their value lies in their ability to delimit misleading images, indicate probable patterns in and components of historical explanations, and raise questions about current convictions. For further discussion of Baxter's data, see Appendix One.
These figures indicate that less than 1% of the British population was upper class, less than 2% upper middle class, less than 20% lower middle class, and almost 80% working class.\textsuperscript{31} By comparison, between 2% and 7% of the SA was upper class (by occupation).\textsuperscript{32} This is higher than in the population as a whole, but even if father's occupation were used to designate antiquaries' class rather than a fellows' occupation, as is used throughout this chapter, only 8% to 15% would be upper class. In either case, this is not as high as might be expected of a prestigious learned society. Between 73% and 89% of SA members were middle class (by occupation), though only about 20% of the British population was middle class. A greater portion of antiquaries worked in upper middle than lower middle class occupations. Less than 3% of antiquaries worked in lower class occupations, though this class comprised nearly 80% of the British population.\textsuperscript{33}

Certain features of the data on fellows' occupations should be noted. First, the number of fellows who are known to have been independently wealthy is less than 5% in 1830, and

\begin{figure}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|}
\hline
Class & Annual Income & % Population \\
\hline
Upper Class & £1,000 and up & .50% \\
Upper Middle & £300-£1,000 & 1.52% \\
Lower Middle & <£100-£300 & 18.84% \\
Working Class & under £100 & 79.13% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Class, Income, and Population Data, Britain, 1867}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{31}This is, of course, an approximation. This information helps to situate this chapter's discussion of the social background and career profile of the antiquarian community. See Appendix One for a discussion of the fit between income levels given in Figure 4.1 and these occupational categories.

\textsuperscript{32}See Appendix One for a discussion of the ways of determining class, and the different values gained for defining upper class membership by parentage and by occupation.

\textsuperscript{33}This result is not surprising. Education and some leisure were required to pursue antiquarian studies. Membership was adjudicated on the basis of publications as well as being known to community members, so it would have been fairly difficult for working class men to gain entrance to the SA.
decreases to 0.97% in 1870. Similarly, the number of antiquaries working in the College of Arms is less than 2% in 1830 and declines to .97% in 1870. Neither the statistical nor the biographical data, then, supports the image of the SA as replete with affluent and affected collectors of dubious archaeological rubbish, more inclined to port than to serious scholarship.

Second, this data shows how successful antiquaries were in gaining better kinds of employment than their fathers. Figure 4.3 compares numbers of upper middle class fathers with SA sons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1830</th>
<th>1840</th>
<th>1850</th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1870</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fathers</td>
<td>12.33%</td>
<td>16.31%</td>
<td>17.14%</td>
<td>12.52%</td>
<td>14.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA sons</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>57.86%</td>
<td>56.01%</td>
<td>44.05%</td>
<td>46.92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.3: Upper Middle Class Fathers Compared with SA Sons

The improvement varies between 300% and 500%, which, despite the overall income gains

30It is unlikely that many of the men for whom data is unavailable were upper class, so these values are probably nearly accurate. Many independently wealthy men cannot be described as idle wealthy amateurs. Robert Clutterbuck, for example, published on chemistry and topography. County historian Hudson Gurney was an M.P. and Vice-President of the SA, and of literary and archaeological societies in Norfolk. His collection of more 15,000 manuscripts and books related to Norfolk and Suffolk went to the British Library after his death. Robert William Hay, William Rae Wilson and Edward Dodwell became archaeologists in the Middle East. Richard Colt Hoare devoted his life to the history and archaeology of Wiltshire. Edward Rudge to those of Salisbury. George Ormerod, John Lee, Thomas Lister Parker, and Thomas Phillipps were expert collectors of books and antiquities.

31Heralds do not conform to a conventional image of court personnel. Of SA heralds, many were sent on diplomatic missions or gave expert testimony in peerage cases. Many were active in antiquarian studies. George Frederick Beltz, executor for Mrs. Garrick, published on archaeology. William Gell’s archaeological publications, published throughout Europe, earned him the epithet "classic Gell" in Byron’s "English Bards" (1809). George Nayler’s knowledge of genealogy led to his appointment to the College of Arms; his abilities led to a revision of College record-keeping practises. James Robinson Planche, an amateur actor and manager of the Adelphi, wrote and produced successful dramas and was an authority on the history of British clothing. Charles George Young catalogued the Arundel manuscripts and published on Tudor court history. Disraeli used Young’s work on the baronetage to detail the florid Sir Vavasour in his novel Sybil. Many heralds were not sons of eminent men: Llewellyn Meyrick was son of a Surrey doctor, Nayler of a Gloucestershire surgeon, Young of a Lambeth doctor, and Edmund Lodge of a Surrey rector.

32Upper middle class refers to men who were clergymen, lawyers, politicians, diplomats, wealthy merchants, bankers or industrialists, wealthy gentleman farmers or university professors.
throughout this period, cannot be typical of these decades.\textsuperscript{37} It is not clear how to interpret this antiquarian facility. University education must be a factor in many fellows’ success in leaving lower middle class backgrounds, but far more fellows improved their social standing than attended university. Antiquaries’ propensity to educate themselves, travel, and pursue a field of study seriously may also account for a part of that success.\textsuperscript{38} To some degree, this facility in improving social class and employment circumstances must reflect an exceptional level of talent and motivation among the individuals who became antiquaries. Further, as will be seen below, the antiquarian community needed to support their studies as their institution could not, and so employed each other, creating an upwardly spiralling relationship between financial gains, social status, and the pursuit of antiquarian scholarship. In this way poor antiquaries prospered at a greater rate than their non-SA counterparts in the British population overall.

Third, many antiquaries rose to occupy important positions in their area of employment, especially in institutions which could use antiquarian areas of expertise such as libraries, the law, architecture, authorship and publishing (see Appendix Two, Section A). Antiquaries filled posts from clerks to administrators, and from illustrious to mundane. Some lawyers, for example, were eminent, but the majority are listed merely as barrister or solicitor, and worked in small local practices.\textsuperscript{39} Many worked in areas related to their antiquarian interest. Legal historian Charles

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{37}On income gains throughout this period, see Peter Mathias, \textit{The First Industrial Nation: An Economic History of Britain 1700-1914} Methuen: London and New York, 1983, pp. 166-205, esp. 200.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{38}As Figure 1.10 of Appendix One shows, the decline in the rate at which fellows improved their social status is not accompanied by a rise in other occupations listed. Proportions of fellows working in medicine, the military, art and architecture, the book trades, and as teachers and masters remain stable, 1830-70. This suggests that new members were likely to be employed in these more ordinary occupations. Further, data for fellows’ employment decreases over the period, suggesting that antiquaries as a whole tended increasingly to be employed in less prestigious jobs during this period. As for other variables, then, this data suggests that the antiquarian community was not primarily comprised of wealthy or professional men.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{39}John Leycester Adolphus was attorney-general to the then County-Palatine of Durham. Codrington Carrington had been council to the EIC in Calcutta, became a judge in the Supreme Court of India, was asked to prepare the legal code of Ceylon in 1800, and became Ceylon’s first chief justice. Henry Hobhouse was solicitor to HM Customs
\end{flushright}
Purton Cooper was treasurer to Lincoln's Inn and Master of its library, presenting it with 2,000 volumes on his retirement. Edward Foss was lawyer to literary men and publishers. Charles Frost and Sir William Elias Taunton were experts in cases involving black-letter documents. Stacey Grimaldi, great-great grandson of the Doge of Genoa, and Francis Palgrave specialised in peerage cases. Joseph Littledale was counsel to Cambridge University. Robert Surtees left his law practice to research the antiquities of Durham full-time. Sharon Turner gave his spare time to the study of Anglo-Saxon and the early English church. Edward Vernon Utterson, a clerk in Chancery, retired on full pay when that court was abolished in 1842, and spent his remaining years editing rare early English texts. The same diversity and pursuit of antiquarian studies are found in every employment category. Even peers pursued some unlikely kinds of employment.

Many antiquaries supported themselves by writing and publishing ventures. Alexander and to the Treasury. Sir Johnathon Frederick Pollock became Attorney General. John Tidd Pratt was consulting barrister to the Commissioners for reducing the national debt (1828ff). John Scott, 1 Lord Eldon, became Chancellor, Lord Privy Seal, and tried the Cato Street Conspirators' case. His brother William Scott, 1 Lord Stowell, became an eminent judge of the Admiralty and rewrote maritime law during the Napoleonic wars. William Sheldon, never called to the bar because he was Catholic, established the Catholic Committee, which achieved some rights for Catholics in the Relief Act of 1778. Catholic lawyer Charles Butler worked in a conveyancing practise from 1775, became the first Catholic called to the bar since 1688, and took silk at Lincoln's Inn in 1832.

For example, Dr. Henry Halford was President of the Royal College of Physicians and physician to George IV and William IV. Surgeon's mate James Johnson, who had practised medicine in unpleasant circumstances and in most parts of the globe, became physician extraordinare to George III and founded the Medico-Chirurgical Review. Dr. Thomas Mantell left his practise for the more lucrative job of transporting prisoners of war and packets at Dover in 1814. Dr. Alexander Henderson gave up practising to study English literature.

For example, George Cappel Coningsby, later 5 Earl Essex, had been an MP but had also been director of the Drury Lane Theatre, and Richard, 2 Earl Mountedgecumbe was an MP and an actor and writer for theatre.

Chalmers was political writer for the *Morning Chronicle* and the *St. James Chronicle*, and editor of the *Morning Herald*. He contributed to the *Critical Review* and the *Analytical Review* as well as compiling glossaries and biographical dictionaries and writing introductions to editions of literary works. He described his literary career as comprised "of incessant labour, and of many personal privations, as is too commonly the fate of professional authors." Samuel Carter Hall also lived by writing for various periodicals, but was interested in art. In 1839, as editor and part owner of the *Art Union Monthly Journal*, he exposed the European trade in fraudulent old masters. This service was recognised in 1880 by a civil list pension (£150 per annum). But subscriptions had not paid the journal’s expenses for its first decade; Hall supplied the journal’s wants in the interim from his own resources.

Many fellows worked in jobs created by the industrial economy. Many applied their technological knowledge to their antiquarian work. Francis Fry was a member of the Quaker chocolate and soap manufacturing family, and a board member of three railways companies, who had experimented with technologies of various sorts. At his home near Bristol he had a press, and printed facsimile editions of early English Bibles, using photolithography. Hugh Welch

---


2. Even the more eminent antiquarian printers were not simply prosperous. For example, three generations of the Nichols family were editors of the *Gentleman’s Magazine*. They lost their stock and equipment in a warehouse fire in 1828, but rebuilt the business through lives of incessant editorial labour. John Murray, publisher of the *Quarterly Review* and the *Edinburgh Review*, was inconvenienced financially and in other ways by publishing Byron, Coleridge, Austen, Disraeli, Walter Scott, Samuel Smiles and Charles Lyell.

3. For example, Thomas Crofton Croker, historian of Irish literature and clerk in the Admiralty Office, introduced lithography into the Admiralty. Francis Freeling, Bristol Post Office surveyor and book collector, assisted in inventing more efficient coaches. George Saunders, writer on Gothic architecture, was surveyor to the county of Middlesex and for 28 years commissioner of sewers. John Newman, writer on Roman London, was surveyor to the Kent and Surrey sewer commissions and the Commission on Pavements and Improvements for Southwark. George Ledwell Taylor, writer on classical marbles, was surveyor to the naval works at Chatham, Woolwich and Sheerness Dockyards. Richard Taylor, Chancery Lane printer, published the *Annals and Magazine of Natural History* as well *Scientific Memoirs Selected from the Transactions of Foreign Academies of Science*. 
Diamond was secretary to the London Photographic Society and photographer to the SA. SA publications began using photography in architectural and archaeological articles in February, 1854, at Diamond’s suggestion.\textsuperscript{46}

Of particular interest are fellows who found employment in fields close to their antiquarian expertise. William Betham, discovering the documents of the office of Ulster King-of-Arms in disarray, obtained employment in the College of Arms sorting them out. He published extensively in early Irish history, and rose to be Ulster King-Of-Arms himself. Thomas Duffus Hardy was junior clerk in the Tower Record Office, published extensively, and eventually became editor of the Records Commissions publications and the prime mover of the 1869 Historical Manuscripts Commission. Thomas Hartwell Horne, son of a barrister’s clerk, was hired to compile indices of the Harleian manuscripts for the Commission on Public records. This brought him a position as clerk in the Tower Records office, then in the Chapter House of Westminster, and then in Queen’s College, Cambridge. The orphaned son of a navy captain, Thomas Frognall Dibdin became librarian to book collector the Earl of Spencer, and catalogued his collection at Althorp. Robert Jamieson found employment early in life in collecting and publishing Scottish ballads. These found favour with Walter Scott, who obtained for Jamieson the post of assistant deputy clerk to the Registrar in the General Register House of Edinburgh, where he remained for forty years.\textsuperscript{47}

Finally, the lives of many antiquaries show considerable uncertainty in their employment

\textsuperscript{46} Evans, p. 190ff. William Hoskins, architect and writer on architectural history, was engineer to the West London Railway Company. His design for a circular reading room in the style of the Pantheon was copied by Panizzi for the British library.

\textsuperscript{47} See Appendix 2.A.1 for a list of men working in jobs requiring antiquarian skills.
circumstances. Many changed jobs numerous times within the same general area of employment, between 5% and 7% per decade changed careers, and those employed in a single field lifelong, such as the professional authors discussed above, experienced changeable demand and periods of insufficient remuneration. This insecurity must have reflected both their lack of education and the changeable industrial economy. The uncertainty of Victorian employment places antiquarian work in an unusual context. Histories of Victorian Britain often separate scholars from the working class, and attribute intellectual work to the upper class and the university-trained. Yet the prosopographical research presented here suggests that significant scholarly work was carried on part-time, by men poorly-equipped for it by their formal education, and poorly supported financially.

Some further data on fellows’ personal profiles, the fourth variable, may help to characterise the antiquarian community. For marriage, data was unavailable for 49% of fellows in 1830, increasing to 82% of fellows in 1870. If available data is employed as a sample, it

---

48For example, Thomas Rickman was apprenticed in his father’s grocer-druggist’s shop, then to a chemist, then to a doctor, after which he worked in two hospitals. He practised medicine for two years, was a corn factor for 5 and an insurance clerk for 10. Only at 42 years did he become an architect, though he had been publishing on architectural history for some years already. Rickman’s case is extreme, but the lives of a considerable number of antiquaries show one major career change. Almost all clergymen antiquaries worked in several locations during their lives, and only about 10% reached even the lower levels of distinction in the church hierarchy.

49Even relatively successful antiquaries were susceptible to economic uncertainty. For example, Thomas Massa Alsager, part owner of the Royal Gardens, shot himself after going bankrupt. See Robert Best, ed., Edward Wedlake Brayley, SA. A *Topographical History of Surrey*, Dorking, Till and Bogue: London, 1841, 5 vols, vol 3, p. 352, n. 81. This property was sold, and the London Polytechnical Institution was built on the site.

50For example, Martin J. Wiener, *English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit 1850-1980*. Cambridge University Press: USA, 1988, pp. 11-24, 30-40. Weiner argues that upper class political and social values co-opted and reformed middle class ambition. The upper middle class was educated to reproduce the kind of political power the aristocracy wished to maintain, thus tempering the business power of the lower middle class. Weiner splits the middle class into two very discrete sections with opposing ideologies and ambitions. However, SA data shows the porousness of the two halves of the middle class, in some cases at least, and the possibilities for members of the lower middle class to do intellectual work. The problems of applying various definitions of intellectuals will be considered in Chapter Five.

51See Appendix One, Figure 1.12.
indicates that between 85% and 95% of fellows were married. Given the SA class structure, few fellows would have been wealthy enough for family matters to have imposed no burdens, either financial or in time lost from their studies.

SA fellows appear to have been mainly Anglican. Catholics, Jews and Dissenters made up 5% to 8% of members, considerably less than their presence in the British population overall. However, the SA tolerated a variety of religious belief, and was not characterised by any one style of Anglicanism. Some fellows were "enthusiastic." Many were not. Differences of religious opinion were legion. The debate around Catholic emancipation organised many

52 The decrease in availability of information over this period is probably accounted for by the fact that decreasing numbers of antiquaries' biographies are given in the DNB over this period. DNB entries regularly give marriage information. Boase rarely gives this information, and the sources which comprise the British Biographical Archive give it only sometimes. This indicates an overall change in the character of new members over these decades, away from the kind of men the DNB selected for, indicating the efficacy of the SA's mid-century reform. Values may have been slightly lower than this in reality. Marriage in the Victorian era presumed a basic level of financial stability. See Mathias, The First Industrial Nation 1983, pp. 166-179. The men for whom this data is missing are more likely to be lower and lower middle than upper middle and upper class.

53 See Appendix One. Figure 1.13.

54 This figure probably underestimates the Catholic and non-conforming segments of the SA population, possibly by a large amount. That a fellow was Catholic is known if he converted, was educated in a Catholic institution, was a member of a Catholic noble family or held a position within the Catholic church. Non-conforming fellows are identified because of their work as clergy for such groups, or publications. Both groups are probably larger than these would indicate. See Appendix One for data on the British population overall.

55 For example, Thomas Blyth and Benjamin Harrison were members of the Hackney Phalanx, a part of the Clapham sect. William Roberts and William Shaw were friends and biographers of Hannah More. Adam Clarke knew Wesley in his childhood and became a preacher in Wesley's style. William Owen Pughe was a follower of Joanna Southcott. Jewish fellows also show diversity. Isaac Disraeli, embroiled in a £40 dispute with the London Portuguese Synagogue, had his children baptised as Christian with English names, or not, depending on the fortunes of the dispute. Isaac Lyon Goldsmid, a founder of University College and purchaser of the godless Gower Street location, was the driving force behind Jewish emancipation and the Jewish Disabilities Bill.

56 Many antiquaries worked for the SPCK, but Hastings Robinson published an attack on this organisation as unprotestant. Edward Maltby, Bishop of Bath and Wells, was burned in effigy by his parishioners for subscribing to a unitarian work. Harry Bristow Wilson was convicted of heresy in the Essays and Reviews scandal for his liberal, Germanising theology. Benjamin Harrison wrote one of the Tracts for the Times, and John Parker published Keble and Pusey. John Lee favoured a union of Anglicans and non-conformists. Richard Warner published an attack on evangelicalism. Catholic legal antiquary Charles Butler engaged in a lifelong, celebrated ultra-Gallican contest with his own Roman authorities, agitating for English Catholics to have the right to elect bishops.
such differences.\textsuperscript{57} Conversions were not uncommon.\textsuperscript{58} Unusual religious convictions were not unknown.\textsuperscript{59} In this, the SA differs considerably from the BAAS, which employed a Broad Church ideology to retain control of executive operations and intellectual products, disseminating a view of their intellectual domain as latitudinarian, non-sectarian, and capable of harmonising regional, sectional and class differences.\textsuperscript{60}

A similar diversity is also seen in fellows’ politics. In every year, data for party affiliation shows antiquaries split almost evenly between Whigs and Tories, differing no more than 2\% overall. Some Tory antiquaries were notorious.\textsuperscript{61} Many others worked to improve legislative

\textsuperscript{57}Tractarian Charles William Russell, Newman’s teacher and spiritual adviser, was first President of Maynooth College. Benjamin Bond Cabbell, Eardley Gideon Culling Eardley and John Nicholl opposed the Maynooth grant. Catholic antiquary James Vincent Harding was Newman’s lawyer when the Tract 90 scandal broke. Charles Smith Bird published against Tractarianism. MP Robert Harry Inglis opposed the repeal of the Test Acts. Edward Augustus Kendall and Rowley published recommendations for repressing Catholicism, but Mark Aloysius Tierney and pacifist Richard Warner supported Catholic emancipation. Thomas Hartwell Horne published pamphlets against Catholic emancipation, but worked amicably with and for Catholics lifelong. James Millingen ceased speaking to his French wife and children when they made their Catholicism known to him.

\textsuperscript{58}For example, Quaker Thomas Byrth and presbyterians John Herman Merivale, Samuel Rogers and William Shaw converted to Anglicanism. Thomas Pell Platt, librarian to the British and Foreign Bible Society, went over to the Tractarians. Francis Palgrave, born Francis Cohen, converted to Anglicanism, and Levi Leone, also born Jewish, to Presbyterianism. Edward Lowth Badeley, Edmund Edgar Estcourt, Frances Henry Lascelles, William Maskell and William Munk converted to Catholicism in the wake of Tract 90. Gore Ouseley, a diplomat in Persia, published favourably on Islam and gave his children Islamic names, though Thomas Hartwell Horne, William Marsden and John David MacBride published on Islam as a religious error.

\textsuperscript{59}For example, Charles Augustus Tulk, former school captain at Westminster, worked lifelong translating Swedenborg and disseminating his doctrines of rational mysticism. Godfrey Higgins published works claiming that Christ was Samaritan by birth and a Nazarite of the monastic order of the Pythagorean Essenes by conviction. William Knight’s work on the likely social structure of heaven was repressed by Knight himself, fearing for his job at Marischal College. Baptist British Israelite Dr. George Moore published works on the power of the mind over the body.


\textsuperscript{61}For example, John Jeffreys Pratt, 2 Earl Camden, in Ireland during the Lieutenancy of Earl Fitzwilliam, advised Parliament to suspend Habeus Corpus in 1796, leading to rebellion in 1798. William Wyndham Grenville moved that suspension, as well as the Treasonable Practices and Seditious Meetings Acts, 1794-95, and later headed the ineffective Ministry of All Talents in 1806. Henry Addington Lord Sidmouth, another unpopular Prime Minister, introduced the 1817 suspension of Habeus Corpus and the hated Six Acts, and was responsible for the Peterloo massacre. Charles Philip Yorke excluded the press from the Walcheren expedition inquiry, jailed journalists who criticised this, and had his windows smashed in the April, 1810 riots. Thomas Rennell’s 1794 sermon on the iniquity of the French Revolution caused William Pitt to call him the Demosthenes of the pulpit.
responses to emerging industrial realities. Reform issues organised many political differences between antiquaries. Some antiquaries were hated by radical politicians. Some antiquaries were closely aligned with radical politics. But antiquaries can be found on either side of most political questions of the time, and some on both.

The antiquarian community, then, was nothing if not diverse. Some fellows' lives included improbable events. Some had celebrated literary and political connections. Many fellows

---


63 For example, Henry Edward Bunbury and John Sinclair supported the Reform Bill of 1832; George Wyndham 3 Earl Egremont and Henry Hallam opposed it. Benjamin Hawes and Godfrey Higgins supported repeal of the Corn Laws. Robert Harry Inglis opposed them, and Robert Peel had introduced them. George Hibbert published against the slave trade, but Henry Phipps 1 Earl Mulgrave declared in parliament that in his year in Jamaica he had not seen a single ill-treated slave.

64 For example, Arthur Trevor Hill 3 Viscount Dungannon moved the bill for national Anglican education, opposed the abolition of clerical subscription in Ireland, and was denounced by O'Connell. Augustus Cavendish Bradshaw was denounced by Cobbett. Francis Burdett criticised John Nicholl's opposition to constitutional reform.

65 For example, Richard Sharp had been a member of the Friends of the People Society in 1791-92. Radical Yorkshire unions asked Godfrey Higgins to stand for Parliament. Thomas Kitson Cromwell was secretary of the Birmingham Education League.

66 For example, Monmouth MP Charles Morgan thought Henry Dundas Lord Melville, First Lord of the Admiralty, guilty of corruption charges brought against him in 1804; Tiverton merchant William Fitzhugh thought him innocent. Robert Smith, 1 Baron Carrington and Charles Long 1 Baron Farnborough had been Pitt's close political allies and held various positions in Pitt's ministries. Martin Davy vetoed the Oxford Caput suggestion to erect a statue of Pitt. Henry Beeke gave Pitt the idea for income tax. George Hibbert introduced the property tax in 1798 and led those who repealed it in 1806. Michael Angelo Taylor was elected a Tory MP but crossed the floor in 1785.

67 John Thomas Barber Beaumont, founder of the County Fire and Provident Life insurance companies, being instrumental in exposing insurance fraud was the object of an unsuccessful murder attempt. William Jordan, parliamentary reporter to the British Press, was present when Bellingham shot Spencer Perceval. Jordan seized the assassin. Robert Harry Inglis, known for his refined manners, was deputized to tell Queen Caroline that she could not attend her husband, George IV's coronation at Westminster Abbey. Richard "Conversation" Sharp was a friend of Johnson and Burke, and had travelled in Italy with Wordsworth. Samuel Rogers was friends with Fox and Sheridan, and had travelled in Italy with Byron and Shelley. His bank was robbed of £40,000 in 1844 but his collection of French paintings, sold by Christie's in 1855 for £55,000, made good the loss. He was known for his generosity in lending money to poor poets, and feared for his sarcasm when they tried to repay him. Archaeologist Edward Dodwell married the daughter of an Italian Count, 30 years his junior and a society beauty, and became a favourite with the Pope, who referred to him as "Caro Doodle," "Dear Dodwell." George Kenyon, 2 Baron Kenyon, held two positions in the Court of King's Bench while still a minor, due to his father's ambition.
founded scholarships and did charitable work.\textsuperscript{69} A small number committed illegal, unethical or unpleasant acts.\textsuperscript{70} Some were eccentric.\textsuperscript{71} Some were disabled.\textsuperscript{72} Antiquaries, then, were not a homogeneous group, and seem to have tolerated diversity in their fellows.

\textsuperscript{69}John Leycester Adolphus, Robert Jamieson, Edward Hawke Locker, John Bacon Sawrey Morritt and Robert Surtees were friends of Walter Scott. Scott used Robert Lemon's work on historical manuscripts in his own work. Scott reviewed John Galt's tragedy on Mary Queen of Scots unfavourably but his novels \textit{The Ayrshire Legatees}, \textit{The Entail} and \textit{The Omen} favourably. Scott praised Thomas Crofton Croker's \textit{Fairy Legends and Traditions in the South of Ireland} in the notes to \textit{Waverley}, which led to their friendship. Francis Douce assisted Scott in publishing \textit{Sir Tristram}. Scott admired John Hookham Frere's translations of classics and Early English texts; Frere hosted Scott in Malta. William Gell in Rome and Thomas James Mathias in Naples during his last illness. Edward Blore was the architect for Scott's Gothic style Abbotsford house and illustrator for Scott's novels and \textit{Provincial Antiquities & Picturesque Scenery of Scotland}. William, Viscount Lowther provided Disraeli with the character for his Lordeskdale in \textit{Coningsby}. William Scott 1 Lord Eldon was friend to Dr. Johnson; Charles James Hoare to Wilberforce and Macaulay; William Lowther 1 Earl Lonsdale to Wordsworth; William Robert Spencer to Fox. Pitt, Sheridan and Sydney Smith; and William Sotheby to Scott, Wordsworth, Mrs Siddons, Byron, Coleridge, Joanna Baillie, Southey and Hallam. Dawson Turner's work on Anglo-Saxon and Icelandic sources was used by Scott, Hallam, Southey and Tennyson. Frederick Ouvry was friend to Charles Dickens and the basis for the character Mr Undery in \textit{Household Words}. George Edmund Street was friend to the Rosettis, Ford Madox Brown, William Morris, Edwyn Burne-Jones and other Pre-Raphaelites.

\textsuperscript{69}See Appendix 2.B.6 and 2.C.1.


\textsuperscript{71}For example, Alexander Hamilton Douglas 10 Duke Hamilton believed he was King of Scotland, and arranged that when he died he should be embalmed within an ancient Egyptian sarcophagus purchased for the purpose, and buried in a vast mausoleum worth £130,000. Diplomat John William Ward 1 Earl Dudley was known to rehearse various sides of important problems aloud to himself, in two voices, one of which was high-pitched and the other gruff.

\textsuperscript{72}Arthur Ashpitel was unable to walk. John Payne Collier was lamed in early childhood: his father's extreme poverty prevented him from wearing shoes, leading to the infection and amputation of part of his right foot. John Adley Repton, born profoundly deaf, had a career as an architect and was a noted writer on architectural history. William Richard Hamilton, Lord Elgin's energetic secretary who retrieved the Rosetta Stone from the French and the Elgin marbles from the sea floor when their ship sank, was lamed for life at Harrow. Publisher John Murray was blinded in one eye by a careless master at Gosport.
It has been suggested above that antiquaries' facility in improving their social status was due to a high degree of energy in acquiring education of various sorts. The picture of antiquaries as exceptionally motivated to pursue their scholarly interests is borne out by data for the fifth variable, scholarly associations, both those which treated subjects now seen as part of the humanities and those now viewed as sciences. Taking humanities societies first, data on fellows' memberships in learned societies other than the SA indicates that 11% to 24% were members of national societies; 5% to 15% were members of provincial archaeological and architectural societies; 4% to 11% were members of publishing societies; 1% to 4% were members of local literary-philosophical societies; and 5% to 14% were members of foreign learned societies. Overall, the probability that a fellow was a member of one learned society in the humanities grew from about 30% in 1830, peaked at 63% in 1850 and 1860, and fell to 53% in 1870.

Certain trends are visible within this data. Many more fellows belonged to national than to local or provincial societies. National societies adjudicated candidates, heard papers on the latest research, provided the chance to meet eminent men and men of similar interests, published journals, and engaged in shaping the emerging orthodoxy and research goals. Many were specialised in focus, and provided members with a sophisticated level of discussion and study. Many were formed during the first few decades of the nineteenth century. Few provincial societies or literary-philosophical societies could reach this standard. Thus antiquaries tended to be interested in specialised, current scholarship and capable of competing successfully to enter learned bodies providing this kind of material and experience. This preference is also suggested

---

73See Appendix One, Figure 1.14.

74For a complete list of societies in each of these categories, see Appendix One, Figure 1.15.
by the fact that membership in literary-philosophical societies dropped steadily during this period. Literary philosophical societies, originating in the eighteenth century, were more concerned with generalist and synthetic forms of knowledge. In all cases except literary-philosophical societies, SA memberships grew in 1830 and 1840, peaked in 1850 and 1860, and diminished somewhat by 1870.

Similar trends can be seen in data for fellows' memberships in scientific societies. Numbers of scientific memberships rose from 1830, from about a third (33%) of the membership, to just over half (53%) in 1850, and declined thereafter to about a quarter (26%) of yearly membership. This shows that, until about mid-century, antiquaries increasingly pursued scientific studies, and that even in 1870, about a quarter of antiquaries were active and recognised in the sciences. It shows that the growth and speciation of knowledge did not exceed many antiquaries' abilities to maintain research in both a scientific and a humanities field until about mid-century. The fact that such a trend is found in both scientific and humanities memberships probably reflects the rapid growth and ensuing specialisation of knowledge during this period as a whole.

SA fellows' participation in learned societies can be used to gauge, approximately, the style of antiquaries' participation in Victorian intellectual work. The total number of non-SA

---


76 See Appendix One, Figure 1.15.

77 Actual numbers of fellows presents a different picture. Membership in the RS decreased from 195 in 1830 to 46 in 1860. However, memberships in other scientific societies increase over the whole period. And the increase 1830-50 is not merely apparent. While exaggerated somewhat by decreasing membership 1830-50, absolute numbers remain approximately stable while membership decreased, showing that fellows with scientific memberships were being elected at a greater rate than fellows with scientific memberships died. These newer fellows' memberships will have been gained during periods when membership requirements were being made more difficult, showing that these antiquaries were scientifically very competent for their times. For a discussion of problems in interpreting memberships as percentages of yearly SA membership, see Appendix One.
memberships may be viewed as an index of the activity of antiquaries' participation. The probability that an SA fellow would participate in another learned body was already 49% in 1830, rose to 68% in 1840, peaked at 116% in 1850, and dropped to 79% in 1870.\textsuperscript{78} That is, in 1850 there were 16% more outside memberships among SA fellows than there were fellows themselves, showing that most fellows belonged to one society other than the SA, and some belonged to more than one. Thus, antiquaries may be described as fairly active in general, and very active around mid-century. As the majority of fellows belonged to adjudicated, specialised societies rather than local and provincial societies, antiquaries’ participation may be described as equal at least to that of their peers in such societies. Antiquaries, then, were active, competent participants in Victorian intellectual life and work. Antiquaries may also be described as eminent. Their participation in Victorian intellectual work was both eminent and varied.\textsuperscript{79} For example, 64 distinguished themselves at university, and 106 had celebrated collections of books, manuscripts, antiquities or other items. Many held executive positions in learned societies: 88 founded scholarly societies, 48 had been founding members, 58 had been Presidents, and 210 had been Vice-Presidents, secretaries, treasurers, trustees, council members, directors or committee chairs, or had received medals. Antiquaries, then, were active, competent, eminent participants in Victorian intellectual work.

Another indicator of SA fellows' participation in Victorian intellectual work is indicated

\textsuperscript{78}See Appendix One, Figure 1.16.

\textsuperscript{79}It is difficult for readers to gain the familiarity with 1636 biographies I have gained while compiling this information. Appendix Two, which presents 23 lists of antiquaries eminent in various fields, occupations and other areas, will help readers to get a more detailed sense of the SA population, and to appreciate its diversity and eminence. These lists precis antiquaries' achievements in various areas.
by their publications in various areas of scholarship.\textsuperscript{80} This, the sixth variable, provides further support for viewing SA fellows as active, competent participants in Victorian intellectual work. Their eminence in two different scholarly areas will be the subject of Chapters Six and Seven. Data on fellows' publications shows that the probability of a fellow publishing one scholarly book per decade in his area of interest was just over 100\% in all years. That is, the great majority of fellows published a volume per decade, and a few published more than one. About 15\% of fellows had significant collections. Fellows rewarded for their scholarship by a knighthood, civil list pension or peerage rose from 5\% in 1830, to 12\% in 1850 and fell again to 9\% in 1870.

Data for fellows' scholarship shows that history, including biography, genealogy, heraldry, British and foreign political, ecclesiastical, local, legal and music history, was the most populous field of study, with 35\% to 43\% of fellows publishing in it. Manuscript-related works, including editions and translations of previously unpublished manuscripts, rolls, state papers, cartularies and calendars, was the next most populous field of study, with 14\% to 17\% of fellows publishing in this area. Between 12\% and 15\% of fellows published on art and architecture, 9\% to 12\% published on archaeology, and 5\% to 10\% of fellows in scientific fields.\textsuperscript{81} Publications on literature, language study, bibliography, classics and biblical studies all remained at levels below 10\% of fellows for all decades. Between 9\% and 14\% of fellows had published in periodicals.

\textsuperscript{80}Naturally, both indicators are in a sense crude. Some may have contributed to fields without belonging to the society or publishing. Others may have belonged to a society or published, without contributing much of merit. However, the latter situation does not disqualify them as participants, only as eminent participants. The lack of accessible mechanisms in the Victorian era for determining levels of competence has often been used, in conjunction with terms such as amateur, dilettante, and aristocrat, to disqualify any consideration of the character and contribution of these sectors of intellectual labourers. This is premature. The eminent are by definition unusual: they may not represent the majority of scholars' styles, methods and views about shared intellectual questions. It would seem more historiographically reasonable to allow the whole intellectual community to provide the context for understanding the unusual, and to allow the mainstream structures of intellectual work to determine how histories of the community and institution are written. See Chapter 1, note 5. See also Appendix One, Figures 1.17 to 1.19.

\textsuperscript{81}This is probably an underestimate, as biographical sources tend to record less publication data for most nineteenth-century scientists than they do humanities publications for men of a similar level of achievement. Unfortunately, a survey of major scientific periodicals and transactions was beyond the scope of this thesis.
Fellows also published on current political and theological issues, as well as producing poetry, plays, fiction, and school texts.\(^2\) Antiquaries, then, were active, competent scholars across the entire range of their traditional areas of study.

Similar trends can be seen in the subgroup of fellows who worked across the boundary between the sciences and the humanities. This group is of interest to this thesis, as the porous character of the boundary between fields of all sorts is among the defining characteristics of antiquarian scholarship. Antiquaries’ traffic across this boundary will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter Six. However, a brief profile of scientific antiquaries may be presented here.

Substantial biographical information was available for a subgroup of 274 fellows who worked in at least one science and one humanities field. The real figure is considerably higher.\(^3\) This subgroup was slightly better educated and had a slightly higher class profile than the SA population overall.\(^4\) But they resembled antiquaries as a whole, in that they were active,

\(^2\) The number of fellows publishing in these areas drops during these decades. The taste, and market, for sermons, print controversies and pacificatory pamphleteering is evident among antiquaries. School texts were published by a number of fellows who were eminent teachers and masters, as well as by men who made their living by writing. Many antiquaries wrote fiction and drama, often treating historical subjects. Extraordinary numbers of fellows published their own poetry, often on antiquarian subjects. Thomas Dudley Fosbroke wrote a book length history of English monasticism in Spencerian stanzas, basing his periodisation on Darwin’s *Economy of Vegetation*.

\(^3\) This is 16.75% of the total SA population 1830-70. In determining members of this subgroup, it was difficult to assess what constituted important scientific work: standards changed rapidly during these decades, and work of significance then is often not so now. Therefore, inclusion was based on competence, as perceived by their peers. Included were: men who published in scientific societies’ proceedings or in book form, who studied science in European universities or under important figures, who lectured on scientific subjects or held executive positions in scientific societies, who had received awards for their work in the sciences, and who were members of a scientific society where entrance was adjudicated (FRS, FRAS, FCS, FGS, FZS, FLS, ICE, FRIBA). Of these 274 fellows, 123 (45%) are accounted for in the first category: they had published in at least one scientific and one humanities field. Inclusion also required publications in the humanities: exceptionally competent scientists who did no work in the humanities were excluded, as they may have been merely “interested in antiquities.” A great many men were excluded because their biographical information was incomplete. For the 274 used as a sample subgroup, information was available for at least four of the six variables. Had this number been dropped, a great many more could have been considered.

\(^4\) The subgroup differs from the SA population. 44.16% attended university compared to 37.88% of SA population, implying a small correlation between education and scientific work. Sons of peers plus independently wealthy men comprise 10.22% of subgroup compared to 6.77% of the SA population (peers only), implying a small correlation between wealth and scientific work. Results are nuanced more by class than by wealth. 12.77% of subgroup fellows had lower class fathers. Information is unavailable for 39.78% of subgroup, who likely had working
competent and, in some cases, eminent. Some amassed significant scientific collections.\textsuperscript{85} Many functioned as executive officers for scientific societies.\textsuperscript{86} Some were best known as eminent scientists.\textsuperscript{87} Their most common areas of publication were geology (23.61%), botany (20.60%), medicine (10.30%) and mathematics (10.30%). In humanities, history (43.32%), archaeology (13.37%), literature (9.10%) and architecture (8.56%) are the most common. Subgroup fellows were relatively more concentrated in their humanities' interests, and more diffusely spread among scientific fields of interest. But some coherence can be found in the way their publications are placed in these two precincts of learning. The relatively great representation of history conforms to antiquarian interests. Peter Bowler has discussed history as Victorians' "preferred way of understanding how both human society and the material world operated."\textsuperscript{88} This perspective may be operative in the work of subgroup antiquaries. That geology is the scientific field with greatest class fathers, producing a figure close to 52.55% for subgroup sons of working class men, compared to around 2/3 of population. Fewer lower class men became scientists than became antiquaries, then. 17.52% of subgroup fellows had professional fathers compared to 14.48% of the SA population, a slight difference. But 19.71% of subgroup fellows had middle class fathers, compared to 10.82% of the SA population. Thus sons of middle class rather than professional, noble or independently wealthy fathers are over-represented in this subgroup, compared to the SA population. The financial gap between lower and middle class is much smaller than that between middle and upper class: thus it not simple wealth but enough wealth to make educated goals visible and possible, that made the greatest difference for these 274 men. Antiquaries of middle class backgrounds or aspirations may have held scientific work in higher regard compared to the SA population generally, but beliefs about the relation of scientific work to career advancement may also have motivated their choice of fields. It is not possible to determine the relative effect of such factors in these lives. Yet antiquaries' commitment to their scientific studies is equally undeniable.

\textsuperscript{85}See Appendix 2.B.5. especially John Adamson, Richard Daniel, John Marten Cripps, George Hibbert, Joseph Dalton Hooker, Aylmer Bourke Lambert, Woodbine Parish, whose collections included the megatherium Richard Owen used to build the specimen exhibited in the Natural History Museum, and Dawson Turner.

\textsuperscript{86}See Appendix 2.B.3.

\textsuperscript{87}For example, John Wrottesley (PRS 1854-58), entomologist John George Children (secretary RS 1826-27, 1830-37), Davies Gilbert (Treasurer RS 1819-27, PRS 1827-30), astronomer William Parsons, 3 Earl Rosse (PRS 1848-54), botanist Joseph Dalton Hooker (PRS 1873-78), horticulturist Joseph Sabine, and hydrographer William Henry Smyth.

representation, and archaeology as the second most popular humanities field, probably reflects antiquaries' historicising disposition.  

In many cases, connections can be seen between the particular scientific and humanities fields these fellows chose. Numerous fellows published in geology and history. Some fellows published in botany or geology and "oriental" literature and antiquities. Their choice of fields reflected career opportunities which permitted them to travel. A natural connection existed between architecture and engineering. Several antiquaries employed as sanitary or railway surveyors published on the scientific and the historical dimensions of architecture and

---


90 Despite its problematic character, this term is used here because it was used by these men and their biographers. Though it encodes assumptions which were bigoted, its use in its original role may hide less about their studies than other terms might.

91 For example, Thomas Thomson, eponymous son of the Glasgow Chemistry Professor, travelled to India as assistant surgeon to the East India Company. Wars and walking tours allowed him to make extensive botanical collections and geological observations as far away as the Himalayas. He was published in both fields and later employed at Kew. But he was also curator of the Asiatic Society's Museum in Calcutta, and his accounts of India and Tibet contain scientific material. Edward Eastwick Backhouse, proficient in several Indian languages, was Professor at Haileybury College, a diplomat and MP. His publications covered Indian and Persian literature, grammar, and geology, though his scientific work is less proficient than that of Thomson. John Piggott's travels allowed him to publish on the history and geology of Iran, though inexpertly. Innkeeper's son Thomas Daniell's extensive travels in India led to the successful *Oriental Scenery* (1808), which included botanical drawings as well as more conventional scenes of travel and antiquities.

92 William Hoskins, for example, was Professor of Civil Engineering and Architecture at King's College, London 1840-61 and senior consultant to the Metropolitan Building office 1844-55. Hoskins published standard work on bridge-building, as well as on architectural history and ornament. Robert William Mylne, an active member of the Smeatonian Society for Civil Engineers, published in sanitation engineering as well as architectural history. See *Archaeologia* 34(1851), Appendix, p. 350; *Proc.Roy.Soc.* 1865; xii-xiii.
engineering. Others' choices of fields are harder to connect to each other or to careers. John Lee, an original member of the Royal Astronomical Society, was President of the 1862 meeting of the British Archaeological Association and published in numismatics. Charles Cardale "Beetles" Babbington was an eminent entomologist, publishing also on Roman British archaeology. Charles Hatchett published on chemistry in the *Philosophical Transactions* and on medieval antiquities. Joseph Woods, founder of the London Architectural Society, produced a two-volume work on French, Italian and Greek architecture, the popular *Tourists' Flora*, articles in the *Geological Transactions*, the *Phytologist*, the *Transactions* of the Linnaean and of the Royal Society, and gave his name to a species of fern. Many more examples could be given. But these indicate some of the ways antiquaries pursued scientific as well as antiquarian

---


94See *Journal of the British Archaeol. Assoc.* 23(1867); 302-305; *Proc. Roy. Soc.* 16(1868); xxx-xxx; *GM* (1866); 592-93.


97These include John Adamson (Portuguese Literature, conchology), Henry Atkinson (mathematics, classics), Thomas Baines (local history, agriculture), Henry Beeke (economics, Roman Britain), Miles Bland (mathematics, astronomy, biblical history), John Peter Boileau (zoology, archaeology), Beriah Bottfield (mineralogy, ornithology, bibliography), James Buckman (geology, botany, Roman Britain), Robert Clutterbuck (chemistry, local history), John Cooke (nervous disorders, Homer), Benjamin Morgan Cowie (mathematics, bibliography), Edward Cresy (industrial drainage, archaeology, architecture), John Marten Cripps (botany, travel literature treating antiquities), Thomas Gery Cullum (botany, Suffolk history), Hugh Welch Diamond (photography, medical biography, archaeology), Richard Duppa (botany, Italian art), Charles Drury Edward Fortnum (entomology, zoology, art history), Charles Frost (local history, economics), Benjamin Hobhouse and Henry Hoare (economics, church history), Edward Griffith (zoology, Huntingdon county records), George Henry Law (maths, church history), John Murray (1876-1851, not the publisher: chemistry, travel literature), Robert Porrett (antiquities, chemistry), Edward Solly (chemistry, heraldry), and Francis Cornelius Webb (medicine, medical jurisprudence, dentistry, sanitation, epidemiological history, medical biography) among others.
work. Beyond these 274, other fellows were involved with the sciences indirectly. Some were publishers of scientific works.\footnote{These include John George Children, Charles Robert Cockerell, William Coulson, George Godwin, Josiah Goodwin, James Johnson, John Richardson Major, John Murray, George Wharton Simpson, Richard Taylor and Francis Cornelius Webb. See Appendix 2.A.5. Richard Taylor was publisher to the SA and co-proprietor of the firm Taylor and Francis, which printed the transactions of the Linnaean, Geological and Astronomical Societies. While a fellow of these societies, he produced no work in scientific areas. Interested in philology of the Teutonic languages, he published the 1823 edition of the \textit{Anglo-Saxon Chronicle} with SA secretary Henry Ellis. See W.H. Brock and A.J. Meadows, \textit{The Lamp of Learning: Taylor and Francis and the Development of Scientific Publishing} Taylor and Francis: London and Philadelphia, 1984, pp. 33-36.} Science popularisers are found among antiquaries who made their living by writing.\footnote{Thomas Allen, George Dodd, Richard Duppa and John Timbs wrote volumes and articles popularising science and technology. Granville Penn's efforts to reconcile geology with scripture are well-known; Penn also did competent work on early biblical manuscripts. John Anderson and Latham Wainewright wrote to promote higher standards in scientific curricula. Charles Joseph Faulkner, mathematics lecturer at Pembroke College, Oxford was a partner in the celebrated medievalising decorating firm of Morris, Marshall and Faulkner. Dudley Costello, employed as a scientific illustrator by Cuvier, spent his free time copying illuminated manuscripts in the Bibliothèque Royale, and later illustrated for \textit{All the Year Round and Household Words}.} Antiquaries, then, were active in various ways in the sciences, just as they were in the humanities. This subgroup represents about 17\% of the SA population for 1830-70, but could have been considerably larger. Many Victorian antiquaries, then, participated in the sciences, making it unlikely that the picture of antiquaries as scientifically engaged is skewed by the presence of a few eminent scientific fellows in their midst. Their memberships in scientific societies make it unlikely that their work was substandard for their time.

The preceding data on fellows' participation in scholarly societies and on their scholarly endeavours has demonstrated that antiquaries were active, competent, and eminent participants in Victorian intellectual work, in both the humanities and the sciences. Many published. A review of their work was outside the scope of this thesis, and evaluating such a range of work would present problems in defining and assessing merit. But it is unlikely that it was all uniformly substandard work which contributed little to the development and direction of these related fields. Further, given the size of antiquaries' scholarly output, their development over centuries of certain areas of expertise, the number of antiquaries whose scholarly peers accepted their
membership in specialist learned societies, the number capable of maintaining work in both a scientific and a humanities field, their competence as executive members of learned societies, and their recognition in the conventional apparatus of British civil rewards, it seems reasonable to conclude that antiquaries cannot be dismissed as amateurs, individually or collectively, at least inasmuch as that term has come to mean inexperienced, ineffective, or incompetent. Antiquaries are often used to define amateurism. Yet it seems improbable that so many talented, accomplished men would have joined a society they viewed as inferior in the scholarly interactions and standards it offered, employed genres that had in their eyes become outdated, or would have published in fields they viewed as irrelevant, using methods they viewed as ineffectual.

The preceding is a remarkable profile for a group, most of whom came from the lower middle class, a third of whom remained there, and almost two-thirds of whom were not university educated. This community is worth studying, possibly for its singularity in British society at this time, but equally possibly because it holds the potential to transform twentieth-century historiographical conventions about Victorian scholarship. The majority of men who became antiquaries escaped the drudgery their social status destined them for by the use of their intellectual and artistic talents. Compared to their peers in their occupational and economic classes, this success is their most distinguishing characteristic. It probably represents sectional opportunities rather than opportunities open more broadly to their class, but accounting for their rise allows the historian to make some claims about the limits of class in shaping the lives of the Victorians who became quietly eminent. And this community is worth studying for the ways it does not conform to conventional conceptions of Victorian social behaviour. Among antiquaries, men of different classes, men with physical disabilities, men from religious minorities, and men holding the full range of political opinions forged a coherent community and worked together.
The variables used to depict antiquaries' demographic profile have now been discussed. The second question to be addressed is, how did antiquaries interact as a community? Antiquaries' employment links and other connections within their community were extensive. The character of these links can suggest what kind of thing they thought their community was. Many antiquaries collaborated on scholarly projects, in the process of which they provided employment to other antiquaries, but also competed for commissions. Many used their occupations to further antiquarian goals. Biographical material demonstrates that the antiquarian community functioned informally as an employment guild. But while introductions and recommendations were necessary to men trying to improve their employment and status, antiquaries' links often stem from shared research interests, from partnerships formed in youth and poverty, from the desire to communicate new material on a topic of interest, or from a uniquely antiquarian sense of their trade. A small number of biographical examples are discussed below. More can be found in Appendix Two.100

Antiquaries tended to congregate in jobs which required particularly antiquarian forms of expertise. They filled posts from clerk to administrator in the British Museum and Library, Records Offices and Record Commissions.101 John Caley, Samuel Lysons and Henry Petrie had been Keeper of Records in the Tower of London. Henry John Todd was Keeper of Manuscripts at Lambeth Palace. Thomas Thynne, Marquis of Bath and Sir William Betham held similar

100 There were other kinds of links within the community as well: 56 fathers and sons were SA members, and 60 fellows had ties of marriage or consanguinity. See Appendix 2.C.3 and 2.C.4. In some cases, these men share similar fields of study, but these familial ties do not appear to have orchestrated joint scholarly projects. Familial ties may have affected some fellows' social status and employment. In other cases they led to strife. For example, Thomas Phillipps cut off relations with his daughter and with James Orchard Halliwell when they married.

101 See Appendix 2.A.1. Eminent among these are Thomas Duffus Hardy, Deputy Keeper of Records and Joseph Hunter Assistant Keeper of Public Records at the Public Record Office; Henry Hobhouse, Keeper of State Papers and originator of the 1852 Record Commission; and archivist Robert Lemon, Deputy-Keeper at the State Paper Office, where in 1823 he discovered Milton's De Doctrina Christiana, an incident which led to the First Record Commission of 1825.
positions within the College of Arms. Antiquaries were librarians at the Royal Library, the Bodleian, the College of Advocates, Buckingham Palace, and Queen’s College, Cambridge. They held eminent positions at the chartered and good schools and at the universities and colleges. Many were governors, trustees, provosts and educational reformers.\textsuperscript{102}

The connection between law and antiquarianism is as evident in the nineteenth as it was in the sixteenth century (see Appendix 2.A.2). Antiquaries held positions in the counties and Inns of Court, on the bench and the circuits, in the Privy Council and the colonies. Many combined law with antiquarian studies and areas of expertise. Charles Purton Cooper was librarian to Lincoln’s Inn; Stacey Grimaldi lectured for the Law Institution; Joseph Littledale was counsel to Cambridge University, and John Leycester Adolphus to St. John’s College, Oxford. Johnathon Frederick Pollock, Joseph Jekyll, George Spence and George Kenyon 2 Baron Kenyon were Readers to their Inns. Dawson Turner advised publisher John Murray on matters such as keeping the \textit{Quarterly Review} free of libel suits.

SA publications, known for the quality of their illustrations, attracted many architects.\textsuperscript{103} These men often worked together.\textsuperscript{104} These links between antiquaries were complex, included


\textsuperscript{103}Many eminent architects of the Regency, builders of splendid late Georgian country homes, originators of the Regent Street, Hyde Park, St. James and Buckingham Palace developments, creators and defendants of the Victorian Gothic style, and writers on the history of English churches, were antiquaries. See Appendix 2.A.3.

\textsuperscript{104}For example, John Newman was employed by Robert Smirke in renovating Covent Garden and building the General Post Office. Sydney Smirke assisted Decimus Burton in restoring Temple Church, and George Basevi in building the Conservative Club.
competition, and extended beyond the occupational group. George Basevi, Robert Smirke Jr. and David Laing had been John Soane’s pupils and had an obvious occupational link as architects. Historian John Bruce became trustee for Soane’s museum, which the SA managed, and bibliographer John Britton catalogued Soane’s collections. These links sprang directly from the antiquarian community rather than from professional or other kinds of associations.

Many antiquaries collaborated on writing and publishing (see Appendix 2.A.5). John Nichols, John Gough Nichols and John Bowyer Nichols were editors and authors for The Gentleman’s Magazine. Edward Wedlake Brayley made his living writing and publishing on archaeology and topography. He launched his career with John Britton. Both were young and poor. Brayley wrote and Britton sang ditties which they then published for popular use. This and similar ventures, interspersed with a stint as an enameller’s apprentice, funded Britton’s 25 volume Beauties of England and Wales, the product of their walking tours of Britain. Brayley published the Graphic & Historical Illustrator.  

Antiquaries who lived by writing provided much employment to those who lived by drawing. Antiquarian artists often specialised in illustrating for antiquarian publications.

---

105 For example, Thomas Rickman, author of the first systematic work on British church architecture, was aided by William Whewell in the design of the New Court of St. John's Cambridge, and was partners with Richard Charles Hussey, but also competed unsuccessfully for the Houses Parliament and Fitzwilliam Museum against fellow antiquaries Charles Robert Cockerell, Anthony Salvin, John Adey Repton, and Robert Smirke Jr. William Tite spoke in parliament against George Gilbert Scott’s suggested Gothic style for the new public buildings beside the Treasury. In Rickman’s case, links within the antiquarian community extend beyond his occupational boundary. He published an analysis of Dawson Turner’s work on the history of British architecture, his own work was published by John Henry Parker, and he did the architectural illustrations for Richard Colt Hoare’s successful volumes on Wiltshire history and topography.


107 For example, Edward Blore was artist to the Surtees Society, which published works on the history of Durham and Northumbria, and for many antiquaries’ county histories. John Carter was the SA draftsman and illustrated many antiquaries’ works on art history and church history, particularly Hoare’s Wiltshire volumes. Frederic William Fairholt engraved for numismatic publications including some of John Yonge Akerman. John Buckler, Samuel Prout,
Charles Robert Cockerell illustrated many antiquaries' travel accounts. John Landseer illustrated antiquaries' archaeological works. Such books included depictions of antiquities seen and archaeological sites visited, an essential service when scholars could not travel easily.

Antiquaries were found throughout the book trades. Publishers John Murray, John Henry Parker and Richard Taylor account for a substantial portion of the historical and literary publications of this era. It is not surprising, then, that antiquaries' publications could lead to introductions, preferments and improved employment. For example, the young Thomas Crofton Croker's publications on Irish poetry brought him to the attention of Irish poet and literature expert Thomas Moore, who helped Croker to come to England and to publish, and introduced him to other antiquaries. With one of these, Alfred John Kempe, Croker published on archaeology and founded the antiquaries' dining and conversation club, The Noviomagians. With another, William Scott I Lord Stowell, who was Johnson's friend and executor, Croker produced


108 These include the Edinburgh Review, Quarterly Review, Blackwood's Magazine, John Bull, Philosophical Magazine, the Anglo-Catholic Library as well as a multitude of antiquarian works by other members of the community. John Bowyer Nichols edited a history of Dorset with John Gough, and printed George Ormerod's Cheshire, Hoare's Wiltshire, Thomas Raine's North Durham, Surtees society publications. Richard Yates's work on St. Edmunds-Bury Abbey, and was printer to the SA. Political reporter William Jordan was part owner of the Literary Gazette. Edward Augustus Kendall was founder and editor of the Literary Chronical & Weekly Review as well as staff writer for the Athenaeum.

109 For example, John Holmes' bibliographical work was admired by Nicholas Vansittart who got Holmes a job in British Museum's Department of Manuscripts. Brayley's publications led to his appointment as librarian to the Russell Institution. Schoolmaster Thomas Smart Hughes worked on an English edition of Strabo with John Yonge Akerman and John Lee, and was presented to a perpetual curacy in Edgeware, Middlesex by Lee. When Rowley Lascelles lost his job with the Irish Record Commission, Lord Redesdale got him another with the London Record Commission. Poet and savant Samuel Rogers helped launch Disraeli's literary career; Francis Douce helped Disraeli with his literary research at the British Library; Disraeli published on antiquarian topics with Douce and with John Nichols, using printer John Murray. Richard Colt Hoare was aided in his historical research by Lord Arundell, George Frederick Beltz and William Henry Black, and used John Buckler as illustrator; Hoare published on Anglo-Saxon manuscripts with Thomas Dudley Fosbroke, Thomas Phillipps, Sharon Turner and James Ingram; Hoare's work on Roman pavements was edited by John Bowyer Nichols, who also published the catalogue of Hoare's library.
an edition of Boswell’s *The Life of Samuel Johnson, LLD*. Antiquaries’ joint publications often arose from shared scholarly interests, then.\(^{110}\) Both remunerative and scholarly collaboration on antiquarian publications was abundant throughout the antiquarian community. Antiquarian research motivated introductions, collaboration, travel and employment. The antiquarian community provided members with a large pool of expertise from which they could choose researchers, editors, co-authors, advisors, illustrators and printers.

Medical antiquaries seem to have been conscious of themselves as such, forming research schools concerned with the history of science (see Appendix 2.A.11). One, centred in the Royal College of Physicians and St. Bartholomew’s Hospital, London, was coordinated by Richard Powell. He was assisted in his history of St. Bartholomew’s by George William Maton. Maton, a Censor, Lecturer and Treasurer at the RCP, published on the history of botany. RCP President Henry Halford published on sixteenth-century views of disease, and RCP lecturer John Cooke on old medical tracts.\(^{111}\) The College of Surgeons also had an antiquarian group.\(^{112}\)

---

110 Samuel Egerton Brydges and Joseph Haslewood’s *The British Bibliographer* treated Old English literature; Edward Cresy and George Ledwell Taylor’s work on European architecture grew out of their walking tours; Anglo-Saxon expert William Hamper aided John Bowyer Nichols, George Ormerod, Reginald Bray and Samuel Cartwright with relevant portions of their county histories. Legal historian Charles Butler edited parts of the county histories of John Gage Rokewode, who had articled in Butler’s office. John Caley, Bulkeley Bandinel and Henry Ellis reprinted a foundational work of antiquarian scholarship, Dugdale’s *Monasticon*.

111 Other RCP antiquaries include the following. RCP lecturer Thomas Clifford Allbut, inventor of the thermometer and founder of the Alpine Club, published on medieval science. Hugh Welsh Diamond, later photographer to the SA, collected materials for medical biography when a student at St. Bartholomew’s. RCP licentiate William Munk published the Roll of the RCP, and a biography of Henry Halford. Licentiate Samuel Ferris published on the history of medicine.

Some parts of the antiquarian community, then, were highly interlinked and self-aware. Other parts of the antiquarian community did not have similar occupational interconnections, in particular clergy, politicians and military men. Though many antiquarian clergy worked in the same parish or diocese, there is no evidence that they formed parish or diocesan research schools or even collaborated on scholarship. They seem not to have worked with others outside their occupational group either, but pursued their studies in isolation.

Politicians also did not collaborate on antiquarian projects, but many used political process or their positions to further antiquarian goals. Samuel Egerton Brydges promoted the Copyright Act (1814), George John Welbore Agar-Ellis | Baron Dover moved the purchase of the Angerstein picture collection to form the nucleus of a National Gallery (1823), Benjamin Hawes worked to get the 1841 Fine Arts Commission appointed, Henry Hobhouse worked with Peel to establish the Record Commission. Philip Henry Stanhope | Earl Stanhope was active in

Thomas Wright and James Orchard Halliwell [-Phillipps] founded the Historical Society of Science in 1841, but succeeded in publishing one volume only before the Society terminated.

113 For example, Henry Kaye Bonney, Edward Maltby, George Griffin Stonestreet, Charles Turnor and Charles Smith Bird all held positions within Lincoln Cathedral, and John Brereton, Thomas Burgess, William Stanley Goddard, George Frederick Nott and Hugh Percy at Salisbury Cathedral, with George Radcliffe nearby at Sarum. Yet they did not work together, and worked in different fields of antiquarian research, publishing on Greek literature, sixteenth-century history, the history of science, and church architecture.

114 This may be accounted for in several ways. In a century of building and reform, many clergy had little time for scholarship. Antiquarian clergy published mainly on local or church history, perhaps the only research interest their duties allowed them. Most antiquarian clergymen were not in wealthy benefices or more remunerative positions, and less than 5% rose above vicar, rector or curate. Resources for such projects were nearby. Travel for research or collaboration entailed costs which limited most to local research areas and colleagues. Clergymen may also have had a different vision of the nature of scholarship, being habituated to the solitary study of the text and the practice of reflecting and commenting on it singly. The hierarchical nature of the church may have prevented some men from approaching, or other men from accepting, collaboration with men of different rank. Administrative duties may have hampered those who were in the best position to initiate and coordinate such work.

115 A few connections can be seen among political antiquaries. For example, in 1816 Henry William Beechey, secretary to the Consul-general in Egypt, explored the tombs of the Valley of Kings with Italian archaeologist Belzoni. On the basis of this experience, in 1821 Beechey was appointed by antiquary and Secretary of the Colonial Office Henry, 3 Earl Bathurst, to examine and report on antiquities of Cyrenaica. Beechey accompanied his brother, Frederick William Beechey, Captain of the Blossom while it surveyed the coast between Tripoli and Derna. See Tony Rice, British Oceanographic Vessels 1800-1950, The Ray Society: London, 1986.
securing moneys for the National Portrait Gallery 1856-59, used his position to acquire funds for excavations at Troy, and assisted in getting the Copyright Act passed and the Historical Manuscript Commission established. James Talbot 1 Baron Talbot de Malahide introduced the Bill for Treasure Trove, which compensated those depositing finds with the law. The terms of this Act were based on Danish legal precedents. Still others held positions which rewarded antiquarian interests.¹¹⁶

Some antiquaries’ political services were dramatic. For example, William Richard Hamilton was Secretary to Lord Elgin in Constantinople. The Rosetta Stone, discovered by Napoleon’s forces in 1798, was ceded to the English by the treaty that followed the battle of Alexandria in 1801. The French, defaulting on the treaty terms, placed it aboard a French ship. Hamilton intercepted the ship in a rowboat and compelled the French to return it to land. Hamilton also supervised the shipment of Lord Elgin’s marbles, including their recovery from the ocean floor when the ship carrying them sank.¹¹⁷ Most, of course, made less dramatic but genuine contributions.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁶For example, William Scott 1 Lord Stowell was MP for Oxford University 1781-1822; Thomas Grimston Bucknall Escourt 1826-47; Robert Peel in 1812, William Hughes Hughes (b. Hewitt) 1830-37, and Robert Harry Inglis 1829-54.

¹¹⁷Episodes such as these have come to symbolise British cultural pillage of the Mediterranean and colonies. Their inclusion here is meant neither to justify or condemn. Both the recognition of the cultural value of these objects, and the moral questions raised by removing such treasures from their peoples are genuine parts of the history of antiquaries and their objects of study. The rudiments of a political perspective on cultural treasures may be seen in Hamilton’s actions. While Elgin has been blamed for having little sense of the entitlement of those he bought from, Hamilton seems to have distinguished between purchasing objects from people who showed little care for them, and cultural theft. After Waterloo, it was he who compelled the French to restore paintings stolen from Italy by Bonaparte’s forces. Hamilton probably saw Elgin’s actions as rescue, given the relative indifference of their owners, and the acquisition of the paintings as theft, given that Italians cared about them. Hamilton may have been influenced by a negative view of the French, and intolerant of cultures that expressed care in other ways. But while the terms of reference for evaluating such acquisitions have changed with time, it would be inaccurate to dismiss antiquaries as lacking all ethical concern about the manner in which they acquired art objects.

¹¹⁸Gore Ouseley, Envoy to India and Persia, co-founded the Royal Asiatic Society. His scholarship enhanced his diplomacy as well as his manuscript collecting. James Dallaway, secretary to the Earl Marshall, used his access to the College of Arms Office for his historical work. Henry Ellis, Benjamin Hawes and Josiah Forshall advised the 1835-36 Select Committee on the British Museum. Hawes supporting opening the Museum to the public, Forshall
Military antiquaries also used their careers to further antiquarian interests. Brevet-Colonel Tompkyns Hilgrove Turner negotiated with General Menou when the French broke their treaty obligations at Alexandria and retained their cultural collections. Turner arranged that the French would keep the entomological and zoological collections, the English the antiquities and manuscripts. When these terms also were broken, Turner, with some artillery men and a cart, physically removed the Rosetta Stone from the General’s quarters and accompanied the Stone back to Portsmouth where, through his request, it was housed at the SA for a year to give antiquaries a chance to study it. Many antiquaries who travelled with the forces published on antiquities they had seen.119

The antiquarian community, then, was inventive in employing diverse careers to advance antiquarian ends. The community also brought its members many ways to improve their employment circumstances and social status. The SA functioned, more in some occupations than in others, as an informal employment guild. But unlike a guild, it did not define employment as its primary purpose. It was often antiquaries’ research interests which brought them into contact with others, which then brought them and others employment, and allowed shared projects to culminate in publication. And if the antiquarian community provided members with employment, antiquaries who were employed cultivated antiquarian concerns in their different lines of work. Antiquaries, especially those working in the Records Offices, libraries, printing trades and politics, contributed much to the development of the public awareness of, and legal and social

119For example, Captain William Francis Ainsworth, founder of the Syro-Egyptian Society, published on archaeological sites seen throughout Asia Minor, as did Lieutenant George Thomas Keppel, 6 Earl Albemarle. General George Robert Ainslie used his extensive travels to amass an outstanding numismatic collection. The work of Admiral William Henry Smyth in geography, hydrogeography and astronomy are well known. But Smyth was also Director of the SA from 1846, and published on the archaeology and antiques of the Mediterranean.
structures supporting, antiquarian concerns.

The preceding suggests that antiquaries' success in improving their social status over that of their fathers was based on shared research interests and publications rather than simple acuity in identifying and penetrating a social enclave which would bring possibilities for preferment. Some support for this comes from an analysis of what antiquaries demanded of candidates for election to the SA. How antiquaries interacted as a community depended in part on how they did, and did not, conceive of membership in their community. The demographic profile of new fellows, using the same six variables as were used above, shows electoral trends in the SA.

Antiquaries became aware of themselves as a scholarly community, and of their larger social context, when they faced the need for reform in the late 1840s and early 1850s. Council proposed to halve membership fees, thus opening membership to a much larger number of men. Response to this proposal centred around concern that the quality of scholarship would drop. No evidence of concern over possible effects on the class profile of the SA has survived, though it must have been present to some degree. In redefining themselves at this time of reform, though, the antiquarian community seems to have viewed itself as primarily scholarly. This self-conception may be evaluated using demographic data for the decade following reform.

The decades 1830 and 1840 show higher attrition than new membership rate, supporting the view discussed in Chapter Two, of falling membership as motivating concern for reform in many areas. But in the years 1850-60, membership growth exceeded attrition by about 30%, showing that the SA was successful in opening their society up to many new men. There is also a change in the demographic composition of the SA in 1860, the moment at which the effects of reform might be expected to be visible. Compared to new fellows of the previous decades, the proportion of peers' sons, sons of upper middle class men, and men holding professional qualifications decreased among new fellows 1850-60, where the proportion of men who had been
apprenticed increased. That is, the SA opened membership to many more lower middle class men. SA electors were electing a lower proportion of upper and upper middle class fellows than were in the extant membership in all previous decades. If electors were concerned primarily to improve their employment circumstances and social status, they might be expected to elect men from the upper and upper middle classes. However, new men appear to have been poor but skilled, as most antiquaries were themselves. Antiquaries, then, did not hold social status as a covert requirement in candidates, but did expect candidates to show a high degree of competence in their field, their scholarship and their participation in other learned societies.

Data describing new fellows' standard of scholarship requires some interpretation. Overall, throughout the period 1830-70, antiquaries were electing men increasingly undistinguished in their class background, but who were improving that status in their own working lives, and who were increasingly distinguished in their scholarly qualifications. Within that general trend, a large proportion of new fellows 1850-60 remained lower middle class during their working lives (36% of new fellows compared to 28% on average in previous years). But they continued the trend towards more distinguished scholarly qualifications, in the areas of public school alumni (12% compared to 9% on average in previous years), university education (36% compared to 29% on average in previous years), and the numbers travelling (13.91% compared to 9.50% on average in previous years). Data for new fellows can also be compared to data for the extant

120 In 1860, the proportion of sons of lower middle class fathers does not rise notably, but the number of peers' sons decreases, and the number of sons of obscure men rises. It is likely that more of the men for whom father's occupation is unknown came from working class than from professional backgrounds. The increase is from an average of 60.28% 1830-1850, to an average of 67.76% in 1860-1870, an average rise of 7.75%. An exception to this is that values for sons of tradesmen and of printers/ book dealers fall steadily throughout these decades except for an increase in 1860. But as these groups make up only about 5% of membership, this rise can be taken as consonant with changes in the demographic composition of the SA as a whole, towards a lower economic and class profile.

121 The increase in university men may reflect electors' concern that the level of scholarship was not weakened by reform. They may have viewed university education as guaranteeing a minimum level of ability. While the majority of post-reform new fellows were not university men, their increased incidence in successful post-reform
membership as a whole. In this case they show higher levels of public school attendance (12.59\% of new fellows compared to 10.36\% extant membership), university attendance (36\% compared to 33.38\%), ratio of degrees to university attendees (1.77 compared to 1.23), the number of honorary degrees attained (6.47\% compared to 6.34\%), and memberships in other learned societies (1.01 compared to .92).\textsuperscript{122} New fellows, 1850-60, then, showed a higher level of scholarly qualifications than new fellows had in previous decades.

Some other features characterise the post-reform community. While the average age at entrance increased overall between 1830 and 1870, it increased at a relatively greater rate between 1850 and 1860, suggesting SA electors had more confidence in older men with appropriate qualifications. The number of entrants for whom data is completely unavailable is lower in 1860 than for any other year, suggesting these men were unusually distinguished in ways which biographical works recognise, compared to other decades' new fellows. But the number of men for whom employment information is unavailable is about twice as large as the average for other decades, suggesting this is not where post-reform new fellows distinguished themselves.

Some data suggests SA fellows may have felt a difference in their community following reform. The number of non-university men is at its highest at this time, and despite the distinguished character of new fellows, the ratio of degrees to university men in the overall population is at its lowest. The number of men working in upper middle class occupations is also at its lowest in 1860, the number of men who improved their social status over that of their

suggests that electors took university men where they could.

\textsuperscript{122}Anomalous results are found in values for professional qualifications and those receiving civil rewards for their scholarship, which are less than values for the extant membership, and unusually low for the trend in new fellows. This may indicate that the kinds of men elected were skilled, competent, but not exceptional scholars. Or the increased number receiving honourary degrees may indicate that Victorian society recognition lower class men's achievements differently.
fathers is lower than previous decades by 12% to 15%, the index for members publishing, and religious diversity, are highest in 1860.123

Antiquaries, then, appear not to have held social class, background, current employment or religious conformity as covert requirements for SA membership. Their election patterns appear consistent with other evidence, that scholarly standards were antiquaries’ main concern in the reform process, and their self-conception as primarily scholarly is accurate. Election patterns for 1850-60 are consistent with those for other decades: in all cases there is a tendency to elect lower middle class but highly talented men.

Similar patterns can be seen in SA Council members, showing that there was not a strong difference between the culture of the membership and that of their leaders. Council was composed of 21 members. While skewed towards the upper class, they show a demographic profile similar to that of members, 1830-70 in other respects. Between 1 and 4 Council members were peers (on average, 14.29% of Council), about twice as prevalent as the average in the membership over this period, but not as high as might be expected of such a prestigious body.124 However, the number of men from noble and upper class backgrounds falls from 5 (23.81%) in 1830 to 1 (4.76%) in 1870, consonant with trends in the membership, though their average presence, 15.24%, is slightly higher than in the membership. Men from all class

123 As the proportion of men taking no degree at university decreased, it may be that dissenters whose religious beliefs were not such as to prevent them subscribing to the Articles of Faith are over-represented among non-conforming new fellows.

124 The SA listed 3 to 6 royal patrons, most from continental countries, who were neither members nor sat on Council. They are not included in values for Council. Their presence must reflect the SA’s desire to improve their image, but they had scarcely anything to do with the SA. Addresses were occasionally presented to them, and, as noted in Chapter 2, pictures and medals were discussed with the king in 1828. But for most royal patrons, their presence on this list was simply a foreign honour.
backgrounds are present. Council members show the same diversity of school circumstances as the membership, but more attended public school, where fewer attended university, and these attained a lower level of degree. A higher proportion of Council members than fellows travelled.

The class structure indicated by Council members' employment remained fairly stable throughout this period. Figure 4.4 compares Council with membership values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Structure</th>
<th>Average, Council</th>
<th>Average, Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Class</td>
<td>7.62% (1 to 2)</td>
<td>3.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Middle Class</td>
<td>54.29% (9 to 12)</td>
<td>49.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Middle Class</td>
<td>47.62% (7 to 12)</td>
<td>32.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Class</td>
<td>4.76% (1)</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>18.07%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.4: Class Structure of Council and Membership Compared

The employment for all Council members is known. About 18% of members' occupations are

---

125 Men from upper middle class backgrounds average 16.19% of Council, of lower middle class backgrounds average 15.24%, and of lower class backgrounds average 7.62%. Information is unavailable for 33% to 66%, so it is difficult to generalise from this data. It is likely that data for men of upper and upper middle class backgrounds is nearly complete, and that men of lower middle class background make up most of those for whom data is missing.

126 An average 34.92% (4-6) attended public schools, compared to 12.04% for membership. But Council included one fellow each in two years who had no schooling (John Britton and Thomas Crofton Croker), 1 to 2 fellows (8.57% average) who were privately educated, and 1 to 4 (average 14.29%) who attended undistinguished local schools. So public school alumni were not a numeric majority, and the diversity of fellows' school experiences must have contributed to the culture within Council. 5 to 9 (32.38% average) attended university, less than the 37.76% average for the membership. The ratio for degrees to attendees averages 1.31 compared to 1.59 for the membership. 1 to 3 took no degree (5.71% average), approximately that for the membership (5.56%). 1 to 4 (13.33%) received honourary degrees, almost twice the membership average of 7.04%.

127 3 to 6 (17.14% average) travelled, compared to members' 13.83% average. 0 to 2 (average 7.62%) served apprenticeships, higher than the apparent 3.85% membership average which is lower than the probable reality. 1 to 4 were called to the bar (average 13.33%), none received RCP or RCS medical licentiates, and only 3 received RIBA and 2 RA status.

128 Figures given as percentages are averages across the 5 decadal moments. Thus, column values need not sum to 100%. For a discussion of the definition of these classes, see the discussion above surrounding Figure 4.3, and Appendix One.
unknown, and these men probably worked in lower middle or lower class jobs. Thus it is likely that values for lower middle and lower classes would correspond fairly closely in both groups. Overall, the class structure of Council is very similar to that of membership, except that Council had a slightly higher proportion of upper and upper middle class men.

Council's personal profile shows that most members were married: 0 to 3 (9.52% average) remained single lifelong, more than among members.129 Evans' history of the SA notes the devotion and industry found in the lives of many Council members (and the inactivity of others). Being single may have fitted these men for the demands placed on Council members. There were 1 to 2 dissenters (average 7.62%), 0 to 1 (average 1.9%) Catholics, and no Jews on Council; higher for dissenters but lower for Catholics and Jews than in the membership.

Of Council members who were politicians (4 to 7, average 25.71%), twice as many were Whig as were Tory. This may reflect the fact that the great majority of Council and membership were from the middle classes, which tended to be aligned at this period with the liberal party. Most members were from lower middle class backgrounds, and though many achieved upper middle class employment, most cannot have found it easy to adopt conservative, upper class views on traditional institutions and values, as their employments were based in the emerging industrial order. The conventional view of the SA would align it with upper class educations and work, making it likely to be conservative in alignment. One of the most interesting results of this prosopographical study is the discovery of the middle-class profile of SA members, making it likely that many more fellows were liberal than conservative. Though antiquarian MPs were split almost equally between parties, Council's political character may reflect the membership's overall disposition, as Council members were voted on by the membership.

---

1294 to 11, 44.76% average, were known to have been married, but data was unavailable for 8 to 17 men, 48.57% average.
Council members had greater scholarly qualifications even than members. Between 3 and 7 (20% average) were noted collectors, higher than members’ average of 14.8%. Memberships in other scholarly societies averaged 1.92 each, more than twice the .81 members’ average. Of these, the average for scientific societies was .68, twice members’ average of .34. Also, 5 to 8 Council members (28.57 average) were knighted, made peers or granted a civil list pension, treble the 8.97% members’ average. Council published in more areas: the index of numbers of areas per Council member was 2.42, twice the 1.13 average index for members, possibly suggesting they were more generalist, less specialist than members.

Many were distinguished contributors to Victorian learned institutions. John Yonge Akerman, a scion of the publishing family, founded the Numismatic Society, and received the gold medal from the Institute de France. Thomas Amyot and John Bruce were founders of the Camden Society, and Edward Blore of the Royal Archaeological Institute. Beriah Botfield was President of the British Archaeological Association. Thomas William Burgess, Bishop of Salisbury, founded St. David’s College. Decimus Burton was the most eminent architect of his time. Irishman Thomas Crofton Croker, the son of an Irish army major who had wandered barefoot across Ireland as a young man collecting ballads, was a founder of the Percy and Camden Societies and of the British Archaeological Association. John Disney, noted collector of British antiquities, founded the Archaeology Chair at Cambridge. Henry Ellis became Principal Librarian at the British Library. Colonel Augustus Henry Lane Fox is better known as Pitt-Rivers, whose extensive ethnological collections are now housed in the Pitt-Rivers Museum in Oxford. Henry Hallam co-founded the Statistical Society. William Richard Hamilton co-founded the Geographic Society and was a Trustee of the British Museum. John Winter Jones was Principal Librarian of the British Library and President of the Library Association. John Lee was an original member of the Astronomical Society and President of the British Archaeological
Association. Frederic Madden was Head of the British Library's Manuscript Department and an original member of the Athenaeum. Frederick Ouvry was President of the Law Society and Treasurer to the Royal Literary Fund. His collection contained the first four Shakespeare folios. Evelyn Shirley Philip was Trustee to Rugby School and the National Portrait Gallery. Thomas Phillipps was arguably the most extraordinary book and manuscript collector in British history, and a Trustee of the British Museum. John Fuller Russell was on the Council of the Royal Archaeological Institute. Charles Roach Smith, tenth child of a poor farmer in the Isle of Wight, received little education but co-founded the British Archaeological Association as well as founding and editing *Notes and Queries*. William Smith, son of a London print-seller, was Trustee to the National Portrait Gallery. Hydrographer and Admiral William Henry Smyth was President of the Astronomical and the Geographical Societies and Secretary to the RS. Arthur Penrhyn Stanley headed the 1850 Oxford Commission. Philip Henry Mahon 3 Earl Stanhope was a Trustee of the British Museum and President of the Royal Literary Fund. George Thomas Staunton co-founded the Royal Asiatic Society. George Edmund Street was the architect of the law courts in the Strand, and President of the Royal Institute of British Architects, as was William Tite. John Evans was a distinguished archaeologist. Other Council members were undistinguished, and some obscure.\(^{130}\)

The SA Council, then, does not resemble those of the BAAS and RS. It was not composed mainly of upper class and university-educated men. Rather, its class profile was mixed, with middle class men in the majority, split fairly evenly between upper middle and lower middle class. Men of lower class backgrounds were Council members. Some never attained dignified

\(^{130}\)George Steinman and James Gerald Joyce appear to have contributed little to Victorian scholarship or learned institutions, and no information was available for 1 member in 1850 and 3 in 1870 (Arthur Taylor, Alexander Nesbitt, Richard Rivington Holmes and Clement Roberts Markham).
employment. Thomas Crofton Croker, for example, worked as a chemist and then a clerk, while publishing on Irish literature. Council was mainly, but not exclusively, conforming, but John Rokewood Gage was a Catholic, and Joseph Hunter a dissenting divine. Further, as discussed in Chapter Two, SA business seems to have occupied most of their energy: they did not attempt to engineer their public image, and only began to court government recognition and financial support in the 1860s. This may not have been an effective stance for a learned society in mid-Victorian Britain. However, their absorption with scholarship and the business of running their society allows them to be characterised relative to other well-defined learned bodies. Membership at the advanced level and in the inner circle of the RS and the BAAS had covert religious, educational and class requirements. But service on the SA Council required scholarship, service in executive positions in other Victorian learned societies and institutions, and a willingness to work hard enough that bachelorhood was desirable. Data for Council, then, is consonant with that for the membership and for electoral patterns. All suggest that exclusivity was not an important feature of the antiquarian community's culture.

Finally, fellows' addresses help define the antiquarian community. These are available from 1850-70. They show that the SA was centred in London, had a well-distributed English county membership, but little membership outside England. London fellows predominate but decline throughout this period, from 56% to 44%. If Middlesex fellows are added to London fellows, they decline over the period from 59% to 47%. Londoners' majority must have had an effect on the culture of the antiquarian community. The great majority of Council members lived

---

131 Evans notes the relatively open religious environment of the SA, p. 235.

132 The contribution of the SA's absorption with scholarly issues to the detriment of their corporate recognition and influence will be discussed in Chapter Five.

133 About twice as many Council members as ordinary members were single.
in London. However, at the start of this period, important antiquarian collections were dispersed around England. It was just as problematic for fellows to be at a distance from the Duke of Sussex's library at Althorp, the art collections at Petworth, Phillipps' manuscripts at Thirlestane, Cheltenham, and others, as to be distant from the SA premises. The Prefaces to many antiquaries' works include thanks to other fellows for the use of their collections, many of which were not in London. Northamptonshire antiquaries were cohesive enough as a group to start and run the Surtees society. Wiltshire antiquaries collected around Richard Colt Hoare's house, Stourhead, to use its library and collections, and for regular discussions about archaeology.

Because of the difficulties of travel during this period, one might expect to find many fellows living in the counties immediately surrounding London, and in the southeast. However, memberships in the surrounding counties decline from about 9% to 4%, and remain steady at just over 10% in the southeast. Membership is about half that for southwestern as for southeastern counties, perhaps because travel west was less developed. After London, the Midlands made up the next most populated region, at about 15% of fellows, perhaps reflecting its larger area and population than other regions. However, fellows living in English counties outside London show a more uniform spread than might be expected. The number of fellows living in the north of England was about 7% on average, where the number living in counties immediately surrounding London was about 6% on average. On the other hand, although antiquaries were fairly well spread among the English counties, offsetting the domination of London somewhat, only 5.64% of fellows lived in Ireland, Scotland and Wales taken together. The Scottish antiquarian society must have decreased the number of Scots men interested in the SA, but similar institutions did not exist in Ireland and Wales. This suggests that nationality was a part of defining the antiquarian community. As data on unsuccessful candidatures is unavailable, it is unknown to what degree this English predominance reflected assumptions about the SA shared broadly
throughout Britain and Ireland, or if a shared positive regard for English nationality functioned to exclude Welsh, Irish and Scottish candidates.

Over the period 1830-70, collections and learned institutions were increasing concentrated in London. Yet antiquaries were increasingly dispersed away from London over this period, showing the success of SA reforms, and suggesting that, while the antiquarian community had a centre in London, it had a county periphery which was not very clearly defined by its proximity to London. Most Council members were London residents; but the majority had been born in the provinces and in Wales, Scotland and Ireland. The SA culture, then, was centred in London, and given that Britain had just the one centre of urbane and political culture, the SA must have shared the assumptions and manners of that culture to a fair degree. However, its periphery seems particularly robust in numbers and geographic spread.

The second question, how did antiquaries interact within their community, has now been discussed. Results agree with those for the first question, who were antiquaries? Antiquaries were mainly lower middle class men, whose energy in pursuing education, participation in scholarly societies, and publications brought them introductions and employment, and led them to collaborate on scholarly projects. This collaboration brought employment to other sectors of the antiquarian community, producing an upward spiral for many, of more and better employment and further scholarship. While they did not orchestrate their public image, antiquaries were increasingly active, eminent participants in Victorian scholarship and in Victorian learned bodies. Antiquaries’ self-conception was based in scholarship rather than class or conformity of any kind. Their interactions were characterised by a meritocratic value, based on scholarship and scholarly participation. Before and after reform, and for Council throughout this period, they elected men not unlike themselves. The major limitation to this meritocratic self-conception and community interaction seems to have been nationality. The dispersion of members reveals a robust periphery
throughout the English counties. But the tiny membership in Wales, Scotland and Ireland suggests that belonging to other nations may have obstructed scholars who had not the fortune to be Englishmen.

These results have broad implications for the historiography of Victorian society and of scholarly fields. The BAAS consciously managed its image as the new custodian of science, making a place for it in British society and government funding. The success they achieved for science was based in a shrewd political containment of the commercial classes, who participated only in social events and introductory lectures. The RS embraced reform, but attained public distinction and funding while leaving executive power in the hands of men linked to the landed, educated classes who had traditionally administered higher learning. But the RS and BAAS may not represent the norm for Victorian learned bodies. Many of the new, specialised societies commanded no special public prestige or government funding. This thesis shows the merit of Geison's notion of approaching the history of fields through research schools, defined as local and with a strictly enumerable membership. Studies of this nature, applied to specialised Victorian scholarly societies, might produce a more normative picture of Victorian scholarship against which to evaluate specific groups, individuals and events.

Three potential historiographic sequelae of such a body of work are identifiable. First, such a body of data would hold the potential to change twentieth-century historiographical conceptions about Victorian intellectual work and its place in Victorian society. In the case of the SA, a large number of poor but scholarly men achieved membership in the SA and improved their status and employment circumstances. Other learned societies may have served other men similarly. If they did, the conventional historiographic account of scholarship as located in the upper and educated classes would have to be altered to reflect these sectional opportunities. Second, this chapter provides material justification for the view that many active, eminent
Victorian scholars worked across the boundary between the arts and the sciences, provoking questions about possible conceptual cross-fertilisations among very disparate fields. Were Victorians employing the methods, insights and materials of one field in others? Or were they highly attuned to the distinct methods, data and genres characteristic of different fields, in the way a person may be bilingual or even multilingual? The many antiquaries who published in science, fiction and theology suggests they had a highly developed sense of such distinctions.

Finally, such a body of work would enable the construction of a more articulate analysis for describing the variety of Victorian scholars and scholarship. Terms such as amateur, dilettante, professional and scientist create the impression of strong distinctions between the individuals so designated, and between learned communities. The data presented in this chapter indicates that these distinctions may not have existed very firmly in the lives of a large number of Victorian scholars. Such changes would produce a much finer historical analysis of Victorian scholarship, and permit the diversity of Victorian scholars and the various circumstances of Victorian scholarship to become evident. As this chapter has shown, the real story of Victorian scholarship is not that of a pale but strengthening outline of our own intellectual and institutional circumstances. Victorian scholars were improbably lower class, their beliefs improbably diverse, and their scholarship energetic and productive. Without recognition of the diversity that existed, and without the ability to model its place in the development of institutions and shared problems, historical accounts of learning in the Victorian era cannot detach themselves fully from disguised Whig subjects, problems and conclusions.
CHAPTER FIVE

"Geology is, in fact, but an elder brother of archaeology, and it is therefore by no means surprising to find that the one may occasionally lend the other brotherly assistance."¹ This was the opinion of an active nineteenth-century antiquary-archaeologist, John Evans. This opinion has had a history since Evans' time, and that history has contributed to the problem of evaluating antiquarianism. While the paternalism implicit in such a relationship does not, in fact, represent most Victorian antiquaries' view of relations between these two fields, nineteenth-century antiquarian archaeologists have nonetheless passed into twentieth-century history with a poor character. Hence, both the reception of antiquarian archaeology, and antiquarian archaeological work itself, will be the subject matter of this chapter.

Twentieth-century histories still present nineteenth-century antiquaries as clumsy amateurs in an age of efficient scientists. Because little academic work has treated antiquarianism, it is necessary to consider persistent misconceptions about antiquarian archaeology.² The work of A. Bowdoin Van Riper will be used to explore these misconceptions. Following this discussion, the historical and the scientific character of antiquarian archaeology will be presented. Finally, this Chapter will characterise antiquarian archaeology in the terms of the traditional antiquarian

¹John Evans, Archaeologia 38(1860), No. XX, “On the Occurrence of Flint Implements in Undisturbed Beds of Gravel, Sand and Clay,” pp. 280-307, p. 280. In this article, pp. 280-281, Evans presents the only comparison of geology and archaeology found in the Archaeologia for the period 1830-70. It should be noted that this perspective pre-dates Evans: it can be seen in the frontispiece to Lyell's first, 1831 volume of his Principles of Geology, which depicted the columns of the Temple at Pozzuoli. Lyell accounts for the water-marks on the columns as the product of earlier subsidence and later rising of the earth below water level. These are issues that would interest a geologist. But the interpretation of the Temple is in no way limited to the way it might illuminate geology. An archaeologist's interpretation can be found in Sir Edmund Head, Archaeologia, 37/2 (1857), No. XXVII, “The Temple of Serapis at Pozzuoli.” pp. 441-450.

The portrait of the antiquary-archaeologist as amateur persists for two reasons. First, few scholars understand the antiquarian intellectual program, and therefore fail to perceive the distinctive form and coherence it gave to the work of many archaeologists. Like antiquaries in other fields, antiquary-archaeologists had a distinctive historical perspective. Chapter Three described that perspective and argued for its role in organising work undertaken in all fields. In the Victorian era, a tendency toward historicism was very common. It is unlikely, then, that archaeologists who were antiquaries would have left aside their antiquarian historical perspective. Twentieth-century histories of archaeology, then, need to accommodate this Victorian reality. But because antiquarian archaeological works often employed archaeological material to construct histories, or used manuscript sources and philology to evaluate archaeological findings, it has been hard for twentieth-century historians even to recognise this material as archaeological work. And because the genre is not recognised as such, the great body of antiquarian archaeological work is commonly dismissed from consideration. Thus, the portrait of the antiquary as a bumbler persists.

That portrait also persists because many renowned archaeologists who were antiquaries are not recognised as such. Where twentieth-century historians take care to note the memberships of Victorian scientists in the Royal, Geological and other societies, membership in the SA is considered less important. Notable nineteenth-century antiquaries are therefore frequently discussed in terms of their expertise in other fields, as archaeologists, or geologists, or numismatists, even though antiquarianism provided a mechanism and rationale for coordinating their work in these fields within an overall intellectual project. In evaluating Victorian scholars, membership in the SA should be taken as indicative of a scholars’ methods, perspective, and
Many twentieth-century histories of archaeology, more or less concerned to present a 
genealogy of the field, perpetuate an uninformed view of antiquary-archaeologists. This chapter 
will offer evidence that the allegations of destructive field methods and indolent, self-indulgent, 
and unscientific interpretation are untrue. Evidence is not hard to find. But a brief exploration 
of various misconceptions about antiquarian archaeology is first required, which will establish 
basic terms of reference for nineteenth-century geology and archaeology, and for exploring what 
antiquarian archaeology actually was. For this purpose, the recent work of A.B. Van Riper on 
nineteenth-century British archaeology is convenient, because he has understood much about 
antiquarian archaeology without recognising it as such, because he introduces pertinent material 
in the cognate histories of these fields, and because he provides a clear example of the 
historiographic problems created by the failure to understand antiquarianism.  

Van Riper begins boldly by asserting that "most [SA] members were wealthy, titled, or 
both." He views them as amateurs: "[d]uring the eighteenth and early nineteenth century, the 
heavy demands archaeology made on leisure time and disposable income limited its participants 
to the titled and the wealthy." Some parts of Van Riper's account are confused: he claims that 
antiquaries' interest in archaeology was the product of cheap railway travel, a desire for rational 

---

3A good example of this is found in Peter J. Bowler, The Invention of Progress: The Victorians and the Past. 
Basil Blackwell: Oxford, 1989, pp. 75ff. Bowler analyses many antiquaries' works without being aware of them as 
such, reproduces the notion that archaeologists who resisted the three-age system were resisting challenges to the 
Biblical chronology, and presents the issue of the antiquity of humanity as central to mid nineteenth-century 
archaeology. All of these notions are questioned in this chapter. Bowler's work concentrates on the relations between 
archeology and anthropology, and thus was not as useful for purposes of comparison.

4Van Riper has been chosen because, while he reproduces many common misconceptions about antiquaries, he 
has also done much primary research. and identified antiquaries without realising it, as "historical archaeologists."

5A. Bowdoin Van Riper, Men Among the Mammoths: Victorian Science and the Discovery of Human Prehistory, 

6Van Riper, Men Among the Mammoths. p. 22.
amusement, patriotic pride, a romantic involvement with the past inspired by novelists like Scott and the new popularity of medieval art inspired by the Oxford movement. He does little to detail the differing class interests which comprise this portrait, or to sort out which group antiquaries might belong to.\(^7\) This neglect leads to inconsistency as Van Riper dismisses antiquaries as participants in the middle class quest for polite accomplishment, but in short order returns to casting them as a wealthy, exclusive archaeological clique. The SA was "a fixture on the London social scene."\(^8\) In response to increased public interest in archaeology, it tightened its entrance criteria to ensure the dominance of wealthy Londoners, allowing its "largely upper-class membership" to amass and preside over archaeological treasures in the privacy of their "richly decorated quarters in central London."\(^9\) Van Riper seriously mistakes the nature of the antiquarian involvement with the artefacts of the past: "the society's problem...was that its members were more collectors of antiquities than students of the past."\(^10\) He describes the antiquarian concern to collect as directed at filling curiosity cabinets, at "displaying, and describing portable bits of the past" and appreciating their beauty. But, as was shown in Chapter

\(^7\)In fact, Van Riper generalises freely: "In 1810, the average archaeologist had been a wealthy gentleman living in London and collecting classical antiquities to display in his home. His counterpart in 1840 was a clergyman, physician, or shopkeeper living in the southern English countryside and studying local ruins and documents in an attempt to learn more about the history of his own town." Van Riper, *Men Among the Mammoths*, p. 26. The deficiency of this portrait is evident even within his own schema of historically- and scientifically-oriented archaeologists.

\(^8\)Van Riper, *Men Among the Mammoths*, p. 17.

\(^9\)Van Riper, *Men Among the Mammoths*, pp. 17ff. The reference is to Burlington House. The SA did not move there until 1873. Riper's account is replete with errors of this sort. He does notice the role of SA members in creating the British Archaeological Association (BAA) and the Archaeological Institute (AI), but has not understood the significance of the integration of BAA and AI memberships: "the members of both soon became integrated into a single community, however. Their goals were broadly similar, and their memberships overlapped significantly." Most BAA and AI members were also FSA. Van Riper does not consider the possibility that the antiquarian intellectual project may have contributed much to the way these archaeologists conceived their field: the BAA founders' reasons for departure from the SA were financial, not scholarly. Van Riper attributes the SA's period of reform to the efforts of middle-class enthusiasts, an analysis which does not allow for much distinction between antiquaries, and fails to note the post-reform growth of SA support for excavations.

\(^10\)Van Riper, *Men Among the Mammoths*, p. 18.
Three, it arose from the desire to preserve and explain. Finally, he asserts that antiquaries’ incompetence in doing field work was due to their insufficient grasp of geology and of field methods.

Little sense of the time-frame and coherence of the antiquarian intellectual trajectory emerges even in Van Riper’s criticism of antiquarian archaeology. Camden had been inquiring of farmers and labourers what turned up when they ploughed their fields. This practice had been taken up by later generations of antiquaries. Van Riper presents eighteenth-century archaeology as isolated from its past and from developments in the nineteenth century. He acknowledges that antiquary William Stukeley was the first British archaeologist to excavate systematically, and that this practice was continued in the late eighteenth century by Reverend Brian Faussett, Captain James Douglas, William Cunningham and Richard Colt Hoare. He attributes the development of modern archaeology to the field work and record-keeping practices of these men, an argument which betrays his own genealogical concerns, but fails to notice that all were antiquaries. He characterises Stukeley and Faussett as atypical members of the antiquarian community. Given the tolerance for eccentricity within the SA, this a difficult judgement to make. And he has not seen the cumulative, collaborative character of antiquarian work: “separated from each other in both time and space, they [Stukeley and Faussett] had little

---

11Van Riper, *Men Among the Mammoths*, p. 20. Misinterpreting the late-eighteenth century tension between Gothicisers and classicisers in the SA, Van Riper alleges that antiquaries’ main archaeological interests were classical Greek and Roman rather than British.


13Lord Albert Conyngham, *Archaeologia* 30(1844), No. III. "An Account of the opening and examination of a considerable number of Tumuli on Breach Downs, in the County of Kent...followed by Mr. Akerman’s Remarks upon Lord Albert Conyngham’s Excavations," pp. 47-56, writes: "Douglas [author of the *Nenia Britannica*, date] informs us, that he sometimes discovered shards and pebbles, not the produce of the soil, placed in various parts of the grave[s he excavated], and I noticed in the Breach Down tumuli several of those globular-shaped flints which have of late so much engaged the attention of our geologists," p. 55.
contact and no opportunity for sustained discussion or cooperative research." This chapter will easily demonstrate that this is simply wrong. These errors demonstrate the need for twentieth-century historians to appreciate the history and nature of the antiquarian enterprise.

In contrast to antiquaries as exclusive amateurs and mainly incompetent archaeologists, Van Riper sets up the new archaeologists of the 1840s and 1850s: whose "radically new approach to the past" was defined by their scientific rigour in probing the earth's surface and reconstructing the human past. In fact, many of these radical new archaeologists were antiquaries. Van Riper analyses the writings of Albert Way, Thomas Wright, Alfred John Kempe, John Bruce, Edmund Oldfield, Thomas Joseph Pettigrew and others, but seems unaware of their FSA status. On the other hand, in reading these men's work, Van Riper has rightly perceived their intense involvement with their historical program, leading him to subdivide archaeologists into two groups, historical archaeologists and scientific archaeologists. We will consider these in turn.

Van Riper describes historical archaeologists' work as characterised by geographically narrow but temporally deep studies.

[A] sense of common purpose and a shared, clearly articulated body of methods and techniques united the historical archaeologists. Their approach to the past, though substantially different than that of later archaeologists (including those of the present day), was no less scientific. The structure of historical archaeologists' research program reflected their view of the past and of their proper role as students of that past. 

---

14Van Riper, *Men Among the Mammoths*, p. 22. Van Riper further claims that this isolation was increased by the dominance of the SA Londoners over provincial members. "[A]s a result, the pioneering work of Stukeley and his successors never coalesced into a coherent research tradition...the field workers of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries thus exerted only a limited influence on antiquarian theory and practise." p. 22.

15Van Riper, *Men Among the Mammoths*, p. 15.

16These men do not easily fit Van Riper's characterisation of antiquaries. Pettigrew was a wealthy surgeon, but Way's father had given away his fortune attempting to convert the Jews. Wright was a scholarship boy at Cambridge, and earned his living writing more and less scholarly works, as did A.J. Kempe, after a short time at H.M. Mint. Bruce gave up law early in his life to become a full-time secretary to many literary and publishing societies. Oldfield had a law career and travelled as secretary to the archaeologically-inclined A.H. Layard.

17Van Riper, *Men Among the Mammoths*, p. 16.
Historical archaeologists made use of diverse bodies of evidence from many intellectual fields in order to reconstruct the past. This reconstructive historical archaeology was pursued inductively, working from the evidence to the narrative account and building from local studies towards the national. The primacy of the local as the best unit of analysis lay in historical archaeologists' belief that artefacts should be interpreted with material from many other fields. Each individual piece of data could be evaluated only in relation to all data that was known about a location, object or people. Van Riper is unaware that his portrait is recognisably antiquarian, and that many of the men he characterises as historical archaeologists were antiquaries. For example, he declares antiquary J. Wright's work *The Celt, The Roman, and The Saxon* (1952) as the best example of historical archaeologists' attempt to build their numerous local studies into a grand, macro-archaeological history of early Britain. Camden's model, as developed by seventeenth-century antiquaries, can clearly be seen underwriting the structure and intent of this work, and that of other historical archaeologists. Further, Van Riper declares that the *Archaeologia* along with the *Archaeological Journal*, published by the AI, and the *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, are representative of this archaeological school, as their contents are characterised by this kind of historical program.

Although he does not recognise it as such, Van Riper has perceived much about antiquarian archaeology. Besides being members of the SA, Van Riper's historical archaeologists

---

18 Van Riper even notes the tendency of historical archaeologists to concentrate either on physical or on textual remains, p. 31.

19 On this basis, Van Riper refers to them as the "national archaeological journals," but seems unaware that the *Archaeologia* was an SA publication. He notes that, while historical archaeology began to wane in the 1860s, this school produced important work until about 1880: *Man Among the Mammoths*, pp. 31ff. He claims, incorrectly, that because historical archaeologists liked to interpret archaeological data with textual, they did little work on pre-Roman sites, and that from mid-century, more than 60% of contributions to the *Archaeologia, Archaeological Journal* and *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* treated Roman-British and medieval rather than Celtic (pre-Roman) or Anglo-Saxon sites. I view this figure as greatly inflated.
are antiquarian in the style of their work. His failure to recognise them involves him in complex and questionable distinctions between Baconian and anti-Baconian historiography in the Victorian era.\textsuperscript{20} He may be forgiven for losing the struggle with this problem: the many Victorian uses for, and styles of, history are genuinely difficult to describe. But the particular point at which his account fails indicates the value of paying closer historiographic attention to the antiquarian tradition.\textsuperscript{21}

Van Riper divided archaeologists into two kinds: historical and scientific. He then uses three major issues in the history of Victorian geology in order to distinguish scientific from historical archaeologists. These are: the search for evidence that would place humans in the Pliocene era (or, very early in prehistory), the acceptance of theorising in general and of the three-age system in particular, and competent field method.\textsuperscript{22} Each of these will be considered in turn.

Van Riper commends scientific archaeologists because they were primarily interested in

\textsuperscript{20}He argues that historical archaeologists, viewing their proper business as the collection, comparison and organisation of facts, participated in a form of Baconism. Once collected, these items might be fused into an overall account of the early British past. But while most recognised this construction as a possibility, they were reluctant to do it themselves. Thus, Van Riper concludes that historical archaeologists were Baconian in the sense that they were hostile to theory. This chapter will show this to be untrue. See Van Riper, \textit{Men Among the Mammoths}, pp. 31ff and 35ff.

\textsuperscript{21}It also suggests that genre theory could provide twentieth-century historians with a fine interpretive tool for distinguishing among different types of Victorian historical and, as Whewell called it, palaeiological writing, or writing that engaged with the anthropological, cultural and physical dimensions of progressionism. Victorian works of these kinds may be seen to spread across a spectrum, with genres shading into each other, and particular works adopting the conventions of one or even of more than one genre. For a discussion of this kind of analysis, see Mark Philipps, "Reconsiderations on History and Antiquarianism: Arnaldo Momigliano and the Historiography of Eighteenth-Century Britain," \textit{Journal of the History of Ideas} 57(2) 1996: 297-316.

\textsuperscript{22}The history of nineteenth-century geology is complex: only issues of relevance to this chapter have been discussed here. For a comprehensive introduction, see François Ellenberger, \textit{History of Geology}, Oxford & IBH Publishing: New Delhi. 1996 and Albert V. Carozzi and Marguerite Carozzi, trs. and revisers, Gabriel Gohau, \textit{A History of Geology}, Rutgers University Press: New Brunswick, 1990.
searching for prehistoric human remains. Therefore they were both the "mainstream" and the "cutting edge" of nineteenth-century British archaeology. Their greater authenticity as archaeologists lies in their geological rather than historical concerns. This prejudges the case in several ways. There is no reason to privilege the time-scale and interests of geologists in evaluating the aims and emphases of archaeology. Archaeology dealt with early human remains. But humans were attested only in about a third of the most recent of the four geological epochs, leaving both the historical and the scientific archaeologist with nothing to do in most other strata and epochs. Where the physical remains geologists studied were fairly evenly spread in all epochs, the physical remains archaeologists studied got rapidly more numerous and interesting in the later parts of the most recent epoch only. It only made sense for archaeologists concentrate on the areas where there were considerable remains to be explored, which meant Celtic, Roman

---

23Van Riper's account of why the two schools had these different foci is confused. On the one hand, he attributes historical archaeologists' lack of interest in early human remains to an "apathy." A few pages later, he notes that this lack of interest is an organic part of their particular methods and goals, and acknowledges the problem historical archaeologists had to write an account of the past based on such scanty evidence. His claim that only 5.4 percent, or a total of 34 articles, on this topic can be found in the national archaeological journals, is an under-estimate. Van Riper, Man Among the Mammoths, pp. 36-40. A personnel problem occurs in his definition of scientific archaeologists, as he claims that John Evans was the founder of scientific archaeology. Evans was an active antiquary who became a Vice-President of the SA in 1876.

24Van Riper, Man Among the Mammoths, pp. 36.

and Saxon sites. And while archaeologists often borrowed methods and materials from geology, no study has yet determined the directions of the flow of field methods. Evidence given in Chapter Four, that many of these men were members of more than one learned society, removes the likelihood of identifying better field method with any one learned community.

Prehistoric human remains were involved in problems of evidence until about 1860. Until late in the period under consideration, there was relatively little evidence to support the idea that humans had existed early in the most current, or Pleistocene subsection of the present geological epoch. There was even less suggesting that they had existed in the previous subsection, the Pliocene. Human skeletal remains and primitive stone tools had been found in the same strata with the bones of extinct mammoths in Kent’s Cavern, in Torquay, Devonshire, which had been excavated in 1825-28. But these had been declared contaminated by Roman Britons at a date much later than that at which the mammoths had died in the cave. For most geologists, this was not evidence for prehistoric humans. Some archaeologists were dissatisfied with this conclusion, antiquary John Evans among them, and they continued to investigate the possibilities for extreme

---

26Van Riper’s account of geology in this period betrays his genealogical objective. He describes 1820-60 as the "golden age" of geology, during which the order of geological ages and the first paid geological positions and professorships were established. Geological heroes wielded power among the scientific elite, and lesser geologists and the interested public followed their lead. Geological method was both empirical and theoretically sophisticated. Studies of stratigraphy and paleontology aimed to describe the structure and history of earth’s surface. But geologists’ first goal was to determine what beings had inhabited former worlds. Van Riper has understood that geologists valued fieldwork as the key to defining strata, and that fossils tended to determine strata, not the other way around, and so lost their value if separated from their locale. But he does not apply this insight to evaluating the way historical archaeologists did their work. His discussion of the strong distinction between the professional geological elite and local amateurs may apply to the Geological Society, but it is one of the most interesting things about the ways antiquaries worked, that they did not structure their collaborative projects in this way. See Men Among the Mammoths, Chapter Three, "Geologists and Human Antiquity to 1858," p. 44-73.

human antiquity. But the possibility of prehistoric humanity remained problematic until the Brixham Cave excavation of 1858, at which antiquaries Thomas Northmore and Walter Calverley Trevelyan assisted. Brixham Cave was the first site at which human remains were confirmed as existing greatly prior to the time-scale Victorians thought was described by the Biblical chronology.

The trajectory of Victorian geology on this particular problem was not clear until about 1860, then. And even after Brixham Cave, archaeologists did not possess a great quantity of evidence placing humans in the Pliocene. Van Riper's distinction between "scientific" and other archaeologists on the basis of their interest in prehistoric human remains, then, seems to reflect hindsight rather than a fair historiographic appraisal of Victorian geology. Antiquaries' focus on the more recent of pre-Roman sites was not due to a failure of imagination or lack of scientific understanding. It made practical sense for them to concentrate their efforts on the thousands of tumuli scattered visibly across the British landscape, rather than searching for what was minimally attested and difficult to find. The scanty evidence for very early humans did not

---

28Evans was not FSA until 1851, so his interest in this area in the 1830s cannot be said to be motivated by antiquarianism. But it seems unlikely that he would join or lead an organisation he viewed as incompetent. In general, continental scholars accepted extreme human antiquity on the basis of finds of human and extinct animal bones earlier in the century. British geologists such as Buckland, Lyell and Mantell were unconvinced, as interpreting the strata was too complex for conclusions to be easily formed. Increased willingness to consider human antiquity came in the 1850s, when the accumulating fossil record, and Quaternary stratigraphy began to provide support for a complex, multi-linear progression of species. Progression with divergence did not render human antiquity any more or less likely, but allowed the two questions to become independent. Evaluation of Quaternary deposits led to the theory of ice ages. These deposits were set down in a short time under rapidly changing conditions. They were thin and existed in widely separated patches, making them hard to relate to other strata. In England and France, they appeared to have drifted in some way, so as to be found both above and below sections of the Pliocene. The theory that they had been deposited by water in a relatively recent past led to the theory of ice ages, which provided a way of explaining geologically distinct human eras, widely separated in time.

compare to the material available to construct closely graduated time scales for Celtic, Roman or Saxon Britain. And what would the antiquary have been able to do with the scant prehistoric material as then existed? Its place in the antiquarian chronological structure would have merited little more than a note. As will be seen, following the Brixham Cave excavation, many antiquaries were involved in gathering more evidence of prehistoric humans. But their concentration on later sites before about 1860 cannot be taken as evidence of their lack of scientific understanding.

There are other ways in which hindsight rather than a sensitive historiography has formed Van Riper’s account of antiquaries’ involvement with the question of prehistoric humans. He notes that John Frere gave a paper on flint weapons in June of 1797 to the SA, which was published in the *Archaeologia*. This paper suggested dating humans by their weapons, and indicated the possibility of extreme human antiquity. Van Riper, like many others, views the SA’s response as a failure to act: "the letter was read before its members...and forgotten." Antiquary John Evans, accounting for the same event in 1863, wrote that Frere’s work was "overlooked" because "at that time...but little advance had been made in geology." Van Riper does not consider what geologists might have made of such evidence in 1797. Given antiquaries’ propensity to work in several fields, it is probable that Frere’s paper was heard by those who would be described as geologists at this time. Buckland, for example, was FSA, and sent copies

---


32 Evans, *Archaeologia* 39/1(1863), No. IV, p. 57.
of his geological works to the SA library. But the geological community had only begun to warm to the possibility of Pliocene humanity around 1830, were divided on the significance of Kent's Cavern at that time, and did not find sufficient material to conclude in favour of Pliocene humanity until about 1860.\textsuperscript{13} It is questionable whether the antiquarian reception of Frere's paper was a failure. This is also the case if the paper is seen in antiquarian terms. As will be seen below, many antiquaries' articles noted fossil and pre-historical human remains as facts, but left it there, as there was not enough information available to connect these items to their historical program. As inveterate note-takers, antiquaries had been recording information of all kinds for centuries, believing that it would eventually be fitted into a super-history. In this sense, Frere fulfilled his antiquarian task by collecting, recording and reporting to the community.

Chief among the characteristics Van Riper attributes to scientific archaeologists was their acceptance of the "three-age system" used by Danish archaeologist Christian Thomsen in 1819 to classify artefacts at Copenhagen's Royal Museum of Northern Antiquities. Thomsen believed that human implements found at excavation sites could be described in temporal sequence by substance: stone, iron and bronze implements corresponded to three successive ages--a stone age, an iron age and a bronze age. Changes in the substance implements were made of corresponded to progressive changes in humans' technological skill. Thomsen thought that this progression had been followed in every European society, although the duration of and transition between periods varied, place to place. This system allowed tools from different sites to be compared, and their relative age determined. Digging up tools was unlike digging up coins, which bore inscriptions that could identify language, country of origin and ruler, and could be compared to manuscript material to determine a chronology. The comparative method Thomsen developed allowed an

\textsuperscript{13}For a careful treatment setting geological ideas within the context of their time, see D.R. Oldroyd, \textit{Thinking About the Earth: A History of Ideas in Geology}, Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Mass, 1996.
approximate and relative chronology to be constructed on the basis of features of the objects themselves. This comparative method also allowed a means of determining simultaneity between artefacts from different, even quite widely separated, sites.

Thomsen's work was popularised by another Danish archaeologist, J.J.A. Worsaae, and made its first printed appearance in the Copenhagen Museum Guidebook in 1836. As will be seen below, antiquaries publishing in the *Archaeologia* were knowledgeable about Worsaae's system even in the 1830s, showing their continued connections to continental scholarship. Van Riper incorrectly characterises the reception of the three-age system among historical archaeologists as hostile, claiming they saw it as unwarranted generalisation, and theorising ahead of the facts. Van Riper claims that scientific archaeologists were more proficient in interpreting excavation results than historical archaeologists because they were more accepting of theory in general, and the three-age system in particular. In fact, antiquaries *were* open to theorising about their data. Van Riper's account conflates three distinct movements within antiquarian archaeology, 1830-70: acceptance, criticism, and sophistication of this model. The delicacies of interpreting sites are not as simple as Van Riper's account suggests: in archaeology, as in geology, evidence was incomplete, and could legitimately be taken more than one way. Antiquaries' concerns with the three-age system often reflect the problem of the complexity of sites and artefacts, not a rejection

34Thomsen's Guidebook was first translated into English by antiquary Lord Ellesmere in 1848. See Evans, *A History*. p. 230.

35In another of the confusions of attributed motivations and styles which abound in Van Riper's book, he argues that only romantic sites like Canterbury Cathedral and sites which could be related to present concerns stirred historical archaeologists' interest, and that because they used a wealth of evidence to fit archaeological data into a detailed historical framework, historical archaeologists had less interest in Celtic sites, *Man Among the Mammoths*, pp. 42ff.

36Van Riper also claims that geologists were better interpreters of the products of excavations because they read continental and international works. As Chapters Three and Four have shown, this does not describe the antiquaries who made up most of those he describes as historical archaeologists.
of this system of interpreting them.

Finally, Van Riper makes field method a distinctive difference between historical and scientific archaeologists. This goes to the heart of the accusations against antiquaries, as incompetent and destructive in the field. As this chapter will show, antiquaries were at least as competent as their scientific peers. But it is useful to consider nineteenth-century scientific field methods in order to be able to compare antiquaries to this standard. Van Riper is not alone in viewing the 1858 excavation of Brixham Cave as exemplifying the best in field technique, and that technique as the cornerstone of the excavations' results. When it was discovered, the Brixham Cave was in a pristine, undisturbed state. Its excavation could therefore shed much light on the question of human antiquity. The geologists excavating Brixham Cave paid close attention to the careful measurement of strata and to the placement of artefacts within strata. Although amateurs were used to do the actual digging, experts in Pliocene stratigraphy removed artefacts from their place in the earth, measured them and recorded their place and position in the strata. While the standard method of searching for fossils was to sink several shafts over the surface of a site in an attempt to locate artefacts below the surface, this tended to be as destructive as it was productive. The excavation at Brixham proceeded by stripping back every horizontal layer over the entire site. While slow and costly, it preserved perfect strata information for every object and prevented any confusion about what strata objects were found in, as could happen when artefacts were brought up through vertical shafts. Record keeping was meticulous: each object had an identity number and notes were taken on each as it was found. These, then, were the features which made this mid-century excavation notable. The field methods of antiquaries will be discussed in detail in a later section of this chapter. Certainly, most antiquarian excavations could

---

not boast of the resources, in time, funding or personnel, that the Geological Society and Royal Society could muster. But their excavations show that they were aware of these methods and the reasons why they were employed.

The history of archaeology, as presented by A. Bowdoin Van Riper, has highlighted some common misconceptions about nineteenth-century antiquarian archaeology, such as its wealthy exclusivity, anti-theoretical stance, unscientific interests and poor field method. The next part of this chapter will consider antiquaries’ own descriptions of their archaeological work. The features Van Riper identifies as crucial to a critique of antiquaries and to defining scientific archaeology will be included in the next section of this chapter, which explores the historical and the scientific character of antiquarian archaeology. Issues considered are: field method and technical expertise, theorising about artefacts and sites and any resistance to particular theories or to theorising in general, and the place of material from non-archaeological fields in interpreting archaeological artefacts and sites. Two features of Mary Jo Nye’s model have been added to these: the role of visual aids in representing archaeological knowledge, and the place of social and political experiences in antiquaries’ prosecution of their archaeological work. Further, the role of Camden’s program in structuring antiquaries’ reporting is considered. The antiquarian program can be seen to structure antiquaries’ interpretations of their sites.

Among the many problems with the way antiquaries are presented in academic writing, the most misleading is the compression of this rich, complex research tradition and its various, at times unconventional practitioners into a type. This may be convenient for purposes of comparison--Van Riper compared antiquaries with scientists just as John Earle compared them with humanists in 1628--but it creates a distorted image. Data given in Chapter Four described antiquaries as sharing many intellectual projects and employment links, but showed that they did this across educational, occupational, religious, political and class boundaries. The evidence found
in the many articles of the *Archaeologia* shows that antiquary-archaeologists were similarly
diverse as individuals, but that they were alike in expending great energy in getting all the
information they could, in any way they could. Their methods were sometimes unusual, but
antiquaries were very attentive to the many ways of collecting information on the past. One
example will suggest an alternative portrait of the antiquary-archaeologist. 

Henry Rawlinson, whose rescue of the Rosetta Stone is described in Chapter Three, spent
some years taking paper casts of inscriptions at Behistun. This site presented an almost sheer cliff
face, into which the exploits of the Persian king Darius had been carved in several languages.
Its significance for oriental philology was keenly felt in Rawlinson’s time, as at least one of the
languages, Babylonian, was little understood. However, it was difficult to read the higher
inscriptions from the plain below, even with "the aid of a good telescope." An accurate
transcription required climbing.

Rawlinson did the climbing, over some years: "When I was living at Kermanshah fifteen
years ago, and was somewhat more active than I am at present, I used frequently to scale the
rock 3 or 4 times a day without the aid of a rope or ladder." He noted that in places, "a false
step...would probably be fatal." Rawlinson described climbing the cliff face to reach the different
inscriptions. As he progressed up the face, he made his way vertically across the different

---


languages, but also across increasingly difficult rock faces:

On reaching the recess which contains the Persian text of the record, ladders are indispensable in order to examine the upper part of the tablet; and even with ladders, there is considerable risk, for the foot ledge is so narrow, about 18 inches or at most 2 foot in breadth, that with a ladder long enough to reach the sculptures sufficient slope cannot be given to enable a person to ascend, and, if the ladder be shortened in order to increase the slope, the upper inscriptions can only be copied by standing on the topmost step of the ladder, with no other support than steadying the body against the rock with the left arm, while the left hand holds the notebook, and the right hand is employed with the pencil. In this position I copied all the upper inscriptions, and the interest of the occupation entirely did away with any sense of danger.41

Having copied these, Rawlinson advanced up the cliff face to the next set of inscriptions:

"To reach the recess which contains the Scythic translation of the record of Darius is a matter of far greater difficulty...the face of the rock presents a sheer precipice." He discovered, while using a ladder to cross a chasm, that "Persians merely fit the bars of their ladders without pretending to clench them outside, and I had hardly accordingly begun to cross over when the vertical pressure forced the bars out of their sockets, and the lower and unsupported side of the ladder thus parted company from the upper, and went crashing down over the precipice. Hanging on to the upper side...I regained the Persian recess."42 Making notes required only ropes, ladders, a notebook and pencil. But Rawlinson was not content with this: he wanted paper casts of the higher inscriptions, as they were in languages about which less was known. Thus, when he assayed the higher languages and rocks, he was carrying large tablets of damp oversize paper and a wooden paddle, along with ropes and ladders. Casts were made by beating the damp paper into the crevasses of the inscription and allowing the paper to dry, producing a reverse image of the inscription. When dry, the cast was fragile and had to be brought down carefully.

This he accomplished. But, of the topmost inscriptions, he wrote: "[t]he Babylonian

41Rawlinson, Archaeologia 34/1(1851) No. X. pp. 74-75.
42Rawlinson, Archaeologia 34/1(1851) No. X. pp. 74-75.
transcript at Behistun is still more difficult to reach than either the Scythic or the Persian tablets.43 His efforts failed him: "I long despaired of obtaining a cast of the inscription: for I found it quite beyond my powers of climbing to reach the spot where it was engraved, and the craigsmen of the place, who were accustomed to track the mountain goats over the entire face of the mountain, declared the particular block inscribed with the Babylonian legend to be unapproachable."44 Finally he hired a Kurdish boy, whose skills "appeared quite miraculous."45 The boy succeeded, and made the casts under Rawlinson's direction.

Rawlinson's exploit is not typical of the experiences of the many antiquaries who excavated British barrows or Roman villas. But it is a fair representation of antiquaries' devotion to acquiring an exact record of every detail of the past they could. So far from being exclusive, antiquarian archaeologists, like many geologists, were accustomed to the strenuous, grubby work of collecting evidence about early human history.

Because they engaged with archaeological sites in this way, antiquaries were conscious of field methods, both practically and as they affected their reporting and interpretation of sites. In most cases, accounts of their excavations include measurements of the site (tumuli, barrow, cemetery, and so on), of trenches dug, and of artefacts and objects found. Even in the 1830s, most articles provide plans and elevations, with scale, trench placement and measurements marked, as well as supplementing these with cross sections.46 Many antiquaries employed artists

---


and surveyors to obtain accurate visual aids. The lack of such materials was an "embarrassment." In several cases, measurements were disputed by other antiquaries who had measured the same site, leading to corrections in later articles. Reports of excavations were plans, p. 59 and 60, on which the location of objects in the tumuli, the placement of trenches are accompanied by a description of depths and measurement. In many cases, built artefacts such as Roman villas and walls or Saxon enclosures were being excavated. In these cases, a ground plan generally accompanies the article. See for example, George Butler, *Archaeologia* 30(1844), No. X. "Account of the Traces of a Roman Villa discovered, AD 1840, at Gayton, near Northampton." pp. 125-29 and John Lee, *Archaeologia* 33(1849), No. III, "Antiquarian Researches in the Ionian Islands, in the year 1812." pp. 36-54.


C.R. Smith. *Archaeologia* 33(1849), No. XXV, p. 326. Some articles are insufficiently supported by plans and elevations. John Gage, *Archaeologia* 27(1838), No. XX, "An Account of a British Buckler, found in the bed of the River Isis, between Little Wittenham and Dorchester, co. Oxford." pp. 298-300, includes a crude map of the site, p. 300, which lacks even a scale. However, this was not a common failing of Gage's work, and may be partially due to the brevity of the article. J.T. Blight, *Archaeologia* 40/1(1864), No. IX, "An Account of Remarkable Subterranean Chambers at Trelowarren, the seat of Sir R.B. Vyvyan, Bart., in the County of Cornwall," pp. 113-18, criticised Richard Polwhele, not an antiquary, because his *The History of Cornwall: Military, Religious, Architectural, Commercial, Biographical*. Law and Whittaker: London. 1816, provided no "plans or accurate measurements," making his work "of little use to the archaeologist," p. 113.

See for example William Bromet disputing J.B. Deane's survey and presenting a better drawing, "Cromlech and Obelisk at Locmariaker in Brittany," *Archaeologia* 32(1847), p. 443. See also below. John Gage's corrections to his first survey of the Bartlow Hills barrows. George Scharf, using and evaluating Samuel Lysons' *Remains of Two Temples, and Other Roman Antiquities Discovered at Bath* (1802) in his own work on Bath, corrected "two or three minor particulars. Having procured an accurate tracing of Lyson's plates, I returned with it to Bath, and collated it with the original, marking carefully the details he had overlooked or misunderstood. In saying this, I should be sorry, indeed, to be considered disposed to lessen or underrate the value of those illustrations of Mr. Robert Smirke, Jun., that of this time, or of the experienced Mr. William Daniel: I am perfectly aware of the different circumstances under which they beheld the sculptures. They were not, then, deposited in the elegant vestibule that now protects them. The light upon them must have been less advantageous, and they were most probably drawn under circumstances of great difficulty. It may also be remembered that in former times the Directors of the Archaeologia
Van Riper's account cast scientific acumen as the force that drove the success of nineteenth-century archaeology. This may be so, but it leads him to cast antiquaries and those he calls historical archaeologists as deficient in this regard. Stuart Piggott writes of: "the fundamental lack, until the close of the nineteenth century, of adequate excavation technique which, with an adequate understanding of the artifacts and their stratification, could enable archaeological evidence to be recovered under controlled circumstances." Neither historian has surveyed the field methods of archaeologists of this period, or tried to evaluate Victorian archaeologists by the normative standards of their own time. In fact, as Chapter Four has demonstrated, many antiquaries were scientifically competent, and were a part of the scientific community. As archaeologists, many used their skills and their contacts to aid their archaeological work. Numismatic antiquaries, for example, knowledgeable about the history and the art-studying public were not, as we know they are now, so very particular. See Scharf, Archaeologia 36/1(1855), No. XVIII, "Notes upon the Sculptures of a Temple discovered at Bath." pp. 187-200, 187-88. See also F.W.L. Thomas, Archaeologia, 34/1(1851), No. XIII, p. 112.

For example. George Richard Corner re-excavated Alfred John Kempe's site at Bromley, Kent, with Admiral William Henry Smyth, John Richard, and Robert Lemon. The re-evaluation of the site led him to conclude that there were pre-Roman remains below those the Romans had left. See Archaeologia, 36/1(1855), No. XIV. Corner re-examined a site reported on by A.J. Kempe in Archaeologia 22(1829), No. XXIV, "An Account of Some Recent Discoveries at Holwood-Hill, Kent," pp. 336-49. John Thurnam re-excavated Hoare's site at West Kennet Long Barrow, and reported in Archaeologia 38/2(1860), No. XXVII, "On the Examination of a Chambered Long-Barrow at West Kennet, Wiltshire," pp. 405-21.


For example, John Adamson, reporting on the mineralogical analysis of some Anglo-Saxon coins by antiquary James Finlay Weir Johnston, Reader of Chemistry and Mineralogy at the University of Durham, uses the relative weights of the coins' mineralogical components to date them, and argue for the relative lack of sophistication of Anglo-Saxon metallurgy. John Adamson, Archaeologia 25(1834) No. XVI, "An Account of the Discovery at Hexham, in the County of Northumberland, of a brass vessel containing a number of the Anglo Saxon Coins called Stycas," pp. 279-310. Henry Thomas Ellacombe, in "Torques Found in Wraxall, Somerset," Archaeologia 30(1844), Appendix, pp. 521-55, p. 521, reports a mineralogical analysis of the torque. Some articles contained material closer to engineering than to archaeology. Thomas Dry's "The Skew Bridge at Rimini, Italy," Archaeologia 30(1844), Appendix, pp. 530-35, presents a trigonometric analysis of why the bridge piers, which are tilted off vertical in the direction of the current, can support the bridge. John Evans was excavating with Prestwich from mid-century. See Evans, Archaeologia, 39/1(1863), No. IV, "Account of some further Discoveries of Flint Implements in the Drift on
of counterfeiting, used mineralogical analysis to determine the probable date various coins were struck. Many antiquaries made use of a knowledge of chemistry in interpreting the artefacts they uncovered. W.M. Wylie, excavating a Carolingian (700-800 CE) site in the south of Germany, compares Stuttgart Professor Fehling's chemical analysis of bronze from the Suabian site with chemical analyses of bronze materials found at a late Merovingian (c. 500-750 CE) site as an aid to dating his site. Noted surgeon and bibliographer Thomas Joseph Pettigrew was unusual in unwrapping a mummy in order to do an autopsy and chemical analysis of its embalming fluids. But many examined skeletal remains in order to determine whether they were human, and their age at death. Many articles cite the works of eminent scientists, and the proceedings of scientific societies.

53 See for example, "these may be the work of forgers," John Adamson, Archaeologia 25(1834), No. XVI, p. 310; Edward Hawkins, Archaeologia 24(1832), No. IV, "Remarks upon the Coins lately discovered in the bed of the River Dove, near Tutbury, Staffordshire," pp. 148-167. Other antiquaries also used mineralogical analysis. See J.M. Kemble, Archaeologia 36/2(1851), No. XXXII, "On some remarkable Sepulchral Objects from Italy, Styria, and Mecklenburgh," pp. 349-69.

54 Wylie also noted the practical use of chemistry in excavating: "Many of the most remarkable objects were of wood, which, though perfect when discovered, rapidly became disorganised on exposure to the air, and were only saved at all by skilful chemical appliances." See Wylie, Archaeologia, 36/1(1855), No. XV, "The Graves of the Alemanni at Oberflacht in Suabia," 129-60, p. 131. Wylie used Buckland's work to evaluate his speculations about the presence of tannin and gallic acids in clayey soil being the cause of good preservation of wooden objects at this site.

55 Pettigrew. Archaeologia 27(1838), No. XVIII, pp. 262-73.

56 Articles reporting on medical opinions sought to determine if bones found were human are too numerous to cite, but appear even in the 1830s. For articles discussing the depth and roughness of the hollows where muscles were attached to bones, indicating age at decease, see Studley Martin, "Discovery of a Roman Urn near Burnley in Lancashire," Archaeologia 30(1844), Appendix, pp. 553-54. See also F.W.L. Thomas, Archaeologia, 34/1(1851), No. XIII, p. 108. The osteological report of John T. Quekett, Professor of Histology (1852) and Conservator of the Hunterian Museum of the Royal College of Surgeons (1856) is included in J.Y. Akerman, Archaeologia 38/1(1860), No. VII, "Second Report of Researches in a Cemetery of the Anglo-Saxon period at Brighampton, Oxon.,” pp. 84-97, 93-96. Two reports are contained in J.Y. Akerman, Archaeologia 38/2(1860), No. XXIII, "Report on Researches in an Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Long Wittenham, Berkshire, in 1859,” pp. 327-72.

57 See for example Charles Tilstone Beke, Archaeologia 32(1847), No. V; the use of the work of John Stevens Henslow, Cambridge Professor of botany but briefly of mineralogy, on the formation of certain hills in Cambridgeshire, in R.C. Neville, Archaeologia 32(1847), No. XXX, "Examination of a Group of Barrows. Five in
Van Riper distinguished between historical and scientific archaeologists on the basis of the greater geological knowledge of the latter. Most archaeological articles in the *Archaeologia* include information about soil types and strata.\(^5^8\) In some cases, articles make soil types or the placement of artefacts within the strata the crux of their interpretation.\(^5^9\) Even in the Appendices to *Archaeologia*, most archaeological notes and letters about excavations contain this information.\(^6^0\)

Antiquaries attended to the many kinds of information the strata could supply. R.C. Neville, for example, wrote: "Incontestable proof that the mound had never been disturbed was..."
afforded by the regularity of the strata." Many interpreted artefacts and objects according to the strata where they were found, and were knowledgeable about the kinds of objects commonly found in certain strata. A.J. Kempe wrote:

When the labourers had penetrated through a factitious accumulation of soil to the depth of about seventeen feet (from 15 to 17 feet beneath the present surface may be, I believe, accounted the level of Roman London), they came to a stratum of argillaceous native earth about two feet and a half-inch in depth, in which numerous marks of roman occupation began to make their appearance; sinking twenty feet still deeper, through a stratum of fine red gravel, they came to the bed in which are found the fossil remains of ages beyond human record. To the Roman level, however, I purpose to confine these notes.

John Yonge Akerman wrote of finding pottery shards in what appeared to be the wrong layer.

The position of objects within the strata, but also in relation to each other and to the site floor, could tell archaeologists much about a site. Many antiquaries understood the importance of discussing the location or placement of artefacts on the site floor, though some did not.

Stuart Piggott asserts that, in the 1830s, "excavation technique was rarely superior to and frequently of a standard below that of [eighteenth-century antiquary William] Cunnington." But many features of antiquaries' excavations suggest that they must be viewed as competent for

---


64For articles by antiquaries who did not understand this issue, see for example John Yonge Akermann, *Archaeologia* 36/1(1855), No. XVII. Akermann merely writes that flints were "scattered on the floor of the grave." p. 176.

their time. Few used shafts as a way of exploring tumuli. R.C. Neville, aware that shafts were unproductive, wrote of his excavation of five barrows in Cambridgeshire, a few years before the Brixham Cave excavation:

the foregoing investigation fully establishes in my mind an idea I have long held with regard to British barrows, that cutting through at once to the centre will in general prove inefficacious, though it may be accidentally successful. From the position of remains in those we have been considering, it is more than probable that had this plan been adopted by the excavators, owing to the magnitude of the mounds, they would have missed the articles; and, even had they driven horizontal shafts in different directions from the centre, it is fair to conjecture that the result would have been the same.

Many antiquaries dug a series of intersecting trenches, but others dug down in layers over the whole site, particularly when a large object was being explored. Antiquaries also understood the need for careful record-keeping: "I am sure the Society will appreciate [the care with which the facts have been collected and recorded] in common with all who in such matters have experienced the advantage of being furnished with a full statement of circumstances, and, on the contrary, have felt the embarrassment that frequently arises from non-attention to particulars."

Some articles in the *Archaeologia* give marginal attention only to these issues. Some minimise the attention given to discussing the excavation in order to concentrate on interpreting

---

66Neville, *Archaeologia* 32(1847), No. XX, p. 448-51.

67See Appendix Three, No. 1.


69See for example William Hamper, *Archaeologia* 25(1834), No. II, "Observations on certain ancient Pillars of Memorial, called Hoar Stones." pp. 24-60. Hamper did no excavation, but provided a survey of opinion about their functions, used philological and manuscript evidence alone to classify different kinds, and provided a long list which was meant to function as the start of a national directory. Thomas Phillipps, *Archaeologia* 26(1836), No. VIII, "Account of the Discovery of an Ancient Canoe at North Stoke, in Sussex," pp. 257-64 provides an inferior plan of the site, without scale, soils or measurements marked, and an inadequate description of the site where the artefact was discovered. Articles in the Appendices to volumes of the *Archaeologia* were mainly shorter. Some cut careful description short, though many more did not.
the objects found. But the preceding review suggests that many more antiquaries had exacting, careful field methods, that they used geological material competently in describing and interpreting sites, and that they did these things long before the Brixham Cave excavation could have set them an example. In evaluating articles in the *Archaeologia*, it is important to distinguish between those sites which were excavated by antiquaries, and those which antiquaries merely reported on. The presence of these articles may account in part for the portrait of antiquary archaeologists as having destructive field methods. In fact, many sites reported on were not excavated by antiquaries, but were brought to their attention by friends and neighbours. Many report hastening to the scene: "In the month of July last, while engaged in some antiquarian inquiries on the borders of Gloucestershire and Wiltshire, I accidentally heard of the discovery of sepulchral remains in the village of Kemble...I lost no time in proceeding to Kemble." C. Spence Bate was disgusted that: "[i]t was only...when they found some bronze articles, for which they anticipated receiving a few shillings, that they reported the discovery." From a sense of

---


71J.Y. Akerman, *Archaeologia* 37/1(1857), No. IX, "An Account of the Discovery of Anglo-Saxon Remains at Kemble, in North Wilts; with Observations on a Grant of Land at Ewelme to the Abbey of Malmesbury by King Aethelstan, in the year 931." pp. 113-21, p. 113. See also his "Hearing by chance of this discovery, I proceeded to Filkins." 37(1857), No. XII, "An Account of Researches in Anglo-Saxon Cemeteries at Filkins, and at Broughton Poggs in Oxfordshire," pp. 134-39, p. 139. Akerman was among the wealthiest of antiquaries. Many others responded similarly, though they had fewer funds to support their efforts. See also "On hearing of this discovery I again proceeded to Bedford," John Evans, *Archaeologia*, 39/1(1863), No. IV, p. 70.

72Bate, *Archaeologia* 40/2(1866), No. XXXIII. "On the Discovery of a Romano-British Cemetery near Plymouth." pp. 501-10, p. 501. Engineers in charge of the site would only let Bate watch, take notes, and take the better articles to the Plymouth Museum. See a similar account by George Rolleston, *Archaeologia*, 42/2(1869), No. XXI, "Researches and Excavations carried on in an Ancient Cemetery at Frilford, near Abingdon, Berks., in the years
the importance of reporting all sites and finds, antiquaries reported on these to their community. But since they were not present at the excavation, they could only report second hand information about the site. Many authors of such articles deplored the casual methods employed, and had little choice but to concentrate on evaluating the objects found. Jabez Allies, for example, reporting on a funerary urn taken from a barrow, noted: "it is said that the arrow heads were not found in the urn, but among the bone and ashes. It is thought that the urn contained a portion at least of the bones and ashes; but, owing to its having been broken by the plough, the fact cannot now be ascertained." This kind of excavation does not represent antiquarian standards.


See for example, Nathaniel Gould, "Ancient Vessels of Earthenware," Archaeologia 32(1847), Appendix. p. 402, found in excavating for the Eastern Counties Railway; and Ellis, Archaeologia 33(1849). No. XIII, "Account of a Gold Torque found in Needwood Forest in Staffordshire," pp. 175-76, on an artefact dug up by a fox and brought to his attention by the Keeper of Needwood Forest. Finds in Europe were also brought to antiquaries’ attention. See Lord Albert Conyngham, Archaeologia 33(1849), No. XII, "An Account of Various Objects of Antiquity, found near Amiens, in France, in the Spring of 1848," p. 174: "I forward herewith ten objects of antiquity found sometime since in France. They were discovered by labourers employed on the railroad." See also Albert Way, "Account of the Discovery of an Armilla of Pure Gold, in Clearing a Coppice near Wendover in Buckinghamshire in 1847," Archaeologia 33(1849), Appendix, pp. 347-49. The armilla was turned up in ploughing a field; the farm owner alerted Way, who reported it to the SA. See also "this building was unfortunately demolished before heard of it, but the following dimensions which I had from recollection are probably nearly correct," F.W.L. Thomas, Archaeologia, 34/1(1851), No. XIII, p. 117; Samuel Birch, Archaeologia 34/2(1851), No. XXIII, "On a Silver Disc from Tarentum, in the possession of Henry Vint," pp. 265-72; A.W. Franks, Archaeologia 36/2(1855), No. XXIX, "Notes on Bronze Weapons found on Arreton Down, Isle of Wight." pp. 326-31.

See for example, John Gage, Archaeologia 26(1836), No. XXII, "Letter...accompanying a Gold British Corselet exhibited to the Society, and since purchased by the Trustees of the British Museum," pp. 422-31. Gage reports as fully as he can on the site, including trench depths and the placement of several skeletons on the site floor, but can only regret the poor excavation techniques and lack of care in preserving artefacts. In other cases, antiquaries report on sites in other parts of the world. See for example, Hudson Gurney, Archaeologia 30(1844), No. VII, "Letter...accompanying Casts of Eight Punic Inscriptions found on the Site of Carthage," pp. 111-112, in which Gurney reports on copies of inscriptions he received from a Danish Naval Captain and former Consul-General in Tunis, M. de Falbe; Samuel Birch, Archaeologia 30(1844), No. XIII, "Letter...communicating an Account of certain Antiquities excavated, under his direction, in the Island of Sacrificios: followed by a Report upon the examination of them, by Samuel Birch," pp. 138-43, an account of vases and other artefacts Birch saw at Nepean’s residence; Charles Roach Smith, Archaeologia 30(1844), No. XXI, "On a recently opened Tumulus in the neighbourhood of Asterabad, forming part of ancient Hyrcania, and the country of the Parthians," pp. 248-55.

Van Riper argued that the reluctance to theorise about artefacts and sites identified backwardness in nineteenth-century archaeological work. He noted that the Victorian revival of Baconism predisposed many "lesser" men to view all theorising as premature. At this time the Biblical account of the earth was straining to contain the extra-theological worlds indicated by the scientific study of the past. The two issues--Christian theology, and the age of the earth and its inhabitants--were related. Nineteenth-century archaeology had to confront both. The confrontation may be traced in the terms archaeologists used to describe human antiquity. Different terms indicate different theoretical positions about the age of the earth and its inhabitants. Antiquaries inherited some terms from their eighteenth-century predecessors. But while their articles tended to understate the controversy, their use of terms and of theories shows that they accepted a Lyellian view of the antiquity of the earth, and the Danish three-age chronology. They were not theoretically backward.

Nineteenth-century archaeologists had to find new ways to describe early human history. In its simplest form, the problem was one of terminology. In interpreting the contents of any pre-Roman site, antiquaries had to find appropriate names for the makers of these sites. Camden's starting place had been the names of British tribes recorded in the time of Caesar, but those ancient records had noted indications in the landscape and the traditions of Britons which pointed to an even greater antiquity. Eighteenth-century antiquary William Stukeley had begun to distinguish types of pre-Roman sites. He had suggested an arrangement which grouped very simple sites like barrows and cromlechs, more complex sites like chambered tombs, and very complex sites like Stonehenge or Avebury. Naturally, this suggested a temporal progression, and

provided the basis for a chronology of Celtic, or pre-Roman Britain. But in describing the more complex pre-Roman sites as "Druidical," Stukeley had speculated well beyond his data, and characterised them culturally, assigning rites of human sacrifice and cannibalism to them. In his time, "Druid" described the culture of the makers of complex pre-Roman sites. By 1830, these sensational views had perished. But the problem Stukeley had identified, of the relative antiquity of pre-Roman remains, persisted. Of the several meanings attached to the term "Druid," as it is found in antiquaries' work in the 1830s, the chronological was the primary sense. It dated a site generally as pre-Roman, and was used interchangeably with Camden's term, "Celtic." 

In a more complex sense, nineteenth-century terminology reflected both scientific and theological theoretical issues which were then difficult to resolve. The names nineteenth-century antiquaries gave to site makers reflected their views about "the degree of antiquity" of these sites. Lyell's work, like Hutton's before him, had suggested a "degree of antiquity" for the earth and for animal life which went well beyond the accepted Biblical chronology. Most antiquaries did not avoid this sensitive issue, but attempted to appraise "the degree of antiquity"

---

77 Respect for Stukeley's systematic field technique, still considered the foundation of nineteenth-century "scientific" archaeology, may have predisposed antiquaries to use his term in articles on the complex sites Stukeley had done important work on. And "Druid" may indicate some resistance to Lyell's expanded timeframe for human history, and to Worsae's progressionist account of that history, though this is not visible in any article. See for example, John Rickman, Archaeologia 28(1840), No. XV, "On the Antiquity of Abury and Stonehenge," pp. 399-419, p. 405. Rickman's article is discussed below: Avebury had been designated a Druid site by Stukeley, and it may have been respect for their opinions, with which he differed, that caused Rickman to use this term. William Roots, Archaeologia 30(1844), No. XXXIII, "Some Relics of Remote Times, found in the bed of the River Thames, between Kingston and Hampton Court." pp. 490-93, uses "barbarian" to distinguish the Britons from the Romans, p. 491.

78 Its use cannot be taken as evidence for antiquaries' terminological or theoretical backwardness, then, especially as some antiquaries used it along with the terms of the three-age system. In this context, "Druidical" denoted the three ages taken as a whole. And the term was rarely used after the end of the 1830s. In 1841, Charles Henry Hartshorne noted that "Druid," in its merely chronological sense, was acceptable but outdated. Hartshorne, Salopia Antiqua J.W.Parker: London, 1841, Preface. W.M. Wylie started his article with a criticism of the term "Druid," but characterised it as outdated, looking back at eighteenth-century archaeology with distaste. He rejoiced that "archaeology has at length cast off such erring traditions." Wylie, Archaeologia 36/1(1855), No. XV, p. 129. Wylie also noted that, in the past, "nor were matters better in France," p. 129.

79 This phrase and similar ones occur in many articles. See for example, Thomas Phillipps, Archaeologia 26(1836), No. VIII, p. 261.
of a site and of artefacts excavated.\textsuperscript{80} From the 1830s, the phrase "the remotest antiquity" appears often in articles interpreting pre-Roman sites, reflecting a Lyellian sense of chronology. This phrase does not necessarily suggest rejection of the Biblical account of human history: the expulsion from Eden, the flood, the dispersal from Babel, and other Old Testament events could be fitted into an expanded time frame.

In some cases, antiquaries' use of such terms can mislead. Akerman wrote uniformly of "barrows of the primeval period.\textsuperscript{81}\textsuperscript{81} But Wylie used "heathen ages" synonymously with "primeval." The former term was not the reflection of a narrow religious conviction: he discussed Worsaae's \textit{Primeval Antiquities} in his article, and supported the Danish system, even though he was working on an early medieval site at this time. For Wylie, the two terms "heathen ages" and "primeval" simply meant "pre-Christian" in a historical sense. He may have referred to this chronological boundary in casual terms, but he was clearly aware of the importance of the dating and terminological issues in interpreting the excavation.\textsuperscript{82} Antiquaries' terms can be misleading, then, in that they can appear religiously informed where in fact they do not function to introduce a religious chronology into articles.

In the terms they used, and in the relation of these terms' geological to their religious

\textsuperscript{80}John Sydenham, for example, comparing barrows in Dorset and Kent, wrote: "I incline, therefore, to the opinion, that these barrows are the remains of the very earliest of the tribes which peopled Britain." Sydenham, \textit{Archaeologia} 30(1844), No. XXIV, "An Account of the opening of some Barrows in South Dorsetshire," pp. 327-38, p. 337. By comparison, Thomas Phillipps sensed only a small temporal degree between pre-Roman and Roman sites. "It seems to me, that we may safely regard [this canoe] as a relic of the aboriginal Britons, wrought before, or soon after, the arrival of the Romans among them." Thomas Phillipps, \textit{Archaeologia} 26(1836), No. VIII, p. 262. Phillipps seems to have held a progressivist view of early human history: "with regard to the degree of antiquity which may be ascribed to [this canoe], there are but slight means of judging, or even forming satisfactorily a probable conjecture; excepting from its structure, its situation, and condition when found, and the knowledge we have of vessels similarly constructed by men in an uncivilised state...The extreme simplicity of its construction indicates its having been the product of an early or rude condition of man..." p. 261. Phillipps compares this canoe with specimens from other parts of Britain and from Virginia.

\textsuperscript{81}Akerman, \textit{Archaeologia} 36/1(1855), No. XVII, p. 176, 182.

\textsuperscript{82}Wylie, \textit{Archaeologia}, 36/1(1855), No. XV.
dimensions, then, antiquaries were theoretically competent, but understated. Before 1860, antiquarian writing is notable for seeming to presume a Lyellian sense of the antiquity of the earth, but not remarking on it. After 1860, they are notable for presuming the extreme antiquity of man, but remarking on it blandly. Only one article, published in 1861, shows signs that its author was nervous of the connections between geological chronology and Christianity. As this issue was among the most significant and controverted of the Victorian period, the fact that antiquaries' did not acknowledge it is in itself an important way of characterising their work.

The reason antiquaries are hard to locate in this important Victorian debate is that their articles presented antiquarian information to fit an antiquarian arrangement. Of archaeological articles published in the Archaeologia, 1830-70, only two authors mention their Christian faith in interpreting their site. Both contain more description and analysis of sites than religious comment, and doctrine does not form their interpretations of their sites. The article by Reverend John Bathurst Deane, for example, published in 1834, employed a religious sociology rather than a Christian orthodoxy to interpret the extensive remains at Carnac in Brittany. Deane argued that a large number of contemporaneous sites in Britain, Brittany, and around the Mediterranean sea, could be described as round or rectangular. He also argued, incorrectly but with a certain sophistication, that these corresponded to religious sites: "the figure of the temple is the

---

83 Only a few articles discuss terminology, and these are later in the period, when the long view of human history had been accepted. John Evans' article in Archaeologia 38/2(1861), no. XX, "On the Occurrence of Flint Implements in undisturbed Beds of Gravel, Sand and Clay," pp. 280-307, shows signs of concern about the implications of the three-age system for Christian belief. He had read this article as a paper to the Society in July, 1859. It received some hostile response in the Athenaeum (July 16, 1859). The version printed in the Archaeologia in 1860 had several cautious circumlocutions treating the issue of early human history in the opening pages, though these do not interfere with the three-age structure of Evans' argument.

84 John Bathurst Deane, Archaeologia 25(1834), No. XII. Deane compares Avebury and Silbury Hill in Wiltshire, Stanton Drew near Bristol, Merivale in Dartmoor, and other sites in the Mediterranean to support his theory. The other article is Thomas Lewin, Archaeologia 41(1867), No. VII, "The Genuineness of the Holy Sepulchre," pp. 116-34.
hierogram of its God." Thus the two configurations must correspond to two contemporaneous but different religious and social groups, based in sun-worship and snake worship.

Deane's interpretation of the site is not informed by received Church of England doctrines, or limited to a narrow Biblical sense of chronology, or restricted to the Biblical record for its interpretation of snake-worship. He employs Camden's term "Celtic," rather than Biblical terms to characterise these two groups. His antiquarianism is more in evidence than his faith: "I cannot but hope, that the day is not far distant when, by a cordial cooperation with the Antiquaries of Brittany, our Society may be enabled to clear away the mist which envelops the early history of the Celtic religion." In the one place where his faith comes to the fore, it casts Christianity as Truth and other religions as idolatry, but departs from orthodoxy by postulating a place for "superstition" within the circle of Christian Truth, even employing a Pauline text to defend this position:

I am persuaded that the more intimate is our knowledge of the esoteric mysteries of this powerful superstition, the more cause we shall have for "holding fast the profession of our own faith"; for with all its corruptions it approached nearer to the Truth than any other idolatrous worship; and exhibits "as in a glass darkly" almost every important feature of the first religion of man.

The preceding discussion has shown that antiquaries tended towards understatement in

---

85 John Bathurst Deane, *Archaeologia* 25(1834), No. XII, p. 191.

86 This was a common archaeological notion at this time. See "the once almost universal Ophite worship, the accurate history of which still continues to be a desideratum in archaeology," W.H. Smyth, *Archaeologia* 33(1849), No. VII, "On the Designation of 'Cold Harbour,'" pp. 125-28, p. 128.

87 John Bathurst Deane, *Archaeologia* 25(1834), No. XII, p. 229. Deane's anthropology is hard to describe in the terms of nineteenth century debates because his remarks on this subject are few. He does not allow the reader to conclude that he held a theory of the degeneration of peoples, that he was particularly ethnocentric or materialist, that he used a late version of the Great Chain of Being, or had either a progressive or an evolutionary notion of culture. In large part, the inability to discern Deane's anthropology is due to the fact that description of the site takes up most of the article. However, this in itself indicates the relative place that Deane, a religious archaeologist, assigned to the technical and theoretical parts of archaeological reporting.

88 John Bathurst Deane, *Archaeologia* 25(1834), No. XII, p. 229.
expressing their views in this matter, but also had a sophisticated awareness of terminological questions as they affected the archaeological subject. Nor can antiquaries be described as theoretically backward, as they were using the three-age system in the decade before Worsaae was translated into English. As has been noted, for nineteenth-century archaeologists, comparison with other sites, in order to establish commonalities in the kinds of objects, their placement, composition, situations and so on, provided the only ground for constructing a chronology and typology of sites. The Danish archaeological theories which Van Riper declares antiquaries and historical archaeologists failed to appreciate were based in the comparative method. In fact, most archaeological articles in the Archaeologia were comparative. Charles Roach Smith wrote: "the best foundation for successful investigation is in combined and accumulated facts recorded and preserved for reference, and forming, as it were, the statistics of antiquities." Augustus Wollaston Franks wrote: "it is only by carefully comparing the remains of this class with such as are known to have been discovered together, that we are enabled to fix their relative ages, or the purpose for which they are made." Antiquaries understood what they were comparing and why: "it is not the mere novelty of type that gives value to such objects, but...the repetition and constant occurrence which can alone warrant sound conclusions and classification."

For the most part, then, antiquaries were not theoretically backward, compared to their British and continental counterparts. References to European archaeological work are common

---

88Smith, Archaeologia 30(1844), No. XI, "An Account of some Antiquities found in the neighbourhood of Sandwich, in the county of Kent," pp. 132-36, p. 136. Smith compares these to the finds of the Breach Down Tumuli reported on in article No. III. It should be noted that by "facts," Smith means the objects themselves.

89Franks, Archaeologia 36/2(1855), No. XXIX. By comparison, "the deficiency of any extensive series of British antiquities, accessible for purposes of comparison, precludes the possibility of fixing, with any precision, the date of remains of this early [iron] age." Albert Way, Archaeologia 34/1(1851), No. XII, "Notice of a Bronze Beaded Collar, found in Lochar Moss, Dumfriesshire," pp. 83-87, p. 87.

90C.R. Smith, Archaeologia 34/1(1851), No. XI, "Notes on Saxon Sepulchral Remains found at Fairford, Gloucestershire," pp. 77-82, p. 77.
in their articles. William Michael Wylie declared that British archaeologists "are greatly indebted to their learned confrères in France and Germany." In interpreting their sites, many use European sites to provide the context for interpreting British sites. Many antiquaries excavated with, and corresponded with European archaeologists.

See for example, "[O]ur more zealous antiquaries are ever seeking to increase our still scanty stock of information on this all-important subject, by such comparison with the remains of the cognate races of continental Europe as the isolated efforts of individuals may effect...The zealous writings of the Abbé Cochet, and Dr. Rigoletot, in France, and of Herr Lindenschmit, in Germany, have rendered infinite service," in W.M. Wylie, Archaeologia, 36/1(1855), No. XV, p. 129. Wylie was working with the notes and drawings of previous German excavators. For articles using continental archaeologists' work, see C.T. Beke. Archaeologia 32(1847), No. V; Samuel Birch. Archaeologia 32(1847), No. XVII, "Observations on Two Bas Reliefs of Assyrian Sculpture removed from Khorsabad." pp. 168-82; F.W.L. Thomas, Archaeologia, 34/1(1851), No. XIII, p. 117; Akerman, Archaeologia 34/2(1851), No. XVII, "On some of the Weapons of the Celtic and Teutonic Races." pp. 171-89; J.M. Kemble, Archaeologia 36/2(1855). No. XXXII, "On some remarkable Sepulchral Objects from Italy, Styria, and Mecklenburgh." pp. 349-69 on the Ninth Yearly Report of the Historical and Antiquarian Society of Schwerin.


See among myriad examples, J.Y. Akerman. Archaeologia 34/1(1851), No. II. "Account of the Discovery of Roman and other Sepulchral Remains, at the Village of Stone, near Aylesbury, Buckinghamshire," pp. 21-32. Akerman uses Italian excavations of Roman and Etruscan sites to interpret his site.


John Yonge Akerman corresponded with Captain Von Dürich of the Royal Wirtemberg Engineers regarding the dating of certain kinds of tumuli. See Akerman, Archaeologia 36/1(1855), No. XVII, pp. 185ff. Charles Roach Smith, trying to identify the use of a bronze instrument found in the Thames bank, "lost no opportunity of bringing it before the notice of those, whose acquaintance with the works of ancient art, in foreign museums and collections, I had hoped might have assisted my endeavours." This proved useless, but Smith added a postscript to his note: "While the above is in the press, by means of Mr. Edwin Keats; who during a 16 months tour, has sought in vain for something analogous to the instrument in the museums of the chief cities and towns of Italy, I am favoured with a communication from Professor Migliorini, of Florence..." Migliorini thought the forceps had the components of a calendar engraved upon them. Smith. "Bronze Forceps Found in Bed of Thames," Archaeologia 30(1844).
Stuart Piggott’s history of antiquarian archaeology declares: “It was not until late in the nineteenth century...that the basic classification of prehistoric artifacts could take place.”

Classification systems have histories, waxing and waning according to their utility within their social context. The failure of past systems to function as well as later systems is an inadequate perspective for an historical evaluation of them. As will be seen, antiquaries were among those pushing for the development of classification systems for prehistoric artifacts. But even in the 1830s, many used the Danish three-age system. In 1836, before Worsaae had been translated into English, Thomas Phillipps used the three-age system to evaluate the antiquity of an early canoe excavated in a river bed in Sussex. By the late 1840s, the three-age system is found commonly in articles, and is taken as conventional rather than being argued for.

By about 1850, the three-age system was a standard part of antiquarian analysis. But from the late 1840s, it had received some criticism for being too elementary. Some antiquaries

Appendix, pp. 549, 550. See A.W. Franks, Archaeologia 36/2(1855), No. XXIX, for his use of J.M. Kemble to look for certain artefacts in German museums. p. 329.


[[It is adverse to reason to suppose that [constructing a canoe by digging out a whole log] should ever be done after the use of iron tools in dividing trees into planks, and the advantage of constructing vessels with wood so divided, became known and practised.” Phillipps, Archaeologia 26(1836), No. VIII, p. 262. Phillipps proposes a diffusionist account of technological change: early Britons got metal-working from people on the coast of northern France, who had received it in turn from pre-Roman mediterranean peoples.

Henry Ellis reported on his discussions with Worsaae during the Danish archaeologist’s visit to the British Museum, about artefacts found in Danish barrows as compared with English barrows, and used the three-age system to date artefacts described in his articles. His remarks betray no sign that Worsaae’s opinions might be controversial in the antiquarian community. See Ellis, Archaeologia 32(1847), No. VIII, “Letter... upon a Gold Ornament found near Mundesley, in Norfolk,” pp. 64-68.

In 1851, Albert Way wrote: “We may without hesitation assign this collar to the period distinguished by Worsaae and the antiquaries of the North as the iron age.” Way, Archaeologia 34/1(1851), No. XII, p. 86. Daniel Wilson used the three-age system to classify artefacts in his Archaeology of Northern Britain, see Evans, A History, p. 280. See also Lord Londesborough, Archaeologia 34/2(1851), No. XXI; W.M. Wylie on Worsaae’s Primeval Antiquities in Archaeologia, 36/1(1855), No. XV, p. 129; John Sydenham, Archaeologia 30(1844), No. XXIV, who uses grave utensils to date some practices as contemporaneous, and to date barrows at his site and in Dorset and Kent relative to each other. He concluded they were “manifestly” (p. 337) “the antient sepulchres of the earliest fathers of the land.” p. 328.
tried to sophisticate it by type of weapon, location and other factors as well. John Yonge Akerman, for example, argued that "the period which has been termed by antiquaries the Bronze age should be subdivided" by artefact type.\textsuperscript{101} He viewed a mere timeline as just the beginning of inquiry: "without such comparison [of artefact types] many obscure points will remain unexplained...though historians may give us the outline of events, many details are wanting which, imperfectly alluded to by them as unimportant, are in our time worthy of minute inquiry."\textsuperscript{102} He also sought a way of relating dating by substance to production technique, as it was possible that older practices might persist alongside newer practices for long periods.\textsuperscript{103}

Antiquaries, then, were not only competent, but critically engaged. And what other historians have presented as weakness is really a sign of the vigour and sophistication of antiquarian archaeological theorising. Many twentieth-century historians of archaeology have used Thomas Wright’s 1861 \textit{Essays on Archaeological Subjects}, in which he criticised the three-age system, to suggest that antiquaries had still not accepted it by this date. But Wright was a part of the antiquarian reaction against the simplicity of the three-age system.\textsuperscript{104} His criticisms show important perceptions about interpreting archaeological objects and sites, and about the different reception of the cognate fields of geology and archaeology in Victorian society. Wright declared

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{101}Akerman, \textit{Archaeologia} 34/2(1851), No. XVII. p. 172.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{102}Akerman, \textit{Archaeologia} 34/2(1851), No. XVII. p. 189.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{103}Akerman wrote: "The presence of fragments of pottery, well-baked and turned in a lathe, forbids our assigning [this barrow] to a very early period, and most assuredly not to the more ancient inhabitants of the district, the aboriginal Britons; but the negative evidence which this supplies leads us to no safe conclusion." See \textit{Archaeologia} 36/1(1855), No. XVII. p. 185.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{104}Wright is aware of the history of opinion on this subject in his community: "[T]he system adopted by the antiquaries of the north...has been rather hastily accepted by some of our own writers on antiquarian subjects." Wright, \textit{Essays on Archaeological Subjects}. J.R. Smith: London, 1861, p. 10. It is tempting to evaluate Wright’s work as a response to developments in natural history in the 1850s. However, his book is a compilation of papers published over that decade, and of work which began even earlier. Evans argued similarly in 1863, that it was the task of the antiquary to subdivide and classification the three-age system. John Evans, \textit{Archaeologia}, 39/1(1863), No. IV, p. 83.}
\end{footnotes}
that classifying all stone, bronze or iron objects together was "unnatural as well as un-historical" as it destroyed important information about each artefact.\textsuperscript{105} Objects could be understood fully only in relation to all data available for the site where they were found. The association of objects with their location permitted a rich ethnological interpretation, and was therefore a better system of identification. Wright was arguing, then, for a minute appreciation of what was unique about each object. Thus his critique of Worsaae was a critique of a comparative method that was too crude.

Wright viewed the interpretation of objects merely by their substance as a "hasty generalisation," driven by the need to arrange them for viewing in museums:

The proper, and the only correct, arrangement of antiquities is, no doubt, the ethnological one. Relics of antiquity should be classed according to the peoples and tribes to whom they are known or believed to have belonged, and to the localities in which they are found, and then only have they any intelligible meaning...But people have been adopting a practice of placing flint implements with flint implements, bronze with bronze, and iron with iron, until, forgetting entirely the real elements which give them an individual meaning, they begin to look at them just as if they were so many fossils belonging to such and such geological strata, and thus form systems which are pretty and attractive to look at, but which, in truth, belong only to the imagination.\textsuperscript{106}

Wright had observed the dominance of scientific concerns over antiquarian, in the social realm in which the work of both intellectual domains was received. But unlike John Evans, who could embrace a viewed of geology as an older brother, Wright perceived, and wanted to insist upon, an important difference between geological and archaeological objects.\textsuperscript{107} For geologists, each individual example of a particular fossil was about as valuable as every other in its contribution

\textsuperscript{105}"If...we wish to understand these relics, we must look at those of each locality by themselves, and pay attention in each case to the circumstances connected with them individually," Wright, Essays, p. 10, 11. Classifying according to substance alone could provide only a "low degree" of information about the societies that produced the object. Wright. Essays, p. 12.

\textsuperscript{106}Wright. Essays, p. 11.

\textsuperscript{107}A factor contributing to Wright's relations with orthodoxy was his Wesleyan Methodist faith.
to understanding the geological record. It was the existence of fossils of a certain type, rather than the individual characteristics of each specimen, that was of use to geologists in establishing the date of strata. The practice of both fields was to acquire further knowledge by relating specific instances to a developing system. But geological evaluation tended to devalue the individuality of specimens in favour of their generic character in doing this. Because archaeologists had begun to adopt the perspective of geologists, much important archaeological information was being lost. Wright’s remarks suggest this loss of the historical and ethnological parts of archaeological knowledge is an effect of the social dominance of scientific conceptions.

Wright had other problems with the three-age system as well. In particular, the use of iron in dating objects was problematic. The components for making bronze alloys were scarce in Britain; might early British peoples have discovered how to work iron before bronze? It had to be admitted that pre-Roman Britons were backward, as compared to other European peoples. Mediterranean peoples had metal-working centuries before the Britons, and classical sources noted that the Britons imported bronze alloy components from Europe throughout the Roman period. At many sites in Britain, bronze and iron implements had been found together, in the same stratum, suggesting that substance might indicate differences of class, tribe, or ceremonial or occasion rather than temporality. For these reasons, determining date by substance had to be sophisticated by attention to the location the objects came from.

Wright was not alone in urging the sophistication of classification systems by features other than mere age. The chapters of Charles Henry Hartshorne’s *Salopia Antiqua* reflected major

---

104Jabez Allies was uncertain about “the analogy of usage” of tools in determining simultaneity. Allies, *Archaeologia* 30(1844), No. XXXI, p. 461. Comparing this urn to some belonging to Richard Colt Hoare, Allies concluded that they were recent Celtic as opposed to “very antient” Celtic, but that the barrow also contained Belgic remains, by which he means a people living in southeastern England at the time of the Roman invasion, p. 461. He argued that burial customs changed more slowly in the northern parts of the country, and thus both are found contemporaneously in the same barrow.
temporal divisions, but were subdivided internally according to site type. John Yonge Akerman’s 1847 *Archaeological Index* identified "transition periods" between ages, when sites and artefacts showed mixed styles and components. Akerman called the three-age system "rational" but "inadequate," and arranged his discussion by site types.\(^{109}\) His discussion of pre-Roman sites, for example, distinguished nine types: tumuli and cairns, menhirs and peulvans, dolmens and triliths and lichvaens, sepulchral caves, rocking stones, stone circles, colossal figures, forts and camps and beacons, and objects found at these sites.

Antiquaries’ critical engagement with theory had led them to demand more of archaeological classification systems. Their critical engagement also allows us to see their conception of the archaeological subject, as distinct from the geological subject, and their view of the appropriate relations of both historical and scientific material in forming conclusions on archaeological subjects. Wright was not alone in mounting some resistance to an unnecessary dominance of scientific analysis in certain parts of archaeological work. In 1851, George Biddel Airy, the then Astronomer Royal, who was not an antiquary, presented a paper to the SA on the probable landing place of Caesar on his invasion of Britain.\(^{110}\) He considered the question from the point of view of the tides, as Caesar’s point of departure from Gaul, and the day, month and time of sailing, were recorded in classical sources. Airy concluded that Pevensey Beach, Kent, was the point of Caesar’s landing, and appended a statement about the Battle of Hastings, speculating on Caesar’s and Harald’s military strategy in these two proximate locations.

Unlike John Walker’s 1834 article on the identification of Flamborough Head as a Roman Port, Airy did not discuss changes to the coastline between the time of Caesar and the nineteenth

---


\(^{110}\) Airy, *Archaeologia* 34/1(1851), No. XX, “On the Place of Julius Caesar’s Departure from Gaul for the Invasion of Britain, and the Place of his Landing in Britain: with an Appendix on the Battle of Hastings,” pp. 231-50.
century. But the coast from Hythe to Dungeness was notable for its marshiness. Saxon and medieval documents as well as excavations had showed that this coastline had expanded into the Channel, in some places by as much as a mile, since medieval times. It might have altered between Roman and medieval times as well. Such changes could have affected currents in the Channel, which might have landed Caesar elsewhere before the growth of the marsh. These issues were pointed out at the next SA meeting by W.D. Durrant, and printed as the paper following Airy's. Responding to Durrant, Airy dismissed the coastline issue, asserting that the beach in question was "sound ground." The "controversy" was taken up again in 1863. A naval survey of the coast for two miles either side of Pevensey beach was undertaken, as well as tidal and current observations. Airy's response to this work was triumphant: "I would first observe that the result of this investigation proves the advantage of the course pursued by the President and Council, namely, that of referring to official authority for the determination of critical points...Nautical men know." But objections were again raised in the very next paper. Thomas Lewin questioned the validity of the survey because it was taken 1.5 miles offshore where the text made it clear Caesar's observations were made within sight of shore, and because some naval observations were taken the fifth rather than the fourth day before the full moon, which was when Caesar had landed, which might have affected the duration of the westward

---

111No primary author. Archaeologia 39/2(1863), No. XV, "Correspondence between the Society of Antiquaries and the Admiralty respecting the Tides in the Dover Channel, with reference to the Landing of Caesar in Britain, B.C. 55: together with Tables for the Turning of the Tide-stream off Dover, made in the year 1862," pp. 277-302, p. 277. This article is a series of letters between the Admiralty and the SA, with appendices on surveying, tides and weather. William Henry Smyth was in the uncomfortable position of being both Director of the SA and an officer of the Admiralty.

112Airy. Archaeologia 39/2(1863), No. XVI, "Observations on the Question of the Spot at which Caesar landed, as affected by the Communication received from the Admiralty on the Tides in the Channel," pp. 303-08, p. 303.

current at ebb-tide. Both were crucial to determining how far the current would have carried Caesar's ships along the shoreline. These considerations, coupled with indications from an account of Caesar's second sailing from Gaul, and recent archaeological excavations, again suggested Hythe as a possible landing place. The controversy was not settled, and Airy withdrew from the discussion. However, this exchange of ideas between antiquaries and the Admiralty does suggest that antiquaries were cautious in proceeding towards a conclusion, and attended to a large number of particulars in integrating scientific and historical material.

In many cases, interpreting archaeological sites was complex. Unlike the sites geologists examined, most sites antiquaries dealt with were relatively shallow, making it harder to date objects found and to attribute simultaneity. Many sites had been in continuous use, some for centuries. Antiquaries knew that these sites were difficult to interpret, and were cautious in attributing dates to the different levels of these sites. John Yonge Akerman, excavating Roman and Anglo-Saxon sites, wrote: "frequently the objects which have been spared by time

114In a later article, Lewin examined changes in the Romney Marsh area, using Geological and Ordnance maps in conjunction with philological, textual and archaeological evidence. See Lewin, Archaeologia, 40/2(1866), No. XXIII. "On the Position of the Portus Lemanis of the Romans," pp. 361-74.

115Earl Stanhope reconsidered the question in Archaeologia 41(1867), No. XIII. "On the Day of Caesar's Landing in Britain," pp. 270-74, noting that French naval observations conflicted with those of the English survey. The "controversy" (p. 271), and the possibility that the landing place was Hythe, turned up in the Contemporary Review in September, 1865. In 1866, Charles Warne applied the same kinds of analysis to the question of where Vespasian landed. Warne, Archaeologia 41(1867), No. XIX. "Observations on the Details of Vespasian's First Campaign in Britain," 387-96.

116See, for example, Lord Albert Conyngham, Archaeologia, 30(1844), No. III. Akerman notes the presence of late Roman coins in the grave site, but writes: "interments may have commenced at a much earlier period," p. 55. Thomas Wright, Archaeologia 30(1844), No. XXX. "On Antiquarian Excavations and Researches in the Middle Ages," pp. 438-57. presents a history of medieval barrow-raiding, citing manuscript sources for the excavation of Verulamium by two eleventh century abbots, discussing their beliefs about the objects found, citing liturgical documents sanctifying these objects and the customs of reburying them with their medieval owners, noting that this "accounts for the discovery of mixed deposits of earlier and more recent deposits in one place." p. 440. Wright produced a second article on this topic in Archaeologia 33(1849), No. XIX. "On Some Early Notices relating to the Antiquities of St. Alban's," pp. 262-68. See also Wright, Archaeologia 32(1847), No. XXIV. "On the Legend of Weland the Smith." pp. 315-24. notes the site had pre-Celtic, Celtic and Anglo-Saxon interments, making its interpretation difficult. See also James Bruce Ross, A Study of the Medieval Attitude towards Antiquities, no publisher given: Chicago, 1934.
serve only to perplex us."\textsuperscript{117}

John Rickman's article on Avebury is a good example of the problems antiquaries had in trying to date levels of sites which had been continuously occupied for long periods. Avebury is the site of extensive pre-Roman monuments, including avenues and circles of standing stones, Silbury Hill, and West Kennet Long Barrow. The first stages of these structures were built about 3500 B.C.E., but the site was in continuous use until, and after, Roman times. Familiar with Danish archaeologists' theories, Rickman considered arguments "in favour of the remote antiquity of Abury."\textsuperscript{118} But as he saw it, the greater part of the available evidence pointed to a date close to the Roman occupation of Britain. In particular, the position of the Roman roads that ran through Avebury, and their path across several counties, did not appear to have been altered in their course in order to pass through Avebury. Noticing that one of these ran directly past the main circle, alongside one avenue, and past Silbury Hill, Rickman excavated the place where the Hill met the road. If the earthworks showed interruption, this would indicate that the Romans had driven their road through an older site. If they showed a relationship, this would indicate that the entire site might be Roman-built. It is now known that Silbury Hill was constructed in three stages, the first in the neolithic era when the circles, avenues and long barrow were also constructed, and the last some few centuries prior to the arrival of the Romans. Rickman's finding, that the place where Hill and road met seemed to have been constructed with reference to each other, reflects its genuine recency with regard to the Roman era, as well as Roman engineering for drainage and basement. Thus his conclusion, that the site was probably Roman,

\textsuperscript{117} Akerman, Archaeologia 34/2(1851), No. XVII. p. 171.

\textsuperscript{118} Rickman, Archaeologia 28(1840), No. XV, "On the Antiquity of Abury and Stonehenge," pp. 399-419, p. 405.
though wrong, can be seen as scholarly for 1838.\textsuperscript{119} 

Rickman adduces other arguments in favour of Roman construction, including the social organisation, population and transportation and construction machinery that would be required to achieve a construction of the magnitude of Avebury. He uses Worsaae's three-age system against him, noting that, while iron tools had been found nearby at Stonehenge, the shaping of such large menhirs, and the tooled marks found on them, would have required steel rather than iron, as would the kind of mortices and wedges used in construction.\textsuperscript{120} And Rickman viewed his suggested date of 200-300 C.E. as provisional, writing: "truth, or (its near adjunct) probability, is preferable to infinite wonder."\textsuperscript{121}

Antiquarian archaeology, then, was competent in both field methods and in theorising about the archaeological subject. Because antiquaries were critically engaged with their subject, their views about a satisfactory correspondence between theory and subject changed over time. It is possible to see three generations of archaeological thought within antiquaries' articles during the period 1830-70. Articles between about 1830 and 1850 use textual and philological information in forming conclusions, at times displacing the geological information they have also offered. These articles seem to view texts as the more reliable witnesses.\textsuperscript{122} By the late 1840s,
criticism of this view and procedure was voiced. A second generation of antiquarian archaeological thought is evident by about 1850. By this time, many antiquaries were seeking to sophisticate the three-age system, and concentrate on classifying artefacts by kind as well as by age. The increasingly minute attention to slight differences among pots, flints, weapons and other artefacts tended to depreciate the value of textual evidence. In 1851, for example, F.W.L. Thomas argued that previous archaeologists’ use of the Icelandic Edda and the Orkney Saga to interpret Orkney sites had produced a date which was far too late. On the basis of archaeological evidence, he identified them as contemporaneous with Stonehenge and Avebury. By the 1860s, the next generation of antiquarian archaeology was beginning to appear. Textual sources were rarely used in article on pre-Roman sites, either to confirm the archaeological record, or in a supporting role. Thomas Lewin, for example, had responded to Airy in the matter of Caesar’s landing with both textual and physical arguments. But in his 1866 article on Roman sites he used archaeological data to argue for the dates of arrival and departure of Romans from various British

Hawkins. *Archaeologia* 32(1847), No. XII. "Observations on the Use of the Sling, as a Warlike Weapon, among the Ancients...accompanying a Present to the Society of a Lead-en-pellet or Sling-bullet, found lodged in the Cyclopian Walls of Same in Cephalonia." pp. 96-107. Hawkins uses the writings of Pliny, Virgil, Ovid and others to describe different types of sling-pellets, and to determine the type found in Cephalonia. Henry Ellis, *Archaeologia* 33(1849), No. XIII. explored the texts of Livy. Aulus Gellius, Strabo, Dionysius Cassius and others in his attempt to date and classify this artefact.

123 See William Roots’ argument, in "Entrenched Camp on Wimbledon Common." *Archaeologia* 32(1847), Appendix, pp. 518-21, that evaluating the site according to Polybius’ account of roman construction techniques was poor method. Roots argued that the archaeological record showed that Roman castramentation methods varied, where the textual sources could not give such a clear account, and that these remains were probably not Roman at all, even though they were found in the vicinity of Roman remains, but were pre-Roman.

124 Thomas. *Archaeologia*, 34/1(1851), No. XIII, p. 112ff. Thomas' dating is fairly accurate, for his time. Orkney contains thousands of barrows, of many ages, but of the more visible ones, which Thomas was surveying and excavating, the Ring of Brodgar, Stenness, Skara Brae and Maes Howe were built around 2500 B.C.E. The most visible stage of construction at Stonehenge dates to about 2100 B.C.E.

125 See "To start, therefore, with the preconceived impression and to bring forward isolated allusions in ancient literature...will only produce a misleading result: because for all practical purposes the question is prehistoric and archaeological, and it is an affair of induction rather than special testimony," Henry Rhind, No. XVIII, p. 266. For a careful use of texts with archaeological evidence, see Thomas Lewin, *Archaeologia*, 40/2(1866), No. XXIII.
encampments. A small amount of textual information appears only. Of articles published in the 1860s, many report on large-scale excavations, in many parts of the world. The scale of comparison had become international. Excavations were often staffed by an international team. Antiquaries increasingly relied on osteological analysis to date sites. Discussions of the results of Brixham Cave and Wookey Hole appear in articles on early remains, without any apparent concern for the religious sensibilities of readers. The division of the stone age into palaeolithic and neolithic segments was used in classifying objects. The need for the subdivision of the three-age system both chronologically as well as by type is no longer argued for, but practised.

---


129 John Evans, for example, wrote of the “almost conclusive evidence of the co-existence of man with these extinct mammalia,” and dismissed the flood for lack of evidence. Evans, *Archaeologia* 38/2(1860), No. XX. p. 303.

130 See John Evans, *Archaeologia* 41/2(1867), No. XX, “On Some Discoveries of Stone Implements in Loch Neagh, Ireland,” pp. 397-408. Evans had excavated this site with the help of John Lubbock, who had helped to popularise the term palaeolithic.

131 See arguments in W.M. Wylie, *Archaeologia* 38/1(1860), No. XII, pp. 178-79, for dividing the stone age into two periods. John Evans, *Archaeologia*, 39/1(1863), No. IV, argues for classifying flints by the methods by which they were constructed. John Thurnam, for example, proposed a classification of barrows by age and form. Thurnam, *Archaeologia* 42/1(1869), No. IX, “On Ancient British Barrows, especially those of Wiltshire and the adjoining
This review of the scientific and historical parts of nineteenth-century antiquaries' archaeology has demonstrated that they had a competent field method, as evaluated by Victorian standards for the scientific study of the past. It has also shown antiquaries' critical engagement with theorising about artefacts and sites. Where critics like Van Riper have permitted a genealogical impulse to characterise their treatment of antiquaries' work, the preceding discussion has shown antiquaries' interpretations of their sites were complex, and changed in response to work done within and outside the community. As noted above, two features of Mary Jo Nye's model may add to our understanding of nineteenth-century antiquarian archaeology. They are: the role of visual aids in representing archaeological knowledge, and the place of social and political experiences in antiquaries' prosecution of their archaeological work. These are among several features of antiquaries' archaeological writing which reproduce the distinctive, traditional antiquarian program.132

Antiquaries' publications were lavishly illustrated.133 Antiquaries viewed illustration as an integral part of representing and understanding archaeological sites: "Even at the risk of appearing needlessly lavish, I would advocate the supply of the most copious illustrations... You must often have felt how comparatively worthless an elaborate verbal and written description has been rendered for the want of drawings: on the other hand, how much the rudest sketches

132For a discussion of this kind of analysis, see Bruce G. Trigger, Time and Traditions: Essays in Archaeological Interpretation, Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh, 1978.

133Articles on numismatics were unusually well-illustrated. See for example, Plates XXXV through LVII for the article by John Adamson, Archaeologia 25(1834), No. XVI; John Adamson, Archaeologia 26(1836), No. XIII, "Further Account of the Anglo-Saxon Coins, called Stycas, recently discovered at Hexham, in the County of Northumberland," pp. 346-48, Plates XXXVI to XLII; Edward Hawkins, Archaeologia 27(1838), No. XXI, "Letter...with an Account of some Saxon Pennies, and other Articles, found at Sevington, North Wilts," pp. 301-05, Plates XXIII. XXIV.
contribute to explain and make intelligible the most meagre and imperfect description." A few examples will illustrate the ways illustrations helped represent sites, and were engaged with many of the scientific issues discussed above. S.D. Saull’s excavation of a Roman wall was accompanied by "A Transverse Section of the Wall," on which he marked the dimensions of its layers, and the kinds of stone it was composed of (see Appendix Three, No. 2). W.M. Wylie’s engraving of the placement of objects around an interred body was somewhat unclear because it depicted small objects and also placed letters beside them, for reference to discussion in the text (see Appendix Three, No. 3). But C.R. Smith’s plan of his excavation of a cemetery in Marston St. Lawrence, Northamptonshire, placed skeletal remains on the site in the orientation in which they were found. The locations of the surveying equipment he used to produce this plan are included in the plan (see Appendix Three, No. 4). Evans’ plan of skeletons on the site floor illustrated the problem of interpreting sites where multiple burials had taken place over a long period (see Appendix Three, No. 5). J.Y. Akerman used symbols to indicate both placement of objects at the site, but also to subdivide them further by manner of

---

134 Thus, "the glass goblet or cup mentioned by Mr. Wylie can scarcely be described without the aid of an engraving." C.R. Smith, Archaeologia 34/1(1851), No. XI. "Notes on Saxon Sepulchral Remains found at Fairford, Gloucestershire," pp. 77-82, p. 77, 82. Elsewhere, he writes: "[T]he care with which the facts disclosed on that occasion have been collected and recorded, and the copious manner in which drawings have been made of the various objects discovered give an unusual degree of interest to this communication, which I am sure the Society will appreciate." C.R. Smith. Archaeologia 33(1849), No. XXV, p. 326. The first archaeological photograph of an object as it was found within the stratum was taken by John Evans, at an excavation site in France with Joseph Prestwich. See Joan Evans. A History, p.292.


136 Wylie, tr., Archaeologia 37/1(1857), No. VIII."Notes on the Interment of a Young Frankish Warrior, discovered at Envermeu, Seine Inferieure, on September 10, 1856, by the Abbé Cochet," pp. 102-12, p. 112.

137 C.R. Smith, Archaeologia 33(1849), No. XXV.

burial, and to map those burials which were hard to interpret (see Appendix Three, No. 6).  

F.W.L. Thomas combined elevations, plans and sections, in order to create a full representation of the "Picts' Houses" he had surveyed and excavated in Orkney (see Appendix Three, No. 7 and No. 8.) The same approach is used in J.S. Swann's article on tombs excavated in Malta, where he presents sections of three tombs along two horizontal and one vertical axis (see Appendix Three, No. 9), and in O. Morgan's representation of a Roman bath at Caerwent, in south Wales (see Appendix Three, No. 10).

In some cases, careful graphic representation represented an author's argument for interpreting a site. S.B. Gould's article on a hill fort in Spain discussed different techniques of encampment to argue that the fort was not Roman but Basque (see Appendix Three, No. 11). In 1836, William Mudge published on an ancient structure found submerged in an Irish bog. In 1860, his article would become part of a discussion among archaeologists across Europe, about upper stone age housing. However, in 1836, Mudge noted its great degree of antiquity, and concentrated on explaining and illustrating its construction, providing its position, elevations, dimensions and measurements (see Appendix Three, No. 12).

---


140 F.W.L. Thomas, Archaeologia 34/1(1851), No. XIII.

141 Captain John S. Swann, Archaeologia 40/2(1866), No. XXXI, "Description of Ancient Rock-Tombs at Ghain Tiffiha and Tal Horr, Malta." p. 483-87.

142 Octavius Morgan, Archaeologia 36/2(1855), No. XXXVI, "Excavations prosecuted by the Caerleon Archaeological Association within the Walls of Caerwent in the Summer of 1855," pp. 418-37.


144 See W.M. Wylie, Archaeologia 38/1(1860), No. XII.

Visual aids were also used to present and explore archaeological possibilities and ideas. Arthur Taylor’s article on Roman London used archaeological evidence in order to determine the extent of the Roman walls, and these were superimposed as shaded lines on a plan of London as it was in 1849.146 Akerman used his extensive numismatic knowledge to suggest that the Romans had used the incipient governmental regions of the pre-Roman British tribes to organise their camps. Using a basic map of England, he used coloured dots, boundary lines and shading to highlight the fact that both Roman and pre-Roman remains were concentrated in the same places.147

For antiquaries, then, visual aids were an integral part of representing and interpreting their excavation sites and the objects unearthed. Their commitment to fidelity in doing so reflected traditional antiquarian concerns. The continuity of antiquarian archaeology with the scholarly traditions of previous generations can also be seen in their presentation of social and political material in their articles. Antiquaries’ articles often reported on the broader context of their work. In some cases, as in Henry Rawlinson’s description of his mountaineering, these comments provide us with insight into how antiquaries fit into the society of their time. In many cases, antiquaries use these discussions of the reception of their work to present their own statement of how they understand their work and goals. These comments allow us to see what

146Taylor, Archaeologia 33(1849), No. VI. "On the original Site of Roman London," pp. 101-24. Taylor was aware of his map as suggestive, and did not claim factual authenticity for it: "The annexed Plan (Plate IV.) has unavoidably a character of more precision than is either professed or warranted by the inquiry it is intended to illustrate; and being founded on a survey which is probably far from correct, will in that respect be received with all necessary allowance," p. 124. Taylor receives a critical response in the following article, Smyth, Archaeologia 33(1849), No. VII. See a similar mapping project in William Tite, Archaeologia 39/2(1863), No. XXVIII, "Notes on the Discoveries of Roman Remains which have taken place at various times in London," pp. 491-502.

147Akerman, "On The Condition of Britain from the Descent of Caesar to the Coming of Claudius, accompanied by a Map of a portion of Britain in its ancient State, showing the finding of Indigenous Coins," pp. 177-90. See also his map of Saxon finds as compared to early land-grant deeds. Both are in Archaeologia 37/1(1857), No. IX, "An Account of the Discovery of Anglo-Saxon Remains at Kemble, in North Wilts; with Observations on a Grant of Land at Ewelme to the Abbey of Malmesbury by King Aethelstan. in the year 931," pp. 113-21.
motivated antiquaries to undertake the work they did. In a few cases, as with Frere’s paper on stone flints and Mudge’s excavation of a structure found in an Irish bog, information is communicated "accidentally," which, from a later perspective, can illuminate other sites.

But antiquaries had practical, archaeological reasons for communicating this information. In many cases, it was directly related to their ability to pursue archaeological work. C.T. Beke, for example, discussed the problems he had to survey a ruined Abyssinian temple, including the negative reactions of local priests and people to the apparatus and activities of surveying, to sketching, and to the production of images of the site. Beke noted that he had more success if he went by several times a day for short periods rather than working for long stretches, and if he desisted when asked rather than trying to argue or persuade. Similarly, John Lee detailed the troubles he had excavating on a Greek Island. In his case, the local military commandant supported his work, and Lee had official authority to excavate. But local officials viewed disturbing graves as sacrilegious, and threatened local labourers with imprisonment if they worked for Lee. Lee’s excavation partner was taken hostage, and his sketches of the excavation site torn up. Lee details his use of the commandant in eventually gaining municipal officials’ cooperation. John Bathurst Deane’s initial survey of Carnac, in Brittany, had introduced him to M. de Penhouët, Commander of the Gen-d’ Armerie of Rennes under Charles X. Penhouët was a Royalist. Deane notes that, on their second trip, Penhouët:

> was very anxious, but quite unable to accompany us, having heard upon good authority, that if he ever ventured into that country [Brittany] again, he would be arrested as a Carlist...Our first appearance on the scene was certainly amusing. It was ridiculous to find that the introductory question to a native from whom we required any information must be, "Parlez-vous Française?" and no less laughable to see four men measuring with tapes and chains, a theodolite, when three languages were put in requisition to desire the

---

148 See Charles Tilstone Beke. *Archaeologia* 32(1847), No. V.

149 Lee. *Archaeologia* 33(1849), No. III.
surveyor's man to tighten the chain, or to move to the right of left!\textsuperscript{150}

Deane was harassed, chased, and interrogated by the local police. His observations on the political and language problems he faced both warned and encouraged others.

The history of negative reception of their work had sensitised antiquaries to their reception. When they remarked on problems they met with, they forewarned others in the community, and suggested ways of coping with a hostile reception. Their practice of reporting this kind of material allows us to see antiquaries, not as blundering amateurs, but as men sharply aware of the utility of political and social sensitivity. Their deliberate use of these skills to increase their chances of archaeological success may in fact suggest an image of them as complicit in the cultural plunder of various nations, but it is difficult to see them as mere dilettantes.

Antiquaries' use of visual aids and their comments about the reception of their work show the distinctively antiquarian nature of these archaeologists' work. Their visual aids helped to describe very precisely the kinds, extent, and character of archaeological remains. These were the basic elements of antiquarian histories. In some cases, visual aids were crucial in making an argument about where they should be placed within the overall structure that Camden had originated, and that had grown over the centuries. Antiquaries' comments about the reception of their work functioned rather like some Items of the 1637 Accord. They were intended to communicate important information to members of the community, and to warn about dangers to their work. In this case, it was not strangers unknown to the community, but their social and political reception.

There are several further aspects of antiquarian archaeology in which the distinctive

\textsuperscript{150}John Bathurst Deane, *Archaeologia* 25(1834), No. XII. p. 203.
features of the antiquarian textual tradition identified in Chapter Three can be seen. Nineteenth-century antiquaries repeat many of the commonplaces of the antiquarian textual tradition. Akerman quoted the sixteenth-century sensibility about the nature of antiquarian historical reconstruction: "that antiquities are like the fragments of a wreck thrown ashore by the waves of the ocean is especially applicable to the more minute objects which engage the attention of the archaeologist." Nineteenth-century antiquaries also acknowledged their intellectual genealogy: many articles begin their analysis by citing Camden, "Gibson’s Camden," Gough’s edition of Camden or Lysons’ edition of Camden. In fact, many dispute Camden’s assertions, but Camden had anticipated correction in the development of antiquarian studies, and it was a natural result of his meticulous, critical method. John Walker, noting the differences of opinion between Camden, Gough and Lysons, wrote: "I cannot err more egregiously than one at

---


152 See, among many examples, Henry Brandreth, Archaeologia 27(1838), No. VII, "Observations on the Roman Station of Magioventum," pp. 96-108, p. 99, 100. Joseph Hunter, Archaeologia 32(1847), No. II, "On the Site of Cambodunum," pp. 16-24. started with Camden in his survey of learned opinion, focusing on how Camden and others had treated their evidence. He argues, on the basis of an unpublished manuscript (Dodsworth LVIII) that Camden’s appreciation of field method was the more acute, and his location of the Roman site the more likely. See also John Evans, Archaeologia 42/2(1869), No. XX, "On Some Discoveries of Stone Implements in Loch Neagh, Ireland," pp. 397-408, p. 405-06; Thurnam, Archaeologia 42/1(1869), No. IX, "On Ancient British Barrows, especially those of Wiltshire and the adjoining Counties. (Part I. Long Barrows.)," pp. 161-244.

153 John Walker, Archaeologia 25(1834), No. VIII, "Observations to prove Filey Bay, in Yorkshire, the Portus Felix, or Sinus Salutaris; and Flamborough Head, the Ocellum Promontorium of the Romans," pp. 127-45, p. 128: J.Y. Akerman, Archaeologia 34/1(1851), No. II. p. 28.


155 John Walker, Archaeologia 25(1834), No. VIII. p. 138; William Tite, Archaeologia 40/2(1866) No. XVIII, passim.
least of those celebrated antiquaries." Other early antiquarian works are also cited as starting points for analysis, such as those of Stow, Llwyd, Douglas, and Stukeley.

Camden’s meticulous method can be seen in antiquaries’ care in the field and in representing and interpreting sites and objects. Camden’s chronology, of Celtic, Roman, Saxon and Medieval Britain can be seen to structure antiquaries’ archaeological chronology. In terms of genre, antiquarian archaeology was analogous to the antiquarian local histories which attempted to assemble all the available data on one place. Many articles present an account of their excavations by date and by site. Thus, F.W.L. Thomas’ account of his excavation of several sites in the Orkney Islands is arranged like an itinerary. The majority of articles dealing with excavations included a numbered descriptive list, analogous to the periodised list, of objects found at sites. And it was still the case that antiquarian work depended on private funding.

---


157G.R. Corner, *Archaeologia* 38/1(1860), No. III. "Observations on the Remains of an Anglo-Norman Building in the Parish of St. Olave, Southwark, hitherto assumed to have been the Hostelry of the Prior of Lewes, but now believed to have been the Manor House of the Earls of Warren and Surrey in Southwark," pp. 37-53, p. 37; William Tite, *Archaeologia* 39/2(1863), No. XXVIII, p. 491.

158See William Hamper, *Archaeologia* 25(1834), No. II.


162Thomass, 34/1(1851), No. XIII.

163Richard Cornwallis Neville’s article, *Archaeologia* 32(1847), No. XXVIII, contained a list of coins found, but did not describe this. The next article, by Charles Roach Smith, supplied the defect, *Archaeologia* 32(1847), No. XXIX. "Letter... on the British Coins found in 1845 at Chesterford." pp. 355-56. Smith’s remarks suggest he viewed Neville’s article as insufficient. Smith dates the coins in Neville’s finds on the basis of their inscriptions, which was
and cooperation. As W.M. Wylie noted, "What we possess is rather owing to the enterprise of individuals than the regular interchange of communications by societies."164

Antiquaries' traditional concern for collection and preservation is evident in many articles.165 Rawlinson's reason for attempting the most dangerous climb, to the Babylonian inscriptions at Behistun, was his belief that "the mass of rock on which the inscription is engraved bore every appearance, when I last visited the spot, of being doomed to a speedy destruction, water trickling down from above having almost separated the overhanging mass from the rest of the rock, and its own enormous weight thus threatening very shortly to bring it thundering down into the plain."166 Edward Hawkins, Keeper of Antiquities and Medals in the British Museum, deplored the dispersal of a find of more than 200,000 medieval coins near Tutbury, Staffordshire among various dealers and collectors, rather than their preservation in a museum.167 In another article, two years later, he voiced strong criticism of the contemporary trade in antiquities. "On Sunday afternoon, June 30, 1833, as four boys, under ten years of age, were playing at marbles in a small piece of pasture," they stumbled on a cache of Norman coins. Not knowing their value, they treated them as marbles, and threw a few in the village pond. Their

impossible from the scant information Neville supplied. this suggests Smith's view of the purpose of numismatics participated in the traditional antiquarian tasks.

164Wylie, *Archaeologia*, 37/1(1857), No. III, p. 31. See also "Such and investigation, full of interest as it doubtless would have been, was of course beyond the powers of our Society. Inquiry was nevertheless attempted," W.M. Wylie, *Archaeologia* 38/1(1860), No. XII, "On Lake-Dwellings of the Early Periods," pp. 177-87, p. 178.

165See for example, "The introduction of Christianity was followed by the destruction of almost all of them, as they were doubtless considered objects of idolatrous worship, and Pagan remains." William Chaffers, "Bronze Figure of an Archer," *Archaeologia* 30(1844), Appendix, pp. 443-44, p. 544.


elders discovered what the boys were playing with, and knowing they could sell them to dealers in antiquities, commenced a "regular scramble for the booty," which led within a few days to friction between the landowner and the treasure hunters. The dispute was only resolved by court order. Hawkins deplored the lack of reasonable law for treasure trove, noting that splitting such collections up means losses and greater difficulty in interpreting those that do eventually fall into the hands of numismatists. In this matter, as in their deliberate use of political and social cunning, antiquaries' single-minded devotion to their goals is notable, and in direct contrast to the portrait of them as dilettantes lacking commitment. As they saw it, few things mattered as much as preservation. Only one author in forty years expressed the conviction that "an interest in [antiquities'] conservation is daily gaining strength," and he was not himself an antiquary.

Antiquaries' concern for preservation led them into some political advocacy, supporting the view presented in Chapter Three, they nineteenth-century antiquaries had become more confident in defending the antiquarian vision in the public realm. Writing about some casual mercantile excavations into the iron age tomb Maes Howe, in Orkney, Thomas wrote:

168 Edward Hawkins, *Archaeologia* 26(1836), No. I. "Description of a large collection of Coins of William the Conqueror, discovered at Beaworth, in Hampshire; with an attempt at a chronological arrangement of the Coins of William I and II," pp. 1-25, p. 2. Akerman regretted "seeing the most curious remains of antiquity gradually perishing under the united assaults of ignorance and cupidity." Akerman, *Archaeologia* 32(1847), No. XXIII, p. 312; Thomas Wright noted, of the same site, "it is greatly to be regretted [that it] has suffered so much under rude and ignorant hands." Wright, *Archaeologia* 32(1847), No. XXIV, p. 312; Henry Rhind criticised the raiding of archaeological sites by "the not very discriminating hands. I presume, of some neighbouring peasants." No. XVIII, p. 254.

169 A.J. Kempe expressed disgust at having to stop an excavation because of the damage it was doing to "a crop of wheat growing in the field." Kempe, "Roman Remains near Blechingly in Surrey," *Archaeologia* 32(1847), Appendix, p. 403. The farmer's livelihood was not part of his considerations. Enclosure was another common object of criticism as it "obliterated many ancient landmarks," J.Y. Akerman, *Archaeologia* 37/2(1857), No. XXIV, "Report of Researches in a Cemetery of the Anglo-Saxon Period at Brighthamton co. Oxford," pp. 391-98, p. 393.

170 F.W.L. Thomas, *Archaeologia*, 34/1(1851), No. XIII, p. 88. Thomas was a Corresponding Member of the SA of Scotland, which had established a museum and enjoyed much greater support, both governmental and public, than its London counterpart. He also noted that "the ruthless plough has been driven by barbarous men over this enduring record of the thoughts and labours of an exterminated people." p. 100.
no inventory was published of its stores; and such will too generally be the case, so long as the possession of a metal ring or bracelet is liable to be hunted for by an official...The law of treasure trove fuses nearly all antiquities of gold or silver; they find their way to a watch-cobbler, and thence to a crucible. It is mere fiction to assert, that either Queen, Government, or nation can derive any pecuniary benefit from the few articles that are occasionally turned up; in fact, neither of these parties ever see them; and the only way to prevent their conversion is to let it be known that they are the property of those that find them, and that the lucky individual is to get the largest amount of sterling money that the articles will fetch on the open market. The more they cost the purchaser, the greater will be the chance of their ultimate preservation.171

On the single occasion reported on in these decades, when the authorities had acted to purchase artefacts in the desired manner, John Gage wrote: "I cannot conclude this letter without paying a just compliment to the Trustees of the British Museum for their spirit in securing to the public this priceless national treasure."172 This was judicious, not effusive praise: as Gage saw it, this treatment of artefacts should be the norm, not the exception.

The traditional antiquarian relation between collecting and authentication is evident in the ways antiquaries wrote about interpreting sites and needing more specimens. Material from fields other than archaeology was imported into many articles in an effort to authenticate a certain interpretation. For example, many articles used numismatics, philology and textual evidence to confirm the history of an archaeological site.173 Numismatics and archaeology were mutually supporting: coins helped to date sites, and sites could be used to argue for chronology.174

171F.W.L. Thomas, Archaeologia, 34/1(1851), No. XIII, p. 88, p. 111. See also "[i]t would be very desirable that they should be united to their fellows in the British Museum," A.W. Franks, Archaeologia 36/2(1855), No. XXIX, p 327.

172John Gage, Archaeologia 26(1836), No. XXII, p. 431.

173See George Richard Corner, Archaeologia, 36/1(1855), No. XIV. Corner uses coins, Saxon and Roman place-names, and analysis of pottery styles to determine the history of a Roman site. See also Edward Hawkins' use of archaeology, numismatics and medieval manuscripts in Archaeologia 24(1832), No. IV. Alfred John Kempe used Tacitus, Suetonius and other Latin sources which remarked on Roman utensils in interpreting the utensils found at a Roman London site. Kempe, Archaeologia 24(1832), No. VI.

174See for example, John Adamson, Archaeologia 25(1834), No. XVI, particularly his "Chronological Table of the Kings of Northumberland," pp. 282-83; Edward Hawkins, Archaeologia 26(1836), No. I. The centuries old trade in counterfeits had made it difficult to determine some parts of British chronology in some locations. When over
In some articles, a certain amount of construction of early British, and even early European and Mediterranean history can be seen. Some articles make the relation between archaeology and the larger, narrative historical project clear: "We are dealing here with times and events on which recorded history is silent; but the spade, with them the only operative, though mute historian, points to these barrows as the only existing sepulchre monuments of the primitive Celtic tribes, the earliest fathers of the land."  

Some articles apply the methods and materials of many fields to a specific set of archaeological remains, in order to constructing a general historical framework. In a few cases, archaeological data is submerged in philological or textual data. In some cases, material from another field is integrated into the analysis. John Walker's attempt to determine the exact location of a certain port referred to by Roman historians used geological and philological information. Walker began with Camden's work on the place-names the Romans gave various British places in the first century C.E. He then presented

---


176 By late eighteenth century, many antiquaries were working on sites outside Britain. John Bathurst Deane, for example, presented an exhaustive evaluation of classical Latin and Hebrew writings, in an attempt to localise geographically and ethnically peoples who had made torque-bracelets, and identify the style of one found in coastal France. His argument extends to torques found in Britain as well, though many antiquaries were working exclusively on sites in other parts of the globe. Deane, *Archaeologia* 27(1838), No. I, "Remarks on certain Ornaments of Gold found near Quentin, in Brittany, in 1832; presumed to have been the [maniakai] of the ancient Gauls," pp. 1-14. Charles Roach Smith. *Archaeologia* 30(1844), No. XXI, evaluates the site in light of Persian and Greek textual sources.

177 See for example, the application of classical textual sources to a geographical question in Richard Garnett, *Archaeologia* 30(1844), No. XX, "On the Eastern Terminus of the Wall of Antoninus," pp. 245-47. But most antiquaries turned to textual methods only after a full discussion of the site. See for example, Henry Brandreth, *Archaeologia* 27(1838), No. VII, "Observations on the Roman Station of Magiovitum," pp. 96-108 for the application of classical sources to the problem of the courses of major Roman roads and stations.

178 John Walker. *Archaeologia* 25(1834), No. VIII.
a series of maps of the Yorkshire coastline near Flamborough Head, discussing each likely location in terms of the philological history of parts of that coastline which allowed him to disqualify some options and argue for Flamborough Head as the Roman port in question.\textsuperscript{179} He then discussed the archaeological evidence for Roman settlement in the Flamborough Head area. In most articles, the author moves between objects and texts. Charles Roach Smith, reporting on Roman remains found in excavations for a London sewer, compares potters' names and marks on the pots found with accounts of Roman cooking utensils and practices found in classical authors in an attempt to construct a social history of Roman London.\textsuperscript{180}

Nineteenth-century antiquarian archaeological writing, then, was still distinctively antiquarian in form. This can also be seen from the kinds of things these articles do not contain.\textsuperscript{181} Unlike much historical writing of the Victorian period, antiquarian archaeological writing does not provide a clear narrative thread. Their itineraries of their excavations do not resemble novelistic, journalistic, or biographical works; details about the site prevail, except where authors discuss the social or political context. Charles Roach Smith wrote of the possibilities of attempting to determine the "habits, customs, and usages" of Anglo-Saxons by excavating their cemeteries and considering their artefacts. But this phrase is the closest he, or any other antiquary, gets to such work, in the \textit{Archaeologia}.\textsuperscript{182} Unlike the kind of work

\textsuperscript{179}Maps include the 1829 survey from Philips' \textit{Geology of the Yorkshire Coast} in order to present the coastline in the nineteenth-century, a projection based on Ptolemy's description, a projection based on description included in the medieval chronicle of Robert of Cirencester, a projection overlaying Ptolemy's description onto the current coastline, and a view of the nineteenth-century elevation of the cliffs showing the sea levels, cliff strata and diluvial earth at three different places along the coast.

\textsuperscript{180}Smith, \textit{Archaeologia} 27(1838), No. XII.

\textsuperscript{181}Stuart Piggott, tracing the relations of history and antiquarian archaeology in the eighteenth century, argues that antiquaries' work shows little trace of the rise of the Scottish conjectural school of history, which had engaged the attentions of so many other writers. "English Antiquaries ignored such things." Piggott, \textit{Ancient Britons} pp. 123-59, p. 152. He sees this as their failure to develop.

\textsuperscript{182}Smith, \textit{Archaeologia} 34/1(1851), No. XI, p. 77-82, p. 77.
popularised by Scott, these articles neither engaged in nor promoted analysis of the customs and manners of early Britons. While popular beliefs and superstitions are the subjects of some articles, antiquaries' evaluation of them concentrates on manuscript and philological issues. Such material was presented in extended Latin quotations, without translations, and the authors of these articles do not provide interpretive material that would bring the reader closer to the imagined experience of people of those times. Thomas Wright, for example, wrote: "popular tradition is at all times a better theme for the poet and novelist than for the sober and inquiring, the fact-loving and painstaking antiquary." And the distinctive character of antiquarian writing seems to have been perceptible as such to Victorians. When in 1869 the recently-elected Colonel Augustus Henry Lane Fox wrote a paper on the interpretation of several Sussex hill-forts, it conformed to the description given above. Fox first presented a description of the geography of the area, then of its geology, and finally an extended description of the sites. Fox then argued for interpreting the hill-forts as stone age, as their castramentation showed signs of having been constructed by stone-chipped flints. The article contained none of the ethnographic material for which he was famed.184

Most archaeological articles in the Archaeologia present several of the same textual features. Many include them in the following approximate order, which can be seen to move from the general location to the specific archaeological evidence. They provide a geographical description of the area, followed by a description of the site, including soil types and strata and measurements of objects, followed by a description of the excavation, often day by day, including trench depths and placement, followed by a description of objects and artefacts uncovered and

183Wright, Archaeologia 32(1847), No. XXIV. p. 313.

184Colonel Augustus Henry Lane Fox, Archaeologia 42/1(1869), No. III, "An Examination into the Character and probable Origin of the Hill Forts of Sussex." pp. 27-52.
their placement, extent and so on. A numbered descriptive list often makes up a part of this section, followed by an evaluation of the site findings as compared with other similar sites, in the terms of any relevant historical and manuscript sources, and regularly from about 1850 in the terms of current geological theory. Most note the provisional nature of any conclusions. Many also include somewhere within the body of the article a statement of the need to preserve these and other remains.\textsuperscript{185}

Van Riper was right, then, to call antiquaries "historical archaeologists." Thus far, this chapter has considered a large number of antiquaries' articles, as examples of various features of antiquarian archaeology. A brief examination of one article, recounting John Gage's excavations in the Bartlow Hills, near Ashdon, Essex, will allow us to explore more organically the features which this chapter has identified as distinctively antiquarian. In 1834, John Gage published his first article on his excavations in the Bartlow Hills.\textsuperscript{186} Gage' article shows his careful field method, and his desire to represent the site accurately and fully. He provided depth and width measurements for the trenches he dug, and presented several visual aids with his account. A plan of the site marked scale, compass and topographical features such as barrows, roads, hedges, and so on. Strata were indicated by shading. A survey was produced by Bury St. Edmunds surveyor J.G. Lenny (Plate I, Volume 25). In an engraving on p. 3, a plan of the site included the placement and width of the trenches Gage dug.

The structure of the article set the excavation within Camden's framework: Gage established his work as part of a local region only, provided supporting data from a relevant field of inquiry (geology), and then concentrated on describing field data, or the site, excavation and

\textsuperscript{185}See for example Charles Tilstone Beke, \textit{Archaeologia} 32(1847), No. V; Samuel Birch, \textit{Archaeologia} 32(1847), No. XVII; Akerman, \textit{Archaeologia} 32(1847), No. XXIII; C.R. Smith, \textit{Archaeologia} 33(1849), No. XXV; J.Y. Akerman, \textit{Archaeologia} 38/2(1860), No. XXIII.

\textsuperscript{186}Gage, \textit{Archaeologia} 25(1834), No. I.
objects found. He gave greater attention to describing artefacts found than to describing the excavation itself. Artefacts were illustrated in Plates II and III. Gage compared them to artefacts found in similar mounds elsewhere in Britain, and to similar Roman artefacts recently excavated in Italy. Thus, he connected his material temporally and in type to other British data and established its chronological place. Following this, Gage began his analysis by quoting Camden’s remarks about the makers of these particular tumuli and considering Gough’s different view of the site given in his 1808 edition of the *Britannia*. He evaluated traditions about the tumuli as recorded in Anglo-Saxon sources, and Roman sources to ascertain the history and styles of Roman burial practices. On the basis of this analysis, Gage concluded the barrows were probably made by Britons of the Roman era, establishing where he thought it belonged in the overall history of Britain.

Gage’s first report of his excavation failed to notice or discuss the distribution of artefacts over the site floor and within the strata, in dating and describing the tumuli. In 1836, Gage reported on further excavations in the Bartlow Hills in 1836.187 He began by correcting three errors made in the previous article in reporting the level of the surface on which the tumuli sat: “I have had a fresh survey taken, and beg to refer you to an elevation and plan of them.”188 This article includes a figure showing the placement of the artefacts as they were laid on the floor of the main gallery of the tomb, a "Plan of the Gallery and Sepulchre in the Great Hill," and a figure showing where artefacts were laid on the floor of the tomb.

Gage then describes the dig: the site was lit artificially, and the gallery walls shored up in case of subsidence. Gage attended to the position of objects on the site floor: "We were

---


188Gage, *Archaeologia*, 26(1836), No. XI p. 300. The survey is reproduced in Plate XXXI, Figure 1.
enabled from the distinct marks of the wooden chest that remained in the soil to ascertain precisely its original position and size. 189 Objects were carefully described, measured, and illustrated (Plate XXXII). In interpreting results, Gage noted the lack of any coins, which introduced some doubt about the date of the site, but relied on similarities in the manner of burial to date this tumulus as approximately contemporaneous with the barrow excavated in 1834. His argument, that this was a Romano-British site, made it clear that he understood the comparative principle as grounding the possibility of dating archaeological sites and artefacts: "It is not by the novelty, nor the excellence of art in any of the objects discovered, that we are to measure the value of the recent excavation, but by the known character of those objects." 190 These details show the meticulous character of Gage's field method, his concern to represent the past accurately, and his caution in concluding on the basis of incomplete evidence.

Gage's scientific expertise is more evident in his second than his first excavation. The partially burned remains were analysed by lecturers at the Royal College of Surgeons, and determined to be human. Gage requested Michael Faraday, then at the Royal Institution, to analyse the contents of the jars and bottles, and printed Faraday's analysis in its entirety. 191 Finally, Gage presented an analysis of the objects in terms of what was then known about Roman utensils and artefacts, again citing classical sources as well as the work of Italian excavators on Roman finds in Italy.

All of these details show that Gage was not an inexperienced and blundering excavator, in the field or in interpreting his results. Another circumstance connected with the 1836

189 Gage, Archaeologia 26(1836), No. XI. p. 302.
190 Gage, Archaeologia 26(1836), No. XI. p. 316.
191 Gage, Archaeologia 26(1836), No. XI, pp. 306-10. Faraday made chemical analyses of the metal artefacts, the dried oils in the lamps and vegetable matter which composed their wicks, and the dried liquids in the bottles.
excavation also shows this, as well as highlighting the antiquarian tendency to work across the boundary between the arts and the sciences. Gage's second excavation was attended by Professor Adam Sedgwick and Professor William Whewell. Sedgwick was Woodwardian Professor of Geology at Cambridge 1818-70, and among the most able field geologists of his time. Whewell had attended Professor Mohs' lectures on mineralogy in Germany, was the Cambridge Professorship of Mineralogy 1828-32, had assisted Lyell with his *Principles of Geology*, and would himself be President of the Geological Society in about a year's time. Among his many accomplishments, he was also an antiquary. The geological sciences changed continuously throughout the period 1830-1870. From about 1850, the geological beliefs of both Whewell and Sedgwick were superseded by a series of new conceptualisations of the ways changes in the earth's crust took place. But in the decade that John Gage undertook his excavations of the Bartlow Hills, both these men were viewed by their geological contemporaries as eminent in the sciences. Sedgwick and Whewell were present at the third excavation in the Bartlow Hills in 1838, as was John Henslow, a botanist but also Professor of Mineralogy at Cambridge. Their presence at these last two excavations must be taken to suggest that they saw Gage as competent by the standards of the time.192

This chapter has explored antiquarian archaeology, as it has been portrayed in the twentieth century, and as it was in the nineteenth. The work of A. Bowdoin Van Riper allowed us to consider persistent misconceptions about antiquaries and their archaeological work. That they were a wealthy and exclusive London clique appears clearly, from the material presented in this chapter as well as that presented in Chapter Four, as an error. That they were historical in orientation is correct. But to distinguish historical from other archaeologists on the basis of

---

their scientific acumen is misleading. Articles cited in this chapter show that antiquaries' field methods, critical engagement with theory, and involvement with early human history were of a standard equal to those of their colleagues who set the leading standard in that century.193

Some further aspects of antiquaries' archaeology have been noticed. During the nineteenth century, antiquaries turned their awareness of their poor social reception into a way of improving their chances of success. Their traditional concern for preservation meant that they reported on, and often rescued objects from, sites discovered in circumstances over which they had no control. This concern led to some outspoken advocacy. Yet antiquaries' archaeological work still showed many of the distinctive features of the antiquarian textual tradition, acknowledging Camden’s text and using antiquarian means of structuring their reports. While moving towards the exclusion of textual and philological material in interpreting pre-Roman sites, antiquaries’ style of presenting and interpreting archaeological material still integrated traditional antiquarian features with scientific material.

This chapter has suggested the need for twentieth-century historians to be more aware of antiquaries and of their distinctive historiography. Membership in the SA must be taken as an indication of a distinct perspective in learned work, not dismissed as irrelevant or construed as an indication of amateurism. This does not mean that all members of the SA wrote only in the traditional antiquarian way. Evidence presented in Chapter Four showed that many antiquaries wrote poetry and fiction, journalistic articles, popularising books, theology, school texts and other kinds of literature. But the very breadth of antiquaries’ output suggests they were able to recognise the elements of genre appropriate to a certain kind of writing, and to produce work

193Of the 581 articles published in the Archaeologia, 1830-70, 207 were on archaeological topics. Of these, 155, or 74.88%, have been cited in this chapter, indicating that the picture of antiquarian archaeology I have built up is very probably correct and comprehensive.
shaped accordingly. This ability increases the likelihood that they recognised the features distinctive of antiquarian work, and shaped their antiquarian writing according to antiquarian norms.

The model articulated in Chapter One proposed to explore three components: institution, intellectual field, and community. Genre presents a fourth way to explore the life and history of an intellectual field. Candidates gaining admission to the SA had to have produced scholarly work recognisable to electors as "good." Given the range of antiquarian fields, candidates' work had to be accessible to the many electors not working in that field. Recognizable structuring features may have helped their work gain favourable adjudication. Martin Rudwick has used the opinions of a broad sample of geologists to map the emergence of scientific consensus in an important geological controversy. Rudwick is sensitive to the fact that conceptual distinctions between intellectual fields are often sharper than the boundaries between the learned communities dedicated to exploring those fields. His work has indicated the wide range of factors which connected the working lives of Victorians, and helped to determine the direction of fields. Genre studies would provide a further means of exploring the causes for specific directions taken in the history of many fields. It would also provide a way of mapping a most absorbing feature of Victorian intellectual history: the intricately interwoven relations between cognate fields. As John Evans wrote in 1860: "The natural connections between Geology and Archaeology must, indeed, be apparent to all who consider that both sciences treat of time past as compared with time

For an example of this kind of analysis as applied to geological writing, see William B. Ashworth, ed., The Linda Hall Library. _Theories of the Earth, 1664-1830, the History of a Genre: An Exhibition of Rare Books from the History of Science Collection_, Linda Hall Library: Kansas City, Mo., 1984.

present. The one, indeed, merged by almost imperceptible degrees in the other."196

196 Evans, Archaeologia 38/2(1860), No. XX.
CHAPTER SIX

This chapter deals with the ways antiquaries studied texts and languages. Looked at simply, this might be described as philology. But the term philology has had many meanings in many ages, and the antiquarian study of texts and languages frequently did not resemble the full range of practices denoted by that term in different times and places. Antiquaries had a peculiarly broad range of features they attended to when examining texts. At the same time, they regularly excluded certain other dimensions of the study of languages. What was included, and what excluded, allows us to identify what was distinctive about antiquarian philology. In order to compare the more philosophical interests of mainstream British scholars of language with the more technical, textual interests of antiquaries, a discussion of the term philology is required, followed by a historical summary of its incarnation in the early antiquarian community, and the divergence of antiquarian from the philosophical study of language as a means of understanding the human mind. Developments in the philosophical study of language among eighteenth-century German and Danish scholars are covered briefly. These German and Danish ideas about language had little effect on late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century British theories of language. Instead, the etymological work of John Horne Tooke was still popular in England in the 1830s. However, the late eighteenth-century work of another Englishman, William Jones, was taken up by Germans and Danes, although it was ignored in England. In the 1830s, antiquaries John Mitchell Kemble and Benjamin Thorpe introduced that German and Danish work into England. In doing so, they also introduced much controversy about the best methods of representing Anglo-Saxon texts.

Antiquaries' involvement with the more tangible dimensions of the study of language and texts, such as printing and cataloguing, are also considered. This kind of work often intersected with a different kind of scholarly study of languages and texts, more historical and bibliographic
than philosophical. The work of Quaker bibliographer Francis Fry on early English Bibles will be examined in depth, as an example of these kinds of questions. His work will be compared with that of his non-antiquarian contemporaries working in the same area, in order to identify the distinctively antiquarian equation of the semantic and the physical attributes of texts, their role in interpreting texts, and the antiquarian interest in facsimile editions as the best method of reproducing the vestiges of the past.

Antiquarian philology needs some introduction. Nineteenth-century antiquarian work was still rooted in a tradition formed in the sixteenth century. Two attributes characterise it throughout this period. First, it was involved with what Camden's generation referred to as res et verba, things and words. Antiquaries tended to interpret each in terms of the other. Chapter Six demonstrated the ways in which antiquaries used texts to assist their interpretations of archaeological artefacts. In the same way, for philological antiquaries, texts were physical artefacts as well as carriers of semantically significant content, and they gained much information from attending to the physical properties of the texts they were working on. Second, antiquarian philology must be understood as directed at the recovery and elucidation of materials for the construction of British history. This was what sustained antiquaries' more technical than philosophical interests, and brought unity to an otherwise heterogeneous set of textual and language studies.

Antiquaries' study of texts and languages can be described as philology. Some of the practices indicated by that term have been taken up by antiquaries at some times, but others have been disregarded by them. A brief review of the philology of Camden's time will introduce the

---

1While res, "things," often meant political affairs, its more primary Latin meaning was physical objects.

2In classical Latin and Greek writings, philologia had referred to a love of eloquent oratory, letters and learning. Important classical works include the Orations of Isocrates, Aristotle's Rhetoric and Poetics, Quintilian's Institutiones oratores and Cicero's De inventione, De optimo Genere Oratorum, Topica, De partitione, De oratore, Orator, and
distinctive, long-lived antiquarian style of philology. Renaissance humanists' rediscovery of classical texts revived an interest in the rigorous study of language. By the sixteenth century, when Camden was using language study to explore the British past, philology had become Janus-faced. It had a philosophical, and a technical dimension. On the one hand, philology was closely connected to the goals of humanist rhetoric. Both Italian and northern humanists believed that carefully structured, eloquent oratory would move listeners to virtuous acts, and so they wrote treatises on how to fit words appropriately to the subject, audience and occasion. On the other hand, philology was often called a "Trojan Horse," a technique which threatened to escape the confines of virtue and overwhelm authoritative interpretation.

---


3On the Trojan Horse metaphor for philology, see Joseph Levine, *Humanism and History: Origins of Modern English Historiography*, Cornell University Press: Ithaca and London, 1987, pp. 126-35. The implications of setting the techniques of judgement into individual hands are evident in Erasmus' comment: "Some, as I understand, are of the opinion that the ancient commentators who knew the three languages gave adequate explanations wherever they were needed. But ... I should prefer to see with my own eyes rather than another man's." EE 182, to
This subversive trajectory was already evident in the work of Christian humanist Desiderius Erasmus. In his Adnotationes (1516) he criticised the poor translations found in the Vulgate, and used philology to recover the original meaning of every word in the New Testament. For Erasmus, the technology of eloquence served a Christian philosophy: eloquence and virtue were different facets of the same Christian reality. But his critics saw the possibility for other authors to produce other results.

By the middle of the sixteenth century, in Britain as elsewhere, the technology had escaped the confines of Christian philosophy. Much depended on how and where it was used.

---


Erasmus was using the work of mid-fifteenth century Spanish religious Lorenzo Valla. Valla's Collatio used examples from classical Greek and patristic authors to judge the translation of Greek words into Latin, using the Greek text as his primary referent in deciding which were correct and which variant readings. This comparative treatment made the fact of errors and variants obvious, and indicated an analytic path for those seeking the single, "right" Biblical meaning. See Maristella Lorch, "Italy's Leading Humanist. Lorenzo Valla" in Albert Rabil, Jr., ed., Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms, and Legacies. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1988, 332-49. See also Brian Stock, The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries. Princeton University Press: Princeton, New Jersey, 1983, on the process by which philological competence supplanted philosophical and theological competence at this time.

Erasmus defined New Testament Greek words by consulting classical texts. The Adnotationes articulated basic components of the technical dimension of philology. Among these were: postulating orthographic errors which changed the meaning of words, conjecturing errors based on close homonyms, conjecturing errors based on assimilation, or the insertion of words and phrases which often, but not always, accompanied other phrases, collecting and comparing variant readings for their age, sense, correspondence with early fathers' quotations and comments and with other manuscripts, identifying the idiosyncrasy of a reading when compared to sacred and pagan literature, and inferences on the basis of combinations of these. See the Introduction by Martin Screech, to Anne Reeve, ed., Erasmus' Annotations on the New Testament: The Gospels: Facsimile of the Final Latin Text, Duckworth: London, 1986, 3 volumes, vol. 1. The Adnotationes went through five editions: 1516, 1519, 1522, 1527, and 1535, considerable additions and revisions being made to each successive edition. H. J. de Jonge argued in his "Biblical Philology and Christian Humanism" Sixteenth Century Journal, 8/2(1977); 9-28.

The notes accompanying his translation presented philology as underpinning a Christian hermeneutic and pointing to an eloquent Christian rhetoric. This included the primacy of the original texts in determining the agendae and emphases of Christian theology; the resulting requirement of language competence; the supporting use of patristic rather than scholastic theology by merit of their temporal proximity ad fontes; and the use of classical Greek and Latin texts as a normative linguistic matrix both for establishing elements and nuances of meaning and as a guide to cultivated style. Erasmus describes the object of philological method as "personal transformation, social reform, and religious renewal." For Erasmus' critics, and the use of philology by Protestants, see Jerry H. Bentley, Humanists and Holy Writ: New Testament Scholarship in the Renaissance, Princeton University Press: Princeton, New Jersey, 1983, p. 124. See also Marjorie O'Rourke Boyle, Erasmus on Language and Method in Theology. University of Toronto Press: Toronto and Buffalo, 1977.
Erasmus had used it to strip away erroneous meanings and uncover divine truth. He was fortunate: when he traced philological paths backwards in time, he had (or believed he had) clear targets to work towards, set by Scripture. But when it was applied to mundane problems, such as the evaluation of antique coins, philology could not move in a pre-ordained direction. The humanist return *ad fontes*, then, cut both ways. The clearer it made the meanings of words, the more evident it became that words and their meanings had to be understood within their full human and social context.

Sixteenth-century Britain participated in these developments in philology. Protestant reformer William Tyndale had argued for technical rigour as constitutive of meaning when he translated the Greek New Testament into English in 1526.⁹ He was burned for his pains. Tyndale's most violent critic, Thomas More, saw the Trojan Horse arrive. In his polemics against Tyndale, he insisted on the authority of the church in determining the meaning of Scripture.¹⁰

By mid-sixteenth century, philology, like the rest of the country, had been divorced from its Catholic past. And it had become a common study at the universities. Among its new forms was lexicography. Thomas Cooper, Master of Magdalen College at Oxford, produced his *Thesaurus linguae Romanae et Britannicae* in 1656.¹¹ In this work, Erasmus' notion of *copia*, or fulsome ness of literary style, was applied both to definitions and to examples of usage. But the humanist concern with eloquence was reformulated as a concern with teaching practical skills

---


¹⁰On the Oxford dispute between philologians styling themselves "Greeks" and others styling themselves "Trojans," and Thomas More's role in arbitrating this dispute, see Joseph Levine, *Humanism and History*, pp. 126ff.

in reading and writing Latin. Erasmus’ philosophical apparatus relating these to virtue had disappeared. Cooper’s work, then, shows a slide towards the technical side of philology. William Camden was Cooper’s protégé at Magdalen in the late 1560s.

Camden’s philology was formed more by Cooper than Erasmus. He was a student at St. Paul’s. Erasmus had written his *De Copia*, a primer on eloquence, for St. Paul’s School in 1512. It was still in use when Camden was there in the early 1560s. But Camden’s historical work engaged with the technical dimension of philology. Elocution and virtue were irrelevant criteria for judging his work. His own criteria were the full and accurate representation of the

---

12Features of an Erasmian philology can be found in Camden’s work. His dislike of the vernacular, cultivation of a knowledge of the Latin language and authors, and view of the better classical and medieval authors as *fontes* was discussed in Chapter Three. In his reply to Brooke’s attack on the *Britannia*, Camden discussed translation issues similar to those Erasmus had discussed, including copying errors, (“sensum corrupit” pp. 12 and 18) the effect of brackets on syntax (p. 18), mistaking near homonyms for synonyms (p. 18), incautious inferences (p. 20) memory and typographical errors (p. 22), failure to interpret capitals correctly (p. 27), the use of sixteenth century Latin words in place of older Latin words (p. 29), and errors in inferring Old English names which had previously been Latinised (p. 29). See also "Ad Lectorem," especially "Translatio iniqua" p. 17ff. For Camden’s use of "fontes" for classical authors, see "Ad Lectorem," *Britannia*, 1600, "fontes...non riuilos" p. 5, "fontes" p. 12, "Fontes ego non riuilos confectus sum" p. 19, and "fontes...riuilos et lacunas" p. 19.

13Camden accepted that words were defined by usage, noting that "that Tyranne custome" could prevail even over reason. *Remaines* p. 24. "[H]ow powerable is time in altering tongues," *Camden, Remaines*, 1605, p. 15. See also "Ad Lectorem," *Britannia*, "Verba et propria virorum nomina," pp 16ff. as well as pp. 8, 13, 15, 17-18, and 20. Camden used contemporaneous sources in determining a word’s past meanings. See for example, in "Ad Lectorem," "vetussum Ms." p. 5, "Rotulo antiquo" p. 5, in priscis authoribus p. 6, "historicos veteros" p. 11, "historicos veteres" p. 18, "vetus verbum" p. 20, and arguments made on pp. 12, 15, 16, 17, 19, and 23. For arguments distinguishing between several older sources, see pp. 6, 7, 8, 11, 13-14, 16, 20, 24, 26, 27, and 29. On the role of authoritative writers, see pp. 4-5, 16, 19, 20. On the work of sixteenth century Antiquaries as authoritative, see pp. 18-19. See also For Camden’s claims of the encyclopedic learning of the *grammaticus*, see "Ad Lectorem," pp. 8-9, 13, and "Grammatici omnes" p. 17. In several places in the *Remaines*, Camden criticises the "merry playing with words," "trifling and toyling" (Rem. p. 27) on which some authors based their conclusions. In the *Britannia*, such criticism is to be found especially in the first 130 pages. Camden took care in lifting meanings from their context: "[M]any words we shall see, not hardly nor violently strained, but passing easily, and in manner without any wrestling, to agree with our British, both in sound and sense." *Britannia*, 1600, p. 18. Camden, like Erasmus, used "gusto" to describe a sensitivity in understanding and translating. See "Ad Lectorem," p. 7: "Velim antequam ita conclusisset, observavisset quod observarunt omnes qui vel primoribus labris huius regni antiquatites gustarunt." "I wish, before he drew such conclusions, he had observed what all observe who have [even] a superficial taste for the antiquities of this kingdom." Translation mine. See also "In universo hoc Antiquitatis studio," p. 19 and *Remaines*, p. 95.

14Because he was trying both to recover and to represent historical facts as accurately as possible, Camden was suspicious of eloquence. In the *Britannia* he wrote: "Taking Industry for my consort...neither purposed I to picke flowers out of the gardens of Eloquence." Holland tr., *Brit.* 1637, Preface. "comite INDUSTRIA rem aggressus omni animo...nec orationis omnes undiq- flosculos carpere decrevi." "Lectori," *Brit.* 1600, n.p. A preference for philology over eloquence may be indicated while Camden was still a teacher. He wrote a Greek Grammar for Westminster
vestiges of the past, accumulated and interpreted by cautious rigour. For Erasmus, antiquity was unique in its legitimacy as a source of linguistic meaning. But there was no similar moment of truth in British history. For Camden, all times were equally important, all meanings had to be determined era by era, and the backward search revealed only "the continual mutability of the world."

Camden needed philology to build up a portrait of the British past, from almost nothing. Where the authority of Scripture had permitted Erasmus to subordinate rigour to truth, Camden had to rely on method to achieve anything at all. Believing with Polydore Vergil, that received historical truths were false and the remaining sources corrupt, Camden had to read medieval sources suspiciously. Suspicious of his sources, he read widely so as to be able to confirm any single article of British history from several sources at once. Uncertain of success in reconstructing British history, he depended upon philology to provide a link between vestiges and

School, which treated "figurae" in just two pages. While no boy would have to function in Greek as in Latin, a good education would have required a knowledge of Greek literature which demanded a language facility closer to that modelled in De Copia. See William Camden, Institutiones Graecae Grammatices, Iohannis Batersbie, London, 1604, first published 1595. Figurae, to which Erasmus gave his greatest attention in the De Copia, are found on pages 58 and 63 only. Eloquence had little place in a work like the Britannia: in many places, his text works through lists of up to seventy examples. It is difficult to make such things read beautifully.

In developing his philological practice, Camden used the work of continental authors Gesner and Budé. Budé was one of Erasmus' sharpest critics. These men were masters of the technical, not the philosophical dimensions of language study. Camden's links to these authors has been remarked in Chapter Three. David Shaw, "La bibliologie in France," in Peter Davidson, ed., The Book Encompassed: Studies in Twentieth Century Bibliography, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1992, pp. 206-14, argues that French bibliologie had a unique historiography and methodology. Balsamo argues, in William A. Pettas, tr., Luigi Balsamo, Bibliography: History of a Tradition, Bernard M. Rosenthal: Berkeley, California. 1990, that Gesner's term for bibliographic knowledge, the "labyrinth." (p. 32) shows the dawn of intellectual specialisation. See also Peter Sharratt, ed., French Renaissance Studies 1540-70: Humanism and the Encyclopedia, Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh, 1976.

In Remaines, 1605, p. 91, Camden describes the search for original British place and family names as "to seek that which never was."

portrait.  

Camden’s dependence on technical rigour broadened the scope and power of philology as a forensic, or investigative method. Camden applied philology to all kinds of materials: monuments, coins, inscriptions, manuscripts, architecture, geography, art objects and more. By evaluating the words they bore, and by considering critically what was written about them in the (often erroneous) medieval and other sources, he could tease historical information out of the most taciturn witnesses to the past. For Camden, then, skills with words were also skills with the physical objects which carried them. This philological practice led him to treat objects as texts, because they carried, or were associated in written records with, certain words. This meant that Camden, and the antiquaries of later generations, treated objects as texts, and words

---

18 For example: “But lest any man cast dust in our eyes, let us out of authors gather and conferre as many words as we can of the old Gaules, as it were ship-plakes caught up from a ship-wracke (seeing that the said tongue is now even drowned under the waves of oblivion.)” Holland tr., Britannia 1610, p. 17. For Camden’s view of the value of a sound knowledge of the Latin language and sources as grounding historical work, see “Ad Lectorem,” Britannia. 1600, p. 12-13; 16, and his introductory comments to “Translatio iniqua,” p. 17ff. For passages using his forensic etymology, see pp. 3, 5, 8, 10, 16-17, and 18. These are the kinds of issues identified by Erasmus also, in his discussions of translation in the Adnotationes.

19 The early chapters of the Britannia contain many examples of Camden’s applied philology. See Camden, “Ad Lectorem,” in Britannia, 1600, “monumenta, Archiva, Historias, Monasteriorum Registra, nummos antiquos, marmora antiqua.” p. 19. See also “In universo hoc Antiquitatis studio,” p. 19. See also his many arguments based on monumental and funereal inscriptions, which are accompanied by facsimile reproductions, and on numismatics, accompanied by engravings of Roman, Saxon and Norman coins.


21 For example, funerary inscriptions copied from the churchyard of a slighted cathedral were both words and objects. But further, the words that were used, even in erroneous records, to name that cathedral, its location, and the families and events associated with it, could provide clues to its history.
as artefacts. They understood that the words associated with any location carried information about the history of that location. As will be seen, this remained true in the antiquarian community into the nineteenth century. Other features of Camden's forensic philology also remained typical of antiquarian philology into the nineteenth century. In particular, nineteenth-century antiquaries also depended on the technical rather than philosophical dimension of philology, and on a broad, critical bibliographic knowledge, to help in evaluating information about the past.

Antiquarian philology began to diverge from the mainstream in the seventeenth century. At this time, many philosophers of language hypothesised that there was one pure, or Adamic language that was innate to the human mind but had been lost during the Babel incident, after which human language had degenerated into many corrupted languages. Philosophical theorists of language sought to return language to its perfect state, so that words would reflect their meanings perfectly. In the late seventeenth century, John Locke countered these philosophers with an empirically-based theory of language.

Camden was not, of course, the only scholar or antiquary working on Anglo-Saxon at this time. On the work of members of the College of Arms, see C.M. Kauffman, "An Early Sixteenth Century Genealogy of Anglo-Saxon Kings," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 47(1984); 209-16. On the term "Anglo-Saxon," see E.G. Stanley, "Old English = 'Anglo-Saxon': William Lambarde's Use in 1576," *Notes and Queries*, 42 (240)/4 December (1995); 4, 437 and E.G. Stanley, "Old English = 'Anglo-Saxon': the Modern Sense for the Language Anticipated by Archbishop Matthew Parker in 1567, and by John Strype in 1711, Camden's Use in remains (1605) for the Anglo-Saxon People Noted; Together With Notes on How OED Treats such a Term and Notes on the Terms Old and Middle English (and Similar Linguistic Terms) in OED," *Notes and Queries*, 42 (240)/2 June (1995): 168-73.

The term mystical is commonly found in the history of language study. For a discussion of mystical as compared with empirical, or Baconian notions of meaning, as they apply to language study, see Hans Aarsleff, *From Locke to Saussure: Essays on the Study of Language and Intellectual History*, University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis, 1982, "John Wilkins," pp. 239-77. In another chapter on RS historian Thomas Sprat, pp. 225-39, Aarsleff shows the co-existence of both philosophies in the (different) works of one seventeenth century Englishman.

Locke had argued, in his 1671 *Essay on Human Understanding*, that meaning and language were not innate, and that the meanings of words were conventions made between people, not degenerate remnants of the true, Adamic language. Words were not an index to objects in the material world, then, but to the conceptions of those objects constructed in the human mind on the basis of sensory experiences, and so the study of language allowed the philosopher to study of the way the human mind worked. Locke presented a complex argument about the passage of sensations through reflection in the formation of concepts and words.
But it was the study of Anglo-Saxon that occupied the attention of seventeenth-century antiquaries.\textsuperscript{25} Camden had declared a knowledge of Anglo-Saxon essential to writing his own history of Britain. Interest in Anglo-Saxon accelerated after the Restoration, leading to "the longest and most prolific movement of medieval research which [England] has ever seen."\textsuperscript{26} William Somner published his \textit{Anglo-Saxon Dictionary} in 1659. Antiquaries published texts, especially those relating to the ecclesiastical and political history of the Anglo-Norman period. Humfrey Wanley, assistant librarian to the Bodleian 1696-99, traced the development of Anglo-Saxon characters through medieval Charters, funeral inscriptions and coins.\textsuperscript{27} Antiquaries, then, were still engaged in the technical rather than philosophical aspects of language study. Their search for materials with which to construct a full and accurate history made the collecting and editing of texts an essential part of antiquarian language-study. As will be seen, text-editing was still a major component of antiquarian language-study in the nineteenth century.

In the SA's Tavern phase, antiquaries' interest in the Anglo-Saxons covered a broader area. In 1721 the SA proposed "a Compleat description and history of all the Coyns relating to Great Britain from the Earliest times to our own."\textsuperscript{28} In typical antiquarian style, the work was

\textsuperscript{25}The term "Anglo-Saxon" is no longer common, as it has been replaced in the late twentieth century by "Old English." It has been retained here because it was the term antiquaries used. It refers to the language used in Britain from about the eighth century to the period of the Norman conquest. See A.C. Partridge, \textit{A Companion to Old and Middle English Studies}, Barnes and Nobles: Totowa Books, 1982; G.A. Padley, \textit{Grammatical Theory in Western Europe, 1500-1700: Trends in Vernacular Grammar I}, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge and New York, 1985 and Ronald E. Buckalew, "Nowell, Lambarde and Leland: The Significance of Laurence Nowell's Transcript of Aelfric's Grammar and Glossary," in Carl Berkhout and Milton Gatch eds., \textit{Anglo-Saxon Scholarship: The First Three Centuries}, Hall: Boston. 1982, pp. 19-50, on the transmission and history of word-lists.

\textsuperscript{26}David Charles Douglas, \textit{English Scholars, 1660-1730}, Eyre & Spottiswoode: London, 1951, reprinted from the Johnathon Cape: London, 1939 edition, p. 16. See also pp. 197ff. In 1623, William L'Isle published his \textit{Saxon Treatise concerning the Old and New Testament}. But the period of greatest publishing was 1660 to about 1730. Sixteenth century patriotic histories had made the Anglo-Saxon church part of their justification for the \textit{translatio imperii}. Antiquaries' work concentrated more on text-editing and grammar.


\textsuperscript{28}\textit{Ants. Corr.} April 29, 1724.
divided among those interested. Two antiquaries took on the Saxon period. The study of the Anglo-Saxon language was producing more specialised works. Humfrey Wanley’s many draft charters for an antiquarian society were discussed in Chapter Three. One of these had included a list of "Good Books Wanted," which he believed an antiquarian institution could supply. In his list were text- and object-related works as well linguistic aids: "A Britannia Saxonica, by the Revd Dr. Hickes" and "A Glossary, containing all written by Spelman, Somner, Cowell, etc. with all the additions to be gotten from the Books and Charters yet remaining to be consulted."²⁹ The major antiquarian philological publications were still in technical areas of language study. George Hickes published an Anglo-Saxon Grammar in 1705. But papers were also read to the Society on Anglo-Saxon jewellery, cemeteries, texts, inscriptions, and architecture.³⁰ Bishop Thomas Percy’s 1775 Northern Antiquities, a translation of Paul-Henri Mallet’s Introduction a l’histoire de Dannemarc (1755), included an historical and linguistic essay on the relations of Anglo-Saxon to other members of the Old German language family. He argued, correctly, that Mallet was wrong to believe the Gauls, Germans, Britons and Saxons were the same people, and used their languages to argue for their distinct, though related, status. Antiquary Sharon Turner’s History of the Anglo-Saxons from the Earliest Period to the Norman Conquest assembled and reprinted important Anglo-Saxon documents. Grammar, comparative grammar, and text-editing, then, were antiquaries’ important achievements during this century.³¹


³⁰See Evans, A History, pp. 132-205, passim.

Antiquaries were not on the cutting edge of eighteenth-century language studies, any more than they had been in the seventeenth. In the late eighteenth century, there were two major British language philosophers, John Horne Tooke and William Jones. Neither were antiquaries. The work of Tooke was influential in Britain, and remained so until the 1830s. But the work of William Jones was slighted in Britain because it dealt with oriental languages and literature and because it was more technical than philosophical. It was, however, taken up eagerly by German philosophers of language in the early years of the nineteenth century. In turn, Danish comparative linguists took up the Germans’ work. Thus, it was only about 1830 that the new continental language study was taken up in England, by two antiquaries, John Mitchell Kemble, and Benjamin Thorpe. Because the history of language study in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries is complex, this situation requires a brief explanation.

Two styles of language study arose in Britain in the last decades of the eighteenth century. One engaged with philosophical questions, and the other with technique. Philosophical language study was alive in the work of John Horne Tooke, whose 1798 *Diversion of Purley* assumed with Adamic philosophers that language was innate to the human mind, but also used elements of Locke’s empirical theory. Tooke believed that the mind naturally apprehended a natural consonance of sound and sense. Most of his philological work involved tracing etymologies, by finding words that sounded the same. The similarity of sound between words, even of very different meanings or taken from different languages, indicated a similarity of sense. Thus, explaining changes in words over time meant tracing the sound back to its original meaning through many contemporary homonyms in the English, and other languages. The allocation of

---

32Tooke both used and rejected Locke’s theory of language. He rejected Locke’s concern that language was imperfectly understood, and that this was cause of the imperfections of philosophy. He postulated that the operations of the mind on the impressions it received was not reflection, but language. He proved his thesis in two ways: first by offering a large number of individual examples of what he called etymologies, and second through a priori reasoning of the universal general processes underlying all the examples.
a root meaning to a phoneme was viewed as inductive, but in fact was often highly arbitrary, particularly when it was broadened beyond a single or related languages. As a philological method, it led to many mistaken etymologies and a very misleading kind of comparative linguistics.\(^{33}\)

The other style of late eighteenth-century British language study originated in the work of William Jones, an unsuccessful lawyer in London, and later a judge in Calcutta. His work on Indian and Persian literature had led him to study Hebrew, Persian, Arabic, Turkish and Sanskrit.\(^{34}\) For Jones, language study had a philosophical dimension, but this was rooted in the technical study of language. Philosophically, Jones was interested in the history of oriental peoples, and believed languages were the best method of getting to know that history.\(^{35}\) But he

\(^{33}\)An example may make Tooke’s method clear. Tooke derived the English words hell, heel, hill, hale, whole, hall, hull, hole, holt and hold from a postulated single phoneme, “hol,” which indicated the idea “covering.” Thus, hell was covered by earth, a heel by the leg, a hill was that which covered the plain surface of the earth, a wound was healed or made whole when the skin covered it over, a hall was a covered building, a hull covered a nut and a ship’s hull was that part of it which was covered by water, a hole was originally a covered pit, a holt was a knoll covered in grass or trees, and a hold was a covered storage area. John Horne Tooke, Epea Pteroenta: Or, the Diversions of Purley. Scolar Press: Menston, 1968. 2 volumes, reprinted from the first, 1798 edition, vol. 2, pp. 377-83. Tooke often went on to relate such root phonemes to words found in African, Asian, Indian, North American Indian, and many other languages. As will be obvious to the contemporary reader, these words stem from various Anglo-Saxon and Latin roots, and this method of linking them amounts to ingenious invention rather than tracing actual historical connections.

\(^{34}\)Jones was a lawyer in Britain, and a judge in Calcutta from 1783 until his death in 1794. His works on oriental literature included the 1770 Histoire de Nadir Chah, and the 1771 Dissertation sur la litterature orientale, appended to his Histoire. His 1783 The Moallakat, or Seven Arabian Poems brought him the reputation of a literary scholar. Jones also knew eight European languages, and had studied Sanskrit, in order to practice law efficiently. In 1771, he published a Grammar of the Persian Language which went through nine editions by 1830. His 1789 translation of Indian poet Calidas’ Sakonata also brought him recognition. It was published Calcutta, reissued in English in several editions, and translated into German by Georg Foster in 1791. This stirred interest in Hindu religion, language and literature in Germany. Herder sent the translation to Goethe, who used parts of it for his Faust.

\(^{35}\)That is, Jones used manuscripts to trace the history of a given language, and compared the grammar and syntax of different languages to determine their connections. I am following Aarsleff’s convincing argument, that the decisive change in language study came when philological arguments were made methodological and historical, and a posteriori reasoning replaced the eighteenth century a priori procedures. Such arguments divorced the study of mind from the study of language. Jones’ Anniversary Discourses in the years 1785-92 treated the origins of cognate languages of different countries, and their inter-relations over time. Jones argued that there were four “media” to ascertain the path of a language through time. Since historical records were incomplete and inaccurate, the first was language and literature, the second philosophy and religion, the third old sculpture and architectural remains and the fourth science and arts. Jones was the first to analyse the development of the parts of languages with accuracy,
viewed history as a science, and believed language study ought to be restricted to attested examples of words and their relationships to words in other languages. He rejected the idea, that such links could be created by a priori philosophical reasoning. In 1784, Jones founded the Asiatick Society. From its first volume in 1789, his Asiatic Researches were a success on the Continent, as they included discussions of the methods of comparative grammar as well as the application of his research on languages to topics in Persian and Indian history, art, architecture, and other topics.

Jones' work founded the study now called comparative linguistics, by fixing attention on the attested linguistic history of specific languages, rather than the philosophy of language as a universal, general phenomenon of mind. His work aroused little interest in England. However, German scholars of the late eighteenth century had been engaged with ideas similar to those their English counterparts worked with. Jones' notion that language was the guide to a people's

---

36 Jones argued specifically, that proof of the kinship of languages was found in related grammatical structures. *Asiatic Researches*, Scholar Press: Menston, 1969, Volume 3, p. 166 "On the Borderers, Mountaineers, and Islanders of Asia" and AR III, p. 114; and III, p. 53

37 Jones criticised the notion of a universal grammar. Of Tooke's style of work, he wrote: "Etymology has, no doubt, some use in historical researches; but it is a medium of proof so very fallacious, that, where it elucidates one fact, it obscures a thousand, and more frequently borders on the ridiculous, than leads to any solid conclusions." *Asiatic Researches*, Scholar Press: Menston, 1969, Volume 3, pp. 25-26. Jones argued that etymologies could only lead to reliable information on the relationships between languages if they were drawn from examples demonstrable in texts.

38 The scope of the Society included Asia and neighbouring parts of Africa, and divided work into three areas corresponding to the faculties of the mind: memory, reason and imagination, history, science and art.

39 Johann Gottfried Herder's 1771 essay on language had addressed philology in the context of questions of universal grammar and the origin of language. His work was part of the growing interest in expressions of the spirit of the folk in vernaculars and early poetry. Johann David Michaelis argued against universal languages and for the study of vernaculars. He did little etymology, either speculative or classical, as he believed language was formed in usage, by ordinary, often illiterate people. Language was the product of generations of speakers, not writers. As language recorded the views of a people, language study could guide historical knowledge. Herder believed language
history was adopted by many German philosophers of language who wished to explore the more intangible idea of the spirit of a people. In the early nineteenth century, Jones' work in comparative grammar was taken up by Danish scholars working on the family of Old German languages.

In England, Jones' work had aroused little interest. In the first three decades of the

exist in the mind, but was conditioned in its outward details by Besonnheit, or reflexion or thoughtfulness. He believed India was the original home of humanity and of all languages, which had developed organically and according to natural laws. In the early history of language, words were onomatopoeic sound pictures. Over time, the fit between words and thought was refined through reflexion. The older a language was, the more the emotions dominate root words, as reflexion had not introduced abstractions. Herder's views were adopted by Freidrich and Augustus Schlegel and Jacob Grimm, among others.

Freidrich Schlegel and Johann Herder set Jones' view of Sanskrit within a philosophical framework that described language as organic and divine. Freidrich Schlegel's 1808 Ueber die Sprache und Weisheit der Indier, viewed language as the key to a people's spirit, in a more organic and mystical sense than Jones had meant. Schlegel was also influenced by his conversion to Catholicism while studying Sanskrit in Paris with Jones' student Alexander Hamilton. Aarsleff argues that Schlegel borrowed heavily from Jones, and that Jones, not Schlegel is more properly credited with being the founder of comparative linguistics. For example, he argued that there were two kinds of languages. The imperfections of languages existed in the mind, but was conditioned in its outward details by Besonnheit, or reflexion or thoughtfulness. He believed India was the original home of humanity and of all languages, which had developed organically and according to natural laws. In the early history of language, words were onomatopoeic sound pictures. Over time, the fit between words and thought was refined through reflexion. The older a language was, the more the emotions dominate root words, as reflexion had not introduced abstractions. Herder's views were adopted by Freidrich and Augustus Schlegel and Jacob Grimm, among others.

Franz Bopp published his Analytical Comparison of the Sanskrit, Greek, Latin and Teutonic Languages, Shewing the Original Identity of their Grammatical Structure in 1868. Rasmus Kristian Rask's published his Undersogelse om det gamle Nordiske ebler Islandske Sprogs Oprindelse in 1818. Rask's sources had been English and antiquarian: Hickes' Thesaurus, Edward Lye's Dictionarium Saxonico et Gothico, and Somner's Dictionarium Saxonico-Latino-Anglicum. He showed by grammatical and manuscript analysis that Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian were not derived from Danish but from Old German. And Jacob Grimm published his Deutsche Grammatik in 1819. Grimm modified his second, 1822 edition, after reading Rask's Undersogelse. His second edition became influential in England as elsewhere, as it was the first large scale historical examination of the old forms of German vernaculars and related languages, including Anglo-Saxon. Antiquary Benjamin Thorpe translated Rask, publishing his Grammar of the Anglo-Saxon Tongue in 1830, arguing in his introduction against Tooke. These men also created general interest in the history, language and literature of the Anglo-Saxons through historical works. Thorpe translated Lappenberg's History of England under the Anglo-Saxon Kings (1845) and antiquary John Mitchell Kemble produced his The Saxons in England, a History of the English Commonwealth in 1849.

Early nineteenth century English interest in oriental language was mainly the practical interest of civil servants going to India. Interest in the comparative study of languages as Jones had practised it struggled against Utilitarian philosophers of language, who still approached explaining language through explaining thought. Writers such as Bentham, Macaulay and Dugald Stewart had evaluated the study of oriental language and literature as worthless. Both racism and questions of method were involved. James Mill's History of British India, for example, took Jones' Sakontala as evidence that India was an inferior civilisation and Sanskrit an inferior language. Mill criticised Jones throughout his 1825 Analysis of the Phenomena of the Human Mind on the question of the correct method for studying language.
nineteenth century, two rival philosophies of language flourished. In both, the study of language remained connected to the philosophy of mind. The rudimentary psychology inherent in Tooke's theory of language became part of James and John Stuart Mill's materialist account of the human mind. The works of Scott also kindled a patriotic romanticism which produced some study of the literatures of Great Britain, which in turn produced some study of the hibernic languages.

In early nineteenth-century England, then, the study of language was still connected to the study of the mind. At the universities, empirical theories of language were linked to notions of materialism and atheism through association with the ideas of John Locke. Therefore, the study of language was not encouraged. Nor did comparative linguistics arouse much interest at the universities. Antiquary Sir Henry Spelman had established a lectureship at Cambridge in 1640, which was soon discontinued. The next chair in philology was founded by antiquary and Anglo-Saxon scholar Joseph Bosworth in 1867. At Oxford, the Rawlinson bequest of 1795 established a chair in Anglo-Saxon studies. Each recipient had a five-year term, but until the middle of the nineteenth century it was often a sinecure. One of its incumbents, James Ingram, who held the position 1803-8, was an antiquary. In his Inaugural Lecture on the Utility of Anglo-Saxon Literature, he argued, against Tooke's speculative etymologies, that Anglo-Saxon had become the English of the present day through "gradual changes which have taken place

43These theories looked back to Locke's ideas about the passage of sensations through reflection in the formation of concepts and words. They conflated these with French philosopher Étienne Condillac's notion of the transformation of sensations, to form the basis for a materialist appreciation of the workings of the mind. For an account of Mill's use of Tooke in his 1829 Analysis of the Phenomena of the Human Mind, see Aarsleff, The Study of Language.


45William Whewell, Chair of Moral Philosophy at Oxford and also an antiquary, viewed his own success at keeping Locke out of the curriculum as a "good work." Quoted in Aarsleff. From Locke to Saussure, p. 124. Locke's works experienced a revival only in the late nineteenth century.
according to the natural course of events,” and noted the role of Anglo-Saxon study in the history of law and religion. But Oxford was not much interested. Coleridge’s 1813 prize essay on etymology used Locke and championed Tooke.

“During the decisive years, all the work was done outside the universities.” In fact, the work of establishing a place for comparative grammar in England was accomplished by antiquaries Benjamin Thorpe and John Mitchell Kemble. Both Thorpe and Kemble had been

46Quoted in Aarsleff, The Study of Language in England, p. 170. Aarsleff notes that Ingram drew an analogy of comparative grammar with comparative anatomy before Bopp or Schlegel did in Germany. Ingram accepted that there was a universal grammar, but argued that one needed to know languages before working on their relations to a universal grammar. Ingram produced the first critical edition of the whole Saxon Chronicle in 1823, which included an Anglo-Saxon grammar. In 1823 Bosworth also published a much lengthier Elements of Anglo-Saxon Grammar, based on Rask’s Angelsaksisk Sproglaere (Stockholm 1817). At this time, Bosworth did not know of Grimm’s Deutsche Grammatik, which traced the historical relations of Old German to Anglo-Saxon. Bosworth also put out a dictionary of Anglo-Saxon which unfortunately included some Tookean etymologies, for which he was strongly criticised. See E.G. Stanley, “J. Bosworth’s Interest in ‘Friesic’ for his Dictionary of the Anglo-Saxon Language (1838): ‘The Friesic is Far the Most Important Language for My Purpose,’” in Rolf H. Bremner, Geart Van Der Meer and Oebele Vries, eds., Aspects of Old Frisian Philology, Rodopi: Amsterdam, 1990, pp. 428-52. Reviews of Bopp’s work by Alexander Hamilton appeared in the Edinburgh Review 33 (May 1820); 432 and the London Magazine 1 (January 1820); 72-3. In 1828, Bopp was appointed Chair of Oriental Languages at the University of London, where he taught Hindustani, Arabic, Persian, Sanskrit. As he was paid £100 per year, he quickly gave the post up for research, supporting himself by writing.

47Coleridge, for example, denied Locke’s work any originality, and argued that his theory of the origin of knowledge in sensations had led others to view learning as a relatively simple matter. In his view, Locke was responsible for popularising a certain philistinism and a reduced appreciation of the experience of learning. Until mid-century, Ingram’s successors were less informed than Ingram was. Thomas Silver’s 1822 Lecture on the Study of Anglo-Saxon, for example, combined information on Gothic, High German, Icelandic and Anglo-Saxon already presented in Hickes’ Thesaurus, with an incomplete review of Grimm’s Grammatik. He used the first, much less competent edition, and knew nothing of Rask. See E. Douka Kabitoglou, “Adapting Philosophy to Literature,” Studies in Philology, 79/1 (1990): 115-36 on English romantic notions of language and their relation to art. On the increasing popularity of Anglo-Saxon at the universities towards the end of the century, see Michael Alexander. "The Cult of Anglo-Saxon and the Literary Canon,” Parergon, 10:1 (June, 1992): 1-14.


49Antiquaries were nearly alone in embracing continental language scholarship in the early part of the period under consideration. However, it should be noted that there was a group on non-antiquarian Anglo-Saxon scholars who, in the 1860s, published extensively and importantly on Anglo-Saxon. They were: Walter Skeat, Frederic James Furnivall and Richard Morris. They were known to many antiquaries, who often published with these men. See Bernard Myers, “F.J. Furnivall. Philanthropist, Lexicographer, Oarsman,” Journal of the William Morris Society, 9/4 (Spring 1992); 32-35 and Peter Faulkner, "‘The Paths of Virtue and Early English’: F.J. Furnivall and Victorian Medievalism.” in John Simons, ed., From Medieval to Medievalism, St. Martin’s Press: New York, 1992, pp. 144-58.
trained in Europe. Thorpe had studied with Danish language scholar Rasmus Rask in 1826 in Copenhagen. Kemble was a nephew of actress Fanny Kemble. Fanny referred to John as a wild youth. Kemble had failed his Cambridge exams because he thought Paley a "miserable sophist." He went abroad, attended university in Heidelberg and Munich, and studied philology. When he returned to England, he was one of the ablest Anglo-Saxon scholars of his day. He made a career in writing and publishing. His reviews of European philologists like Jacob Grimm and Rasmus Rask were too technical for all but a tiny audience. But he argued for the integration of English with continental language scholarship, and advocated German work on language at every opportunity. In 1830, Thorpe published his translation of Rask's work, as the *Grammar of the Anglo-Saxon Tongue*. It was the first volume of continental-style comparative philology available in England. Kemble was among those who praised it for avoiding Tookean

---

50Among many examples, in 1830 Kemble went to Spain to support the Constitutionalists. Supporters refused to cut their hair or beards until the Constitutionalists won. When the Constitutionalists were beheaded he returned to England, to find that his chances of a church career were ruined. See Francis Ann Kemble, *Records of a Girlhood*. Henry Holt: New York. 1877: *Records of a Later Life* 1882 and *Further Records* 1891. See also Percy Fitzgerald, *The Kembles: An Account of the Kemble Family*, Tinsley Brothers: London. 1871, passim.

51Hans Aarsleff, *The Study of Language in England*, p. 42. Kemble was schooled at Clapham by Charles Richardson, a student of Horne Tooke but known for his classical lexicography. At Cambridge, he was a member of the Apostle’s club, as the Cambridge Conversazione Society was called, many of whom had sympathy with German mystical philology and disliked the hearty style of the Oxford evangelical movement. Kemble had loved Germany so much when he studied there that his friends feared he might not return.


53Kemble was editor of the *British and Foreign Review; or European Quarterly* for its entire print run, 1835-44.

54Kemble's review of Jacob Grimm's *Grammatik*, for example, was typeset for the *Foreign Quarterly Review* in 1833, but was considered too technical and so was not printed.

55Prior to this, in 1823, antiquary Joseph Bosworth had published a short Anglo-Saxon grammar, but Thorpe's translation of Rask was both a more thorough work, and was also a clearer grammar than Bosworth's *Elements* because it contained nothing of Tookean etymology. Bosworth had included some, though not much, etymological material in his grammar. Further, Bosworth had used Anglo-Saxon characters, where Thorpe used Roman characters supplemented by the two extra Anglo-Saxon characters, the thorn and eth. This made Thorpe's work more accessible, where the typography made Bosworth's grammar more forbidding.
etymology. By their publications, then, Thorpe and Kemble demolished the influence of Tooke's style of language philosophy.\textsuperscript{56} However, they put controversy in its place.

While Thorpe and Kemble established the empirical over the \textit{a priori} method, they disagreed about how Anglo-Saxon studies should be prosecuted, and about the best way to reproduce Anglo-Saxon texts. As few of these had been edited and published, the study of Anglo-Saxon as a language necessarily involved the study of Anglo-Saxon texts. Anglo-Saxonists were thus expert in palaeography (the study of the handwriting of various times), epigraphy (the study of inscriptions) and codicology (the study of the physical and historical aspects of rolls and other ancient documents). The Danish were active in studying the family of languages related to Old-German. Danish Old Norse and Anglo-Saxon scholar N.F.S. Grundtvig was in England from 1829 to 1831. He had transcribed \textit{Beowulf}, as part of continuing the work of his predecessor, G.J. Thorkelin, on the history of early Germanic peoples.\textsuperscript{57} Grundtvig had published editions of important Anglo-Saxon texts, including \textit{Beowulf}, in Denmark. A dispute between Benjamin Thorpe and Grundtvig over a contract to publish a British edition of \textit{Beowulf} leaked into the

\textsuperscript{56}Few antiquaries used Tooke's notion of etymology by 1830. "Indeed, in the period, 1800-1840, the Society of Antiquaries showed themselves to be surprisingly modern in their outlook." T.A. Birrell, "The Society of Antiquaries and the Taste for Old English, 1705-1840" in \textit{Neophilologus}, J.B. Walters: Groningen, 1966, pp. 107-116, p. 114. Exceptions were Joseph Bosworth, who had used Tooke's notion of the "affinity" of languages in occasional places in his Anglo-Saxon grammar. The only example I have been able to find, of an antiquary embracing Tookean Etymology, is John Trotter Brockett, \textit{A Glossary of North Country Words, with their Etymology, and Affinity to Other Languages, and Occasional Notices of Local Customs and Popular Superstitions}, E. Charnley: Newcastle-on-Tyne, 1846. See Raymond Wiley, "Grimm's Grammar Gains Ground In England," in Elmer H. Antonsen, James W. Marchand, and Ladislav Zgusta, eds., \textit{The Grimm Brothers and the Germanic Past}, Benjamins: Amsterdam, 1990, pp. 33-42.

\textsuperscript{57}The Royal Museum in Copenhagen funded a research trip for G.J. Thorkelin to England in 1786-90, to find further manuscript material. In England, Thorkelin transcribed \textit{Beowulf}, which he took to be about the conflict between a Danish hero and Swedish kings. It was published in 1815 as \textit{De Danorum rebus gestit seculo III et IV Poema Danicum dialecto Anglo-Saxonica}. For a study of \textit{Beowulf} before this, see Eric Stanley, "The Continental Contribution to the Study of anglo-Saxon Writings up to and Including that of the Grimms," in Thomas Finkenstaedt and Gertrud Scholtes, eds., \textit{Towards A History of English Studies in Europe}, University of Augsburg Press: Augsburg, 1983, pp. 9-39.
press. Beowulf was suddenly discovered as a national literary treasure, as patriots thundered about the indignity of a Dane publishing English literature.

Most Anglo-Saxon experts in Britain at this time were antiquaries. One was Frederic Madden, the seventh son of an Irish captain in the navy. Madden became Head of the Department of Manuscripts at the British Library, and spent a lifetime waging war with other members of the British Library staff who did not meet his standards as book-lovers. His bellicose letters to his superiors had increased budgets for the cleaning and preservation of just such manuscripts as those being disputed. However, in this case Madden acted temperately, on behalf of the SA Council, of which he was a member. Concerned both to ensure that an Anglo-Saxon series was done well, and to increase the prestige of the SA, Madden proposed that the Society undertake an Anglo-Saxon series, to include the disputed material and more:

[W]hile in France, Germany, Denmark, and Sweden, much has been done of late for the cultivation of ancient native literature, it has been a source of mortification to the English Antiquary and philologist, that in this country few have been the steps taken, during the last century, towards communicating to the world the literary treasures preserved among us, from the times of our Saxon and Anglo-Norman forefathers.

---

58 In 1830, Grundtvig drafted a proposal to the Oxford publishing house Black, Young and Young, for a Bibliotheca Anglo-Saxonica in ten volumes. It was to include Beowulf, Caedmon, the Exeter Book, Layamon, and some Homilies. Black’s agreed to begin issuing the first volume in 1831. But Thorpe had a prior agreement for the publication of a similar project, and his own subscription list, prior to the issuing of the Grundtvig prospectus, contained most of the names on Grundtvig’s later subscription list.


61 Madden, GM 101(March 1831); 253-54. Madden’s diary included the following: "Agreed to join some gentlemen in forming a Society for the purpose of publishing Saxon and Early English MSS. in opposition to Grundtvig’s plan, which is a reproach to English scholars." Quoted in Aarsleff, The Study of Language in England, p. 188. The national rivalry was remarked on in the Foreign Review 5(March 1830), p. 493. See also T.D. Rogers, ed., Sir Frederic Madden at Cambridge: Extracts from Madden’s Diaries 1831, 1838, 1841-2, 1846, 1859 and 1863,
The series was a success both with antiquaries and the public, although it was expensive, and was cut back for a time during the reform period.62

This controversy engendered a second phase, known as the Anglo-Saxon Debate of 1834-36. Typographical and representational issues came to the fore.63 The protagonists were Kemble and Thorpe. The question was whether the Anglo-Saxon alphabet could be accurately represented by the Roman alphabet supplemented by two further characters (thorn and eth), or whether the Anglo-Saxon alphabet should be represented by the often similar, but rather more angularly shaped characters found in many Anglo-Saxon manuscripts. Kemble argued for the supplemented Roman characters, Thorpe for the older, original characters.64

The two positions reflected the different continental language schools these antiquaries had trained in. Thorpe had studied with the Danes, who traced the history of peoples and languages through careful attention to the remaining manuscript evidence. The Danes had a tradition of manuscript preservation going back two centuries, and their skills in interpreting

62 An Anglo-Saxon Committee was formed immediately. At their suggestion, the initial series was intended to produce texts, with notes and introductions to Caedmon, Layamon, Ormulum, Beowulf, the Exeter Book, Appolonius of Tyre, Aelfric's Grammar, and the Saxon Gospels, accompanied by English translations and complete glossaries. The series in fact went considerably beyond this.

63 This debate received comment in many periodicals at the time, including the British and Foreign Review: or European Quarterly, the Times, the Gentleman's Magazine, the Foreign Quarterly Review and others.

64 The language known as Anglo-Saxon was written in England about 600 to about 1100 C.E. Naturally, texts from different times showed variations in the way characters were made. The great majority of manuscripts were unpublished: many had not even been seen by scholars of language. In others, Latin, Greek and other languages were also attested within Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, further complicating analysis of the alphabet. Evaluation was made still more difficult by the presence of Runic funerary inscriptions which were clearly Anglo-Saxon in language but variant in form. And the relations of Anglo-Saxon to other members of the Old-German family were not yet clearly known. The question arose, did a particular character set identify a distinct language? Were there several Anglo-Saxons, perhaps associated with different kingdoms? What were their differences? Thus, it was possible in the 1830s to question whether manuscripts using the more Latinate Anglo-Saxon alphabet represented all Anglo-Saxon material. Ingram's Inaugural Lecture had used the supplemented Roman alphabet but his edition of the Saxon Chronicle used the Anglo-Saxon alphabet. See J.D.A. Ogilvy, Books Known to the English, 597-1066. Medieval Academy of America: Cambridge, Mass, 1967.
hands and codices were better than those of their German counterparts. For Thorpe, attuned to the unique character of each manuscript, accuracy meant reproducing the authentic Anglo-Saxon script. Kemble had studied with the Germans. Their interest in the historical relations between languages was more theoretical, and less involved with the physical aspects of texts, characters. German language study was also applied to the history of peoples, but tended to be less sedulously attached to manuscript citations and more interested in broad thematic areas such as law, religion, and archaeology. Kemble understood the value to British Anglo-Saxon scholarship of a greater appreciation of German comparative linguistics, and wanted to turn this expertise towards a German-style history of Anglo-Saxon Britain. To him, it was more important to achieve a good model of links between the Old-German related languages, and a history of Anglo-Saxon Britain, than to attend endlessly to the particularities of manuscripts. The anticipated Anglo-Saxon series sharpened the investment of these two men in these issues. Very few Anglo-Saxon manuscripts were at that time published, heightening the interest felt by all Anglo-Saxonists in those that were. The SA, true to its traditional concern with accurate representation, was, initially, producing texts using the Anglo-Saxon rather than Romanised characters.

Battle was joined in the press. Kemble called the Society's publications "bibliomaniacal foppery," and asserted that the new printing societies were doing better editions than the SA.

---


67At the time of the Debate, only the first volume had appeared (*Caedmon*, 1833). It was edited by Thorpe, and used the original rather than the Roman characters. After this, the SA switched to the supplemented Roman style.

68Kemble had published in supplemented Roman characters through the Aelfric Society.
He condemned English universities for their poor language scholarship as compared to continental scholarship. He argued that the original characters were forbidding, and deterred new students from learning Anglo-Saxon. He declared that faithful representation made SA publications too expensive to gain a wide readership among the poor students with the best minds.69 Thorpe and others responded in more moderate language, pointing out that German philologists did more than comparative linguistics and history—they were prone to flights of metaphysical fancy. No-one understood their work because it was obscure.70 Kemble replied that their "ignorance would, if perpetrated by a boy in the second form of a public school, have richly merited and been duly repaid by a liberal application of...[the] birch." Thorpe responded with the observation that Kemble was only half-educated in what either country had to offer, and gave a few good examples.71 Naturally, the public followed the argument with interest.

Madden again mediated peace, allocating kudos and redirecting energies.72 His response again addressed the scholarly issue and improved the prestige of the SA. His temperate discussion of the merits and defects of various works almost disguised the fact that he sided with Kemble. Thus the SA series changed over to the supplemented Roman alphabet. But Madden questioned

69Kemble, in GM 102(1833); 329-31.

70Antiquary Henry Crabb Robinson, whose experiences travelling on £100 per annum during the French Revolution were noted in Chapter Four, had attended the University of Jena. He noted German students' acceptance of a transcendentalist theory of language. See Thomas Sadler, ed., The Diary, Reminiscences, and Correspondence of Henry Crabb Robinson, J.W. Parker: London, 1869, 3 volumes, Vol. 1, p. 128.

71The major articles involved are: GM August 1834 (New Series II, 140); September 1834 (NS II 259-60) and (NS II, 326-4).

72Madden's articles are in GM N.S. 2(November 1834); 483-86 and (December 1234); 591-94. Bosworth had previously tried to mediate, unsuccessfully. Madden had authority within the community because he had edited Havelock the Dane in 1828, and was very familiar with the manuscript record. See also Gretchen P. Akerman, "Sir Frederic Madden and Arthurian Scholarship," in Valerie M. Lagorio and Mildred Leake Day, eds., King Arthur Through the Ages. Garland: New York, 1990, pp. 27-38 and Akerman, "J.M. Kemble and Sir Frederic Madden: 'Conceit and Too Much Germanism'?" in Carl Berkhout and Milton Gatch eds., Anglo-Saxon Scholarship: The First Three Centuries, Hall: Boston, 1982, pp. 167-81.
whether languages were lawful in quite the naturalistic way Kemble had suggested, and acknowledged the problems the traditionalists pointed out. The path forward, as he counselled his colleagues in print, involved a new series, collating all orthographic variants in the corpus, in order to test the community's assumptions about Anglo-Saxon.73

The controversy Thorpe and Kemble had engaged in had involved questions in language study. It was rapidly resolved in favour of Kemble's approach. Both men continued work, in this but also in another area of antiquarian language study: editing, publishing and writing about Anglo-Saxon manuscripts. For the next two decades, both published many texts from the original manuscripts. Thorpe, whose eminence as an Anglo-Saxonist was in no way diminished by this controversy, edited many of the SA series' publications.74 After the publication of Thorpe's Analecta, done in supplemented Roman type, the animosity died out of their reviews and publications.75

Kemble published less with the SA Anglo-Saxon series than did Thorpe.76 However, he

73This second series was not gratuitous: some aspects of Anglo-Saxon grammar were still undetermined. But it is also true that the controversy brought the Society notoriety, that Madden's actions brought it distinction, that making Anglo-Saxon chic was to enhance antiquaries' public role as arbiters in intellectual questions, and that antiquaries would benefit from being the new series' editors and printers.


75Kemble praised Thorpe's Analecta Anglo-Saxonica in his review of GM (April 1834) N.S. 1; 391-3. Thorpe's Analecta Anglo-Saxonica addressed the problem of the forbidding appearance of Anglo-Saxon to students, was printed in supplemented Roman type, and was intended as an introductory work. It also contained excerpts from many manuscripts never before published, and so was of great interest to many Anglo-Saxonists.

76Kemble did the Poetry of the Codex Vercellensis, one of the most important Anglo-Saxon literary volumes, and the Dialogue of Salomon and Saturnus in the Aelfric Society's Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church. Kemble was critical of Thorpe in his 1833 review of the SA Caedmon in GM 102(1833); 329-31. In 1833, Kemble also
published several articles in the *Archaeologia*. One of these was an important contribution to Anglo-Saxon studies, and all show distinctive features of antiquarian philology. In 1838 Kemble published on Runes.\(^7\) He analysed the social meaning of the wood and stone objects into which runes had been carved, to show that they had formed an occult, hieratic language, used only on religious occasions. He used material from Tacitus’ history of the Germans to show that this had been the case in late Roman Germany as well. In the analysis that followed, Kemble made one of the most dramatic announcements in the history of the study of Anglo-Saxon poetry: the name of an important poet. He was able to do this because, like Camden, he had an archaeological appreciation of words. By evaluating the physical properties of objects bearing runic inscriptions, he developed a theory about the context of their use and thus about regularities found in runic and related writings. By comparing these with continental and Icelandic cases, and analysing their elisions, ellipses and case endings in conjunction with contemporaneous manuscripts, marginalia and glosses, Kemble could discuss the place of riddling and alliteration in understanding previously obscure Anglo-Saxon poetry. On this basis, he showed that one poet had signed his name, Cynewulf, anacrostically, in a poem which had previously been thought unimportant.

\(^7\)John Mitchell Kemble, *Archaeologia* 27(1838) No. XII, "On Anglo-Saxon Runes," pp. 327-72. The various Runic alphabets are reproduced in Plate XV. Kemble comments repeatedly on the destruction of Anglo-Saxon materials by Christians: "It is a lamentable thing, that no early copy should have been made of this before the sacrilegious fury of the Presbyterian iconoclasts, in 1642, caused the cross to be flung down," p. 350. Kemble’s theoretical commitments are also evident. See among several examples: "these preliminary remarks will not be without service in assisting to explain why my interpretations of certain Anglo-Saxon runic monuments differ *toto coelo* from those of the learned Danes, who have been so obliging as to attempt to decypher them for us: and to save them this trouble in future, a sort of tacit understanding in this country [has arisen], that the labour and the honour might just as well be left to them: in the propriety of which view it is difficult to concur." p. 327 and "as German is as yet by no means so generally understood as it must be by all who pretend to any successful investigation of our national antiquities, I shall take the opportunity at once of stating some of William Grimm’s results," p. 328.
nonsense. This initiated a great deal of research into Anglo-Saxon riddling and alliteration.\textsuperscript{78}

In another article, Kemble showed that a fragmentary inscription found on an Anglo-Saxon cross was a version of a poem found in the Vercelli manuscript, and explained how Runic characters were keyed to written characters.\textsuperscript{79} In this article, as in the previous one, careful attention to the physical makeup and context of runic-inscribed objects was constitutive of Kemble's interpretive method. In a third article, Kemble used the work of Jacob Grimm as well as archaeological and mineralogical analysis to evaluate inscribed funerary articles found at several European sites. Kemble concluded with a claim that this kind of problem, and, he infers, the integrated archaeological and philological method of solving it, "especially belongs to the competency of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of England."\textsuperscript{80}

Camden's forensic philology was still in use among nineteenth-century antiquarian philologists, then. Its presence can also be seen in the articles of antiquaries who worked on numismatics, archaeological artefacts, and hieroglyphics.\textsuperscript{81} In such cases, the interpretation of


\textsuperscript{79}See "The relation of the poem to the inscription is perhaps not a matter of much interest, except insofar as the collation of the one proves the accuracy of the system by means of which the other was deciphered." In Kemble, Archaeologia 30(1844). No. II, "Additional Observations on the runic Obelisk at Ruthwell; the Poem of the Dream of the Holy Rood; and a Runic Copper Dish found at Cherty," pp. 31-46, p. 38.

\textsuperscript{80}Kemble, Archaeologia 36(1855). No. XXXII. p. 369. See the same approach, also using Grimm, in W.M. Wylie. Archaeologia 37(1857). No. XXIX, "The Burning and Burial of the Dead," pp. 455-78. For Kemble's German training in this direction, see Hans Frede Nielsen, "Jacob Grimm and the 'German' Dialects," in Elmer H. Antonsen, James W. Marchand, and Ladislav Zgusta, eds., The Grimm Brothers and the German Past, Benjamins: Amsterdam, 1990. pp. 25-32. This article makes it clear that Grimm did less with the physical context of inscriptions than did Kemble.

words necessitated attention to their physical context.82

The presentation of such material in the *Archaeologia* makes it clear that an appreciation of the physical contexts of words was conventional among antiquaries during the period under consideration. Articles treating inscriptions regularly gave a copy and translation of the material within the text. But this was accompanied by engravings which attempted to provide a near-facsimile reproduction of the item in its original state. A similar antiquarian equation of the semantic and physical aspects of texts can be seen in the many articles presenting previously unpublished manuscripts. These commonly presented the text, followed by notes and a glossary, and were accompanied by plates giving at least examples, and sometimes the entire manuscript in near-facsimile engravings.83 The relations of the facsimile to the traditional antiquarian desire for fully accurate representation of the vestiges of the past will be discussed later in this chapter.

In the 1830s, John Mitchell Kemble and Benjamin Thorpe were engaged in a philosophical argument about language study. But they published editions of Anglo-Saxon texts

---


83See for example, George Stephens, *Archaeologia* 30(1844), No. XXVII. "Extracts in Prose and Verse from an Old English Medical Manuscript, preserved in the Royal Library at Stockholm," pp. 349-418; Thomas Joseph Pettigrew, *Archaeologia* 30(1844), No. XXVIII. "Observations upon the Extracts from an Ancient English Medical MS in the Royal Library of Stockholm," pp. 419-29, which also provides a critical review of N.F.S. Gruntvig's translations of the same manuscript.
throughout their working lives. The editing of texts, and publishing on and about manuscripts, was a more common scholarly activity among antiquaries than engagement with the philosophical questions surrounding the study of languages and texts. Access to printed texts was intimately connected to the growth of philology, as well as to many fields of antiquarian knowledge. In 1830, there was much manuscript material which had not previously been read, collected, published or evaluated by scholars. The new industrial print technology made it possible to provide the scholarly community with inexpensive editions of these primary sources. It also made possible scholarly aids such as catalogues and bibliographies. Large numbers of nineteenth-century antiquaries were involved in this intersection of the new printing capacity, and the study of languages and texts.

Previous chapters have made plain the fact that many antiquaries were printers, had connections with the printing trades, and formed printing societies. These societies proliferated. The Surtees Society, for example, founded in 1834, led to the foundation of the Camden Society in 1838, which in turn led to the creation of the Aelfric, Shakespeare, and other societies.

---


85 Of these, the Roxburghie Club was the first and most exclusive. See Edward Edwards, *Libraries and Founders of Libraries*, Trubner: London, 1865, pp. 424-26. Roxburghie editions were uneven, but the criticism of them in the antiquarian community led to much more careful standards. For other printing societies, see Appendix 2.B.3.

Antiquaries can be found on their councils, and often make up a large proportion of editors and subscribers. Of the 104 publications produced by the Camden Society, 1838-70, for example, 80 were edited by antiquaries.\(^{87}\) Antiquaries made up twenty-three of twenty-eight original Council members of the Shakespeare Society. In 1842, the Philological Society of London was formed. Antiquaries made up 24% of founder members and 23% of Council members throughout the period under consideration, and contributed 16 articles to its 5 volumes published in its first decade. Antiquaries, then, were deeply involved with editing and printing the materials they wanted to study.

Print technology also made possible comprehensive bibliographic aids. Many antiquaries published catalogues of manuscripts available in various collections. Many of these were related to Anglo-Saxon studies.\(^{88}\) Others organised catalogues of manuscripts according to the collection


in which they were found. Still others catalogued material related to the study of Anglo-Saxon. Some fitted this information into traditional antiquarian works. John Caley, Bulkeley Bandinel and Henry Ellis, for example, re-edited Dugdale's *Monasticon* in the same way Gibbon, Gough and Lysons had edited Camden's *Britannia*, appending much new manuscript material on the Anglo-Saxon church.

For many antiquaries, philological work meant an involvement with contemporary words and regional usage. Some antiquaries wrote grammars of British languages such as Gaelic and Cornish. Many catalogued provincial iotacisms and phrases, as a part of recording the unique

---


91 William Dugdale, Roger Dodsworth, John Caley, Henry Ellis, Bulkeley Bandinel, Richard Cowling Taylor and John Stevens, *Monasticon Anglicanum: A History of the Abbies and Other Monasteries, Hospitals, Frieries, and Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, with their Dependencies, in England and Wales: Also of all such Scotch, Irish, and French Monasteries, as were in any Manner Connected with Religious Houses in England...Originally Published in Latin by William Dugdale*, J. Bohn: London, 1846, 6 volumes.

history of a county. Others published sets of words organised by author or period.93 This kind of work harmonized with antiquaries' traditional interest in exhaustive collections, resulting in a large number of dictionaries and glossaries.94 James Orchard Halliwell-Phillipps attempted to set this new antiquarian form of language study into their traditional historical framework.95

The encyclopedia and the dictionary were arrangements bound to appeal to antiquarian ambitions. Nineteenth-century antiquaries published encyclopedic compilations in many different fields.96 Many antiquaries published dictionaries of words of various kinds. Mark Antony Lower's dictionary of English family names traced their historical paths in the same way Camden


had done, in treating the important families of the provinces. Thomas Wright's dictionary of obsolete English was concerned to preserve information about words which were dying out or no longer in use. His Biographia Britannica Literaria included a "[b]ibliographical list of editions of anonymous books in Anglo-Saxon, and of works specially illustrating the Anglo-Saxon language and history." Many antiquaries combined a glossary of terms or words with work on a particular set of manuscripts. John Brand was the only antiquary who managed to make this pursuit popular, by linking provincialisms to their local contexts and customs.

---


98 See Thomas Wright, *A Dictionary of Obsolete and Provincial English: Containing Words from the English Writers Previous to the Nineteenth Century which are no longer in Use, or are not used in the same Sense. And words which are now used only in the Provincial Dialects*. G. Bell: London, 1880.


101 See John Brand, *Observations on the Popular Antiquities of Great Britain: Chiefly Illustrating the Origin of our Vulgar and Provincial Customs, Ceremonies and Superstitions*, H.G.Bohn: London, 1848-49, arranged and enlarged by John Ellis, edited by James Orchard Halliwell-Phillipps. This was his first edition, which was a part of Bohn’s Standard Library. Another version was published under the same title by G. Bell and Son in London in 1900-02 for Bohn’s Antiquarian Library. The popular edition was Brand, *Brand’s Popular Antiquities of Great Britain. Faith and Folklore: A Dictionary of National Beliefs, Superstitions and Popular Customs, Past and Current, With their Classical and Foreign Analogues, Described and Illustrated, forming a New Ed. of "The Popular Antiquities of Great Britain" by Brand and Ellis, largely Extended, Corrected, Brought Down to the Present Time, and now first Alphabatically Arranged*, Reeves & Turner: London, 1905, which was arranged as a dictionary. Alexander Dyce's
Richard Chenevix Trench appealed for a more systematic lexicographical practice among these very diverse works.\textsuperscript{102}

As has been noted throughout this thesis, bibliography was an area in which many antiquaries worked. For antiquaries, this term still held its extended sense, and intersected naturally with the study of language and of manuscripts. Many antiquaries catalogued important manuscript collections.\textsuperscript{103} Many traced the history of rare books and manuscripts.\textsuperscript{104} Joseph Hunter, for example, published a catalogue of Anglo-Saxon charters in 1831. His historical preface states the traditional antiquarian links between collection and preservation, and the construction of history from as complete an evidential base as possible:

it is to be desired that what still remains in manuscript should be brought to light, and that what is to be found in our printed works should be collected...Forgotten names would be recovered, and our imperfect catalogues of English writers be rendered less incomplete...nowhere can we find the result of so much labour lying within what is so


\textsuperscript{103}For the works of Dibdin, see Chapter Three, n. 122. See also William Younger Fletcher, who had been a member in 1870, \textit{English Book Collectors}, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner: London. 1902. This work dealt with the collections of Duke Humphrey, the Royal Library, Cotton, Selden, Harley, Ashmole and others. Fletcher had been a member in 1870. James Orchard Halliwell. \textit{A Handlist of the Early English Literature Preserved in the Malone Collection in the Bodleian Library: Selected from the Printed Catalogue of that Collection}, for private circulation: London, 1860 and \textit{A Hand-List of the Early English Literature Preserved in the Douce Collection in the Bodleian Library: Selected from the Printed Catalogue of that Collection}, for private circulation: London, 1860. These hand-lists described many of the most rare manuscripts in the Bodleian’s exceptional collection. See also William Harris, \textit{A Catalogue of the Library of the Royal Institution of Great Britain, methodically arranged with an alphabetical index of authors}, W. Savage: London, 1809; and Richard Colt Hoare. J.B. Nichols, \textit{Catalogue of the Hoare Library at Stourhead, co. Wilts.: to Which are Added an Account of the Museum of British Antiquities, a Catalogue of the Paintings and Drawings, and a Description of the Mansion}, John Bowyer Nichols and Son: London, 1840. Frederic Madden, Bulkeley Bandinel and John Gough Nichols edited the periodical \textit{Collectanea Topographica et Genealogica}, John Bowyer Nichols and Son: London, 1834-43, which provided bibliographical information on topography and genealogy.

\textsuperscript{104}See for example, Adam Clarke, \textit{A Bibliographical Dictionary: Containing a Chronological Account, Alphabetically Arranged, of the most Curious, Scarce, Useful and Important Books, in All Departments of Literature, which have been Published...from the Infancy of Printing to the Beginning of the Nineteenth Century}, W. Baynes: London, 1802-04, 6 volumes; and John Reid, \textit{Bibliotheca Scoto-Celtica: or, An Account of All the Books which have been Printed in the Gaelic Language, With Bibliographical and Biographical Notices}, J. Reid: Glasgow, 1832.
manageable a bulk. His sense of the value of every manuscript, however trivial, resembles archaeological antiquaries' sense of the value of all excavated artefacts. Both had their roots in the traditional antiquarian historiography.

The activity of editing and printing manuscripts, and of producing scholarly aids for the location and study of them, produced its own theoretical questions. The most pressing of these involved systematising the way individual works and libraries were described, and the ways they communicated this information to scholars. Printed editions of Anglo-Saxon texts were highly desirable, but it was often difficult for scholars to know what editions were available to them, either in print or in manuscript, as many libraries had no catalogues, and others had alphabetic catalogues only. Antiquaries led the emerging nineteenth-century consensus about the inadequacy of alphabetic cataloguing. Catalogues arranged first by subject and then alphabetically by

105 Hunter, English Monastic Libraries. I. A Catalogue of the Library of Bretton in Yorkshire and II. Notices of the Libraries Belonging to Other Religious Houses, J.B. Nichols: London, 1831, vii. A similar perspective can be seen in George Laurence Gomme's bibliography of archaeological papers: "Local details cannot be acquired without minute research and extensive knowledge, to be obtained only in the localities by residents in those localities...No doubt many of the local details are vitiated by false theories concerning their origin and history and by false conclusions as to their purpose and meaning. But these defects do not destroy the recorded fact." George Laurence Gomme, Index of Archaeological Papers, 1665-1890, Archibald Constable: London, 1907, x.

106 Many [manuscripts] might have deserved preservation, as exhibiting what was the literal character used in successive ages, thus assisting to determine the age of manuscripts of far greater importance than them. Even those which we now esteem of the least value would have remained sensible and evident proofs of what was the kind of reading in the middle ages, and what the extent of knowledge on important points; which might enable us to set a just value in the opinions of the men of those times, whenever they are to be put in opposition to the opinions of a more enlightened age. The commentators, the schoolmen, the theologians have thus an historical value." Hunter, English Monastic Libraries, x-xi. Hunter placed the sciences within the historiographic project. His statement about the history of the sciences shows his sense of antiquarian historiography: "I see not how the history of any science is to be conducted through the middle age period, but by the assistance of the works of science of the middle age writers, though the contents of them, as works of science, may have now become of little value...not a chronicle could perish, by which the world lost not the knowledge of some fact in our public history; and facts, like experiments in physics, never lose their value." Hunter, English Monastic Libraries, x-xi.

107 The contribution of antiquaries working in the British Library has been discussed in Chapter Three.
author were more useful to the scholar than merely alphabetical catalogues. Advocacy for this system can be found in many antiquaries' works. Bulkeley Bandinel, for example, wrote of his catalogue of British topography: "it is hoped that the present attempt will possess the advantages both of an alphabetical and a classed catalogue."

It is clear that many of these issues are inter-related. A nineteenth-century scholar could not study a language or the manuscripts composed in that language without knowing what was available and where. Thus, nineteenth-century antiquaries' publications often combine information about these related areas. Beriah Botfield, for example, was sheriff of Northamptonshire and MP for Ludlow, 1840-47. His travels through English counties resulted in his 1849 Notes on the Cathedral Libraries of England. His volume exemplifies the intersection of the antiquarian concern for preservation, interest in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, pursuit of bibliography, and advocacy in the question of cataloguing systems.

Each chapter in Botfield's volume treated the arrangement and classification system, history, physical upkeep, regulations, and contents of one of thirty English cathedral libraries. It was the first information available for most of these libraries. Botfield remarked on antiquaries' need for information about manuscripts and early printed books. For him, this information, systematically arranged, founded the possibility of constructing British history: "How tedious


109 Bulkeley Bandinel and Richard Gough, A Catalogue of the Books, Relating to British Topography, and Saxon and Northern Literature, Bequeathed to the Bodleian Library in the Year MDCCXCIX, Clarendon: Oxford, 1814, Preface, p. 4. The catalogue was divided into sections such as Manuscripts, Maps, Missals, Psalters, Primers and so on, and entries were arranged within sections first by county and then alphabetically by author.

soever may be this long series of Works upon British History and Antiquities to the general reader, the Bibliographical Antiquary will thank me for the enumeration of many rare and valuable Illustrations of English History, as well as for keeping as distinct as possible the Historical and Topographical Departments." He was sure that: "if...[my] object can only be effected by a dry catalogue of books, the enthusiasm of the genuine bibliographer will carry him through the task." He declared:

A complete Catalogue,...even in manuscript, [is] greatly to be desired; but, for facility of reference, its arrangement should be alphabetical, as a separate Index to the different cases might be added. It would also be desirable that each work should be described with that attention to bibliographical minuteness which may ensure the accuracy of the Catalogue, and render it worthy of being perpetuated by the power of the press.

Botfield was remorseless in the pursuit of his task. Of Canterbury he wrote: "It is creditable to the curator of this library that two Catalogues of its contents have already been printed." But at Exeter, he criticised the "most careless manner" of "some indolent librarian," who had entered new acquisitions in the existing printed catalogue by hand, and "regretted to notice how much these valuable documents...are still suffering from the dampness of the chamber in which they are kept." Lichfield is commended, as "the manuscripts are kept under lock...in

---


114Botfield, *Notes on the Cathedral Libraries*, p. 16. Of Durham and its librarian James Raine, FSA, he writes: "The third [catalogue of the Durham cathedral library collection] is the catalogue now in use, accurately arranged in alphabetical order, by the Rev. Jas. Raine, the present Librarian. It is to be hoped that this gentleman may be enabled to steal a few hours from his antiquarian researches, to prepare this [new, extended] Catalogue, with appropriate notices of the rarer articles, for the press," p. 92. This was the first catalogue of materials held in twenty-seven of the provincial cathedral libraries covered. They contained "many books now but seldom met with," p. 48.

brass-wire cages," and "[a] classed Catalogue appears to have been in contemplation."116 But at Carlisle: "the place wears the aspect of neglect, and a beggarly account of empty cases disappoints the ardent enquirer for intellectual food; he seeks for Books, and in some Presses finds only a stone."117

Most of each chapter of Botfield’s volume listed and described the contents of each cathedral library. He paid particular attention to medieval manuscripts and early printed books. His work drew attention to many important and previously unknown Anglo-Saxon works, and incunabula, leading to their publication.118

Botfield’s work illustrates the intersection of the antiquarian concern for preservation, for new information about manuscripts, for comprehensive bibliographic information, and for systematic catalogues to support their work on texts. This kind of antiquarian work could lead to foundational scholarship in the study of texts. The work of Francis Fry, on early English Bibles, is a good example of this. Fry’s work also enables us to compare antiquarian with mainstream scholarship, in order to consider what was unique about antiquarian work.

Francis Fry (1806-1886) came from a Bristol family that had been Quaker since 1658.119


117Botfield, Notes on Cathedral Libraries, p. 72. Similarly at Ely: "the fastidious Bibliomaniacs will look here in vain for any Editiones Principes, or for any other of the earlier efforts of the Press," p. 131.

118See Botfield, Notes on the Cathedral Libraries. For a publication by the Surtees Society of a previously unedited manuscript, see p. 116-17. Botfield drew attention to an eighth century edition of Bede and a manuscript of Chaucer’s poetry, p. 117-18, a manuscript copy of Wycliff’s Bible, p. 174, and to numerous copies of works printed by Caxton and Wynkyn de Worde throughout. His discovery of an Anglo-Saxon map of Britain led to its publication by the Royal Society, p. 188.

119They had been chocolate manufacturers since 1728, but also had a soap-making and chemists business by late in the century, and a printing firm, the “Cicero Press” in London, which mainly printed Bibles, from 1788. Joseph Fry, the father of Francis, was an enthusiastic advocate of industrial technology, introduced the first steam-driven printing press into London, and encouraged turnpike road and new methods of building carriages, for which he received a Board of Agriculture silver medal in 1818. He and his wife Ann were also known for their work in poor relief. See Theodore Fry, A Brief Memoir of Francis Fry, FSA of Bristol, “Not Published,” 1887. The only copy of this work I have been able to find is in the British Museum, and was probably printed at the Cotman Press at Fry’s residence outside Bristol. Fry’s sister Anna was known for her translation of Luther and Melancthon.
He attended a local Quaker school, and went into the family business. In 1831 he acted as a special constable during the Bristol riots, but the family’s factory and warehouse were burned. In 1833 he married, and in 1839 moved into Cotman House, outside Bristol, where he remained until his death. While not a large house, Cotman housed Fry’s personal printing operation.120 In business, Fry was known for his energy and his attention to detail. These qualities can be seen in his antiquarian work on the bibliographic history of early English Bibles.

William Tyndale had produced the first translation of the Bible into English in 1526.121 As noted above, Catholic Britain was hostile to his efforts. But by the 1540s, the new Church of England began issuing its own, official translation.122 The issue of interest to Fry was this: how many editions of Bibles were there between Tyndale’s and the Authorised Version, and what were they like? This simple question was difficult to answer. Sixteenth-century printers bound pages from a previous edition into a later edition. Books which fell apart in later decades were similarly "made up" when rebound. Some editions had misleading colophons because they were illegally printed, others lacked them completely. Much information on sixteenth-century print

120 As well as his work with the Fry chocolate and soap concerns, Fry was also a Board Member of the Bristol and Gloucester Railway Company, and a founder member and from 1854 Director of the Bristol and Exeter Railway Company. The Bristol and Gloucester Company amalgamated with the Gloucester to Birmingham company in 1845. Fry played a leading role in the move, and continued on the Board. When the Bristol and Exeter merged with the Great Western in 1876, Fry retired. He was also a Board member of the South Devon Railway Company, but withdrew when I.K. Brunel wanted to try his atmospheric power system. Fry did not, therefore, lose money as did other shareholders, and returned to the Board after this event. He was a representative of the Bristol and Exeter to the Devon and Cornwall Railway Company and Chair and Director of the Bristol Waterworks, where he worked to ensure a clean water supply for all districts of the city.

121 That is, Tyndale was the first to translate from the original Greek and Hebrew into English. The translation by Wycliff was from the Vulgate into Middle-English, and Anglo-Saxon translations were from the Vulgate into Old English.

122 After Tyndale’s death, Miles Coverdale began translating into English the portions of the Old Testament Tyndale had not done. Coverdale’s translation was published illegally on the continent in 1535. Within a few years of this, the Church of England was created, and Coverdale’s and Tyndale’s translations became the basis for the Great Bible, issued in 1539, and placed in all English churches in the 1840s. But the Great Bible had been done hastily and had errors. The Bishops took on a second edition, known as the Bishops’ Bible, issued throughout the 1550s. Numerous further publications were issued between these and the 1611 Authorised Version.
shops was unknown in the nineteenth century, and much of what was known was carried in the heads of a few experts, and was unpublished.\textsuperscript{123} Finally, the printed specimens from which this information could be garnered were spread across Europe and America.

For over thirty years, Fry worked on this problem in British and European libraries and collections, examining and recording the paper sizes and types, seam wires, collation, signatures, pagination and colophons of every copy of every edition he saw. He counted and recorded numbers of letters per line and lines per page, on every page of every copy. He used details such as watermarks, unique capitals, and regularities in the slips of engravers’ tools, to determine which leaves in particular copies had come from an earlier edition but had been rebound into later editions. He travelled throughout Britain and the continent, to see every copy of an early edition he could. He corresponded with American collectors Henry Stevens and James Lenox, who sent him photographs of every page of every early Bible they owned.\textsuperscript{124} In 1878, Fry published an exhaustive catalogue of the editions of English Bibles, 1526-1611.\textsuperscript{125}

\textsuperscript{123}Antiquary Edward Arber’s, The Term Catalogues, 1668-1709 A.D.; with a number for Eastern Term, 1711 A.D. A Contemporary Bibliography of English Literature in the Reigns of Charles II, James II, William and Mary, and Anne. Edited from the Very Rare Quarterly Lists of New Books and Reprints of Divinity, History, Science, Law, Medicine, Music, Trade, Finance, Poetry, Plays, etc.; with Maps, Engravings, Playing Cards, etc.; Issued by the Booksellers etc. of London, was privately printed in London, 1903-06, 3 volumes. This was printed a few years before Arber’s death, and was the product of a lifetime’s work.

\textsuperscript{124}See Henry Stevens, A Catalogue of My English Library, Collected and Described, C. Whittingham: London, 1853. In 1860, Fry travelled in Europe for this purpose. Prior to that, he had worked in the Royal Library at Windsor, at Lambeth, at the collections of the Duke of Spencer at Althorpe, the Marquis of Northampton at Castle Ashby, the Earl of Ashburnham at Ashburnham Place, the Earl of Leicester at Holkham Hall, the Earl of Pembroke at Wilton and Lord Zouche at Parham. He was a close friend of George Bulleyn and Bulkeley Bandinel at the Bodleian and John Winter Jones at the British Library. He had corresponded with most notable collectors in Europe and America. The Emperor Alexander II of Russia, for example, corresponded with Fry about the 1864 discovery of the Codex Sinaiticus and sent him a facsimile copy. James Lenox founded the New York Public Library with his own remarkable collection.

\textsuperscript{125}Francis Fry, A Bibliographic Description of the Editions of the New Testament: Tyndale’s Version in English, with Numerous Readings, Comparisons of Texts and Historical Notices: the Notes in Full from the Edition of Nov. 1534. An account of Two Octavo Editions of the New Testament of the Bishops’ Version without numbers to the Verses, Illustrated with 73 Plates, Titles, Colophons, Pages, and Capitals. Henry Sotheran: London and Fry: Bristol, 1878. Fry’s bibliographic work established the makeup and order of editions which scholars have depended upon since. Fry collated the 136 copies then owned by the British Library, as well as many other copies elsewhere,
To appreciate Fry's work, it must be seen both for what it was, but also for what it was not. It was bibliographically exhaustive and accurate, and it was not sectarian. It is hard to overstate the presence of sectarian comment in nineteenth-century works on Biblical topics. Less than 10% of antiquaries published in Biblical studies. Their work might be expected to show sectarianism similar to that found in non-antiquarian works. But a comparison of Fry's work with that of popular and scholarly non-antiquarian authors also working on Tyndale's Testament shows that there was a distinct difference between antiquarian and non-antiquarian Biblical studies. Sectarianism is much more present in editions of Tyndale's work by non-antiquary authors, and the concern for exhaustive accuracy is much less evident. A review of popular and scholarly non-antiquarian works will reveal these differences.

Popular works were stridently sectarian. Tyndale's Testament was the answer to "the gorgeous mummeries, the sensuous ceremonies, the towering corruptions of the Church of Rome." Non-conformists thanked God for "[t]he voices that once ascended in praise from

---

126 See data presented in Chapter Four and Appendix One.


the forum, the dungeon, the solitude of exile, the rack, the scaffold, or the stake." Church of England authors, less enamoured of extroverted rebellion, referred only to Tyndale's "work in connection with the reformation," and legitimated conformity by noting: "everyone cannot be Luthers or Latimers." All emphasised the virtue of "the modest, learned, self-sacrificing Tyndale." Few mentioned the history of the text.

Scholarly works were less colourful, but not much better at discussing editions or presenting recensions. Three Victorians produced scholarly editions of Tyndale's works in the nineteenth century: Thomas Russell, George Offor and Henry Walter. For each, their religious

---

129 W.L. Thornton, Lectures Delivered, p. 217. Great numbers of examples of the glorification of martyrdom could be given from popularising works. For non-conforming authors, martyrdom validated Tyndale's work and non-conforming English religiosity. Passages like the following are not uncommon: "these Christian brothers were hunted like wild beasts from hiding place to hiding place: decimated at the stake, in the certainty that however many years they might be reprieved, their own lives would close at last in the same fiery trial...imprisoned, racked and scourged...the flesh shrinking before the dread of a death agony...thus it was that they struggled on, earning for themselves, martyrdom, for us, the free England in which we live and breathe." Hester, Bible Class Lectures, p. 23.

130 Smith, William Tyndale, p. 160.

131 Clarke, The Life of William Tyndale, p. 29.

132 Thornton, Lectures, p. 207.

affiliation provides a reliable guide to their Biblical scholarship. Thomas Russell was raised Anglican but educated at Hoxton Dissenters' College. He worked lifelong as a non-conforming divine but held positions of trust on Church of England committees. He was concerned to reconcile the parts of English Protestantism by granting dissenters equal rights but retaining a position of privilege for the established church. Among Tyndale's most controversial translations was "congregation" rather than "church" for the Greek word "ecclesia." The difference lay in whether the sacred text was presented as investing authority in all church members equally or in a priest caste. The meliorist Russell avoided dealing with such uncomfortable issues by providing jejune philological information, and by quoting Archbishop Cranmer's solemn warning against interpreting Scripture too freely.

George Offor scraped a living writing for periodicals and publishers. He was vehemently

---


135 "May not this sense be...confin[ed] to the spirituality, or ecclesiastic body?" Russell, Vol. 1, p. 517. See also, on the issue of the difference between God's elect and sinners, Russell merely comments on Tyndale's use of the arcane word "gest," and its relationship with the word "jest." The main theological issue is not addressed at all. See Russell, The Works, p. 560-62, p. 565. Where Tyndale criticises the cult of Saint Thomas à Becket, Russell's extended history of the shrine may in fact suggest to the sensitive reader that men have returned to worshipping shrines rather than God. In this and many cases, Russell's notes counter the thrust of Tyndale's remarks.

136 The Elizabethan architect of the Church of England, Thomas Cranmer, writes: "The books of Common Prayer neyther useth any suche speach nor giveth any such doctrine, nor I in no point improve that godly booke, nor varye from it. But yet glad I am to heare that the sayd book lyketh you so well as no man can mislike it, that hath any godlynes in hym ioyned with knowledge." Russell, Prologue, p. 6. Russell supports the legitimacy of the Church of England by quoting extensively from the works of Richard Hooker. Hooker, a sixteenth-century moderate Protestant theologian whose major work, The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, is a defence of Church of England principles and structure, argues that nothing may be established in the church which is not commanded by the Word of God, and without discussing the question of what may be meant by the word "church." Russell concludes by encouraging theological students to get to know Hooker's writings and wisdom intimately. See Russell, vol. 1, p. 517.
opposed to the established church, and took Tyndale’s writings as proof that only non-conforming Christians could comprise the true church. He had an expert grasp of Greek and Hebrew and a competent understanding of bibliography. But unlike Fry, he was not systematic and exhaustive, nor did his bibliographic knowledge appear in the notes to his edition of Tyndale’s works. Instead, his commentary veered unpredictably between careful philological exposition and violent ideological proclamation.

Henry Walter was Cambridge educated, a second wrangler in mathematics, an evangelical clergyman, and Professor of Natural Philosophy at the East India Company’s Haileybury College. He shared the orthodox alarm at the Tractarian Movement, and became editor of Tyndale’s works to the Parker Society, a printing society dedicated to reprinting early Protestant texts. His Anglicanism formed his edition. He regularly omitted Tyndale’s obscene comments.

In his translation of Tyndale’s Gospel of Matthew discusses correct millenarian theology. Another discusses whether resurrection will be bodily or spiritual. His translation of the Gospels is subtitled: "Humbly intended for an Argument in Favour of a Revised and Corrected Edition of the Authorised Version of the Holy Scriptures; Whereby the Treasures of Biblical Criticism Which have Long Been Accumulating in the Hands of the Pastors of the Church of England Might be Imparted to the People at Large." His notes to Bible publisher Samuel Bagster’s 1836 edition of Tyndale’s Testament describe the "ceremonies, creeds, and confessions" of the established church as "intolerance, bigotry and persecution to those that cannot conscientiously conform, and hypocrisy in those who subscribe merely for place or lucre" (p. 49). He wrote, of the Act of Supremacy: "a more real Magna Charta, a truer reform Bill was never conferred upon the people." Offor, The Triumph of Henry VIII, pp. 5-6.

Offor was aware of the problems of the standard lists of editions of early English Bibles. His copies of various publications and editions, filled with his autograph notes, are in the British Library’s collection. See for example his copy of Llewelyn, An Historical Account. Offor’s copy of Bagster’s 1836 edition of Tyndale’s Testament has been bound with blank leaves interleaved with the text, onto which Offor has copied out manuscript material, pasted newspaper cuttings about relevant publications, made notes about editions’ title pages, owners and histories, and noted errors. For example, he went carefully through his own copy of the 1768 reprint of the Dedication to the 1567 New Testament like a copy editor, comparing it with the original which he has copied from manuscript, noting at the bottom: "148 Typographical errors in reprinting this dedication.” Russell, The Works, pp 559-560.

See Offor, The Triumph of Henry VIII, pp. 5-6. One twenty-three page note to his translation of Tyndale’s Gospel of Matthew discusses correct millenarian theology. Another discusses whether resurrection will be bodily or spiritual. His translation of the Gospels is subtitled: "Humbly intended for an Argument in Favour of a Revised and Corrected Edition of the Authorised Version of the Holy Scriptures; Whereby the Treasures of Biblical Criticism Which have Long Been Accumulating in the Hands of the Pastors of the Church of England Might be Imparted to the People at Large.” His notes to Bible publisher Samuel Bagster’s 1836 edition of Tyndale’s Testament describe the "ceremonies, creeds, and confessions" of the established church as "intolerance, bigotry and persecution to those that cannot conscientiously conform, and hypocrisy in those who subscribe merely for place or lucre” (p. 49). He wrote, of the Act of Supremacy: "a more real Magna Charta, a truer reform Bill was never conferred upon the people.” Offor, The Triumph of Henry VIII, pp. 5-6.

By comparison Russell writes: "It is not to be supposed that Tyndale exceeded his contemporaries in the homeliness of his language...I have been induced to suffer the author’s language to appear in the text; and now have no other apology to offer those who may justly expect one, than to express my regret that Tyndale should have used such expressions; and that the taste and discretion of the literary world, in its present state of refinement, should not allow an editor the privilege of a common scavenger in removing the filth which past ages have left behind them.” Russell, The Works, pp 559-560.
dealing with the "ecclesia" translation, he referred the reader to antiquary Sharon Turner, whose 1799 History of England was a milestone in the use of manuscript evidence in the reconstruction of British history, but was dense and rather unreadable, creating the false impression that documents existed showing a unified sixteenth-century reforming vision which culminated in the Church of England. Walter was also an indifferent bibliographer. His belief that the editors of past centuries had produced an accurate text led him into errors. For example, he accepted the insignia of Hans Luft in Marburg, used by Tyndale to disguise the real place of publication of his Practice of Prelates. This editorial interpretation was consonant with the hagiographical tradition that claimed Tyndale and Luther had met in Germany at about that time. But Fry, certainly, knew better than to accept such an imprimatur at face value.

This comparison of Fry’s work with those of popular and non-antiquarian but scholarly editions of Tyndale’s work allows us to see what was distinctively antiquarian about nineteenth-century antiquaries’ study of texts. First, it was based in previous antiquarian work. Fry was working with lists of early printed Bibles made by earlier antiquaries, Christopher Anderson and

---

140 Walter, Notes and Expositions, p. 314 n. 1; see similar uses of references to Turner on p. 315 n. 3, and p. 322 n. 1. See also p. 316 n. 1 for citation of supporting manuscript evidence; also 317 n. 3, 4, 5, 6, p. 318 n. 1, 3 and p. 319 n. 4. In his Introductory Note to Tyndale’s polemical treatise, The Practice of Prelates, Walter wrote: “As the prelates whose conductTyndale intended to expose were indisputably those of the Church of Rome, it was thought proper to mark this, in an edition issued after the establishment of a Protestant prelacy; especially when that prelacy had begun to be assailed by men who might be tempted to cite Tyndale’s words as meant to condemn any inequality of ranks amongst the presbyters of a Christian church.” Walter, Exposition and Notes, p. 238-39.

141 He collated the Cambridge University Foxe folio himself, but otherwise used Offor’s collation if he noticed these issues at all. Walter, Notes and Expositions, Introductory Notice, p. 238-39.

142 Fry’s careful attention to paper types, watermarks and other details allowed him to prove Tyndale’s printer was Peter Schoeffer of Antwerp. On the other hand, Walter made many sound editorial decisions based on what he did know of the history of editions. For example, he insisted on reverting from the use of “pope,” common in editions of Tyndale’s works from the time of John Day, back to Tyndale’s “Bishop of Rome.” Walter, Notes and Expositions, p. 134-135. And Walter alone provides references to various versions of the Bible. For example, The Vulgate, the Authorised Version, the Hebrew Scriptures, the Foxe and other editions of Tyndale’s works. Walter also cross-referenced Tyndale’s uses of biblical phrases with his translation of the New Testament. This resulted in the most useful text for other scholars of the English Reformation then published.
Lea Wilson. Until Fry's work these were the most complete lists available. But Fry noted that errors had been made in copying, examining and comparing editions. Poor or incomplete descriptions, and careless cataloguing, dating and attribution had led to the postulation of chimerical editions, and these errors had then been repeated in later lists. Fry believed that a comprehensive and accurate list was needed, and could only be generated by one mind, and by one pair of eyes that had seen all extant copies.

Second, Fry's work aimed at exhaustive, meticulous accuracy. His 1878 Bibliographical Description listed all variant readings and collations of signatures for each edition, and reproduced in 73 photolithographs the colophons, watermarks, capitals and other items he had used in determining the composition and dates of the editions, so that readers could use his work to identify any edition they came across.

Third, Fry's work treated both the physical and the semantic portions of books as equally significant. His Bibliographical Description, arranged like a chronological catalogue, was a kind

---

143 See Lea Wilson, Bibles, Testaments, Psalms and Other Books of the Holy Scriptures in English In the Collection of Lea Wilson, Esq., FSA, Charles Wittingham: London, 1845 and Editions of the Bible and Parts thereof In English, from the Year MDV to MDCCCL with an Appendix containing Specimens of Translations and Bibliographical Descriptions, Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1852, second edition, revised by Henry Cotton. Related work had been done by Adam Clarke, in A Succinct Account of Polyglot Bibles, from 1516, to...1750: including several curious particulars relative to the London Polyglot, and Castel's Heptaglott Lexicon, not noticed by bibliographers, J. Nuttall: London. 1802.

144 See Fry, Bibliographic Description, 1878, Preface, xiv, x. For example, errors could easily be made in determining collation if the sheets had been folded an extra time. A book made by folding quarto sheets an extra time was not correctly designated an octavo. These terms referred to the signatures bound, not the size of a book, though the two went together in most cases. Signatures could be determined attending to the direction of the seam wires across the paper of the pages.

145 "[The mode of explanation aimed at is recording facts in order that every reader may use them for his own purpose. Speculation, too much introduced by some writers on bibliography, is here generally avoided." Francis Fry, A Bibliographical Description, p. x. "[My] description of a book should, if possible, be such that no other can be mistaken for it." Fry, A Bibliographical Description, p. x.
of variorum edition. But the crucial difference between Fry’s work and that of twentieth-century variorum editions was that he had treated all aspects of the physical text equally with the words on the page. That is, he catalogued the minute differences found in the physical makeup and pictorial components of editions, exactly as he catalogued differences of wording. Fry’s work, then, shows a sense of text as artefact, and of the word as object. This was a distinctively antiquarian perspective. Camden’s forensic, applied philology had erased the differences between texts and monuments in using them to construct an account of the past. Antiquaries from the time of Camden on had been collecting, preserving and commenting on both. The same practice can be seen in the work of antiquarian archaeologists, who integrated philological and textual analysis into their interpretation of sites.

Fourth, Fry’s equal treatment of the physical and semantic parts of texts reflected the antiquarian belief in history as representational, based in the vestiges remaining from the past. Another product of Fry’s industry was a series of publications of early editions of Tyndale’s and Coverdale’s editions of the Bible, the Great Bible, and seventeenth-century editions of the Bible. All were reproduced with the same antiquarian sense of meticulous, representative accuracy. Fry’s 1862 edition of Tyndale’s Testament, for example, was a perfect photolithographic facsimile. Even the paper type and colour were simulated, and the production techniques of the sixteenth century reproduced.147 Its preface recounts the processes of reproduction, and the

146 I am using “variorum” as it applies to editions of classical texts, in which the best text is presented on the majority of the page, with variant textual readings attested in other manuscript sources listed at the bottom of the page or in the back of the book. The exception to this usage has grown up around editions of Shakespeare’s works, and has tended to include the history of criticism as well as textual variants. I am grateful to Professor William Elton for discussing this point with me.

147 See Francis Fry, ed., The First New Testament Printed in the English Language (1525 or 1526) Translated from the Greek by William Tyndale. Reproduced in Facsimile with an Introduction, Bristol: for the editor, 1857; Fry, ed., The Christian Soldiers Penny Bible, London, Printed by R. Smith for Sam Wade, 1693. Reproduced in Facsimile with an Introductory Note, Willis and Sotheran: London, 1862; Fry, ed., The Bible by Coverdale, MDXXXV, Remarks on the Titles, the Year of Publication; the Preliminary; the Water-Marks; etc.; with Fac-similes, Willis and Sotheran:
numerous kinds of checks against the originals that Fry devised to be sure his copying was physically and visually a near-perfect reproduction.

The printed facsimile reveals a distinctively antiquarian sense of preserving the vestiges of the past. In effect, antiquaries were reproducing these vestiges as nearly perfectly as possible. Many other antiquaries also produced facsimile editions of texts, thus conveying as fully as possible all the information, physical and pictorial as well as semantic, about text and context.\textsuperscript{148} Since many antiquaries could not travel to gain access to the manuscript copies of materials they were working on, facsimiles permitted a nearly perfect replica of those materials. For many antiquaries, palaeographic questions were crucial to the evaluations and historiographic decisions they made in their work. Facsimile editions allowed them to adjudicate unsigned manuscripts they were familiar with, and make judgements in cases where they could not get to the original edition.\textsuperscript{149}

The information conveyed by facsimiles could also be of scholarly importance to the community. The sale of the book collection of German collector Dr. Georg Kloss by Henry Leigh

\textsuperscript{148}See, for example, the same approach in John Evans. Archaeologia 37(1857), No. XVI, "Unpublished Letters from the Queen of Bohemia, daughter of James I, to Sir Edward Nicholas," pp. 224-43. In every one of the twenty-five cases, the signature of the Queen is reproduced in facsimile. This functioned both to introduce antiquaries working in this area to this particular autograph, but also to prove that each of the letters, transcribed in full, were hers.

Sotheby. This collection contained many medieval and Renaissance scientific works, as well as a variety of Reformation-era religious works. Sotheby spent months cataloguing the latter. As he did so, he attended to the autograph marginalia in them, and began to distinguish different hands. One book had been signed by German reformer Philip Melancthon, a humanist, a friend of Erasmus and the protégé of Martin Luther. From this signature and from extant autograph letters, Sotheby was able to evaluate the marginalia found in the religious books in Kloss' collection and determine that Kloss had owned a large portion of Melancthon's personal library.

Sotheby's palaeographic work demonstrated that Kloss had owned a portion of Melancthon's personal library. Sotheby reproduced the extensive annotations in Melancthon's own hand in toto, in two large folio volumes. These volumes are arranged so that numbered entries in the text correspond to numbered plates. The text lists Melancthon's marginalia, and describes the work and page number where they are found in Melancthon's hand. The numbers correspond to photolithographic facsimiles of every comment, sentence, paragraph, doodle or blotch in Melancthon's hand found in Kloss' religious books. Thus, the scholar of humanism, the Reformation, or any other related study, could use Sotheby's volumes in tandem with other copies of the works Melancthon had been annotating, in order to know how Melancthon had responded to them in print.  

Henry Leigh Sotheby and Francis Fry, like many other antiquaries, were expert in the technical rather than the philosophical dimensions of the study of languages and texts. Thus,

---

150 See Chapter Three, note 133.

151 See Samuel Leigh Sotheby, Observations upon the Handwriting of Philip Melancthon. Illustrated with Facsimiles from his Marginal Annotations, his Common-Place book and his epistolary Correspondence..., J. Davy: London, 1839, 2 volumes. See also Sotheby, Paper-marks in the Early block-books of the Netherlands and Germany..., Privately: London, 1858; Sotheby, Principia Typographica. The Block-Books or Xylographic delineations of Scripture history..., W. McDowall: London, 1858; Sotheby, Unpublished Documents, Marginal Notes and Memoranda, in the Autograph of Philip Melancthon and Martin Luther: with Numerous Facsimiles... Privately: London, 1840.
Hickes, Somner and Lye, and later Sotheby, Fry and others, defined their philological inquiries within the realm of attested, historical materials rather than within the broader realm of human understanding. The traditional antiquarian program had long encouraged SA members to work towards a comprehensive knowledge of a small, specialised part of British historiography. Membership in the nineteenth-century SA tended to recognise work of this sort already accomplished. Throughout their centuries of work on British history, then, antiquaries’ philological work aimed at knowledge about a limited, text-based problem, rather than understanding of the more profound philosophical questions such as those taken up by Adamic and German language scholars.

For generations of antiquaries, doing philology within the context of the British manuscript record meant studying Anglo-Saxon, both the language and the texts. A few energetic souls like Henry Rawlinson pursued the languages of the ancient near east, but even the classical languages held antiquarian attention only insofar as they discussed Roman Britain. It might, then, be said that antiquaries were "not quite philologists" because they limited the scope of their inquiry to British topics. Further, they attended to the relations of the semantic content and physical and contextual aspects of manuscripts. That is, they practised an archaeological kind of philology. Even more, antiquaries were not quite philologists because they abstained from pursuing philosophical questions, in the same way Momigliano described antiquaries as "not quite historians," because they wrote systematically rather than following a narrative thread.\(^\text{152}\) A narrative thread indicates that a judgement has been made about issues of significance to human communities, past and present. It shows that a selection has been made among materials, on the basis of that judgement. The antiquaries considered in this chapter did not judge or select: every

scrap of manuscript material was prized for its eventual contribution to the perfect representation of the past. Where nineteenth-century antiquaries did engage with theoretical questions, these arose directly out of the technical dimension of philology. What was the best way to represent an alphabet in modern type, which appeared in several forms in the manuscript record? What was the best way to order bibliographic information, so that scholars from all fields could use a catalogue to find what they needed quickly? Could the full reality of a manuscript be conveyed by a facsimile? Questions of mind, or of human understanding, were regularly excluded from antiquarian work.

This realistic approach brought antiquaries success in their chosen, delimited areas. Without doubt, they contributed largely to bibliography, palaeography, epigraphy and history. Their many editions and publications contributed to the rapid growth of knowledge in these and other areas. Their prodigious labour in collecting, organising and publishing primary materials was foundational to literary, linguistic and historical studies undertaken in the twentieth century. But the nineteenth-century SA had a problem with public recognition of their realistic work. In the case of the Anglo-Saxon Debate, Madden and the SA Council successfully mediated a dispute which might have generated criticism of the antiquarian community. They took advantage of the patriotism felt about the publication of Beowulf to generate some public respect and admiration for the SA and its work. But despite these attempts to improve the public reception of antiquarian work, antiquaries' subjects of research could never generate wide speculative interest in the way Locke's rational, the Mills' material, or Tooke's implausible theories did. In most cases, as with the work of Fry and Sotheby, antiquarian scholarship received almost no attention at all, except from other specialists. Where antiquaries focused on the minutiae of manuscripts, it was the romantic Anglo-Saxonism of Scott's Ivanhoe which became widely popular at the beginning of the period under consideration. Where Kemble attended to the details of Runic crosses, and John
Yonge Akerman excavated numerous Anglo-Saxon graveyards, it was William Morris' artistic kind of medievalism that became fashionable towards the end of the period under consideration. Despite the importance of their scholarship, from the perspective of the non-specialist Victorian world, antiquaries' enduring reputation for dullness was justified. As for antiquaries' own account of their persistence, Scott's character Johnathon Oldbuck's reply to being asking the reason for his inquiries may be representative: "'For my own satisfaction solely,' replied the Antiquary." 153

CHAPTER SEVEN

The preceding chapters have described nineteenth-century antiquarianism as a modest institution, a complex intellectual domain organised by a simple question, and a vigorous, interconnected community. These facets of antiquarianism correspond to the three components of the model set out in Chapter One. While it has been convenient to separate them out for the purposes of examination, they are usually highly interconnected. Chapters Two, Three and Four indicated some of the ways in which they were connected. Chapters Five and Six portrayed these connections in greater detail. For example, John Mitchell Kemble’s intellectual commitment to a German style of language study led to a public confrontation with another SA fellow and Anglo-Saxonist, Benjamin Thorpe. Their battle was on intellectual grounds, but both community and institution profited when Frederic Madden negotiated a cease-fire. Madden’s skilful intercession also led to the SA’s Anglo-Saxon series, further promoting the study of language and texts.

These kinds of connections are the subject of this concluding chapter. A multitude of connections could be discussed. Those chosen are significant in three ways. First, they account for the sudden eclipse of antiquarianism late in the nineteenth century. As has been noted throughout this thesis, the adverse fortune of this venerable intellectual enterprise requires explanation, and is made more piquant because it flourished at the moment of its eclipse. Second,

---

1 The problem of funding, for example, formed the developing SA institution, motivated the collaborative methods antiquaries devised in order to pursue their intellectual fields, and gave rise to many kinds of links between community members.

2 Similar connections can be found between institution, community and field in the case of archaeology. Archaeological fellows found that the lack of financial support from the SA affected their ability to pursue their chosen field. Members’ agitation for better funding, and advocacy on behalf of sites and artefacts, succeeded in moving the SA towards financial support for excavations, and Council towards adopting a more public role as an agent of, and advocate for, the protection of sites and artefacts. These actions promoted the pursuit of archaeological knowledge.
some connections help to characterize antiquarianism with specific reference to antiquarian issues and problems brought up in previous chapters. Thus they define what is unique about antiquarianism as an intellectual project and domain. Finally, some connections are significant because they help to provide a critical response to current models of fields. Reviewing the work of Mary Jo Nye, Maurice Crosland and Gerald Geison, I will suggest that their models of fields could be improved by including analysis of the social reception of scholars and their work, and the relations of scholarly institutions to their social and political context. Personal motivations and textual form should also be given a place in models of intellectual field. They contributed to the longevity of antiquarianism, and are probably significant elements of the histories of many fields. These three kinds of connections are dealt with in order in this chapter, beginning with the sudden eclipse of antiquarianism.

Nineteenth-century antiquarianism was a vigorous embodiment of Camden's historiographic vision. By 1870, while still the object of ridicule, the SA had built a public role for itself. Its chances of retaining some part of that public role into the twentieth century must have seemed very sound. Yet thirty years later, at the end of the nineteenth century, the SA had narrowed its intellectual pursuits to an archaeological fragment of its former domain, and had no

---

3The role of genre and of personal motivations in the development of fields is implicit in the models that have structured this thesis. The Nye models of chemical processes Nye analyses were dependent on schools of thought that existed in those times, about the nature of chemical interactions. The visual conventions she diagrams were products of conceptual conventions, which were expressed in the form of texts about chemistry. Both visual and textual material structured the conceptual progress of the field, then, and it seems artificial to insist on a strong difference between these two highly conventionalised methods of conveying information. It would make more sense to evaluate the ways in which various kinds of conceptual conventions structure work in a given field over time. Nye makes visual conventions a separate feature of a model of the field. But to achieve a more generally applicable model of intellectual field, the ways conceptual material is structured, reproduced and reformulated should form its own distinct component of a model of field.

notable role in government or education whatever. How did this happen? It was not the product of any internal SA struggle between text-oriented and object-oriented fellows. No evidence for such a struggle has survived. Both internal and external causes can be identified. Briefly, antiquaries’ success at the cautious, meticulous, and specialised pursuit of the evidence for a super-history inundated them with new material, which began to undermine their ability to coordinate it all towards that distinctively antiquarian work. Some of the causes of their eclipse lay within antiquaries’ own intellectual project, then. But the definitive cause is found outside the antiquarian community, in the new ways industrial England structured the pursuit of knowledge and ordered the provision of education. Antiquaries’ stewardship of their traditional scholarly fields was lost because many parts of historical and literary scholarship began to be undertaken by university-based scholars, who had better financial support and greater time to pursue this work than did the private scholar. Let us examine these processes in greater detail.

SA historian Joan Evans presents the reduction in the antiquarian intellectual domain as the product of three things: the effort to secure an archaeological survey of England, which consumed the Society’s attention in the 1870s, the fact that the memberships of the SA, the British Archaeological Association and the Royal Archaeological Institute were virtually identical, and the increasing scholarly and financial burden of the kind of textual works antiquaries had formerly undertaken. This shift in the kinds of projects late nineteenth-century antiquaries undertook reflects a shift in the kinds of lives industrial-era antiquaries led, as compared to their predecessors. In Chapter Four it was noted that few antiquaries were wealthy enough to devote all their time to scholarship. Instead, most worked at some form of remunerative employment, and pursued scholarship as they could. Antiquaries’ changing work circumstances interacted with

5See Evans, A History, 313-45.
their intellectual project and the fortune of their fields. In 1879, Lord Carnarvon lamented the fact that antiquaries now lacked the time to pursue the kind of literary work that had been done in the past.\textsuperscript{6} In every antiquarian field, the scope of studies was narrowing, and the work of attaching it to the projected super-history was being abandoned. In 1885, when John Evans became PSA, it was not simply because he was himself an archaeologist that he assumed archaeology was antiquaries’ chief concern. Excavation of one barrow might occupy weeks, and its explication months, but the body of relevant scholarship was less substantial than that of the more developed historical fields. In general, this did not demand the extensive, comprehensive knowledge or the lifetime of continual study required, for example, to produce a new edition of Camden or Dugdale.\textsuperscript{7} Because of their work conditions, then, late nineteenth-century antiquaries’ ability to devote a lifetime to the minute evaluation of a narrow historical or literary question, as a contribution towards a generously defined intellectual project whose fulfilment was many generations distant, decreased sharply. As Momigliano put it, "the time-honoured antiquarian has fallen victim to an age of specialisation."\textsuperscript{8}

The SA’s slow response to nineteenth-century specialisation contributed to the eclipse of antiquarianism. The size of the antiquarian domain before its reduction suggests it would have been hard for the SA to coordinate the production of knowledge without eventually developing complex institutional structures. The need for coordination became critical in the nineteenth century. In the sixteenth through eighteenth centuries, informal collaboration had successfully

\textsuperscript{6}In Evans, \textit{A History}, pp. 320-21. Carnarvon was PSA 1878-85.

\textsuperscript{7}Evans argues that these changes had an effect of antiquaries’ intellectual goals, which became more specialised from about the 1870s. Evans, \textit{A History}, pp. 326ff. In 1888, the SA began to organise Archaeological Conferences, “for the better organization of antiquarian research.” p. 329.

coordinated antiquaries’ work. But as membership grew in the late eighteenth century, the work produced outpaced the SA’s ability to coordinate it through publications and meetings. In the nineteenth century, the growing popularity of antiquarianism greatly increased the emergence of new fields and the complexity of the scholarly discussion in each. The institutional body that could coordinate this activity would need an array of expertise in many fields, and structured processes of certification and evaluation. Even funding at the level French scientists enjoyed might not have sufficed to calibrate institution and personnel to intellectual developments.⁹

Early in the nineteenth century, the SA recognised that it was facing an intellectual explosion. Attempting to meet the new demand for support and coordination, Council proposed building a museum for historical materials.¹⁰ When this proposal failed to raise the interest which might have led to the requisite funds, Council decided that what funds they had should support the library, and gave parts of their collection to the British Museum. Even in the 1830s, then, the SA was responding to the growth and speciation of knowledge, and the need for coordination of antiquarian fields of knowledge, by reducing its intellectual domain and acknowledging another institution as more able to undertake one of antiquaries’ traditional goals.

---

⁹The SA was not the only institution facing this crisis. In the sciences, the proliferation of specialist societies in the early part of the century was as much a response to, as a catalyst for, the growth and speciation of scientific knowledge. These include the Geological (1807), Entomological and Zoological (1826), Geographical (1830), and Statistical Societies (1834) and the BAAS (1832). See D.S.L. Cardwell, The Organization of Science in England: A Retrospect, Heinemann: London, 1957; Brian Simon, Studies in the History of Education, 1780-1870, Lawrence & Wishart: London, 1960; R.M. McLeod, “Of Medals and Men: A Reward System in Victorian Science 1826-1914” Notes and Records of the Royal Society 26(1971): 81-105. For both the RS and the SA, the proliferation of new areas of study and new methods of analysis scattered their members, speciated their intellectual domain, and placed extraordinary pressures on the institution.

The growth and speciation of knowledge transformed the experiences of antiquaries. Ironically, their traditions of specialisation and collaboration helped to drive the very conditions that made it difficult for the SA to coordinate. As Chapter Four showed, antiquaries were active members of many specialised learned societies. Before reform, the community's traditions would have supported this kind of action. After reform, SA activism was directed at excavations and restorations. Thus, antiquaries' activity in addressing their scholarly needs outside their institution developed ahead of the SA's own ability to coordinate members' work and develop a public image and role commensurate with their actual scholarly authority. Over time, the gap between the SA's coordinating role, and members' intellectual and institutional investments outside the SA, widened. Antiquaries began to be publicly visible not as antiquaries but as

---

11This move reflected the institutional culture of pre-reform SA Councils, but it is possible to doubt whether an activist Council, with the funds and will to generate coordinating structures, could have acquired a critical component of institutional success: public recognition. Data presented in Chapter Four suggests the SA may not have had the social influence of elite societies like the RS. Scientific societies were assisted by the times; the British government was investing in tides, meteorology, and other scientific work useful to government and industry. The SA was new to the techniques of self-promotion, and culturally hostile to the kind of opinion-engineering that had brought the BAAS recognition. Although by 1870 it had achieved much, its performance was still that of a novice, and it had to develop public recognition for its work against a headwind of ridicule. Though erroneous, this ridicule only had to exist to have an effect. For the SA, then, the external recognition that linked the antiquarian institution with its intellectual domain and its practitioners, reflecting and reinforcing their social credibility in pursuing their areas of scholarship, was weak.

12Antiquaries in the Royal Society for Literature, for example, comprise an average of 56.25% of council members, 49.17% of members, 86.46% of Royal Associates, 12.11% of Honourary Associates and 16.55% of Honourary Members. Just over half the "Contributions of Books, Manuscripts, and Objects of Learned Antiquity," and 41.6% of communications read were by antiquaries. See the Reports of the Royal Society for Literature. These values were calculated as averages from five-yearly samples, 1832-50. Examples could be multiplied. In 1864 the Early English Text Society was founded through the efforts of antiquaries F.J. Furnivall, Walter W. Skeat, and Henry B. Wheatley. These men also founded the New Shakspere, Chaucer, and English Dialect Societies, of which antiquaries made up a substantial fraction of council members, editors, and subscribers. This was the case even late in the century. See Julian Roberts, "The Bibliographial Society as a Band of Pioneers" in Robin Myers and Michael Harris, eds., Pioneers in Bibliography, pp. 86-100. Antiquaries comprised 80% of the Numismatic Society's Council in its first decade, and 46.21% of its membership. See the Reports of the Numismatic Society of London John Wertheimer & Co: London. A systematic study of antiquaries' presence in other societies is beyond the scope of this thesis. But see Appendix 2.B.3 for an indication of their participation in other specialised learned societies.
specialists in other fields.  

Antiquaries' institutional and intellectual diaspora interacted with important social and political changes in the nineteenth-century pursuit of knowledge. Before 1830, few antiquaries had wanted, or acquired, executive experience in any learned society. But as Appendix Two shows, between 1830 and 1870, many antiquaries became veteran administrators in the British Museum, in learned and in printing societies. The SA did not provide any integrating or coordinating function for the many and diverse fields and societies its members participated in, commensurate with that the BAAS provided to its scientific constituencies. The dispersal of humanities scholarship begged for coordination, and this was eventually achieved. However, the institution that was designated to play the coordinating role was the university, and the authority which decided on the implementation of coordination was Parliament and its Select Committees. Their terms of reference for achieving coordination were pragmatic and their goals political rather than scholarly. While antiquaries' projects narrowed over the course of the century, it is for their work in these specialties that antiquaries have passed into historical record, and are appreciated by twentieth-century historians, themselves attuned to specialisation. Antiquaries' traditional strength in working without strong institutional support validated the credibility of these other fields and institutions at the expense of the SA. So, for example, the British Museum and Library were founded on and developed by antiquarian expertise, which then undercut the credibility of the SA's claim as custodian of the physical remains on which history was built. Thus arose the odd, and as yet unremarked situation, that many nineteenth-century institutions and societies whose work has been basic to twentieth-century scholarship was done by many individual antiquaries, who are nevertheless as a group dismissed as the mediocre authors of irrelevant work—that is, as amateurs. The related problem of terms such as "amateur" and "professional" is discussed below.

This administrative expertise was itself specialised by field of study. Such specialisation was the essence of the expertise antiquaries had begun to publicise. Specialisation also motivated the foundation of the many societies whose charter declarations testified to the need to advance work in their particular field of interest. By comparison, the lack of a specialised focus was a source of reproach, and inferior work was criticised in periodical reviews for its failure to meet the increasingly exacting standards of comment within specialised learned communities. For a discussion of this feature of critical discussion within Victorian natural science, see Alvar Ellegard, *Darwin and the General Reader: The Reception of Darwin's Theory of Evolution in the British Periodical Press, 1859-1872*, University of Chicago Press: Chicago and London, 1990, especially Chapters 2 and 8.

It should be noted that the word university has two senses that are relevant in this chapter. In nineteenth-century Britain, it referred to the administrative unit coordinating the institutions that provided teaching, the Colleges. It is generally used in twentieth-century histories to mean the overall institution of higher education. It is mainly used in the latter sense in this chapter.
nineteenth century, and antiquaries' investments increased in institutions outside the SA, the
effects of these on the fortune of antiquarianism pale in comparison to the effects of changes in
the provision of education in same period.¹⁶

During the nineteenth century, education became the responsibility of national and
municipal governments. From early in the century, education was perceived as essential to the
success of industrial Britain.¹⁷ Basic schooling became linked to job performance, and
certification to middle-class employment. Various informal foundations attempted to fulfil the
widespread demand for education, but were moderately effective only.¹⁸ By mid-century, the

¹⁶This situation can be modelled in the terms of David Hull's evolutionary account of the speciation of knowledge, discussed in Chapter One. Hull does not use most of the social and institutional factors other historians have included in their works, preferring to stress the ways in which law-like regularities of species (fields) and their environments can be used to account for their fortunes over time. But in his terms, the social forces driving the demand for a high standard of universal education were changing the environment in which the intellectual species known as antiquarianism lived. By changing it fundamentally, these forces created circumstances in which the intellectual species known as antiquarianism might not be able to survive. By changing it rapidly, they created a likelihood that antiquarianism would not be able to adapt to the new circumstances fast enough to survive. The changes to British education which began around mid-century required systematic structures for education and certification: no matter how scholarly, informal learned societies could not provide these. That is, the environment changed in such a way that other species began to invade antiquaries' niche, consume their resources, and provide the benefits they had traditionally provided.


demand for a national educational system had powerful adherents.\textsuperscript{19} Local governments became involved in providing for, and the national government in legislating the style of, universal education.\textsuperscript{20} This legislation became increasingly extensive.\textsuperscript{21}

These developments motivated the Universities Commissions of the 1850s and 1870s, which eventually led to placing intellectual work, and certification of practitioners in these fields, within the university context. Learned societies could not have met this need. Even highly organised societies such as the RS and BAAS had minimal, mainly cooperative structures for coordinating work in the sciences. Providing education and certification would have been beyond their capabilities.\textsuperscript{22} Legislators and Commissioners had practical and societal as well as scholarly


\textsuperscript{22}The SA had no reason to concern itself with certification, as its fields were not directly connected to a livelihood. Like many specialist societies, they viewed their function as recognising and facilitating rather than training and certifying experts in their fields. If British society was increasingly embracing legislation governing education, and attempting to use structures already at hand to do so, this could seem to have little to do with learned societies and their activities. But by not adapting to the growing demand for certification, or participating in the
interests in mind. While the universities had been adjusting their offerings to the growth of knowledge from late in the eighteenth-century, they resisted becoming responsible for coordinating work across the late nineteenth-century breadth of knowledge. But they were the only institutions with the physical plant and administrative practice to attempt it. Despite objections, from the 1870s, university curricula began to be recalibrated to the industrial map of knowledge. By late in the century, the universities had become the institutions which provided education and supported scholarship in most fields of the humanities and the sciences.

To a large degree, then, it was the rapid changes in the environment in which all nineteenth-century British scholarship took place, rather than the flaws in the SA, its members or its intellectual pursuits, that accounts for the SA's eclipse late in the century. The SA's loss of intellectual territory was due to the difference between traditional kinds of institutional support public discussion, as the BAAS had, the SA was at least partly foreclosing its chances of continuing to be seen as the legitimate custodian of the matter of history.

23Gladstone, for example, wrote of the need "to increase its [the University of Oxford's] means of meeting the wants of the country." BM Add. MS. 40470 folios 305-08. Quoted in D.C. Lathbury, Correspondence on Church and Religion of W.E. Gladstone, Macmillan: London, 1910. 3 volumes. Vol. 1, pp. 342-7.

24Resistance could be found at many levels. College and university administrators and professors did not want to increase their workloads, and there was resistance to broadening the curriculum. The Edinburgh Review criticised "the recent fashion [at Oxford] of despising mere scientific pursuits or mere literary studies, as unworthy, frivolous or dangerous...The utter absence of all spirit for investigation of every sort, except in polemic theology." 1837 Vol. 132. p. 715.

25There may also have been an element of prejudice for the universities among legislators. However, the individualist character of nineteenth century societies supported an environment in which the coordination of knowledge did not seem practicable, as has been noted by many historians of science. On this individualism, see John Theodore Merz, A History of European Scientific Thought in the Nineteenth Century, Dover Publications: New York, 2 volumes, 1965 (first printed 1904, 1912) Vol. 1, p. 251. See also Maurice Crosland, ed., The Emergence of Science in Western Europe, Science History Publications: New York, 1976, Introduction, pp. 1-15. Even the efforts of the BAAS to arrange its sections to reflect the changing map of Victorian sciences were meant more to facilitate yearly deliberations than to direct work done in those fields. See Jack Morrell and Arnold Thackery, Gentlemen of Science: The Early Years of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1982.

for scholarship, and the emerging kind of scholarly institution that fitted new educational demands. Indeed, the process of transferring intellectual work from the disorganised network of private foundations, to schools and universities, shaped the fortunes of many intellectual fields. In the case of antiquarianism, its internal structure, as a large number of indifferently connected fields which had for centuries developed their various primary questions more than their relation to the historical whole, anticipated developments in the late nineteenth-century university curriculum. Fields that had been developed by antiquaries bequeathed their subject matter, methods and goals to newly created university departments. Indeed, given the growth and speciation of knowledge that took place earlier in the century, it is possible to doubt how much longer the SA could have induced its members to view the projected super-history as a valid means of integrating antiquarian fields. In another sense, the SA had formulated in the late sixteenth century, a robust means of coping with a problem which appeared in the universities only in the late nineteenth century. This problem remains even in our own time. The division of scholarship into discrete parcels, or fields, is somewhat artificial. Most fields and disciplines share some territory, interests and problems with cognate fields and disciplines. Many scholarly accounts of a given problem cannot be adequately generated from within the methods, subjects and perspectives of a single field alone. Language competence still remains a requisite skill across a large area of scholarship. Antiquaries' simple question, "what happened in the British Isles in the past?", produced a structure of inter-related evidential, linguistic, temporal and regional sections which was simple but well-suited to the multitude of specific historical problems involved, and flexible enough that the range of specialised fields did not defeat the overall coherence of the structure. While the encyclopedic ideal is no longer espoused in our own time, the problem of coherence at that level continues to affect the work twentieth-century scholars undertake. One can admire, then, an elegant solution that lasted more than three
The preceding discussion has explored several ways in which the antiquarian institution, community, and intellectual problems were involved in the sudden eclipse of antiquarianism. It also begun to review the models of fields which have structured this exploration of antiquarianism. The next set of issues will carry that review further. The following discussion will evaluate how far some features of contemporary field models apply to antiquarianism. This will both define what is unique about antiquarianism as an intellectual project and domain, and indicate ways in which field models need to be developed.

The model of intellectual field presented by Mary Jo Nye indicated the primacy of shared problems to the continuance of a field. Nye argued that a field disappeared if its problematic was fragmented or taken over by other fields, if those sharing it ceased to be united as a group, or if it ceased to be recognised by others as a distinct entity. Antiquarianism is hard to locate in these terms. While its data and methods were partly taken over by eighteenth-century historians, antiquaries' traditional orientation to bodies of evidence rather than generation of narratives prevented the competition for the same fields from becoming troublesome to either community. When academic work moved into the universities late in the nineteenth century, it was social transformations in the institutions providing education and directing advanced research, rather than anything about the way antiquaries dealt with their intellectual material, that determined much about the fortune of both antiquarian and mainstream history. Before about 1870, antiquaries were dispersed among many fields, sharing data with colleagues in cognate fields, but little with those in distant fields. The form of recognition they received might, on Nye's model,

---

be expected to have fragmented their cohesion and community. But it did not. Antiquaries remained united as a community, as the debates around reform show. Until about the 1870s, antiquaries also remained fairly unified intellectually, by their shared methods and projected third task. Antiquaries, then, had a healthy, if strangely ordered, problematic.

Nye relates the longevity of the institution to the health of its problematic. She argues that the most powerful institution may disappear if its field of inquiry fragments. Antiquarian problems were shared in a peculiar manner which could be called fragmented. Antiquaries working in cognate fields were knowledgeable about each others’ data, but antiquaries working in widely separated fields might share no intellectual territory at all. In such cases, the hypothetical contribution of all fields to the deferred super-history, and the antiquarian textual tradition, were what antiquaries shared.

Not sharing questions did not endanger the antiquarian institution because, for much of their history, antiquaries had none. Its functions were carried out by informal structures, cooperatively within the community. Despite the fragmentation of antiquaries among many fields, these informal structures did not disappear, but persisted and led to even more complex agreements over time. This can only be accounted for by noting that the men who became antiquaries had a robust devotion to their work. The models articulated by Nye, Crosland and others presume, and have been generated from within, societies which educate, certify and reward scholarship. Entrants to such systems assume certain relations between scholar, field and social context. Such relations have mainly not existed in the past, indicating a need for a substantial reworking of current models of fields, if they are to be of use to historians working on intellectual traditions before industrial-era social systems arose.

Nye notes that it is the sharing of the questions, rather than any specific formulation of the question, or possible answers, that unites the community over time. This does describe antiquaries’ work.
Antiquaries were sustained by passion rather than system. Most did not want or expect their work to be noticed, let alone rewarded. This indicates that accounts of fields would be improved by integrating scholars' emotional states more fully into every part of the life of fields, and treating them as a structuring element potentially as powerful as the institution itself. Nye restricts her analysis of the emotional states of scholars to tensions within the community, and confines these tensions to the ritual rehearsal of unsolved intellectual problems. But there is clearly no reason to restrict human feelings to this arena. A model of intellectual fields could encompass the role and effects of states such as compulsion, satisfaction, curiosity, and fulfilment; of less attractive states such as rivalry and competition, and various forms of chauvinism, revenge and retaliation; and of states experienced by individuals but also widely shared motivations such as vindication, justification, and aspiration.  

Many antiquaries seem to have shared a few emotional states. First, they were both distressed and motivated by the loss of historical materials. Camden lamented that the past was "yet overcast with so darke a mist, through the iniquitie of former times, that much easier it is in this case to confute what is false, than to find out the truth." He wrote of the materials of history: "they lie so deeply hidden in the utmost nooke and secretest closet of Antiquitie, as it were in a most thicke wood, where no pathwaies are to be seene, that very small hope there is or none at all, to fetch those things back again with all my diligence, which oblivion hath so long

29Geison has placed a premium on studying the development of intellectual questions by studying a strictly enumerable, identifiable community. This approach has been very productive in accounting specifically for the exchange and mutation of ideas and the development of research trends over time. But it tends to limit the scope of human motivations which can be introduced into the historical account of a field to those matters strictly connected to a given intellectual question or problem. It has now become commonplace for historians to consider the role of institutional tensions and competition in shaping an intellectual field. Such approaches can supplement the kind of accounts produced by Geison's style of historiography, but could reasonably be wider still.

30Camden, Britannia. 1600, p. 154.
remooved out of the sight our ancestrous." The sense of living with terrible and continuing loss was shared by antiquaries across many generations. In the seventeenth century, "[t]here was an air of urgency about antiquarian enquiry, for so much of the material seemed on the verge of disappearing." In the eighteenth, Thomas Astle's history of libraries documented the "most irreparable and deplorable losses" of "the writings of the Antients [which] have been attributed to the zeal of the Christians, who, at different periods made great havock amongst the Heathen Authors." Joseph Haslewood was not alone among nineteenth-century antiquaries in comparing the Protestant treatment of Catholic learning to the fall of Rome at the hands of the barbarians: "During the age of neglect, their destruction was almost equal to that excited by the warfare of Vandalism."

Antiquaries also shared the ability to persist in their scholarly course despite the ridicule they received. This persistence must have shaped their lives and works, just as it left its mark on their community and culture. Camden was unmoved when his work was "cr[ied] down...with much contempt." Antiquaries' persistence in their self-appointed tasks is found in the nineteenth century also:

---

31 Philemon Holland, tr., William Camden, Britannia, p. 9.


33 Thomas Astle, The Origin and Progress of Writing, as well Hieroglyphic as Elementary, Illustrated by engravings taken from Marbles, Manuscripts and Charters, Ancient and Modern: Also Some Account of the Origin and Progress of Printing, For The Author: London. 1784. p. x. Astle was Keeper of the Records at the Tower.


The point cannot be made too strongly that it was primarily the book collectors of the
eighteenth and first half of the nineteenth century who amassed and saved from oblivion
the bulk of the literature of earlier periods...[Men who] were regarded as eccentric almost
to the point of insanity in their own day...garnered not only printed books but pamphlets
and manuscripts of all kinds which were not then regarded as worth preserving, and saved
what was only considered suitable for burning or the rag-and-bone man. Many members
of this lunatic fringe bequeathed their entire lives' collections to the Bodleian and the
British Museum and these institutions often owe the still under-explored richness of their
resources to such men to an extent which is largely forgotten today.36

Finally, patient industry may be included in the list of antiquaries' shared emotional states.
Among their most striking characteristics is their Herculean, almost Brobdingnagian industry.
Like Camden, they could say of their work: "wherein what toyle is to be taken, as no man
thinketh, so no man believeth but hee that hath made the triall."37 Yet they rarely indulged in
the very human act of concluding about a subject. It is surprising that so many scholars tolerated
their industry to continue unfulfilled of its ultimate goal. Some, like Francis Fry, had the pleasure
of achieving nearly perfect closure, but even he achieved closure only in a narrowly defined, very
specific area. Camden's legacy had inculcated specialisation. In the generation after Camden,
antiquaries moved away from encyclopedic closure. By addressing more limited questions, many
more of them could reach a limited form of conclusion. By dissolving Camden's structure into
discrete fields, antiquaries created a domain in which members understood the relationships
shared between diverse fields, and organised many possibilities for discussion within their learned
community. This must have provided its own kinds of rewards, even if it deferred fulfilment.

Such states would, of course, vary from individual to individual. The task of collecting
materials for an analysis of commonalities in antiquaries' descriptions of their attitude towards
their work would itself be a labour of antiquarian proportions, and its interpretation would require

36Frank Herman, Sotheby's: Portrait of an Auction House, (Chatto & Windus: London) 1980, p. 23. The same
argument is made by Kelley, Early Public Libraries, p. 43-4.

37Holland tr., Camden, Britannia, "The Author to the Reader," p. 4.
great delicacy. However, it seems clear that widely shared emotional states may be constitutive of a field, its work on shared intellectual questions, and an institution's development.

Nye presents communities as exclusive, colonising, or open, in different phases of their evolution, but argues that their disciplinary boundary must remain permeable to outsiders with new ideas, without which neither the field nor the community can persist. Predictably, antiquaries do not fit this analysis. While some of the ridicule aimed at the SA asserted its exclusivity, and the error has passed into academic histories of antiquarianism, the SA never reached a level of prestige that would support exclusivity.\(^{38}\) Antiquarianism can be viewed as extensively colonising in its early decades. However, the fact that no other intellectual community was exploring many of the areas of research antiquaries were interrupts the standard terms of analyses of this sort: no other community lost the fields antiquaries gained. The SA seems to have been open to new members, but advised "provident care" in dealings with "any stranger."\(^{39}\) This ambivalence reflects concern both to avoid political misunderstanding about their work, and to preserve their collections. New data, and its power to generate new fields of study, correspond to the new ideas Nye argues are essential to the continuance of the field.

Antiquaries, then, were an odd intellectual community, providing for their institutional needs informally among themselves, and sharing a passion with many whose work had little in common but a distant goal and a textual structure. It might fairly be asked, in what the coherence of antiquarianism as an intellectual domain consisted. Antiquaries' shared goal has been discussed in Chapter Three. The role of the textual tradition will be discussed at the close of this chapter. But the overall coherence of antiquarianism might also be framed in the terms that Robert Bud

\(^{38}\)See for example, "most members were wealthy, titled, or both." in A. Bowdoin Van Riper, \textit{Men Among the Mammoths: Victorian Science and the Discovery of Human Prehistory}, University of Chicago Press: Chicago and London, 1993, p. 17.

\(^{39}\)Item 8 of the 1637 Accord, reprinted in Evans, \textit{A History}, pp. 22-23. See also Chapter Three, note 74.
and Gerylyn Robert have described as providing the legitimacy of early chemistry. As chemists struggled to define chemistry in the neighbourhood of a greater intellectual power (physics), they could show that the legitimacy of their work was practical rather than axiomatic. Antiquarianism may be similarly described. Its coherence lay in the practical endeavour to collect the materials necessary to the study of British history, the insistence on the authentication of each article of history, the construction of history from the evidence alone, and the meticulous concern for the competencies required to interpret the evidence accurately. Where chemistry used taxonomy and experimental regularities to arrange and coordinate its many constitutive elements, antiquarianism used region, evidential bodies and periodisation by language. Chemistry shared questions, objects and processes with physics. Until the eighteenth century, antiquarianism did not share its many fields with other communities. After that time, because of its emphasis on arguing from the evidence, many of its fields remained undisturbed by prospectors writing conventional histories. Antiquarianism, then, continued to coordinate, in a practical manner, the many antiquarian fields and their various bodies of data.

Like Nye, many of the historians discussed in Chapter One stressed the defining role of the institution in the life of a field. Maurice Crosland, for example, stressed the role of the institution in producing and organizing new knowledge, promoting discussion and adjudication, and educating and certifying new members.40 As has already been noted, some of the functions Crosland assigns to the institution were carried out informally within the antiquarian

The 1637 Accord and the 1717 Constitution had formalised the manner in which antiquaries produced and organised knowledge. But paradoxically, they formalised the cooperative, voluntary associations through which antiquaries got much of their work done. Some of the functions which Crosland would assign to the institution were also carried out by structures formally outside the SA. In this sense, antiquaries were adept at using what was available to them, inside and outside their community. Italian historiographer Luigi Balsamo argues that journals such as the Gentleman's Magazine caused "a perceptible refinement of technique, which was linked to the ongoing academic definition of the disciplines, and the establishment of scientific research in new directions."42 They "gradually imposed more rigorous standards than the general scholarship of the previous century had attained."43

The SA lacked many of the features of institutions which contemporary historians of science consider crucial to the development and direction of intellectual work. For example, it had no formally recognised gerontocracy to govern links between members. Therefore the brokering of introductions, employment and fame happened in the community, primarily to

---

41Nye's model assigns the provision of a physical homeland as a part of the institution's functions of creating identity and stability for members. For a considerable period, the SA had no homeland. Even from the Tavern phase, SA rooms were rented and subject to frequent changes of location. Thus the informal, cooperative links shared between members seen in the 1637 Accord must be viewed as replacing the homeland, providing members with an identity and creating a sense of permanence. Even in the nineteenth century, SA premises had problems. The expensive Anniversary Dinners after the Charter century had been stopped mid-century. Requests for conversazioni of the kind the RS held were finally fulfilled in 1862. Complaints continued about the quality of the china and refreshments, and of the problems of sharing space with the RS, which was inclined to take space in Somerset House not formally allotted to it. These problems were alleviated with the move to Burlington House in 1874. Throughout the period under consideration, then, the community can be seen providing the benefits of the homeland: a variety of dining clubs, such as Thomas Crofton Croker's Noviomagians Club, replaced the anniversary dinner, and conversazioni were held at a member's family residence in Piccadilly.


support shared projects, but also to bring antiquaries employment. Both eminent scholars, but also ordinary scholars could take on these tasks.

The SA can be described as a minimalist institution. Where the RS and BAAS produced annual summary lectures, the SA depended on features of its textual tradition—subject, method, tasks, genres and research strategies—to fit material from many fields into shared categories of analysis. Evaluation of members’ work was informally accomplished. Where the RS, the RA and the medical schools gave medals for distinguished work, membership alone was adjudicated in the SA. Antiquaries’ institutional culture tended to alienate them from the formal evaluation of members or from assigning rank among themselves. Distinction was recognised among antiquaries working in the same field, in publications and reviews, and through executive

45By comparison, links between BAAS members, except for those of the inner circle, were fewer and less essential to their employment and scholarship, and did not produce the same degree interconnection in community and scholarship. Links between members of the Paris Academy of Science were fewer and based in competition. Both the boundary between members and outsiders, and the competition among insiders being educated and certified, was fierce. The RS had a gentlemanly dislike of competition, but its self-assurance was based increasingly on the boundary between members and outsiders.

46The institution was involved in a small amount of this kind of work only, as it had to select editors, illustrators, photographers, publishers, and others for its publications. Most of these were financial and scholarly successes, indicating a basic institutional competence at brokering relations between personnel and coordinating expertise. But much more of this kinds of activity went on informally among members.

47In Mary Jo Nye’s terms, antiquaries used archetypal genre rather than language or visual conventions, to organise their discussion of their subjects and promote the development of antiquarian knowledge. From 1849, the SA President also delivered anniversary lectures presenting the state of work in progress.

48Ridicule and accusations of treason in the first centuries of their existence did not encouraged them to seek public recognition. Lacking this, the SA did not develop ways to commemorate their expertise and achievements. The fact that their work habituated them to cooperation rather than differentiation probably accounts for some of their resistance to awarding medals in the manner of the RS. In Mary Jo Nye’s terms, the antiquarian institution did not provide a homeland because it did not articulate members’ rights and responsibilities, codified entrance criteria, and methods of differentiating members. These things were present in the antiquarian community. However, their execution was informal rather than prescribed.
positions in specialist societies.\textsuperscript{49} Before its period of reform, even the performance of executive officers was indifferently evaluated.\textsuperscript{50} Because the SA gave minimal attention to directing and evaluating the work of its community, this does not mean that antiquaries were unconcerned with scholarly standards. As the debates around reform show, and the data on newly elected members confirms, antiquaries were concerned to elect competent scholars only. While they maintained high standards, their indifference to its formal regulation was a product of their cooperative culture, and of having little competition for the intellectual domain they inhabited.\textsuperscript{51}

Much of the labour of summarising, coordinating and directing work in progress was provided to the antiquarian community by the \textit{Gentleman's Magazine}, from late in the eighteenth century. The \textit{Gentleman's Magazine} allowed antiquarianism a new rate of information exchange, a broadcast kind of communication which reached a wider readership, the exchange of less consequential information than SA publications dealt with, and a forum for requests for help and discussions of interpretive problems. It is unlikely that the SA executive, meeting monthly except in the vacations, could have produced anything similar. It certainly did not have the funds. The

\textsuperscript{49}Consensus also identified inferior scholars (but removal of fellows happened only occasionally, for arrears, not incompetence). For example, the Shakespearean forgeries of John Payne Collier were discredited in print by James Orchard Halliwell, Thomas Duffus Hardy, Frederic Madden, Samuel Weller Singer, and others. Madden criticised the care British Library manuscripts had received by Josiah Forshall, who had criticised their care by others in the early years at Montagu House. For examples, see Appendix 2.C.5. James Pycroft was removed for his eccentricities, which mainly involved defacing SA documents such as candidatures, which were conventionally left on the main table in the library for fellows to pursue. Pycroft’s alterations had verisimilitude, and led to requests even from candidates to suppress his activities. See Evans, \textit{A History}, p. 298. In the main, less eminent fellows were working and publishing just as notable fellows were, and there existed no mechanisms for allowing the SA to distinguish the competent antiquary who published little from the antiquary who published inferior work.

\textsuperscript{50}For a list of antiquaries’ positions in numerous Victorian learned societies, see Appendix 2.B.1.

\textsuperscript{51}Though historians had invaded antiquarian territory in the eighteenth century, and nineteenth century antiquaries began to publicise their expertise, they were concentrated in areas historians laid no claims to, and so no clear competition or conflict arose. Many new societies addressed areas with which antiquaries had traditionally been concerned, but SA members filled their executive positions. The founders and members of the society which was most vocally critical of the SA, the British Archaeological Association, remained active SA participants. Far from expressing a desire to secede from or compete with the SA, they urged it to take a coordinating role for the smaller, specialised societies.
question arises, whether the SA must be viewed as an inadequate institution because it did not provide the services supplied by the *Gentleman's Magazine*; or whether, given its limited funding and modest capability to coordinate work, it can be viewed as a successful, if minimalist, institution. It is probably most accurate to view the SA and the *Gentleman's Magazine* as providing different services to the antiquarian community, and at different rates. "It is important to remember that the Society's proceedings were the incunabula of antiquarian research, that it meetings provided a forum for co-operative inquiry."52 The SA achieved much basic historiographic work during the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, with little institutional direction other than structuring the sharing of information and collections and minimal, but definitive, publications. Antiquaries were not seeking an activist institution when the *Gentleman's Magazine* arose as a vehicle for antiquarian work. That the periodical took on the functions it did reflects antiquaries' practice in turning what was to hand to their own uses. The SA and the *Gentleman's Magazine*, then, were complementary. Both served to introduce antiquaries working in similar fields to each other. Because of its low subscription rate, the *Gentleman's Magazine* was not expected to produce lavish works of expert scholarship, and so could reflect the *status quo* of the antiquarian discussion from moment to moment, mapping and communicating areas of ignorance as well as achievements. SA publications offered the production of authoritative works, which provided intellectual direction to members. Where the practice of representing all fields prevented SA publications from reflecting the changeability of the immediate discussion, this equity minimised friction within the community, and provided longterm intellectual stability in presenting material from fields whether they were fashionable

52 Parry, *The Trophies of Time*, p. 5.
or not.\textsuperscript{53} The SA, then, although minimalist in coordinating the work its community produced, was successful in achieving its scholarly goals through its limited formal means, relying on the initiative and cooperation of members to evaluate and direct their work voluntarily. This was successful until the nineteenth century, when antiquaries’ tendency to organise work informally, and outside the SA, began to work against the antiquarian institution.

Shared intellectual, institutional and community problems were all shaped by one particular issue: funding. From the time of Camden’s \textit{Britannia}, the production and organisation of new antiquarian knowledge had depended on cooperative structures and on the antiquarian textual tradition. Reliance on cooperation was inadequate by early in the nineteenth century. Projects such as excavations were too expensive for the SA to fund. Council’s reaffirmation of the SA’s traditional publishing policy, and their reconsideration of the SA’s historic intent to create a museum, can be seen as retrenchment, defending against the new demands created by the explosion of antiquarian work and workers. By the 1830s, then, the SA was failing as an institution because its community was more productive than traditional structures could support or coordinate, and the work produced went well beyond what the SA could hope to organise or fund. Therefore members began to invest in learned societies outside the SA for projects other than publications.\textsuperscript{54}

Throughout the nineteenth century, membership dues were the main source of SA revenues. These were not sufficient to the breadth of the community’s interests, but many antiquaries retained the belief that funding and scholarship functioned antagonistically within the

\textsuperscript{53}The mercurial antiquarian discussion in the \textit{GM}, had it been the only mechanism providing direction to antiquaries and their fields, might, for example, have neglected classicisers in the excitement of the Gothic, or allowed too much authority to powerful voices such as that of Horace Walpole, to the detriment of studies on Roman Britain.

\textsuperscript{54}In 1845, for example, the British Archaeological Association was founded by antiquaries Thomas Wright, Charles Roach Smith, Thomas Joseph Pettigrew, William Bromet and Albert Way, in order to support excavations.
institution: if fees dropped, so would scholarship. During the era of reform, antiquaries' concern that cutting fees to increase membership would weaken scholarly standards led to stricter admission requirements. While this addressed the immediate concern, it did not help the SA to close the gap between its goals and its revenues. As long as fees remained the chief source of SA revenue, the more the institution cultivated antiquarian scholarship, the more it undermined its ability to support that work. Activities such as those the BAAS pursued to raise funds were not discussed during the reform period, probably because they were perceived as competitive. It was not until the 1860s that the SA began raising and investing funds for large-scale projects. By the end of the period under consideration, then, they had begun to adapt, reshaping their institutional practices and culture to the demand of their environment.

The preceding discussion of the ways the SA, its community and its intellectual pursuits do, and do not, fit current models of fields, has characterised antiquarianism as a coherent if oddly structured intellectual domain, the SA as a successful if minimalist institution, and antiquaries as a vital, cooperative scholarly community. It has also highlighted the ways in which antiquarianism does not conform to some of the most sophisticated models of fields yet developed. Its unconventional character has indicated four areas in which these models might be improved.

First, the definition of the institution needs amplifying. In the case of antiquarianism, informal community agreements, "the force of friendship," interpersonal networks, texts and periodicals all functioned to educate and certify, and to produce, direct and coordinate knowledge. They contributed to organising work across a broad area, setting research goals, creating

---

55 Parry, Trophies of Time, p. 7.
recognition, introducing people of like interests, and coordinating joint projects. The argument of Mary Jo Nye and David Hull, that it is more the sharing of questions and problems, than the exact questions which can mutate radically over time, could be applied to describing these kinds of carriers of institutional and intellectual continuity. Twentieth-century historical studies of Victorian institutions also need more careful definition. Well-known societies such as the RS and BAAS have served as exemplars in developing the theoretical parameters of the institution, skewing historiographical attention towards eminent societies at the expense of the smaller societies in which so many Victorians participated. The study of less prestigious institutions could contribute to a more normative image, or perhaps a taxonomy, of Victorian learned societies.

Second, the data presented in Chapter Four demonstrates that the materials exist to describe very precisely the network of scholarly relations that existed in Victorian England. The Victorian era is the first for which a quantity of personal information is available, from school, university and employment registers, periodicals, and other materials from many collections, from the holdings of the General Register’s Office to those of local historical societies. This suggests several directions for research on Victorian scholars and scholarship. As this thesis has shown, London was not in all cases the centre of important intellectual work. Materials exist for tracing the web of cross-country scholarly connections. Prosopographical research also makes it possible to map the class connections seen within scholarly communities. This thesis has delineated the scholarly work and employment relations of men of the upper and lower middle classes, in some cases penetrating into the lower classes. Data presented in Chapter Four suggests that a large

56 The case could be made that genre took on some comparable functions. In the nineteenth century, writing can clearly be seen assuming the functions of a scholarly institution, replacing the physical homeland and providing structures of education and certification. Publishing was the mechanism for producing and distributing knowledge, and for criticising, shaping and directing fields. Thus, Victorian periodicals might be analysed as cooperative, informal institutions. A distinction between scientific and humanities fields might be based on the different forms of writing in the two precincts of knowledge.
portion of antiquaries were not public school boys, university graduates, lawyers, clergymen or politicians. They were hatters, chemists, writers and clerks, dissenters, Catholics, Jews, radicals and heretics. While poor, they had scholarly passions. While self-educated, they performed well enough to earn recognition. Prosopographical research would permit the historical exploration of Victorian scholarship in Geison's terms, identifying schools and members and tracing the history of their work very precisely. Results would provide a more normative context for writing the history of fields, describing the evolution of expertise, and situating eminent figures.

Third, models of Victorian fields need terms for scholars that are more flexible and precise than "amateur" and "professional." Without doubt, data presented in Chapter Four has cast doubt on these terms. As twentieth-century historians of Victorian Britain use them, they tend to imply educational attainments and social class. Harold Perkins, for example, defines "professional" in terms of the training required for expertise, and presents this as creating a

57See Gerald Geison, *Michael Foster and the Cambridge School of Physiology: The Scientific Enterprise in Late Victorian Society*. Princeton University Press: Princeton, 1978 and J.B. Morrell, "The Chemist Breeders: The Research Schools of Liebig and Thomas Thomson" *Ambix* 19(1972): 1-46. This model has its problems when applied to Victorian Britain in the way suggested. Geison describes research schools as having a local culture, educational tradition, research programs, theoretical systems and personal networks, all of which produce a sense of identity. Antiquaries were dispersed, but could be said shared several local cultures specialised by place and field. Suspicion and ridicule could be said to create a sense of identity. Method and genre functioned as an educational tradition, providing models to new members. Antiquaries' specialised fields of inquiry and concern for collection and authentication, are similar to research programs, intentionally articulated and coordinated towards a determined end. The counties and periods that organised bodies of remains and genre functioned like theoretical systems, fitting data into an accepted organisation and structuring new lines of inquiry. That antiquaries had strong personal networks has been demonstrated.

distinct social class. But this may be misleading, if applied to circumstances before the late nineteenth century. The rapid speciation of knowledge in the Victorian era was widely reflected in university departments only from about 1870. The expertise to fill these positions had to come from somewhere. Preliminary data presented in this thesis suggests that some university positions in the final decades of the century were filled by antiquaries whose work had been accomplished in learned societies and journals. That is, those who did scholarly work in the first two-thirds of the century are referred to amateurs. Those who did much the same work after about 1870 are referred to as professionals. Yet some of these were the same men, who received professional positions on the basis of the expertise they acquired when writing as amateurs. The difference between the two groups, then, may be more apparent than real. The class connotations of these terms have also been used to indicate a social separation between those who attained higher education and certification and those who did not. Victorian scholars have generally been put in the more elevated group. But many antiquaries were lower middle class in origin, educated themselves, used their learning to obtain better employment, but had to pursue their scholarly interests privately. They tended to repudiate competition and embrace cooperation, across class

---


60 See Appendix 2.A.7.

61 Data presented in this thesis also suggests that scholars cannot adequately be identified by simple field-related designations, such as "archaeologists" or "botanist." Chemists and botanists were also often historians, archaeologists were also philologists, and so on. Given that Victorian Britain had very little formal institutional infrastructure supporting scholarship, class background and field of study are related problems in defining terms. The reality for many nineteenth-century British scholars was closer to that described by a French bibliographer of the same period: "there are no differences among them other than those due to birth, or status, or chance: one cannot suppose that someone is a good Librarian if he doesn’t have the abilities of a Bibliographer. The latter cannot exercise these abilities with any confidence if he is not in charge of a large library; and the Amateur can only operate with difficulty if he does not have the knowledge needed by the Librarian and Bibliographer...[T]he connoisseur of beautiful books, the amateur, in one stroke became a three-fold personage, more complex and complete than the other two." Née de la Rochelle, cited in Balsamo, Bibliography, p. 142.
and educational boundaries. This suggests another way in which prosopographical research might reconstruct twentieth-century historiographic conventions. A model of Victorian intellectual fields articulated not on the basis of class and education, but on the basis of the links actually found between scholars working in the same field, might blur the boundary between amateur and professional, and suggest more fitting descriptors.

Finally, models of intellectual fields need to pay much greater attention to the role of the text in the continuity and development of fields. This is especially the case, as many scholarly traditions have flourished in the past, and others are still being undertaken in our own time, without strong institutional support. Beyond the three components which have formed the model of intellectual field used in this thesis, antiquaries’ distinctive textual tradition should be considered as a fourth, long-lived, widely shared feature which helped to define the many fields antiquaries pursued. One way to describe this textual tradition, and account for the longevity of its form, may be found in genre theory. The antiquarian community was a textual community:

---

62 From the time of Aristotle, genre theory has provided a way to explore the formal characteristics of texts. But there are important differences between ancient and modern literary theories. In particular, contemporary literary criticism has shifted its traditional focus from the analysis of authors and the meaning of their works to the reader and the act of reading. Contemporary critics have explored the range of interpretive possibilities all texts offer their readers, emphasising reading as an active process, profoundly constitutive of the meaning of the text. In the process of reading, the meaning of a text acquires a kind of drift, away from that held between author and audience at the moment of publication and towards increasing diversity, depending on the circumstances of later readers. Modern literary criticism has created many delicate investigative tools for exploring changes in the reception of texts and in the ways the formal characteristics of texts such as genre traits have mutated over time. Thus they can be used to evaluate antiquarian texts. Undoubtedly, antiquarian readers interpreted Camden’s Britannia differently in different times and places. However, antiquarian writers retained certain formal features as structuring devices, which their readership appreciated and re-appreciated. Genre theory can help evaluate these, and provide an account of their history.

63 Theories of genre were first articulated by Aristotle. In the Renaissance, writing about literary styles increased, but by early in the eighteenth century classical forms were overtaken by a proliferation of vernacular literary styles. Twentieth-century genre theory reveals some of the same impulses as classical theories. In the 1920s, Benedetto Croce protested the scientific categorization of genres, arguing for understanding literary works as intuitive and unique. Italian historiographer Arnaldo Momigliano was among mid-century critics who, responding to Croce, reasserted that it was possible and useful to distinguish between kinds of writing by their formal properties. In the 1950s, structuralists and others such as Northrop Frye returned to creating elaborate systems to define and relate different genres. Post-structuralists, discovering characteristics which all forms of écriture shared, again erased the boundaries between kinds. In recent decades, structuralist work, merging with discourse studies, has modelled genres
that is, a community of readers and writers whose reading and writing practices were highly stable over time, integrated with others' work, and directed towards a shared goal. While individual members' field work or research was pursued alone or in small groups, the work of all members of the community was shaped and propelled towards its goal by a structured, interrelated set of organisational and analytic categories—the chronological, linguistic, regional and evidential categories of Camden's *Britannia*. Together, these created a highly formalised textual structure. By reproducing this structure generation and generation, antiquaries helped to ensure the longevity of their historiographic vision and their ultimate goal.

The constancy of the formal features of antiquarian writings over many generations is unusual, when compared to most other kinds of literature, and to non-antiquarian historical writing. The forms and features of non-antiquarian histories have varied with times and places, transforming the historical subject, historians' methods, and their choices of literary style.

---

64 That is, members read past antiquaries' works in order to acquire a critical appraisal of the ways they had organised information about the past. They read other antiquaries' notes and books in order to better their understanding of the total resources and information available to them. They wrote in order to arrange newly discovered material within the current temporal and systematic framework, intending these to contribute towards an eventual total and comprehensive account of the past.


Momigliano, among many others, has shown that one of the most characteristic features of non-antiquarian historiography is its chameleon-like capacity to mirror the social and political interests of the times. Usually, then, the kind of history written in a given period has changed from that of previous decades, and is itself eventually superseded by newer kinds of histories. By comparison, antiquarian works are noteworthy because they did not go through any similar degree of evolution. Antiquaries' long-lived conservation of the formal features of their historiographic paradigm requires some exploration, then. Genre theory can give precision to that exploration.

Of contemporary theories of genre, the most comprehensive treatment of historical writing is found in the work of Alastair Fowler. Fowler inventories fifteen traits which allow historical works to be described as a distinct genre. While some are more prominent than others in various epochs or specific works, taken as a whole, they characterise the great majority of western historical works. Of the traits that describe antiquarian works, representational aspect, subject, external structure, entrelacement, and reader's task are the most definitive.

Aspect and subject are interconnected. Aspect refers to whether a work is written in...
narrative, dramatic or discursive (dialogue) style. Antiquarian works were, formally, narratives. But that term indicates an integrated and developed set of ideas, and a smoothly flowing literary style. Antiquarian works were so highly segmented and interrupted, and the forest of notes and appendices accompanying and qualifying the main text so great, that the term "narrative" is stretched to its limit when applied to them. Further, antiquarian works did not resemble non-antiquarian historical narratives because of the way they defined their historical subject. Antiquaries conceived of this subject, or "everything that happened in the British Isles in the past," as fundamentally uncertain and possibly indeterminate. This has not generally been the case for non-antiquarian histories of Britain written between the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries. Antiquarian works stressed the problems of evidence rather than presenting evidentiary fragments within a smoothly developed, politically-organised narrative. Antiquarian authors drew attention to, and explored the ways gaps in the evidential record made it difficult to determine the basic components of historical narratives--facts, events and chronologies. Antiquarian works also presented the results of research as incomplete and temporary, creating a sense of the subject as very partially understood only, as larger than any single narrative could adequately convey, and as a goal which might be achieved, through collective effort, sometime in the future. Such works indicated the need for readers to read many other antiquarian works as well, undermining the sense of the genre as a sure guide to the past and the meaning of past events. By defining the subject so broadly, antiquarian works removed political and philosophical material from their central position, interfering with the educative role often assigned to works of history.70 Antiquarian works were intended as real explorations of questions to which antiquaries did not

---

70The guidance in civic affairs provided by mainstream British historical works before the eighteenth century had rarely questioned whether wisdom could be provided thus. By comparison, geography, numismatics, archaeology and philology provided far fewer opportunities to exemplify wisdom or folly.
have an answer at the time they put pen to paper, and which they declared openly might never have answers.  

The structure of antiquarian works, like their definition of subject, was defined by their stress on bodies of evidence. The sectioning of Camden’s Britannia, for example, reflected the parts of his temporal, linguistic, regional and evidential examination of the remains of the past. The tendency to section in these ways was retained into the nineteenth century. Archaeological antiquaries’ critical engagement with the classification of artefacts, for example, resulted in volumes arranged according to the many different kinds of sites. Philological antiquaries’ indices, bibliographies and catalogues reflected the kinds of words, regions, texts and libraries they came across in their research. Antiquarian county histories tended to be divided into regional and evidential sections. Structuring works in this way tended to disintegrate the narrative flow generally found in non-antiquarian historical works, and to fragment the historical subject among many different evidential perspectives.

The trait known as entrelacement describes the ways in which the various parts of a text are interrelated. Works aiming at a formal perfection indicate that an author has conceived his or her subject very completely. Discontinuities in the relations of the parts of a work indicate an

---


72The character of antiquarian work seen in their structuring and subject was reflected in another genre trait: size. Size can vary from very small (such as an epigram) to very large (such as an epic), and establishes in readers’ minds the quality of the author’s vision of the subject. By producing lengthy works, antiquaries indicated that they saw the historical subject as complex. Size also indicates the demand placed on the reader. Where eighteenth century histories of customs and manners attempted to ease the reader’s path through difficult or foreign material, antiquarian narratives made no concessions to readers’ discomfort. Content was comprehensive rather than brief or synopsised. A similar analysis may be done for scale. This refers to authors’ statements about how long it will take, and how difficult it will be, to read their work with understanding, and how easily the subject may be conveyed. For antiquarian narratives, scale was slow rather than fast, and difficult rather than easy.
author's reservations about being able to provide an impeccable account of the subject. It is clear that antiquaries did not construct themselves as able to provide a perfect account of any field or subfield. Instead, the tentative entrelacement of their works suggests that they saw themselves as competent in a specialised subject only. Further, by nesting their specialised studies within the framework articulated by Camden, they indicated that individual works were components of a larger, collaborative work, the formal perfection of which existed ideally, in the future. While indicating that overall perfection, many antiquarian works attempted very little entrelacement.

These features of antiquarian works—their problematised subject, grand size, discontinuous structure and hypothetical entrelacement—made them hard to read. In order to achieve the interpretive task set by an antiquarian author, the reader had also to read the many other works identified as important to grasping that part of history. Understanding many works was required to understand any one work. All works were long and full of comment on the problems of interpreting evidence. All made expert knowledge of languages, bibliography, and of various evidential and documentary bodies a prerequisite for reading at an informed level. The reader was left to attempt his or her own integration of the material into an overall picture of British history. The reader of antiquarian works, then, had to be resolute.

Antiquarian works, then, shared a number of formal textual features which provided structure and stability to their intellectual domain and ultimate goal. Camden's historiographic

---

[^73]: This also reflects on the author's sense of the historical subject. "Discontinuities between the parts have a profound effect" on the definition of a subject. Fowler, *Kinds of Literature*, p. 63. Decreasing the narrative continuity decreases the amount of completion and definition the work can give to its subject, and increases the work the reader must do in order to understand the work and solve the problem the work presents its readers.

[^74]: This indicates the degree to which antiquaries were writing to each other, an implication borne out by perusal of the subscription lists for many nineteenth-century antiquarian works. The notion of "interpretive task" originated and has been developed in the works of literary critic Frank Kermode.
vision had established the goal. His *Britannia* had provided formal structures for attempting to achieve it. Those formal structures became the means of organising and coordinating work undertaken in many and diverse fields, over many generations, where, in many cases, the antiquarian institution could not, and where fields were too diverse for their intellectual relations to structure research. This remained the case even when the nineteenth-century institution could no longer coordinate the work its community produced, and the intellectual cohesion of antiquarianism began to break down under the pressure, and the success, of specialisation. The formal features of antiquarian texts were the first characteristics of antiquarian work to appear, and the last to disappear. The diaspora of the nineteenth-century antiquarian community among specialised institutions is not mirrored in their written products. As Chapters Three, Five and Six showed, nineteenth century antiquaries' written works still retained their distinctive textual features and connection to the traditional antiquarian project. Textual features, then, may form a fourth component of fields, especially in cases where intellectual work has been pursued without strong institutional support. Genre theory has allowed us to explore how the features of this particular textual tradition shaped the antiquarian intellectual project, and allowed it to persist over generations without strong institutional support.

This thesis has appraised antiquarianism in three related incarnations, as an institution, a community, and an intellectual domain. Exploring the connections between the parts of antiquarianism has highlighted its long history of voluntary cooperation, and the ways in which its under-determined subject was given form by shared passions and long-lived textual structures. The eclipse of this intellectual community and project, at a moment of great vitality, has been explained more in terms of its social and political environment than any definitive failure in its institutional, intellectual or communal health. Many ways to explore both the tenacity and the eclipse of this unusual intellectual tradition remain, but cannot be considered here. However, it
is possible to identify a few issues which this research has highlighted.

The eclipse of antiquarianism in the nineteenth century has had the effect of removing this rich tradition of scholarship from the view of many twentieth-century historians. Because little work has treated antiquaries, either singly or as an intellectual community, the ancient portrait of them as dull, incompetent amateurs has been reproduced through yet another century, though in more professional terms than those used by John Earle, Bishop of Salisbury, who valued antiquarian work at approximately the worth of a mouldy cheese. This thesis has attempted to create a new, and more faithful portrait of antiquarianism, by asking the rather simple questions, who were antiquaries, and what did they do? Answering them has indicated the depth and importance of their contribution to a large area of literary and historical scholarship, which has in turn raised certain historiographic questions. If historians of nineteenth-century Britain were to treat SA membership as they have membership in other learned societies, how would this alter our image of Victorian society and scholarship? Should the work of Arnaldo Momigliano, though an extraordinary achievement, continue to provide the basis for relating the historiographic streams he identifies, or can their differences and interactions be examined more finely? Other questions are theoretical. In what ways might genre be used to define the kinds of British historiography and relate it to cognate fields of inquiry? Might the definition of institutions be broadened to include long-lived textual traditions and informal, voluntary associations? In what ways do scholars’ motivations and personal investments in their work account for the directions their research takes?

Finally, in asking who antiquaries were and what they did, this thesis has indicated the value of an inclusive approach to the history of fields now located in either the sciences or the

---

75 For Earle’s caricature of the antiquary, see Chapter Three, note 100. See also Philip Bliss, ed., John Earle, Microcosmographie, White and Cochrane: London, 1811, pp. 22.
humanities. It is clear from data presented throughout, that antiquaries worked across this boundary, and that this boundary was not as formative a force in their intellectual endeavours as it is in our own. It is equally evident that there must have been considerable cross-fertilisation between fields. The cautious, meticulous approach which led antiquaries to protest: "I feel I have taken but a superficial view of the objects entrusted to my care," even when their work was exhaustive, must have been transferred to the non-antiquarian fields they worked in. The same is very likely true of their tendency to historicise their material, including physical objects. In this matter, as in the historiographic and theoretical questions identified above, much could be gained by emulating antiquaries' own tendency to question what has been taken for granted about the materials of British history. Despite their reluctance to conclude, antiquaries nevertheless collected and evaluated an extraordinary amount of material. This tends to undermine their frequent expressions of pessimism about what they might achieve. But that pessimism was always evenly matched with their ambition. Recording his own scholarly memorial at the close of the Britannia, Camden wrote:

Nothing remaineth now, seeing my penne hath with much labour strugled and failed at length out of so many blind shelves and shallowes of the Ocean and craggy rocks of antiquity, save onely this, that as seamen were wont in old time, to present Neptune with their torne sailes, or some saved planks according to their vow; so I also should consecrate some monument unto the Almighty and most gracious God, and to Venerable Antiquity...Meanwhile, I would have the reader to remember, that I have in this worke wrastled with that envious and ravenous enemy, Time."77


77 Camden, Britannia, 1600, p. 233.
APPENDIX ONE

This appendix presents the data set from which the values in Chapter Four are drawn, and describes problems in interpreting the data. It is necessary first to define a few terms. The abbreviation "N." is used for number. For example, "N. scientific societies" is the number of men holding memberships in scientific societies. "T" is used for "total." The total body of data is termed the data set, and is found at the end of this Appendix. The data set represents information of certain kinds found about the 1,636 men who were SA members, 1830-1870 inclusive. This group is termed the population, and is composed from the names found on the membership lists in 1830, 1840, 1850, 1860, and 1870. Data has been grouped into categories for analysis; Schooling, Father's Occupation, and so on. These categories are termed variables. They have been defined, and data treated, according to the protocols presented in A.T. Fomenko, Empirico-Statistical Analysis of Narrative Material and Its Applications to Historical Dating, Dordrecht, Boston: Kluwer, 1994, particularly chapters 1 through 4. A Figure is a selection from the total information given in the data set, by variable. It is important to qualify how the data and the conclusions based on its analysis is understood. The seven issues discussed below indicate important limitations on interpreting the data, both generally, and for this population in particular.

There are seven main problems discussed here, problems in understanding and using the data set. The first involves the definition of rows, columns and variables. When data is presented in table form, it must first be organised by variable. Organising data in a certain way displays some features of the data set, where organising the same data into other variables, which would show other features, could be equally valid. The definition of variables used here reflects features the author views as most useful for the project articulated. However, this decision should be seen as shaping the data, and producing a quantitative interpretation. The statistical picture thus achieved should not be mistaken for the only picture which could legitimately represent the population the data describes.

For example, in presenting data for "Fathers' Occupations," in Figure 1.5, sons of bankers, manufacturers and wealthy merchants are grouped together. As a group, they make a noticeable number. Grouped separately, each would make up such a small figure that it would be hard for the reader to see that the sons of those members of the new industrial society who based their wealth in capital were, as a group, a noticeable if small portion of the membership, among the sons of men from more traditional professions. Neither arrangement is more or less correct; both make a particular truth about the membership evident. In this case, the presence of sons of the industrially wealthy was considered the more important fact to make evident.

It should be noted that, when the object of classification is men's lives, even the mostly carefully defined variables will not yield a set of identical products. Thus columns should not be taken to demonstrate more than their barest denotation. The category "clergymen," for example, includes poor country curates, eminent dissenting preachers, a young curate who started a pamphlet war and ruined his career when he ran away with his vicar's daughter, and two Archbishops. While columns could have been subdivided further, the determination of subclasses is notoriously difficult. And subdivision does not, in many cases, provide greater clarity. In this case, judgements would need to be made about the relative desirability of country parishes, of dissenting versus established posts, of the different towns' wealth, status, proximity to London, and so on. For this, as for many variables, there exists very little data for making these judgements. And it is unclear how much complicating the picture in these ways would bring to an understanding of the antiquarian community, which was nothing if not diverse. In several cases, variables have been defined inclusively exactly because displaying a larger number of
highly defined columns would have made it hard for the reader to see any trends occurring within the data at all. The approach taken for this first study has been to keep categories, analysis and conclusions simple, in order to enable basic trends to become visible.

Chapter Four stresses the heterogeneity of the experiences fellows placed in the same categories had. It might be objected, that if every category contains such a miscellany of instances, the quantitative approach tends rather to mask than to illuminate the character of the SA community. Every taxonomy obscures some features while making others plain. Conventional demographic categories are used in this analysis because no work has evaluated the SA population thus far, and therefore no demographic profile of any sort exists for them. Until this work was done, it was not possible to determine how antiquaries fit into nineteenth-century British society. And while the quantitative analysis may require much additional discussion to portray the community accurately, this is true of most quantitative work. Finally, the degree of heterogeneity discovered during this analysis is itself a part of making the character of the population visible. Thus, both the profile revealed by the chosen taxonomy, and the disorder uncovered by a conventional analysis, are equally valuable kinds of information about this population. For this reason, much biographical detail has been given in Chapter Four, to demonstrate the heterogeneous character of the SA population.

The second problem in understanding and interpreting the data involves its quality and presentation. Features of statistical presentation such as the choice of scale or kind of graph can mislead the unwary reader. Some Figures are meant to sum to 100% vertically, others horizontally, and still others, not at all. It is also important to note that the Figures and analyses presented here and in Chapter Four employ scales which are in proportion to the known data, rather than the total data for the population. That is, the largest value for many variables often represents men for whom information is unavailable. In most cases, a scale which could include this number would dwarf the area depicting the remaining data, making it hard to see trends within it. Excluding such a column emphasises the relative differences between values for existing data, allowing potential trends to become visible, but hides the fact that the results function more like a sample than a population. Thus, all quantitative results should be viewed as indicative rather than determinate or conclusive. In cases where the reasons for the unavailability of information can be even partially explained, this is discussed. In all cases, figures for the "unknown" portions of the membership are cited, and can be used by readers as a context for evaluating the data that is shown.

The third problem in understanding and using the data involves the ways in which conclusions have been, and may be, drawn from this data. Simple correlations are difficult to draw between variables due to the incomplete state of the data, especially as data is most available for men of the higher classes. Information on university education, career and publications was most available, where fathers' occupations, schooling, and personal information was scanty. Information was completely lacking for 315 or 19.25% of fellows, but was available for at least one variable for the other 1321 or 80.75% of fellows. Where required, a demographic analysis of specific subgroups is given. But it should be noted that data is not commensurable between variables, and there can be no simple connection drawn between trends identified for one variable and those found in interpreting another, without further statistical and biographical exploration. For example, increasing university education over these decades cannot be linked to increases in antiquaries working in the professions because (1) there is a large group of men for whom data is unavailable for the latter variable, and (2) the group of individuals represented in the first is not identical with the group represented in the second.

Although many inferential statistical operations could have been carried out in instances
like this, this was not done, for two reasons. First, description of the SA is the main purpose of this first study of this population. While probable areas for further statistical exploration appear in Chapter Four, pursuing these would have made it much harder to provide a clear answer to the two elementary questions which Chapter Four asks. Second, the data set could not be limited to men for whom data existed for all variables without drastically reducing the population to a small sample, which would have rendered results very uncertain. It was deemed better in this first study of the Society, to use a larger quantity of data, and draw minimal but secure results. A distinction should be made between data already secured, which has enabled the author to fill in segments of the overall picture, and speculating carefully about the blank areas of the picture from the fragments which have been recovered. Those parts of the total picture which are currently empty of data are neither more nor less significant, and can neither validate nor disqualify, those parts of the picture already painted in. The reader should be aware that filling them in at a later date, if more data becomes available, could, however, change the appearance of currently painted-in parts of the portrait.

The fourth problem in understanding and using the data touches on the causes of areas of poor information within the statistical portrait of the SA population. The biographical dictionaries used in this thesis (see Chapter Four, note 3) tend to select for eminent men. In most cases, this means politicians, diplomats, lawyers, scientists, authors and others eminent in their field. Thus, a lawyer who wrote a volume of British history is more likely to be recorded, even if briefly, than a tanner who did the same, though both works may have had little impact on the field and both may still be found in library catalogues. The tendency to select for educated, professional men skews the recorded information towards those parts of the demographic pool, over several generations. On the other hand, the biographical works used here were all produced in the early twentieth century, which tended to magnify the accomplishments of many antiquaries to an importance greater than they would now seem to have. However, it is still harder to find biographical information on antiquaries who worked in ordinary rather than professional occupations, who are considered to have contributed little of importance in their career, or whose antiquarian work was not then or is not now considered crucial to the history of their particular intellectual field, than it is to find adequate information within these six variables for an antiquary who published nothing but was a lawyer or politician. Further, some of the standard sources used by these biographical works select for the same segment of the population. Institutions and employment guilds, such as the Inns of Court, Parliament, the military, church and medical colleges, being responsible for certifying practitioners, tend to keep registers. Less formally organised kinds of employment do not register their practitioners. Thus, it is likely that men for whom little information is available were working or lower middle class men.

These selection biases of biographical works affect the SA data set. The statistical image built up of the SA depends on information gathered from biographical sources. Much greater information exists for antiquaries who were university educated or worked in the professions. Much information exists for about the 40% to 60% of fellows who acquired upper middle class work. Much less information was found for the remaining men, who are a most interesting segment of antiquaries. Thus, the data set can identify the size and some features of lower middle and working class antiquaries, but it provides a much less detailed portrait of this segment of the antiquarian population.

The fifth problem in understanding and using the data involves how biographical information was stored and sorted. Information was collected in two ways: as text-files in
WordPerfect 6.0 and in spread-sheet files within a statistics software package, *Minitab 8.* Text files were of two types: those containing biographies (organised alphabetically), and those containing information organised by category of demographic analysis. For example, information on Sir John Barrow appears on a file page under his name in the biographical text file. However, his name also appears in the demographic file under "Employment: Military," "Travels: Outside Britain," "Honours: Earned," "Publications: Travel" and so on. This duplication made evaluation more flexible and corroboration more reliable. Barrow also appears in similar incarnations, as an identity number, in *Minitab 8* files, as a "1" in columns representing "Employment: Military," "Travels: Outside Britain," "Honours: Earned," "Publications: Travel" and so on, and as a "0" in other columns. Database programs were rejected as a means of storing and sorting information as the definition of variables was not sufficiently flexible, the number of fields not large enough, and few operations could be performed. Operations on the data were done by *Minitab 8.* One complete check for correctness of entries was performed. Allowing software to do the "counting" and "sorting" relieves concern over possible errors by the author's own fallible brain. All calculations were run twice. Photocopied source material was held in alphabetised binders as a backup.

The sixth problem in understanding and using the data is that it has been limited in some ways, in order to increase certainty of results. Though data is incomplete, the data that has been used is reliable. In cases where an identification of an antiquary was probable but uncertain, no information was included in this analysis. For example, three SA members were named William Hughes. Biographical sources identified many men with this name. Membership dates suggested birth and death dates, but not conclusively; membership lists for earlier decades were used to exclude possible matches. Matching qualifications from the SA lists such as Reverend, MA, FRS to institutional lists allowed others to be excluded. But this process still resulted in conjectural identifications only. In the absence of a clear indication of FSA status, such a conjecture was not treated as an identification and biographical material was not included in the analyses below. Similarly, where SA lists identified a man as FRS but his name was not found in the Royal Society lists, he was not included in figures of RS members. Thus, the statistical portrait that emerges from this data can be viewed as minimal but probably accurate. However, it should be noted that fuller information could change the interpretation of the SA.

It should also be noted, that the statistical portrait of the SA that has been constructed here is likely to contain some errors. There are several potential sources of error. Biographical sources can be inaccurate. SA membership lists contain errors and unintentional misdirections. Even in 1850 and despite complaints from fellows, names of Fellows who were dead appeared on membership lists. Peers before and after their majority or call to the House are listed under different names, creating the false impression of two or more different people. For example, John Thynne is listed as "John, LORD CARTERET," and later as "John EARL GRANVILLE." Bishops similarly may appear under their own full name before their translation and their ecclesiastical name after, as "Samuel Wilberforce" and "Samuel, Lord Bishop of Oxford." Dead men have been left out of counts for variables, and calculations have been corrected for peers and bishops, but some may have escaped notice. Many men were trained for a profession they did not practise. Where this is known, they are entered under any professional qualifications such

---

I am grateful to Professor Larry Poos, Chair of the History Department at the Catholic University of America, for inviting me to attend his 1996 graduate seminar on quantitative methods, and his computer seminar on *Minitab 8.* This data set was tested in that class, and the results acquired much polish.
as being called to the bar or getting a medical licentiate, but not under that category of employment. But it remains probable that some cases, of these kinds and others, have escaped notice. These contribute to error in the analyses presented here.

The seventh problem in understanding and using the data involves the determination of class by occupation. Chapter Four presents data for fellows by class. The use of income estimates to construct class profiles on the basis of wages and costs is one of the two main methods of constructing class profiles of this sort, but is arduous. Information is available after 1842, for men with incomes over £150. Returns for the period covered by this thesis are scanty and considered misleading in many cases. Many SA members would not have had incomes great enough to require filing returns in any case. The second common method of producing distributions of economic wealth is estimating income by occupation through sampling, and comparing income group with population data. This approach has already produced widely used norms, and these norms can be integrated with data available for the SA population. The income and class structure of the British population overall, for a year late in the period under consideration in this thesis, extrapolating from occupation, as given in Figure 4.2 of Chapter Four, is reproduced below.³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Annual Income</th>
<th>N. Recipients</th>
<th>% British Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Class</td>
<td>£1,000 and up</td>
<td>49,500</td>
<td>.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Middle Class</td>
<td>£300-£1,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>1.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Middle Class</td>
<td>&lt;£100-£300</td>
<td>1,853,500</td>
<td>18.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Class</td>
<td>under £100</td>
<td>7,785,000</td>
<td>79.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.2: Class, Income, and Population Data, Britain, 1867

This portrait provides an approximate relation between class, as indicated by occupation, and income. Baxter divided the upper class into two sections. These have been conflated here because they describe a small section of the antiquarian community. Baxter divided the lower middle class into two and the working class into three sections. These have been conflated into one lower middle class and one working class because little income information is available for an analysis of such refinement for the SA population. Baxter's values were based on a sample of the British population. His values have been converted to a percentage, to estimate what fraction the overall British population fell into the different classes. These values will allow some comparison of antiquaries with the British population as a whole. Baxter's values represent data taken from the 1860s, after a period of rising wages, while this thesis considers men working between 1830-70. Antiquaries' fathers are also discussed, some of whom were earning in the 1750s. But almost no comprehensive income information is available for the British populace.

before Dudley Baxter's estimates of 1867, and Baxter worked at the end of a period during which working class wages had been rising steadily overall. Thus it seems prudent to view the income estimates given in Figure 4.2 as slightly high overall.

Class categories are here related to occupational categories as follows. Upper Class includes independently wealthy men, bankers, industrialists and manufacturers. Peers are included in other classes if they pursued an occupation. Many were lawyers and politicians, and some were clergymen. However, they are also indicated separately as peers. Upper middle class includes clergymen, lawyers, politicians, diplomats, wealthy merchants, gentleman farmers and professors. Lower Middle Class includes heralds (members of the College of Arms), doctors, surgeons, apothecaries, military men, artists, merchants, architects, civil engineers, authors, book printers and sellers, schoolmasters, civil servants, theatre managers, musicians, clergymen and men doing antiquarian work such as librarians and records clerks. Lower class includes tradesmen, laborers and small farmers. These choices reflect the employments found in the antiquarian community, rather than the British population as a whole. Income is less important to this thesis than class and occupation, which help to situate antiquaries' career choices and expectations. The class and employment profiles of the antiquarian community are also important to explaining the kinds of personal and professional links seen in many antiquaries' lives.

Certain problems arise from allocating class by occupation. As discussed in Chapter Four, a striking feature of the SA membership is its middle class profile. But the population does present a few anomalously wealthy men. For example, three sons of the Hoare family, the extraordinarily wealthy Fleet Street banking family, were antiquaries. However, the majority of SA fellows who were bankers, manufacturers or industrialists were much more modestly wealthy. Francis Fry, for example, co-proprietor of the Bristol cocoa and soap concern, was educated at a local village school and became wealthy enough to buy a moderately large house in the area. But his income did not begin to approach that of the Hoares. Since greater information exists for wealthy than for poor men, it has been possible to estimate the presence of 26, or 1.59% of the total SA population, who were bankers, manufacturers or industrialists and whose wealth must have exceeded £1,000 per year. But others may not have had such an income. Further, some "independently wealthy" men will not have been as wealthy as these men. But flagging some biographies for alternate classification, up or down the class scale, was too complex given the variables already in use.

Further, it has been possible to identify only 43 of 144 peers (including made peers) in the population, whose income must have exceeded £1,000 per year. While the actual figure may be greater, the great majority of antiquarian peers were of recent creation, and their biographies show that many received their income by working. Only 17.05% of noble antiquaries were fourth generation peers or more, so about 83% had a commoner grandparent who had been raised to the peerage. Only 5.68% had been noble ten generations or more, and 15.91% were sons of a commoner who had been raised to the peerage. Wealth did not universally attend their circumstances, then. Further, most noble antiquaries were lower down in the peerage: Viscounts and Barons rather than Dukes, Marquises and Earls. Therefore, creation would not have brought their families great wealth. Yet all these men are placed in the upper class category. This suggests that a downward adjustment of the figure for upper class men would be necessary if income data had been the criteria used to determine presence in the upper class category.

Complicating this picture further is the likelihood that a small number of lawyers and politicians (upper middle class), and doctors and architects (lower middle class) made more than £1,000 per year, for at least a period of their working lives. Further, some fellows worked in occupations which improved in income levels dramatically during the period under study. Charles
Ansell put the problem of the status and remuneration of new occupations succinctly, replying to Bishop Blomfield's protest at a 100 guinea charge for actuarial services to the church: "actuaries are bishops." Further, in a few cases, where the terms of a bequest or amount of a personality are known, a high income level is suggested for fellows able to save or bequeath such amounts. But this is not conclusive: the source of such an income or bequest may not have been fellows' employment. However, these cases do not involve even as many as 1% of all fellows. Adjusting figures for such fellows would have involved much effort on an unsound basis for small returns, and so was not attempted.

Finally, income does not always reflect the social status of occupations, and it is status more than income which is of interest in this thesis. For example, many Victorian clergy were poorly remunerated. Estimates for the basic clerical income vary between £80 and £150 per year. Clergy are here placed in the upper middle class, though only about 10% of clergymen antiquaries rose above curate, rector or vicar, and many must have had ordinary rather than well-paid positions. But clergymen's education and role gave them a place in society which was equally the object of lower and lower middle class aspirations. This provides some reason for placing them in the upper middle class. In Chapter Four, the object is to relate antiquaries' class profile to aspects of their interactions as a community.

For all these reasons, and chiefly because of a lack of clear income data, figures have not been adjusted within the occupational categories, for fellows who may have made more than, or less than, the income estimates given for the class they inhabit. Adjustments would, in any case, have been few and small. As Chapter Four shows, the great majority of SA fellows were from poor backgrounds and improved their social status, but did not become rich. The statistical impact of any possible adjustments, then, would have had a small impact on the resulting statistical portrait.

THE DATA SET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1830</th>
<th>1840</th>
<th>1850</th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1870</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Members</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l = (%)</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.1: Membership Size by Decadal Moment

For each year, the number of members is calculated as follows. The five to eight names which appeared at the head of the membership lists as royal patrons are not included as these people had little to do with the SA. Honorary and foreign members are not included in these values. Local secretaries and council members were members, and are included in the values. Information is given about the percentage one individual comprised, in order to give a context for evaluating smaller values. All values given in this thesis have been rounded to two decimal places, as one member represented between one and two tenths of a percentage point within the total decadal membership.
The number of entrants is large for 1830 because all cases where age of election is known were used. Until 1850, membership lists were printed, folio-size, for SA use only, and can only be obtained from the SA library at Burlington House. From 1850, membership lists are available in SA publications. Lists given in the Gentleman's Magazine are unreliable. In Rows 2 and 3, percentages are of total entrants, not of population. Sample sizes make it likely that the trend identified is accurate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1830</th>
<th>1840</th>
<th>1850</th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1870</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Age at Entrance</td>
<td>35.45</td>
<td>37.34</td>
<td>39.05</td>
<td>42.67</td>
<td>45.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Entrants for whom data exists</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.49%</td>
<td>53.10%</td>
<td>57.19%</td>
<td>52.20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Entrants Unknown</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.51%</td>
<td>46.90%</td>
<td>42.81%</td>
<td>47.80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.2: Average Age of Fellows When Elected SA Members

All decades other than that following reform show greater attrition than growth, suggesting that the SA was in need of the kinds of public relations efforts the BAAS was so efficient at, and the SA developed late in the century. The relatively large figures for both suggest that SA membership was fluid and changeable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T Membership</th>
<th>- Dead Fs</th>
<th>+ New Fs</th>
<th>= Next Decade T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>311 (-39%)</td>
<td>209 (+21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>342 (-49%)</td>
<td>145 (+21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>127 (-26%)</td>
<td>278 (+56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>236 (-36%)</td>
<td>205 (+32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.3: Decadal Membership Changes by Attrition and Election
The reader should note the relatively large size of the final row, representing the number of fellows for whom information on their father's occupation was unknown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peers</th>
<th>1830</th>
<th>1840</th>
<th>1850</th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1870</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.07%</td>
<td>8.23%</td>
<td>6.05%</td>
<td>4.79%</td>
<td>3.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.77%</td>
<td>2.16%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.65%</td>
<td>6.06%</td>
<td>4.56%</td>
<td>4.64%</td>
<td>5.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politicians, Diplomats</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>1.88%</td>
<td>1.61%</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankers, Manufacturers</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.40%</td>
<td>5.05%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>3.86%</td>
<td>3.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.65%</td>
<td>5.63%</td>
<td>3.83%</td>
<td>3.25%</td>
<td>4.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentlemen Farmers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td>0.81%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artists, Architects, Engineers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.51%</td>
<td>2.45%</td>
<td>3.63%</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
<td>3.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writers, Printers, Booksellers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.51%</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
<td>1.62%</td>
<td>2.16%</td>
<td>3.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors, Apothecaries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.31%</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
<td>1.85%</td>
<td>1.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>0.58%</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.88%</td>
<td>0.43%</td>
<td>0.81%</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradesmen</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.89%</td>
<td>2.31%</td>
<td>1.62%</td>
<td>2.47%</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.76%</td>
<td>3.32%</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
<td>1.24%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Unknown</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63.14%</td>
<td>57.43%</td>
<td>60.69%</td>
<td>68.47%</td>
<td>67.05%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.4: SA Fellows' Fathers' Occupations
This data is discussed in Chapter Four.

There is a 15 to 25 year gap between schooling and SA membership. The average age of membership in 1830 was 35.45, in 1840 was 37.34, in 1850 was 39.05, in 1860 was 42.67, and in 1870 was 45.21. Thus, 1830 members were schooled in any of the last four decades of the 1700s. Some fellows who were members in 1870 were schooled in the 1840s at the latest, but most were schooled earlier.

Trends in the data may reflect changing attitudes about schooling in Britain in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. For example, the increase in numbers attending public and good schools 1830-50 may reflect these schools’ improvements during the first part of the
century. However, the apparent decrease in numbers attending undistinguished schools may reflect recording practices of biographical works rather than any trend among fellows. Despite these schools’ poor reputation during this period, fathers’ employment suggests most fellows were sent to just such schools as these, if at all. While the number of fellows educated privately is small, its decline may reflect then-contemporary criticism of private schooling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1830</th>
<th>1840</th>
<th>1850</th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1870</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Men</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.36%</td>
<td>42.57%</td>
<td>37.30%</td>
<td>33.38%</td>
<td>37.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-University Men</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61.64%</td>
<td>57.43%</td>
<td>62.70%</td>
<td>66.62%</td>
<td>62.82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.7: Fellows’ University Education (% yearly membership)

This data may show a tendency among late eighteenth and early nineteenth century SA electors to select for university educated men. Decreasing values after 1840 may be a result of reform, as antiquaries elected non-university men at a greater rate after 1840 than previously. The small rise in 1870 is unlikely to reflect the increasing demand for university education evident throughout Victorian society during the century. The average age at admission in 1870 was 45 years. Therefore, this data reflects university education undertaken in the middle 1840s at the latest, before the demand for a reformed university system became great. Trends in data relating to reform are discussed in detail in the second section of Chapter 4.

---

3As antiquaries were on average 35 to 45 when first admitted to the SA, this data reflects educational trends which pre-date the removal of disabilities for non-conformists and the introduction of basic universal schooling. Any effects of the introduction of basic universal schooling would become visible only at the end of this period, and would involve a small number of fellows.

4Biographical works tend to record exceptional cases such as attendance at a public school, good local schools or a private education. These cases show the individual to have had schooling which is supposed good or unusual, but are atypical of the population overall.

The first two rows provide absolute numbers for variables. The last three rows provide absolute numbers and percentages of the yearly membership. Row 3 presents the ratio of numbers of degrees taken to number of fellows who were university educated, producing a crude indicator of how many fellows carried on to the master's degree. Values indicates that most university fellows had two degrees in the 1830s, under a third had proceeded to the master's degree in 1840, about two thirds of university fellows proceeded to the master's in 1850, again under a third had taken a master's degree in 1860, and in 1870 the figure was back up to about two-thirds. This figure drops in 1860, which may reflect changes in the kind of candidate fellows found acceptable after the reform years. However, the figure also drops in 1840, and rises again in 1870. While the numbers of Catholics and dissenters increase as a percentage of the membership over these decades, this change in the religious constitution of the SA has no clear relation to their university profile. These figures represent education taking place at least 20 to 30 years earlier than the decades represented in the columns. Antiquaries who attended but took no degree varies between 4% and 8%, suggesting a figure slightly below these for university-educated dissenters in the antiquarian community. Similarly, values for antiquaries known to be Catholics, who took degrees nonetheless, vary between 1% and 2%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1830</th>
<th>1840</th>
<th>1850</th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1870</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Degrees</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees per University Man</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorary Degrees</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.C. taking Degrees</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N taking No Degree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.8: University Education: Other Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1830</th>
<th>1840</th>
<th>1850</th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1870</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Travelling</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>14.14%</td>
<td>15.12%</td>
<td>13.91%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.9: SA Fellows Who Travelled Outside Britain**

This data is discussed in Chapter Four.
Medical Licentiates were given by the royal College of Surgeons, and the Royal College of Physicians. The Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) elected associates and fellows whose work was particularly good: thus, associate or fellowship status indicated a level of attributed professional competence among architects. The same is the case for the Royal Academy (RA) and the Institute for Civil Engineers (ICE). Fellows who exhibited with the RA but never became associates are not included in the above figures. Fellows who received medals but whose biographies do not state they were associates of these organisations are not included in these figures.

Data for fellows' professional qualifications shows that about 11% of fellows had such qualifications in 1830, rising to around 17%, 1850 to 1870. The largest subgroup is barristers, who make up about half of all qualified men. Doctors, artists, architects and engineers who had qualified made up only 1% to 3% of SA fellows overall.

Comparing this data with that for fellows' occupations shows that just over half (53% average) of fellows working in the law were barristers, indicating that something under half were solicitors. About 2/3 (65% average) of fellows working as doctors had taken a medical licentiate. Data for artists, architects and engineers, taken together, shows that just over 3/4 (77% average) had been elected members of their professional institutions. This may suggest that it was easier for legal men without professional certification to become SA fellows than for men working in medicine, art, architecture and engineering. However, from its inception in the sixteenth century, lawyers were strongly represented in the SA because their profession so often brought them into contact with the questions and documents associated with the intellectual domain of antiquarianism. Thus, it may be that solicitors are over-represented in the nineteenth century SA because they, more than doctors, artists, architects and engineers, worked in fields related to antiquarianism.
Another explanation for the relatively higher level of professional qualifications among antiquarian doctors, artists, architects and engineers may be that antiquarian electors demanded more of these candidates than of candidates from the traditionally strongly represented occupations. Some support for this comes from the data for 1860 and 1870. Following reform, the average for artists, architects and engineers jumps from about 50% to about 90%. Figures for 1830-50 reflect the early want of prestige of these newly-formed professional institutions, but figures for later years must also reflect this bias, as it is unlikely that it was mostly men who had obtained professional certification who had an active scholarly interest in antiquarian subjects. However, figures for doctors with licentiates fall very slightly after reform. (Until late in the century, a licentiate was not required in order to practise. The Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons were reorganising to meet the need for education and certification during the period this thesis covers.) A demand for professional qualifications made by SA electors of artists, architects and engineers might be expected to be found for doctors as well. This may be explained by the fact that, in the SA population overall, about 44% of doctors had attended university where only about 15% of artists, architects and engineers as a group had. Thus post-reform SA electors may be selecting for university education rather than professional qualification in the case of doctors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1830</th>
<th>1840</th>
<th>1850</th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1870</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independently Wealthy</td>
<td>39 4.91%</td>
<td>18 2.60%</td>
<td>8 1.61%</td>
<td>8 1.24%</td>
<td>6 0.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankers, Manufacturers</td>
<td>13 1.64%</td>
<td>9 1.30%</td>
<td>8 1.61%</td>
<td>6 0.93%</td>
<td>7 1.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Upper Class</td>
<td>52 6.54%</td>
<td>27 3.90%</td>
<td>16 3.23%</td>
<td>14 2.16%</td>
<td>13 2.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>129 16.23%</td>
<td>114 16.45%</td>
<td>77 15.52%</td>
<td>85 13.14%</td>
<td>95 15.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>159 20.00%</td>
<td>134 19.34%</td>
<td>86 17.34%</td>
<td>101 15.61%</td>
<td>92 14.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td>19 2.39%</td>
<td>34 4.91%</td>
<td>23 4.64%</td>
<td>25 3.86%</td>
<td>23 3.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politicians, Diplomats</td>
<td>101 12.70%</td>
<td>81 11.69%</td>
<td>65 13.10%</td>
<td>52 8.04%</td>
<td>52 8.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants</td>
<td>17 2.14%</td>
<td>11 1.59%</td>
<td>11 2.22%</td>
<td>8 1.24%</td>
<td>14 2.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Upper Middle Class</td>
<td>425 53.46%</td>
<td>374 53.97%</td>
<td>262 52.82%</td>
<td>271 41.89%</td>
<td>276 44.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heralds</td>
<td>11 1.38%</td>
<td>8 1.15%</td>
<td>7 1.41%</td>
<td>5 0.77%</td>
<td>3 0.49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Between 5% and 7% of men in each year are listed in two occupational categories as they had two consecutive and different careers. The result of 0% in the working class category for 1830 is probably wrong. The information available does not indicate any fathers in that category, but there were probably some among the 13% of fellows for whom this information is unknown.

Figure 1.11: SA Fellows’ Occupations (% yearly membership)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctors, Apothecaries</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.65%</td>
<td>2.45%</td>
<td>3.43%</td>
<td>3.86%</td>
<td>3.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.78%</td>
<td>4.91%</td>
<td>4.44%</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artists, Architects, Engineers</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.92%</td>
<td>6.78%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>6.03%</td>
<td>7.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors, Publishers, Book Sellers</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.91%</td>
<td>5.19%</td>
<td>5.44%</td>
<td>5.87%</td>
<td>4.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.40%</td>
<td>4.04%</td>
<td>3.63%</td>
<td>3.09%</td>
<td>2.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Servants</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.26%</td>
<td>1.59%</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre Managers, Actors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.13%</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
<td>0.81%</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.77%</td>
<td>3.17%</td>
<td>3.02%</td>
<td>3.09%</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiquarian work</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.64%</td>
<td>2.31%</td>
<td>4.84%</td>
<td>4.33%</td>
<td>3.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musicians</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Lower Middle Class</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.09%</td>
<td>32.47%</td>
<td>34.27%</td>
<td>31.38%</td>
<td>30.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradesmen, Laborers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.31%</td>
<td>1.41%</td>
<td>1.24%</td>
<td>0.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Lower Class</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.31%</td>
<td>1.41%</td>
<td>1.24%</td>
<td>0.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.21%</td>
<td>15.01%</td>
<td>15.12%</td>
<td>30.29%</td>
<td>16.72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John D. Gay, *The Geography of Religion in England* Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd: London, 1971, studied the returns for the 1851 Census of Religion for England and Wales. Gay estimates Jews were about 1% of the British population overall. Gay estimates Catholics in England and Wales to be something between 2% and 5%. Values for the SA range between 1.62% and 2.16%. Gay estimates the total non-conforming population to make up around 45% of the population. Values for the SA range between 2.4% and 5.4%, though data probably underestimates their real presence in the SA.

The presence of Jews and Catholics in the SA is higher than might be expected, considering that Gay shows that most worked in lower and lower middle class occupations, and that members of religious minorities would probably have found it harder to gain entrance to learned societies than their Christian counterparts. Jack Morrell and Arnold Thackray show that it was difficult for members of these religious minorities to gain membership in the BAAS, for instance. See Morrell and Thackray, *Gentlemen of Science: The Early Years of the British Association for the Advancement of Science*, Clarendon Press: Oxford, 1982. Gay estimates that Irish immigrants made up about 1.9% of the population of England and Wales mid-century, and in total, Catholics comprised 3 to 4% of the population. He also notes that the Irish did not usually have much education or hold upper middle class jobs. However, dissenters, whose education and employment opportunities usually exceeded those for Catholics and Jews, seem to be under-represented in the SA for their place in British society as a whole. Since data on failed candidatures is unknown, interpreting these results is difficult. It can be said that SA electors were not completely intolerant of religious differences. However, it may be that fellows were more tolerant of the very dissimilar than their closer brethren.

While the number of non-Anglican fellows was small, their combined presence rises
slightly during these decades. Their greatest presence is in 1860, which may reflect fellows' choices of new members in the wake of reform. But the steepest rise, between 1840 and 1850, may reflect official tolerance of religious non-conformity broadly within British society, as seen in legislation removing disabilities for Catholics and Dissenters. The value for 1870 shows a slight downturn, which may reflect a retreat from reform measures adopted in the 1840s and 1850s, which were necessary to increase membership numbers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1830</th>
<th>1840</th>
<th>1850</th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1870</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Learned Societies</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.96%</td>
<td>10.97%</td>
<td>23.99%</td>
<td>20.71%</td>
<td>16.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Archaeological &amp; Architectural</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.65%</td>
<td>5.34%</td>
<td>12.70%</td>
<td>13.76%</td>
<td>15.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing Societies</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.52%</td>
<td>7.65%</td>
<td>8.87%</td>
<td>10.97%</td>
<td>8.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary-Philosophical Societies</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>2.01%</td>
<td>1.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Learned Societies</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.53%</td>
<td>7.07%</td>
<td>13.71%</td>
<td>9.89%</td>
<td>11.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Membership, All Humanities Societies</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.14: SA Fellows' Participation in Humanities Societies

"National Learned Societies" denotes non-local or provincial humanities societies only, including: the London Architectural, Ecclesiastical History, Hellenic, History of Science, Numismatic, Philological, Royal Asiatic, Royal Historical and Watercolour Societies; the Art Union of London, Athenaeum, Archaeological Institute, British Archaeological Association, New Philosophical Institution, Royal Academy, Royal Irish Academy, Royal Irish Institution, Royal Society for Literature, Royal Society for Musicians, Russell Institution, the Society for British Artists, and the Society for Arts. Some exceptions have been made for societies with local names which nevertheless functioned as national societies and had a national membership, such as the London Architectural Society.

Provincial Archaeological and Architectural societies include: the Bath and West-of-England, Berkshire Ashmolean, Caerleon Antiquarian, Edinburgh Speculative Society, Chester Architectural, Highlands, Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, Hull Literary-Philosophical, Kent Archaeological, Manchester Literary-Philosophical, Newcastle-on-Tyne Literary-Philosophical, Norfolk and Norwich Archaeological, SA Edinburgh, SA Newcastle-on-Tyne and Surrey Archaeological societies.

Publishing Societies included: the Abbotsford, Bannatyne, Camden, Caxton, Chetham, Early English Text, English Dialect, Harleian, Granger, Maitland, Manx, Parker, Percy, Roxburghe, Shakespeare, Surtees and Typographical Societies as well as the Society for Publication of Oriental Texts, Welsh Text Society, the Cymreigyddon and the Gwyneddygion.

Literary-Philosophical societies include: the Abernethian Society (St. Bart's Literary
Philosophical Society), Bath Literary-Philosophical, the Philosophical Club of London; the Cambridge Antiquarian, Cambridge Architectural, Homily, Literary and Scientific Institute of Huntingdon, Manchester Athenaeum, Norfolk Literary, Surrey Institution, the Anglo-Biblical, Syro-Egyptian Athenian, and Stourhead Circle groups; and the Blair-Adam, Essex Head, Eumelean, Garrick's, Glee, King of, Literary, Melodist's, Nobody's, Traveller's, and Unincreasable Clubs. Though many clubs had a dining element to them, those without a stated subject of study are not included here, for example the Sublime Society of Beefsteaks.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1830</th>
<th>1840</th>
<th>1850</th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1870</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Royal Society</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.94%</td>
<td>22.51%</td>
<td>24.60%</td>
<td>12.67%</td>
<td>7.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Astronomical</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.88%</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td>3.83%</td>
<td>3.55%</td>
<td>1.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geological</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.89%</td>
<td>2.89%</td>
<td>7.26%</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>4.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Geographical</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.88%</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
<td>5.44%</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linnaean</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>3.17%</td>
<td>4.84%</td>
<td>2.16%</td>
<td>1.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.03%</td>
<td>6.49%</td>
<td>7.46%</td>
<td>5.72%</td>
<td>5.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Scientific Memberships</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.87%</td>
<td>37.52%</td>
<td>53.43%</td>
<td>34.78%</td>
<td>26.14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1.15: SA Fellows' Participation in Scientific Societies*
Row 7, "Other" includes the Botanical, British Wool, Chemical, Cornwall Geological, Edinburgh Natural History, Edinburgh Wernerian, Entomological, Herefordshire Agricultural, Horticultural, Meteorological, Royal Medical, Medical and Chirurgical, Medico-Botanical, Photographic, Royal Society of Edinburgh, Statistical and Zoological Societies as well as the Agricultural Society of Scotland, the Institute for Civil Engineering, Lyceum Medicum Londinense, Royal Institute of British Architects, and the Royal Institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1830</th>
<th>1840</th>
<th>1850</th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1870</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T Memberships</td>
<td>389 (.49)</td>
<td>469 (.68)</td>
<td>575 (1.16)</td>
<td>596 (.92)</td>
<td>489 (.79)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.16: SA Fellows' Overall Participation in Learned Societies

Values given below the total membership are not percentages. Percentages would suggest that one membership corresponded to one member, where many fellows were members of both scientific and humanities societies, and others were members only of the SA. The figures in brackets are ratios of memberships to total yearly fellows, indicating how prevalent memberships were among fellows. 1.00 would indicate that memberships were as prevalent as fellows. Figures under 1.00 they were fewer, and figures above 1.00 indicate there were more memberships than fellows. While somewhat misleading if viewed as an average, this figure is best viewed as an indicator of the probability that a given fellow had a membership outside the SA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1830</th>
<th>1840</th>
<th>1850</th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1870</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>60 7.54%</td>
<td>41 5.92%</td>
<td>46 9.27%</td>
<td>49 7.57%</td>
<td>43 6.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language-related</td>
<td>28 3.52%</td>
<td>27 3.90%</td>
<td>34 6.85%</td>
<td>46 7.11%</td>
<td>40 6.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>322 40.50%</td>
<td>241 34.78%</td>
<td>215 43.35%</td>
<td>274 42.35%</td>
<td>236 38.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents-related</td>
<td>137 17.23%</td>
<td>96 13.85%</td>
<td>85 17.14%</td>
<td>113 17.47%</td>
<td>98 15.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliography</td>
<td>52 6.54%</td>
<td>39 6.53%</td>
<td>24 4.84%</td>
<td>41 6.34%</td>
<td>47 7.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>35 4.40%</td>
<td>22 3.17%</td>
<td>14 2.82%</td>
<td>20 3.09%</td>
<td>16 2.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art, Architecture</td>
<td>95 11.95%</td>
<td>85 12.27%</td>
<td>76 15.32%</td>
<td>99 15.30%</td>
<td>83 13.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>74 9.31%</td>
<td>76 10.97%</td>
<td>49 9.88%</td>
<td>80 12.36%</td>
<td>66 10.71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Several of the twelve categories used here include sub-topics. Literature includes literary history and criticism for both foreign and British literature. Language-related topics include philological topics, lexicons, dictionaries, grammars and glossaries. Bibliography and Classics are self-explanatory. Documents includes editions and translations of older works, both literary and historical, as well as editions of rolls, state papers, cartularies, calendars and so on. History includes biography, British and foreign history, genealogy, heraldry, and ecclesiastical, local, legal and music history. Art and Architecture includes works of history and criticism on collections, engravings, other antiquities and numismatics. Archaeology includes works on British and foreign sites and excavations, and travel literature. Biblical Studies includes criticism and history but not works of theology. They were separated out to show important trends, but the categories used in Chapters Three and Four can easily be obtained by simple addition. At times, attributing works to categories was difficult. Errors may have been made. Many works included in this category contain some theological content. When obscure works were unavailable or difficult to classify, they were omitted. Scientific works include applied and theoretical work. "Other" includes publications on current affairs, poetry and fiction, theological works, and school texts. Values for periodicals include articles only: letters are not included. Other than for periodicals, values reflect the number of fellows publishing books in these areas, not the number of works published or the number of antiquaries studying in those areas. Values are likely to underestimate the number of works published, as this data is dependent on biographical sources, which tend to list important works rather than provide an exhaustive list. Except in the last row, articles were excluded from this count. Thus men who wrote for a living, who published articles in the main, are not over-represented here, as they might have been if articles had been included. These values represent the number of fellows publishing at all, in a given area, in a given decade. Columns need not sum to 100% or to yearly membership totals. Figures represent the number of fellows publishing in those areas in that decade, but not all that fellows published, where many others published in more than one area. It should be noted that the number of fellows publishing in an area gives a minimal indication of the number of fellows working in an area: the real figures would be higher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biblical Studies</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>2.89%</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>3.17%</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>3.02%</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>3.25%</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>2.60%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Works</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>9.94%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8.95%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.44%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>32.33%</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>25.11%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>18.95%</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>18.24%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodicals</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>14.09%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>13.91%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>9.27%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.17: SA Fellows' Areas of Publications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N Members Publishing</th>
<th>1830</th>
<th>1840</th>
<th>1850</th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1870</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.18: Index of Publications to Membership**
These values are for scholarly publications only. The category Other from Figure 1.14 has been excluded, as have periodical publications.

**Archaeology**: 177 = 30.20%  
**History**: 162 = 27.65%  
**Manuscripts**: 91 = 15.53%  
**Art**: 83 = 14.16%  
**Architecture**: 42 = 7.17%  
**Literature**: 17 = 2.90%  
**Philology**: 14 = 2.39%

Total articles published, exclusive of the Appendix, 1830-70: 586

**Figure 1.19: Analysis of articles in the Archaeologia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1830</th>
<th>1840</th>
<th>1850</th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1870</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Made Peers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td>0.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knighted+ Civil List</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.91%</td>
<td>8.80%</td>
<td>10.08%</td>
<td>5.41%</td>
<td>6.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Knighthood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
<td>1.85%</td>
<td>1.78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.20: SA Fellows’ Awards for Scholarship**

Values for "Knighted + Civil List" indicate fellows receiving these awards for their scholarship. Fellows rewarded for political, diplomatic or other services are not included. For information on the knighthoods and other similar honours, see Bernard Burke, *The Book of Orders of Knighthood and Decorations of Honour of All Nations*, Hurst and Blackett: London, 1858.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1830</th>
<th>1840</th>
<th>1850</th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1870</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books, Manuscripts</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.54%</td>
<td>6.34%</td>
<td>8.47%</td>
<td>6.03%</td>
<td>5.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.39%</td>
<td>1.44%</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
<td>3.86%</td>
<td>2.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiquities</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.26%</td>
<td>2.74%</td>
<td>2.82%</td>
<td>2.78%</td>
<td>3.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coins</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.88%</td>
<td>1.59%</td>
<td>1.81%</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
<td>1.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Collections</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.75%</td>
<td>2.16%</td>
<td>1.81%</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
<td>1.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index, Collectors in SA Population</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.21: Notable SA Collectors**
Antiquities included marbles, casts or samples of architectural features such as friezes and mouldings, medieval seals, statuary, mosaics, and other similar objects. Scientific collectors collected plants, mosses, zoological specimens, fossils and minerals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>1850</th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1870</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55.85%</td>
<td>45.60%</td>
<td>43.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.02%</td>
<td>4.48%</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counties surrounding London</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.67%</td>
<td>5.72%</td>
<td>3.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West Counties</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.65%</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
<td>5.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Counties</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.69%</td>
<td>9.43%</td>
<td>12.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.12%</td>
<td>17.77%</td>
<td>13.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North of England Counties</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.27%</td>
<td>6.96%</td>
<td>4.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.01%</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.41%</td>
<td>1.24%</td>
<td>0.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>3.09%</td>
<td>2.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Addresses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>1.08%</td>
<td>1.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Fellows with More than One Address</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.13%</td>
<td>12.36%</td>
<td>10.23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.22: SA Fellows' Addresses By Region

SA membership lists began including fellows' addresses between 1840 and 1850. Therefore, this data is available for the last three decades of this study. Regions are defined as follows. London and Middlesex have been treated separately because Middlesex was a county during these decades and because this gives a clearer idea of the way fellows were clustered around London. "Counties surrounding London" includes Berkshire, Buckinghamshire, Essex, Hertfordshire and Oxfordshire. "Southwest counties" includes Cornwall, Devon, Somerset, Dorset, Gloucester and Wiltshire. "Southeast counties" include Hampshire, Kent, Surrey, Sussex and the Channel Islands. "Midlands" includes Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Cheshire, Derbyshire, Hereford and Worcester,
Huntingdonshire, Leicestershire, Lincolnshire, Norfolk, Nottinghamshire, Rutlandshire, Shropshire, Staffordshire, Suffolk and Warwickshire. "North of England counties" includes Durham, Cumberland, Lancashire, Northumberland, Yorkshire and Westmorland. Ireland, Scotland and Wales had relatively few members each and so are not broken into counties. Foreign addresses included New Zealand, Paris and Rome in 1830, Halifax, Hong Kong, Mauritius, New Zealand, Oporto, Rome and St. Lucia in 1860, and Barbados, Copenhagen, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Jamaica, Luxemburg, New Zealand and St. Vincent in 1870. Of fellows with two addresses, the great majority had one in London, and a tiny fraction had more than one address in the counties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1830-40</th>
<th>1840-50</th>
<th>1850-60</th>
<th>1860-70</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peers' Sons</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.70%</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
<td>5.04%</td>
<td>4.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sons of Upper Middle Class Men</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.00%</td>
<td>11.72%</td>
<td>10.07%</td>
<td>13.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public School</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.13%</td>
<td>10.34%</td>
<td>12.59%</td>
<td>12.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apprenticed</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.31%</td>
<td>4.14%</td>
<td>5.76%</td>
<td>1.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travels</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.00%</td>
<td>5.52%</td>
<td>10.43%</td>
<td>11.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N. University Men</strong></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.62%</td>
<td>27.59%</td>
<td>35.97%</td>
<td>44.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N. Degrees</strong></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ratio Degrees/Men</strong></td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Honorary Degrees</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.31%</td>
<td>7.59%</td>
<td>6.47%</td>
<td>5.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N. No Degree</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.31%</td>
<td>4.14%</td>
<td>3.96%</td>
<td>6.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Qualifications</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.88%</td>
<td>17.24%</td>
<td>11.51%</td>
<td>19.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Class Employment</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.48%</td>
<td>2.76%</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Middle Class Employment</strong></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.66%</td>
<td>38.62%</td>
<td>37.78%</td>
<td>43.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lower Middle Class Employment</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.27%</td>
<td>28.28%</td>
<td>36.33%</td>
<td>27.32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percentages are of the total new members, not of total yearly population. Percentages are not given for "T Memberships." This would suggest that one membership corresponded to one member, where many members were fellows of both scientific and humanities societies. The number presented is a ratio of memberships (not fellows) to total new fellows, indicating how prevalent memberships were among new fellows. 1.00 would indicate that memberships were as prevalent among new fellows as new fellows were. Figures under 1.00 indicate memberships among new fellows were fewer than new fellows. Figures above 1.00 indicate there were more memberships among new fellows than there were new fellows.

Between 25% and 50% of SA membership died between decades, suggesting an average attrition rate of 2.5-5% per year and a near-complete replacement of the membership over the period considered.

Where values for newly elected fellows are below the previous decadal average, but the value for the current decadal average has in fact increased, this is accounted for by the demographic profile of fellows who died during that decade. For example, 11.19% of fellows in 1830 were public school alumni. Between 1830 and 1840, 8.13% of newly elected fellows were public school alumni. Yet 13.56% of the 1840 members were public school alumni. This is accounted for by the educational profile of the 311 who fellows died during that decade. That this is true of data for this variable until 1860 suggests that in the early decades of the century, public school alumni tended to be elected at a younger age than graduates of more ordinary schools. Because they would probably live longer, and so hold membership longer, they would skew the overall demographic profile of total membership towards a higher presence of public school alumni than the profile of newly elected fellows suggests.

Between 1830 and 1850, new membership decreases from about 25% to about 20% of the previous decade’s total membership. The number of new fellows in 1840 was 209, or 26.29% of the 1830 and 30.16% of the 1840 membership. The number of new fellows in 1850 was 145, or
20.92% of the 1840 and 29.23% of the 1850 membership. The number of new fellows in 1860 was 278, or 56.05% of the 1850 and 42.97% of the 1860 membership. The number of new fellows in 1870 was 205, or 31.68% of the 1860 and 33.28% of the 1870 membership. In 1860, new membership had increased by just over 50% of its 1850 total, reflecting the SA’s efforts at opening membership to more, and more ordinary men. In 1870, new membership had decreased to near its former level, at about 30%.
APPENDIX TWO

These lists are not exhaustive: some of the more examples are given for each category, which otherwise would have held hundreds of names. Abbreviations are noted at the top of each list. Section A treats Careers, section B treats Scholarship and section C treats Elements of Community. Each section is subdivided by number. Dates showing when a position was taken and when relinquished are given where known. Where only one date is given, this indicates the start date for that position, but its end point is unknown, and this does not indicate that this position was held for one year only. It should be noted that, for the sake of brevity and clarity, this appendix uses the convention found in the catalogues of Burke and other works on the peerage, of using numerals to denote the ordinal of rank, e.g., Charles, 11 Duke Norfolk.

Appendix 2.A.1: Antiquarian Kinds of Employment

Robert Archibald Armstrong: Gaelic lexicographer to King George III
Thomas Thynne, Marquis of Bath: Custos Rotulorum, Somerset
Sir William Betham: Deputy, Subcommissioner, Office of the Ulster King of Arms, Ireland
John Caley: clerk, Record Office in Tower; Keeper of Records 1787, Augmentation Office; Keeper of Records 1818, Westminster; Secretary 1801-31, first Record Commission; Subcommissioner, Record Commissioner
Henry Campkin: Librarian, Reform Club
Nicholas Carlisle: Assistant Librarian, Royal Library
Charles Purton Cooper: Secretary, Second Record Commission
James Crossley: Librarian, Chetham Library, Manchester
William Cureton: Sublibrarian, Bodleian, Oxford 1834-37
Thomas Frognall Dibdin: Librarian to Duke of Spencer at Althorp
John Duncumb: employee of Charles, 11 Duke Norfolk, at £2 2d week to write a history of Herefordshire, 1790-1815
Edward Backhouse Eastwick: Librarian, Haileybury College 1850
Henry Ellis: Assistant Librarian 1798, Bodleian, Oxford
Charles Long 1 Baron Farnborough: Chair, Committee for Inspection of National Monuments
Robert Fitch: Curator, Norwich Museum
John Thomas Gilbert: Secretary 1867-75, Public Record Office, Dublin; Librarian 1861-98, Royal Irish Academy
John Gillies: Royal Historiographer for Scotland, 1793
John Gutch: Keeper, All Souls' College Museum, Oxford
Spencer Hall: Librarian, Athenaeum Club 1833-75
James Orchard Halliwell (-Phillipps): Librarian, Jesus College Cambridge
Thomas Duffus Hardy: clerk, Public Record Office, Tower of London, 1819; Deputy Keeper, Public Records 1861-78; Originator, Public Records Commission 1869
William Hardy: clerk 1823, Record Office, Tower of London 1823; Keeper of Records, Duchy of Lancaster 1830-68; Assistant Keeper, Record Office 1878-86; Commissioner, Historical Manuscript Commission 1878
William Henry Hart: clerk, Public Record Office 1855-69
Henry Hobhouse: Keeper, State Papers 1826-54; originator, Commissioner, Record Commission 1852; Superintendent, Publications 1811
John Holmes: Assistant to Bertram 4 Earl Ashburnham, Manuscript Collection
Richard Rivington Holmes: Royal Librarian 1869-1906, Keeper, prints and drawings 1870-1906, Windsor Castle

Thomas Hartwell Horne: employed compiling indexes of Harleian Manuscripts for Public Records Commission 1808; Sublibrarian, Surrey Institution; clerk, Record Office 1816-19; clerk, Chapter House Westminster; employed cataloguing Queen’s College Cambridge Library 1821

Joseph Hunter: Sub-commissioner 1833, Editor, Assistant-Keeper 1838, Public records; catalogued Queen’s Remembrancer records

William Illingworth: Deputy-keeper, Records, Tower of London 1805-19

James Ingram: Keeper of Archives, Trinity College, Oxford 1815-18

Robert Harry Inglis: Commissioner, Public Records 1831

John Edward Jackson: Librarian to Marquis of Bath

Robert Jamieson: Assistant Deputy Clerk to Registrar, General Register House, Edinburgh 1808-44

Llewellyn Frederick William Jewitt: Chief Librarian, Plymouth Public Library 1849-53; Curator, Derby Museum

Thomas Jones: Librarian, Chetham Library, Manchester 1845-75

John Kenrick: Curator, Yorkshire Philosophical Society Museum

David Laing: Librarian, Society of Writers to H.M. Signet

Rowley Lascelles: clerk, Record Commission for Ireland

John Lee: Treasurer, Librarian, College of Advocates 1816-58

Robert Lemon: clerk 1795, Deputy-Keeper 1818c State Paper Office; Second Clerk, Record Office 1801; Assistant Historian 1810, East India Company; editor 1810 Annals of the East India Company; discovered in 1823 Milton’s autograph De Doctrina Christiana among the State Papers, which led to the First Record Commission 1825; Secretary, Record Commission 1825-35, interpreted a cypher of sixteenth century state papers which had made them previously unintelligible

Samuel Lysons: Keeper of Records, Tower of London

John MacLean: Keeper, Ordnance Records, Tower of London 1855-61

Frederic Madden: collated the manuscripts for Caedmon at Oxford University; catalogued Earl Holkham’s manuscripts

Samuel Roffey Maitland: Librarian, Keeper of Manuscripts, Lambeth 1838-48

Thomas James Mathias: Librarian, Buckingham Palace 1812

Richard Edgecumbe 2 Earl Mountedgecumbe, Viscount Valetort: custos rotulorum 1795, Cornwall

William Henry Overall: Clerk 1847-57, Sublibrarian 1847, Librarian 1865-88, Guildhall Library

Henry Petrie: Keeper of Records, Tower of London 1819; revived Gibbons’ project of a complete corpus historicum, which was funded by the Record Commission 1823-41

Francis Palgrave: Municipal Corporations Commissioner 1832, Deputy-Keeper H.M. Records, Tower of London 1838-1861; created the Record Repository, arranged for records from more than 50 locations to be housed together, published annual reports on the Records Commission progress for 22 years

John Henry Parker: Keeper, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford 1870-84

Lewis Hayes Petit: Commissioner, Public Record Commission 1835

Thomas Pell Platt: Librarian, British & Foreign Bible Society

Edward Davis Protheroe: Commissioner, Public Records 1830-34

Charles William Russell: member, Historical Manuscripts Commission 1869
George Scharf: Secretary 1857, Director 1882, National Portrait Gallery
William Sparrow Simpson: Librarian, Queen’s College Cambridge 1850; Librarian, St. Paul’s Cathedral 1861-97
Samuel Weller Singer: Librarian, Royal Institution 1827-35
Robert Henry Soden Smith: Assistant Keeper 1857, Keeper 1868, National Art Library, South Kensington
Philip Henry Stanhope 5 Earl Stanhope: Commissioner 1844, Promotion of Fine Arts
William John Thomas: Deputy-Librarian, House of Lords 1863-82
Thomas Thomson: Curator, Asiatic Society Museum, Calcutta 1840
Henry John Todd: Keeper of Manuscripts, Lambeth
James Henthorn Todd: Librarian 1852, Trinity College Dublin
William Robert Whatton: Librarian, Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society 1828
Bernard Bolingbroke Woodward: Librarian, Windsor Castle 1860-69
Richard Yates: Custodian, Bury Abbey ruins 1803
William Sandys Wright Vaux: employed to catalogue Bodleian coins 1871-76

British Museum Staff:
William Alexander: Assistant Keeper, Antiquities and Coins; did the engravings for British Museum catalogues
Nicholas Carlisle: Librarian, Royal Library at the British Library
William Hookham Carpenter: Keeper, Buyer, Prints and Drawings 1845-66
John George Children: Librarian, Antiquities 1816-40
Henry Charles Coote: Assistant, Department of Books 1858-85
Henry Courbould: Draftsman to Trustees for British Library and Museum publications
William Cureton: Assistant Keeper, Manuscripts
Francis Douce: Keeper, Manuscripts
Henry Ellis: Library Assistant 1800, Assistant-Keeper of Printed Books 1805, Keeper of Printed Books 1806 (then to the remaned Department of Manuscripts 1812), Secretary to Museum 1814, Acting Principal Librarian 1818-27, Principal Librarian 1827-56
Josiah Forshall: Assistant Librarian, Manuscript Department 1824, Keeper, Manuscript Department 1827-37; Secretary to the Museum 1828-49
Augustus Wollaston Franks: Assistant, Coins and Antiquities 1851; Keeper, British and Medieval Antiquities and Ethnography 1866-96
Edward Hawkins: Deputy Keeper, Department of Antiquities 1825, Keeper, Antiquities 1826-60
John Holmes: Assistant, Department of Manuscripts 1830, Senior Assistant 1837, Assistant Keeper 1850-54
Thomas Hartwell Horne: Cataloguer, Printed Books 1824
John Winter Jones: Assistant 1837, Assistant Keeper 1850, Keeper of Printed Books 1856, Principal Librarian 1866-78
Edward Levien: Assistant, Department of Manuscripts 1850-74
Frederick Madden: Assistant, Printed Books Catalogue 1826-28; Assistant-Keeper 1828, Head, Manuscripts 1837
Richard Henry Major: Assistant (Maps and Charts), Printed Books 1844; Keeper, Maps and Plans 1867-80
James V. Millingen: buyer for the British Museum and Library
William Otley: Keeper, Prints 1833-36
William Sandys Wright Vaux: Assistant, Antiquities 1841; Keeper, Coins and Medals 1861-70
Appendix 2.A.2: Legal Careers
IT: Inner Temple
MT: Middle Temple
LI: Lincoln’s Inn
KC/QC: King’s/Queen’s Council

John Adolphus: Home Circuit judge, Old Bailey judge, defence for the Cato street conspirators
John Leycester Adolphus: Northern Circuit judge, Attorney-General of County-palatine Durham, King’s, Queen’s Bench 1834-52, Marylebone Circuit judge 1852, IT Bencher, Stewart, Counsel to St. John’s, Oxford
George Lane Blount: Baron of the Exchequer
Thomas Heywood: High Sheriff, Herefordshire 1840
James Baldwin Brown: Northern Circuit judge, Lancashire Sessions judge, Oldham Court of Requests judge 1840
Rt.Hon. Sir J.L.K. Bruce: Welsh Circuit judge, IT Bencher 29, Brecon Recorder, Puisne judge, Vice-Chancellor 1841, PC 42, Chief Justice in Bankruptcy Court 1842, senior Lord Justice of Appeal in Chancery Court, PC 1851
William Burrell: High Sheriff, Northumberland 1811
Charles Butler: LI Bencher 1832; assisted in writing Catholic Relief Bill 1788
Benjamin Bond Cabbell: Western and Somerset Circuit judge, MT Bencher 1850; High Sheriff Norfolk 1854
George Cappel Coningsby 5 Earl Essex; Recorder, High Steward, Leominster
Codrington Carrington: Supreme Court of India judge, Counsel to EIC Calcutta, prepared law code for Ceylon 1800; first Chief Justice, Ceylon Supreme Court 1800-06
Charles Purton Cooper: QC 1837, Queen’s Serjeant in Duchy Lancaster, LI Bencher 1836; Treasurer LI 1855, master of Library LI 1856
William Durrant Cooper: solicitor to Reform Club 1837
Alexander Croke: Vice-Admiralty Court Judge in Halifax, Nova Scotia 1801-15
John Drinkwater-Bethune: drafted Municipal Reform Act, Tithe Commutation Act, County Courts Act; Fourth Ordinary or Legislative Member of the Supreme Court of India 1848
John Foy Edgar: Sheriff, Bristol
John Evans: QC 1837; Bencher 1837, Reader 1849, Treasurer 1850 IT
George Edward Eyre: Western Circuit judge; Recorder, Romsey 1834-35
James William Farrer: Master in Chancery Court 1824-52
Edward Foss: Under-Sheriff London 1827-28, founded Incorporated Law Society, President Law Society 1842-44; Chair, Magistrate’s Bench Canterbury 1844
Edwin Freshfield: Solicitor to the Bank of England
Davies Gilbert: High-Sheriff, Cornwall 1792-3
Stacey Grimaldi: lecturer, Law Institution 1834; Auditor, Law Society 1853
Sir Henry Gwilliam: Chief Justice, Isle of Ely, Judge of the Supreme Court of Madras
Benjamin Harrison: Chair, Exchequer Loan Board, London Appeals; Commissioner for Income Tax
James Vincent Harting: solicitor to Cardinal Newman
Charles Harwood: Shrewsbury Recorder 1839-66, Circuit judge 1850
Henry Hobhouse: solicitor, H.M. Customs 1806-12, solicitor, Treasury 1812
Henry Howard: High Sheriff Cumberland 1832
Thomas Hughes: IT Bencher 1870-96
William Hughes Hughes: Southeast Circuit judge, Commissioner of Lieutenancy, City of London
Joseph Jekyll: IT bencher 1795, IT Reader 1814, IT Treasurer 1816, Western Circuit judge; Solicitor-General 1805; Master in Chancery 1815; Senior KC and Senior Bencher
Alexander Johnston: Home Circuit judge; Advocate-General 1799, Chief Justice 1805 Ceylon; author, East India Company Charter 1809, President, member, PC 1811; Admiralty judge 1817, PC 1832; member, PC Court of Ceylon 1833; led legal reform in Ceylon, drafting law for religious liberty, the prohibition of slavery, the opening of employment to half-castes, trial by jury; refused his salary though worked as an Admiralty judge
George Kenyon 2 Baron Kenyon: MT Bencher 1811-55, MT Reader 1515, MT Treasurer 1823; *custos brevium*, Clerk of Outlawries, Filacer-exiguenter of Court of Queen’s Bench 1802-37, Commissioner, building of churches
Edmund Knowles Lacon: High Sheriff of Norfolk 1823
Rowley Lascelles: South Wales Circuit judge
Thomas LeBlanc: Western Circuit judge, Second Master of the Court of Common Pleas 1814, Court of King’s Bench, Master of Court of Queen’s Bench 1818
Hugh Leycester: Chester Recorder, first Justice of Anglesey, Carnarvonshire & Merionethshire
Joseph Littledale: Northern Circuit judge, Council to Cambridge University 1813, Court of King’s Bench judge 1824-31, PC 1841
James Heywood Markland: Parliamentary agent for West India planters
John Martin Leake: MT Bencher 1830, MT Treasurer 1844
Richard Neave: Deputy Paymaster for the Forces 1812
Sir John Nicholl: Dean of Arches; Judge, Perogative Court, Canterbury 1809; PC 1810; Judge, High Court of Admiralty 1833; Judicial Committee, Privy Council
John Nicholl: Commissioner, Jersey 1791, King’s Advocate 1798
Francis Palgrave: Municipal Corporations Commissioner 1832
Charles John Palmer: Mayor, Yarmouth 1854-55, Deputy-Lieutenant Suffolk
James Alan Park: 1791 Vice-Chancellor of Lancaster 1795. Recorder of Durham, Attorney-General of Lancaster 1811, Head of Northern Circuit 1802, Court of Common Pleas judge 1816-38
Charles Peers: Sheriff Oxfordshire 1821
Lewis Hayes Petitt: Chester & North Wales circuit judge
John Delafield Phelps: Exchequer Bill Loan Commissioner
Richard Nathaniel Philipps: Northern Circuit judge
Sir Johnathon Frederick Pollock: Northern Circuit judge, Head of Northern Circuit, IT bencher 1827-44, IT Reader 1836-37, IT Treasurer 37, Attorney-General to County-Palatine Lancaster 1834-35, Commissioner of Inquiry into Courts of law 1831; Attorney General 1834-35 and 1841-44; Lord Chief Baron of Court of Exchequer 1844; Commissary of the University of Cambridge 1824-35
John Tidd Pratt: Home Circuit judge 1828-70, Consulting Barrister to Commissioners for Reducing the National Debt; Registrar of Friendly Societies 1846-70, advised government for legislation on banks and Friendly Societies
Fletcher Raincock: Counsel at Law for County-Palatine Lancaster, Commissioner Bankrupts Liverpool, Depty Judge Advocate General for Northwest District
Thomas Rennell: Master, Temple 1798-27
Henry Revell Reynolds: Commissioner for Bankrupts 1806-20; Chief Commissioner in Insolvent Debtors’ Court 1820-53
John Richardson: solicitor to the University of Glasgow
William Roberts: Home Circuit judge
Henry Crabb Robinson; Head, Norfolk Circuit
Thomas Sampson: Deputy Lieutenant, Surrey
William Sandys: Commissioner, Affadavits, Stannary Court Cornwall
Thomas Saunders: solicitor to the Salter’s Hall; member of the Court of Common Council for Ward of Bridge 1814-20; Comptroller to the Chamber of the City of London 1841-54
William Scott 1 Lord Stowell; Advocate-General, Lord High Admiral 1782; Registrar of Court of Faculties to Archbishop of Canterbury 1783, Consistory Court judge 1788; Advocate-General to the King 1788; Dean of Arches 1788; Vicar-General to the Province of Canterbury and Commissary of Canterbury City 1788, Chancellor to the Diocese London 1788; Master of Faculties of Halifax 1790; MT Bencher 1794, MT Treasurer 1807; High Court of Admiralty judge 1798, PC 1798; author of celebrated judgements in maritime law
John Sewell: Chief Justice, Lower Canada
Samuel Shepherd: Home Circuit judge; King’s Serjeant at Law 1796; Solicitor General 1812
John Augustus Francis Simpkinson: LI Bencher 1831, LI Treasurer
George Spence: IT Bencher 1835, IT Reader 1845, IT Treasurer 1846; Judge
George Frederick Stratton: High Sheriff, Oxford
Thomas Swinnerton: High Sheriff, Staffordshire
Sir William Elias Taunton: Oxford Circuit judge, Oxford Recorder 1806; Court of King’s Bench judge
Michael Angelo Taylor: LI Senior Barrister
Charles Abbott 1 Lord Tenterden: Oxford Circuit judge, Junior Counsel to Treasury, Oxford Recorder 1801; declined the bench 1805; Court of Common Pleas Puisne judge 1816; King’s Bench judge 1816; Attorney-General 1818; tried the Cato Street conspirators, Thistlewood, and the Cobbett libel case
John Vincent Thompson: Serjeant at Law; Recorder of Beverley
Charles Kemys Kemys Tynte: High Sheriff Somerset
James Wigram: KC 1834; LI Bencher 1835; Judicial Committee of the Privy Council 1842
Sir J.B. Williams: Mayor, Shrewsbury 1836
Sir James Eardley Eardley Wilmot: Midland Circuit judge; Warwick Recorder 1852-74; Bristol County Court judge 1854-63; Marylebone judge 1863-71
Appendix 2.A.3: Architecture Careers

The buildings listed are those antiquaries designed and/or supervised construction for. When fellows are listed as "architect to" an institution, their work involved upkeep, restorations, renovations and some new building.

George Basevi: Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge; Belgrave Square; the Conservative Club
Edward Blore: Sir Walter Scott's Abbotsford home; restorations to Peterborough Cathedral, Lincoln Cathedral, Royal Savoy Chapel, Glasgow Cathedral, Merton College chapel and Lambeth Palace; Pitt Press, Cambridge; Government buildings, Sydney, New South Wales; restorations to Windsor Castle, Hampton Court Palace, Buckingham Palace; Architect to Westminster Abbey; Architect by appointment to William IV and to Victoria
Decimus Burton: Colosseum in Regent's Park; Hyde Park improvements; Athenaeum Club; Architect to Royal Botanic Club
Benjamin Ferrey: Diocesan Architect, Bath and Wells 1841; restored Wells Cathedral 1842; built many London churches in the Gothic style; Consulting Architect, Incorporated Church Building Society; Secretary, Member, Competition Committee for the new Houses of Parliament
George Gwilt: restored St. Mary-le-Bow; Architect to the West India Dock Company
Joseph Gwilt: Surveyor, Grocer's Company; Architect to the Waxchandler's Company; Surveyor, county of Surrey 1807-46
Philip Hardwick: Architect to St. Brideswell and Bethlehem Hospitals 1816-36, to St. Katherine’s Dock Company 1825, to St. Bartholomew’s 1827-56, to Goldsmith’s Company 1828, to Greenwich Hospital, to the Duke of Wellington, and to the Portman Estates; built St. Katherine’s Docks with Telford; London & Birmingham Railway, Euston and Victoria Railway Hotels; Euston Station; Birmingham Station; Globe Insurance Building, Pall Mall; City Club house; renovations to Lincoln's In 1842; Exhibitor, Great Exhibition 1851 and Paris 1855; Examiner, District Surveyor under Metropolitan Building Act 1843
William Hoskings: Engineer to the West London Railway, and the Colchester Railway; Senior Referee, Metropolitan Building Act 1844-55; his Pantheon-style submission for the British Museum Reading Room was copied by Panizzi
Samuel Rush Meyrick: consultant to Tower of London architect for setting up National Armoury 1826; Consultant to George IV for armoury at Winsor 1828
John Nash: restored St. David's, Wales; Regent's Street improvements 1811-20; Constitutional Club 1834; Haymarket Theatre; United Services Club, Pall Mall; St. James' Park; enlargements to Buckingham Palace; Carleton House; Marble Arch; Royal Mews; additions to Brighton Pavillian
John Newman: assisted John Smirke Jr. with Covent Garden Theatre 1809 and General Post
Office 1823-29; numerous London churches and schools; Surveyor, Commission for Kent and Surrey Sewers 1815; Surveyor, Commission for Southwark Improvements; Honorary Architect to Royal Literary Fund 1846.

Charles John Phipps: theatres in Bath, Nottingham, Bristol, Brighton, Ireland and Scotland; Theatres in London including New Queen’s 1867, Gaiety 1868, Vaudeville 1879, New Princess 1880, Savoy 1881, Shaftesbury 1888, Lyric 1888.

William Pilkington: Surveyor, Architect to the Board of Customs 1782-1810; Architect to Westminster 1784; Surveyor, Architect to the Earl of Radnor 1789, to Duke Grafton 1789-1822, to Sun Fire Assurance 1792, to Charterhouse 1792; Customs House, Portsmouth; Salisbury Town Hall; Great Yarmouth Naval Hospital and Barracks; Charterhouse New School.

John Adey Repton: assisted Nash with Carlton House.

Thomas Rickman: architect, Commissioner for building churches; New Court of St. John’s Cambridge.

Anthony Salvin: renovations to the Tower of London; Embankment; renovations to Carisbrook, Carnarvon, Bangor, Newark-on-Trent, Durham, Warwick, Alnwick, Rockingham, Dunster castles and Petworth House.

George Saunders: Montagu House, British Museum; Surveyor to Middlesex; Commissioner, Sewers; Member, Committee on the Condition of Middlesex Bridges.

George Gilbert Scott: Architect to four Poor Law Unions 1834, built more than 50 workhouses; Martyr’s Memorial Oxford 1840; restored Chester, Chichester, Ely, Exeter, Gloucester, Hereford, Lichfield, Ripon, Rochester, Salisbury and Worcester Cathedrals; restored Exeter College Chapel, Oxford 1859; Architect to the Dean and Chapter of Westminster Abbey 1849-78; designed Home and Colonial Offices 1870; designed Albert Memorial 1865.

Sir Robert Smirke Jr.: National Gallery; Architect, Board of Trade and Board of Works 1813-32; Covent Garden Theatre; various national monuments; General Post Office; additions to the British Museum; Surveyor to the Inner Temple 1814-28; restored York Minster 1829; East Wing, Somerset House; London Customs House; new College of Physicians Building 1825; Carlton Club 1835; Union Club; United Services Club; Oxford and Cambridge Club; Commissioner, London Improvements 1845.

Sydney Smirke: Architect to St James palace 1828-32; Surveyor to the Inner Temple 1818; restored Temple church 1841 and Savoy Chapel 1843 and 1860; Assistant Architect, West Quadrangle and Reading Room, British Museum 1854-57; renovations to the Carlton Club 1857, Temple 1863-64 and Inner Temple Hall 68-70; Exhibition Galleries, Burlington House 1866-70; Surveyor, Duchy of Lancaster; Royal Academy 1870.


George Edmund Street: assistant to George Gilbert Scott; built many Cornish churches; Diocesan Architect to Oxford, York, Winchester and Ripon Dioceses; Crimean Memorial Church, Constantinople 1864-69; built many London churches and schools; Competitor for the New Government Offices 1856 and National Gallery 1866; Architect, Law Courts, The Strand; restored York Minster, Cathedrals of Salisbury, Carlisle, and Christchurch, Dublin.

George Ledwell Taylor: Superintending Architect, Montagu and Bryanston Squares 1811;
Surveyor to Chatham, Woolwich and Sheerness Dockyards 1824-37; North Kent Railway 1849
William Tite: built many London churches, banks, hotels; rebuilt the Royal Exchange 1841-44; land evaluator for railway companies; Architect of many London, Edinburgh and other railway stations
Edward James Willson: restored many provincial churches; Architect of many Roman Catholic churches; Surveyor to Lincoln county 1834
Matthew Digby Wyatt: Paddington Station with I.K. Brunel; Designer, Superintendent, Fine Arts Department, Great Exhibition; Surveyor to the East India Company 1855; Rothschild Mausoleum, West Ham Cemetery; Indian Government Buildings, Lambeth; East India Museum; Adelphi Theatre
Sir Jeffry Wyatville: renovated Sydney Sussex College Cambridge 1821 and Windsor Castle 1824

Appendix 2.A.4: Artists Careers

William Alexander: draftsman to Earl MacCartney’s Embassy in China
Edward Blore: artist for the Surtees Society publications
William Henry Brooke: portrait painter for the Adelphi, illustrator for travel publications
John Buckler: engraver on architectural subjects for topographical works
John Carter: draftsman to the SA
Francis Legatt Chantrey: eminent sculptor; did sculptures of George III, George IV, Walter Scott, William Wordsworth, an equestrian statue of the Duke of Wellington, statues of Pitt, Canning and Joseph Banks
Thomas Daniell: landscape painter of India, Egypt, China
William Daniell: landscape painter of India, Egypt, China
John Hulbert Glover: fashionable drawing-master
John Landseer: engraver of archaeological, antiquarian, zoological, and scriptural publications; Engraver to William IV
Samuel Prout: illustrator for topographical and European architectural works; friend and neighbor to John Ruskin
Richard Westmacott: well-known sculptor; his busts include John Henry Newman, Francis Burdett and Lord John Russell; the Royal Exchange pediment
Appendix 2.A.5: Publishing Careers

William Ayrton: editor, *Harmonicum*
John Britton: editor, publisher, * Beauties of Wiltshire*; author, *Penny Cyclopedia*
William Henry Brooke: illustrator, cartoonist for the *Satirist*
Edward Wedlake Brayley: publisher, *Graphic & Historical Illustrator*
Samuel Egerton Brydges: printed privately many editions of early English literature, 1813-22; author and printer, *British Bibliographer*
Charles Robert Cockerell: joint editor, * Zoological Journal* 1824
William Coulson: staff writer, *Lancet*
William Hepworth Dixon: editor, *Athenaeum* 1853-69
John Doran: staff, *London Literary Chronicle* which became the *Athenaeum* 1828; editor, *Church and State Gazette* 1841-52; editor, *Athenaeum* 1869; editor, *Notes and Queries*
George Edward Eyre: Queen’s Printer 1837-82
John Hookham Frere: founder, *Quarterly Review*
George Godwin: editor, *Builder* 1844
Alexander James Beresford Hope: proprietor, *The Saturday Review*
Llewellyn Frederick William Jewitt: illustrator, *Punch*
James Johnson: editor, contributor, * Medico-Chirurgical Review*
John Richardson Major: editor, *Journal of the Photographic Society* 1853
John Nichols, editor, *The Gentleman’s Magazine*, publisher of many antiquarian volumes
John Gough Nichols, editor, *The Gentleman’s Magazine*, publishers of many antiquarian volumes
John Bowyer Nichols, editor, owner, *Gentleman’s Magazine*; publisher of many antiquarian volumes, publisher, *Literary Anecdotes*; printer to Corporation of the City of London; Printer, Houses of Parliament; master, Stationers’ Company
John Henry Parker: publisher, *Anglo-Catholic Library*
Richard Pearson: editor, RS *Philosophical Transactions*
William Owen Pughe: publisher, editor of Welsh dictionaries, 1806-57; Welsh literature before 1370; editor, *Cambrian Register*
Charles William Russell: editor, *Dublin Review*
John Sharpe: publisher, *British Classics* series, *Sharpe's Peerage*
George Wharton Simpson: owner, editor, *The Photographic News*
Samuel Weller Singer: publisher, French and Italian works on art, Latin Manuscripts, printer for the Chiswick Press
Seth William Stevenson: owner, *Norwich Chronicle*
William John Thoms: founder, editor 1849-72, *Notes and Queries*
William Tyson: editor, *Bristol Mirror* 1826-51
Francis Cornelius Webb: editor, *Medical Times and Gazette*
John Wilson: staff writer, co-editor, *Blackwood's Magazine*
George Woodfall: chair, London master-printer meetings; stock-keeper, Stationers' Company; Master, Stationer's Company
Appendix 2.A.6: Schoolmaster Careers

HM: Head Master  GS: Grammar School

George Thomas Keppel 4 Earl Albemarle: Trustee, Westminster
Robert Archibald Armstrong: HM, South Lambeth GS
John Bransby: HM, King’s Lynn GS
George Butler: HM, Harrow 1829
Robert Pedder Buddicom: Principal, St. Bees College 1840-46
John Jeffrey Pratt 2 Earl Camden: Governor, Charterhouse
John Carter: HM, Lincoln GS 1792-1820
Henry John Thomas Drury: Master of Lower School, Harrow; taught Lord Byron
George Grant Francis: Trustee, Gore GS, Swansea
John Allen Giles: HM, Camberwell College School 1834; HM, City of London School 1836
Joseph Goodall: HM, Provost, Eton
Charles Oldford Goodford: HM 1853-62, Provost 1862-84, Eton
William Stanley Goddard: HM, Winchester 1796-1809
John Septimus Grover; Vice-Provost, Eton
Dudley Ryder 1 Earl Harrowby: Governor, Charterhouse
Thomas Harwood: HM, Lichfield GS
Charles Thomas Longley: HM, Harrow 1829-36
John Richardson Major: HM, King’s College School, London 1830-66
Benjamin Heath Malkin: HM, Bury-St-Edmunds GS 1809-28
Joseph Neeld: Governor, Harrow 1828-36
John Louis Petit: Governor, Christ’s Hospital
Francis Bolingbroke Ribbans: HM, Sir Thomas Powell’s School, Carmarthen 1843-56; HM, Queen Elizabeth’s GS Carmarthen 1856-57
George Richards: Governor, Christ’s Hospital 1822;
James Ridgway: Vice-Principal, North London Collegiate School 1855-62; Principal, Culham Collegiate School, Abingdon 1862-73
Hastings Robinson: Cambridge examiner for Rugby School
John Russell: HM, Charterhouse 1811-32, taught Grote, Thackeray
John Sleath: Master, Rugby 1787, St Paul’s, taught Benjamin Jowett
William Boulby Sleath: HM, Repton GS 1800-32; Master, Rugby
William Hepworth Thompson: HM, Leicester Collegiate School 1836
Charles Tucker: HM, Guilsborough GS Northamptonshire 1829-38
Richard Valpy: HM, Reading GS 1781-1831
Samuel Butler: HM, Shrewsbury Royal Free GS 1798
Appendix 2.A.7: University Careers

William Alexander: Professor of Drawing, Military College at Great Marlow
Miles Bland: Public Examiner, St. Johns College, Oxford, Maths
George Adam Browne: Proctor 1808, Vicemaster 1842, Cambridge
John Jeffreys Pratt 2 Earl Camden: Chancellor, Cambridge 1834
Edward Cardwell: Camden Professor of Ancient History 1825, Principal, St. Alban’s Hall 1831, Delegate of Estates, Curator of University Galleries; managed the Bible department of the University Press; private secretary to Chancellors William Wyndham Lord Grenville, Duke of Wellington and Lord Derby, Oxford
Charles Robert Cockerell: Chair and Professor of Architecture, Royal Academy 1840-57
Edward Copleston; Proctor, Provost, Oxford, 1814-28
William Cotton: Member, First Counsel of King’s College
Benjamin Morgan Cowie: Warburtonian Lecturer 1866-70; Principal Lecturer, Maths, College for Civil Engineering, Putney 1844-51; Select Preacher, Cambridge 1852, 1856; Professor, Geometry, Gresham College, London 1854-1900; Inspector of Schools 1858-72
Thomas Stephens Davies: Master, Maths, Royal Military Academy, Woolwich 1834
Martin Davy: Master, Caius College, Oxford 1803; Vice-chancellor 1803-04, 1827-28
Philip Henry Delamotte: Professor, Landscape Drawing and Perspective, King’s College, London 1855-79; Professor, Fine Art 1879-87; drawing instructor to the royal family
Edward Backhouse Eastwick: Professor of Hindustani 1845, Haileybury College 1845
Alexander John Ellis: Life Governor, University College London, 1886; Fellow, College of Preceptors 1873
Charles Joseph Faulkner: Life Fellow, 1856; Senior Fellow, 1877; Lecturer, Maths 1864-71; Tutor 1868-89; Dean 1870-75; Dean of Degrees 1875-89, University College, Oxford
William Wyndham Grenville: Chancellor, Oxford University 1809
Stacey Grimaldi: Lecturer on Public Records, Law Institution 1834
John Gutch: Registrar, Chancellor’s Court, Oxford, 1824-31
James Astbury Hammersley: HM, Manchester School of Design 1849-62
Benjamin Harrison: Select Preacher, 1835-37, Oxford
John Hewett: Professor, Belle-Lettres, Royal Institution
Edward Grose Hodge: Whitehead Professor, London Divinity College
William Hosking: Lecturer, Architecture, 1829, Western Literary Institution; Professor, Construction and Civil Engineering and Architecture, King’s College, London 1840-61
Thomas Hughes: Principal, Working Men’s College 1872-83
Thomas McKenny Hughes: Woodwardian Professor, Geology 1873-1917
James Ingram, Oxford Examiner 1809, Rawlinsonian Professor of Anglo-Saxon 1803-09; President, Trinity College, Oxford 1824
James F.W. Johnston: Professor, Chemistry and Mineralogy, Durham University; chemist to Agricultural Society of Scotland 1843
John Kenrick: Resident Tutor, Manchester College, York (which became Manchester New College, Oxford 1840) 1811-40; Professor, History, 1850; College Visitor 1851
William Knight: Lecturer, Natural History, Chemistry 1810-16, Marischal; Professor Natural Philosophy, Academical Institution 1816; Professor Natural Philosophy, Marischal 1822
David Laing: Professor of Antiquities, Royal Scottish Academy 1854
George Henry Law: Visitor, Wadham College, Oxford
Thomas LeBlanc: Master, Trinity Hall 1815-17, Cambridge
Thomas Hayter Lewis: Professor, Architecture 1865-81, Professor Emeritus 1881-98, Dean, Faculty of Arts and Sciences 1870-71, University College, London
John Lubbock: Vice Chancellor 1837-42, London University; Visitor, Royal Observatory
John David MacBride: Lord Almoner's Reader in Arabic 1813-1868; Principal, Senior Head, Magdalen College; Oxford
Edward Maltby: Senator, University of London
Herbert Marsh; Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, Cambridge, 1807-39, lectured on German liberal theology
Wharton Booth Marriott: Select Preacher 1868, Grinfield Lecturer 1871, Petrean Fellow, Exeter College 1843-46, Oxford
John Henry Monk: Professor, Vocal Music, King's College London 1874; Professor, National Training School for Music 1876; Professor Bedford College, London 1878; Lecturer, Philosophical Institution Edinburgh, Royal Institution Manchester
William Mure: Rector, Glasgow University 1847-48
John Murray: Lecturer, Surrey Institution 1816
Hugh Percy 3 Duke Northumberland: Governor 1831, King's College
George Fred Nott: Proctor 1801, Bampton Lecturer 1802, Oxford
Richard Parkinson: Principal, St. Bees College 1846-58
William Parsons 3 Earl Rosse: Chancellor, University of Dublin 1865-67
Thomas Phillips: Professor of Painting 1825, Royal Academy
Charles William Russell: President, Maynooth College 1857; Chair, Ecclesiastical History, Maynooth, 1845-57
John Russell: President, Sion College 1845-46
George Scharf: Director, Life Governor, University College 1882
George Gilbert Scott: Professor, Architecture, Royal Academy 1868
John Barlow Seale: Steward, Senior Dean, Cambridge
Sydney Smirke: Professor, Architecture, Royal Academy 1861-65
John Soane: Professor, Architecture, Royal Academy 1806-10
Edward Solly: Lecturer, Chemistry, Royal Institution 1841; Professor, Chemistry, Addiscombe College 1845
Samuel Solly: Arris and Gale Professor, Human Anatomy and Surgery 1862, Royal College of Physicians
Arthur Penrhyn Stanley: Tutor 1843, Select Preacher 1845-46 and 1872-73, Secretary, 1850 Oxford University Commission, wrote the Report; Professor, Ecclesiastical History 1857-63; Rector, University of St. Andrews 1874
William Hepworth Thompson: Tutor 1837, Regius Professor, Greek 1852-66, Master 1866-86, Trinity College Oxford
Thomas Thomson: Examiner, Botany, University of London
James Henthorn Todd: Tutor 1831, Donellen Lecturer 1838-39, Regius Professor, Hebrew 1849, Trinity College, Dublin
Francis Cornelius Webb: Chair, Medical Jurisprudence, Grosvenor Place School of Medicine 1857; Lecturer, Natural History, Metropolitan School of Dental Science
Harry Bristow Wilson: Dean of Arts 1831; Bampton lecturer 1851; Rawlinsonian Professor of Anglo-Saxon 1839-44
John Wilson (1789-1873): President, Trinity College Oxford 1850-66
John Wilson (1785-1854): Professor, Moral Philosophy, Edinburgh University
John Wilson (1812-1888): headed Admiralty coals investigation under Henry de la Beche 1845-
46; Principal, Royal Agriculture College Cirencester 1846-50; Chair, Agriculture 1854-85; Emeritus Professor, 1885-88, Edinburgh University

Samuel Wix: President, Sion College
Matthew Digby Wyatt: Slade Professor of Fine Arts, Cambridge 1869
Appendix 2.A.8: Clergy Careers

Robert Alexander: Prebend, Connor; Archdeacon, Co. Down, Ireland
Francis Vyvyan Jago Arundell: Chaplain, British Factory at Smyrna 1822-36
William Barrow: Archdeacon, Nottingham 1830-36
Charles John Bird: Rural Dean, Ross
Charles Smith Bird: Prebend 1843, Chancellor 1849-62, Lincoln
Samuel Taylor Bloomfield: Canon, Peterborough 1854-69
Henry Kaye Bonney: Prebend, Lincoln Cathedral; Archdeacon, Bedford, Ely; Dean, Stamford
Henry Beeke: Dean, Bristol 1814
Miles Bland: Prebendary, Wells Cathedral 1826
Henry Kaye Bonney: Prebend, Lincoln Cathedral 1807; Chaplain, Bishop of Lincoln 1820:
Archdeacon, Bedford 1821, Lincoln 1845; Dean, Stamford 1827
John Brereton: Prebend, Salisbury
George Adam Browne: Chaplain, Duke of Sussex
William Thomas Parr Brymer: Archdeacon, Bath 1803, Salisbury 1825-37
Thomas Burgess: Prebend, Durham; Bishop, St. David's 1803, Salisbury 1825-37
Charles Parr Burney: Archdeacon, St. Albans 1840, Chelmsford 1845-64
George Butler: Chancellor 1836, Dean 1842, Peterborough
Samuel Butler: Prebend, Lichfield Cathedral 1807; Archdeacon, Derby 1822; Bishop, Lichfield 1836
George Owen Cambridge: Archdeacon Middlesex, Prebendary Ely
Stephen Hyde Cassan: Chaplain, Duke of Cambridge
Edward Copleston: Dean, Chester 1826; Bishop, Llandaff 1828; Dean, St. Paul's, London 1828-49
Henry John Cockayne Cust: Canon, Windsor 1813-1861
James Dallaway: Chaplain, British Embassy at the Porte; Prebend, Chichester 1811
Martin Davy: Prebend, Chichester 1832
Thomas Frognall Dibdin: Preacher, Archbishop Tenison's Chapel, Swallow Street London;
Evening Lectureship, Brompton Chapel, London; Preachership, Fitzroy Chapel, Quebec
Chapel; Royal Chapel 1831-47
William Henry Dixon: Prebend, Weighton 1825; Canon-Residentiary, York 1831; Canon, Ripon
1836; Domestic Chaplain, Archbishop of York
Edward Edwards: Precentor of Westminster; Chaplain, Duke of York, Assistant Chaplain-General
to Forces; Minor Canon, Westminster Abbey; Chaplain to Bishop Horsley
Charles Drury: Prebend, Hereford
Joseph Eaton: Canon, Precentor, Chester Cathedral
Johnathon Parker Fisher: Subdean, Canon Residentiary, Exeter Laurence Gardner: Treasurer,
Lichfield Cathedral
Robert Hurrell Froude: Archdeacon, Totnes 1820-59
Joseph Goodall: Canon, Windsor 1808
William Stanley Goddard: Prebend, St. Paul's London 1814; Canon, Salisbury 1829
John Gutch: Chaplain, All Souls 1770, Chaplain, Corpus Christi 1768
Barnard Hanbury: Chaplain, Duke of Sussex
Frederick Kill Harford: Canon, Westminster 1861
Benjamin Harrison: Canon, Canterbury; Archdeacon, Maidstone 1845-87
Edward Auriol Drummond Hay: Canon, Dean, Prebend, York; Prebend, Southwell; Royal
Chaplain in Ordinary

Charles James Hoare: Curate to Dean of Winchester 1804; Rural Dean of Ewell, Archdeacon of Winchester Cathedral 1829; Archdeacon, Surrey 1847

Edward Grose Hodge: Canon, Birmingham

George Hodson: Archdeacon, Stafford; Residuary Prebend, Lichfield

Thomas Henry Hartwell Horne: Prebend, St. Paul's London 1831

William Howley: Canon, Christ Church Oxford; Bishop, London 1813-28; Archbishop of Canterbury 1828-48

Philip Hunt: Chaplain to Earl of Elgin; Prebend, Canterbury 1833

Edmund Kell: Secretary, Unitarian Societies of South England

John Keysall: Chaplain in Ordinary to George III 1816

George Henry Law: Prebend, Carlisle 1785, York 1812; Bishop, Chester 1812-24, Bath and Wells 1824-45

Charles Thomas Longley: Bishop, Ripon 1836-57, Durham 1856-60, York, 1860-62; Archbishop, Canterbury 1862-68

Daniel Lysons: Chaplain, Horace Walpole Earl of Orford, 1804-33

John Maddy: Chaplain in Ordinary to George IV; Canon, Ely 1835-53; Chaplain-in-Ordinary to Victoria, 1830-53

Edward Maltby: Chaplain, Bishop of Lincoln; Prebend, Leighton Buzzard and Lincoln 1794; Preacher, Lincoln's Inn 1824-33; Bishop, Chichester 1831, Durham 1836

Herbert Marsh: Bishop, Llandaff 1816-19, Peterborough 1819-39

Charles Mayo: Whitehall Preacher 1799-1800

John Merewether: Chaplain 1824 to Duchess of Clarence later Queen Adelaide; Dean, Hereford 1832

Edward Moore: Canon, Lincoln 1870-89

George Frederick Nott: Sub-preceptor to Princess Charlotte of Wales 1803; Prebend, Colworth Chichester 1802; Fourth Prebendary, Winchester 1810; Prebendary, Salisbury 1814

Hugh Percy: Canon Residuary, Prebend 1810, Exeter; Chancellor, Salisbury Cathedral 1812; Prebend 1816, Archdeacon 1822, Canterbury; Bishop, Rochester 1827, Carlisle 1827-56, Prebend, St Paul's

Assheton Pownall: Rural Dean, Gartree 1867; Hon. Canon Peterborough 1875-85; Archdeacon, Leicester 1884

Josiah Pratt: Secretary, Missionary Society 1802-23; Founder, Church Missionary Society, Islington Seminary for Missionaries 1822-25, Spitalfields Benevolent Society, Malta Mission, Church Pastoral Aid Society, British and Foreign Bible Society 1804; Governor, British and Foreign Bible Society, 1811; Lecturer, St. Mary Woolnoth 1804; Evening Lecturer Spitalfields Church 1804; Lady Campden's Lecturer, St. Lawrence Jewry

Thomas Protheroe: Chaplain to Prince Albert 1848-53; Chaplain in Ordinary to Queen Victoria 1853-70

George Radcliffe: Prebend, Sarum 1833-49

Thomas Rees: Afternoon Preacher, Newington Green Chapel, London 1807; Minister, Newington Green 1808-13, St. Thomas' Southwark 1813-22, Stamford St Chapel Blackfriars 1823-31; Member 1813, Secretary 1825-53, Presbyterian Board 1813; Secretary, Three Denominations Union 1828-35

William Jenkins Rees: Prebend, Brecon

Thomas Rennell: Prebend, Dean, Winchester 1805; Master, Temple Church 1827

Hastings Robinson: Honorary Canon, Rochester Cathedral 1862
Charles William Russell: Apostolic Vicariate of Ceylon 1842-45
John Russell: Prebendary, Canon Residentiary, Canterbury 1827
John Barlow Seale: Senior Dean, Cambridge; Chaplain to Archbishop Cornwallis
Lancelot Sharpe: Prebend, St. Paul’s 1843-51; Chaplain, Grocer’s and Salter’s Company
John Sleath: Prebend, St. Paul’s 1822; Chaplain in Ordinary to George IV 1825; Subdean, Chapel Royal St. James 1833
Bowyer Edward Sparke: Dean, Bristol 1803-09; Bishop Chester 1809-12, Ely 1812-30
John Hume Spry: Prebend 1828, Canon 1828-54, Canterbury
George S. Griffin Stonestreet: Lecturer, Ely; Chaplain, Duke of York; Chaplain to Forces 1814; Chaplain with the Guards to the Waterloo Campaign; Prebend, Lincoln 1832-57
Thomas Streatfield: Chaplain, Duke of Kent
John Bird Sumner: Prebend Durham; Bishop Chester; Archbishop Canterbury
Henry John Todd: Canon, Canterbury; Prebend, York 1830, Archdeacon, Cleveland 1832-45
Edward Trollope: Prebend, Lincoln Cathedral 1867-74; Archdeacon, Stow 1867; Bishop Suffragan Nottingham 1877
Charles Turnor: Prebend, Lincoln
Thomas Valentine: Prebend, Chichester 1824-59
John Webb: Lecturer, St. Martin’s with St. Bartholomew’s Birmingham; Canon, Worcester Cathedral; Canon, Gloucester Cathedral
Samuel Wilberforce: Chaplain to the Prince Consort 1841; Dean, Westminster 1845; Bishop, Oxford 1845-69; Bishop, Winchester 1869-73
Samuel Wix; Hospitaller, St. Bartholomew’s the Less, London 1808
Jacob George Wrench: Chaplain, Duke of Sussex; Chaplain, British Embassy in Constantinople
Richard Yates: Chaplain, Chelsea Hospital 1798
Appendix 2.A.9: Political Careers

PC: Privy Council member

George Gordon, 4 Earl Aberdeen: Envoy, Austria, 1813-16; Foreign Secretary 1828 and 1841-46; Prime Minister 1852-55; Ambassador Extraordinary, Vienna; PC; Chancellor, Duchy of Lancaster; Secretary, War and Colonies; Lord of Treasury 1852-55

George James Welbore Agar-Ellis: PC 1830; Chief Commissioner, Woods and Forests; moved the purchase of Angerstein collection for a National Gallery 1823 (38 pictures were purchased in 1824 for £60,000) Commissioner of Public Records

George Robert Ainslie: Governor, Eustatius, West Indies

George William Anderson: judicial officer, revenue collector, political administrator, Mahratta district, India; improved Indian police and law codes; Bombay member, Indian Law Commission; Governor, Eustatius 1812, of Dominica 1813

Charles Ansell: advised Select Committee, Joint-stock Companies 1841-43; Member, Select Committee, Assurance Associations 1853; Member, Parliamentary Committee, Friendly Societies 1849; Chair, Bonus Investigation of National Provident Company, 1874

Henry William Beechey: secretary to Henry Salt, British consul-general in Egypt 1816, explored the Valley of Kings’ Tombs with Italian archaeologist Belzoni; appointed by Earl Bathurst to examine and report on the antiquities of Cyrenaica, 1821

John Bidwell: Superintendent, Consular Department, Foreign Office 1826-51

Hon. Augustus Cavendish Bradshaw: Sheriff, Wiltshire 1798

Robert Bree: Mayor, Birmingham 1854-55, Deputy-lieutenant, Suffolk

Samuel Egerton Brydges: MP, Maidstone 1812-18, active in Copyright Bill

Henry Edward Bunbury: Under-Secretary of State, War, 1809

Charles Butler: Secretary, Committees for Abolition of Penal Laws 1782-89

John Jeffreys Pratt 2 Earl 1 Marquis Camden: Teller of Exchequer 1780-1840; Lord of the Admiralty 1782-83; Lord of the Treasury 1789-94; PC 1793; Lord Lieutenant of Ireland; President, PC 1805-06

Edward Cresy: advised Health of Towns Commission, Metropolitan Sanitary Commission

Laurence Dundas 2 Baron Dundas: Lord Lieutenant, Vice Admiral, Orkney and Shetlands; Lord Mayor York

George Wyndham 3 Earl Egremond; Board of Agriculture 1793, Lord-Lieutenant, Sussex 1819-35

Henry Ellis: advised Select Committee on British Museum 1835-36

Thomas Grimston Bucknall Estcourt: MP, University of Oxford, 1826-47

Charles Long 1 Baron Farnborough: Secretary to Treasury 1791-1801; Lord of the Treasury 1804; Secretary of State, Ireland 1806; Paymaster General 1810-17; Commissioner to French and English armies 1817

Josiah Forshall: advised Select Committee, British Museum 1835-36

John Hookham Frere: Under-Secretary of State, Foreign Office 1790; Diplomat, Lisbon, Madrid, Berlin, Spain; PC 1805
John Galt: Commissioner, Upper Canada 1824
Thomas Garrard: Chamberlain, Bristol 1836; Treasurer, Bristol 1856
Richard Carr Glynn: Sheriff, London & Middlesex 1790; Lord Mayor, London 1798-9
Stephen Richard Glyne: Lord-Lieutenant, Flintshire 1845-74
Thomas Philip Grantham, 3 Baron Grantham: Lord Lieutenant, Bedfordshire 1818-59; First Lord of Admiralty 1834-35; PC 1834; Lord-Lieutenant, Ireland 1841-44
Richard Grenville Duke Buckingham: Lord Privy Seal 1841-42; PC 1841
Thomas Grenville: Diplomat, U.S.S 1782, Vienna; PC 1798; Chief Justice, Eyre and south Trent 1800, President, Board of Control 1806, First Lord of Admiralty, 1807
William Wyndham Grenville: Secretary to George N.T. Grenville, Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland; Irish PC 1782-3; Paymaster-General; PC 1783, Vice President, Board of Trade; Speaker, House of Commons 1789; Secretary of State 1789; President, Board of Control 1790, Secretary of State, Foreign Affairs 1791, Ranger and Keeper, St. James & Hyde Parks 1791-4; Auditor, Exchequer; First Lord, Treasury 1806; Prime Minister 1806-07
Hudson Gurney: High Sheriff, Norfolk 1835
Alexander Hamilton 10 Duke Hamilton and Brandon: Lord Lieutenant, Lanarkshire 1803-52; Ambassador, St. Peters 1806-12; PC 1806
William Richard Hamilton: Secretary to Lord Elgin, Constantinople 1799; diplomat, Egypt 1801; Under-Secretary of State, Foreign Affairs, 1809-22; Minister at Naples 1822-25
Dudley Ryder 1 Earl Harrowby: Under-Secretary of State, Foreign Affairs 1789; PC 1790; Paymaster of Forces, VP Board of Trade, Chair, Finance Committee 1791; Treasurer, Navy 1800; Foreign Secretary 1804; Chancellor, Duchy of Lancaster 1805; Ambassador, Austria and Russia 1805; President, Board of Control 1809; President, PC 1812; Chair, Lords’ Committee on Currency 1819; refused Prime Ministership 1827
Benjamin Hawes: Deputy-Lieutenant, Surrey; Under-Secretary of State, Colonies 1846; Deputy Secretary 1851, Permanent Under-Secretary, War Department 1857-62; worked to get the Fine Arts Commission appointed 1841, helped open the British Museum to the public on holidays
Benjamin Hobhouse: Secretary, Board of Control 1803-03; Chair, Committee for Supplies 1805, First Commissioner investigating Nabobs’ Debts
Henry Hobhouse: Permanent Under-Secretary of State, Home Department 1817-27; PC 1828, Ecclesiastical Commissioner
Alexander James Beresford Hope: MP, University of Cambridge 1868-87
Thomas Hughes: Commissioner, Royal Trades Union 1867; MP Lambeth 1865-68
William Hughes Hughes (b. Hewitt): MP, Oxford 1830-37; Sheriff, Hampshire
Robert Harry Inglis: Secretary to Sidmouth 1808-14; Commissioner investigating Debt in Carnatic 1814-30; MP, Oxford University (defeated Peel) 1829-54; PC 1854
Joseph Jekyll: Commissioner, Lunacy
Edmund Knowles Lacon: High Sheriff, Norfolk 1823
George Thomas Keppel 4 Earl Albemarle: Secretary to Lord John Russell 1846
Thomas Frankland Lewis: Chair, Poor Law Commission 1839; Commissioner, Irish Revenue 1821; Commissioner, Irish Education 1825-28, Secretary, Treasury 1827-28; VP Board of Trade 1828; PC 1828; Treasurer, Royal Navy 1830; Commissioner, Rebecca Riots 1843
William Lowther 1 Earl Lonsdale: Lieutenant, Cumberland and Westmoreland; Recorder, Carlisle
William Viscount Lowther: Lord, Admiralty 1809-10, 1813-27; Commissioner, India Affairs 1810-18; Lord, Treasury 1813-30, Chief Commissioner, Woods and Forests 1828-30; PC 1828, Treasurer, Royal Navy 1834-35; VP, Board of Trade 1834-36, Postmaster-General 1841-
46; Lord-Lieutenant, Cumberland & Westmoreland 1844-68; Lord President PC 1852
Francis Graham Moon: Lord Mayor, London 1854-55
Charles Morgan Robinson Morgan: Lord Lieutenant Monmouthshire 1866-75
Charles Octavius Swinnerton Morgan: Deputy-Lieutenant, Monmouthshire
John Bacon Sawrey Morritt: High Sheriff, Yorkshire 1806
Richard Edgecumbe 2 Earl Mountedecumbe, Viscount Valetort: Lord Lieutenant, Cornwall 1795, PC 1808
(Constantine) Henry Phipps 2 Earl Mulgrave: Governor, Jamaica 1832-34; PC 1832; Lord Privy Seal 1834, Lord Lieutenant, Ireland 1835-39; Secretary, War and the Colonies 1839; Home Secretary 1839-41; Ambassador, Paris 1846-52; Minister to Court of Tuscany 1854-58
Gore Ouseley: Diplomat, Office of Persian Officials 1809; Ambassador, Persia 1810
Charles John Palmer: Mayor, Yarmouth 1854-55; Deputy-Lieutenant, Suffolk, chief promoter of the Victoria Building Company, which built Wellington Pier
Woodbine Parish: diplomat, Sicily 1814, Naples 1815, Ionian Islands 16, Aix-la-Chapelle 1818; Secretary to Lord Castlereagh 1815; Commissioner, Consul-General, Buenos Aires 1823-32, claimed the Falkland Islands as British territory; Chief Commissioner, Naples 1840; Plenipotentiary, Naples 1842
Sir Robert Peel 2 baronet: Secretary of State, Ireland 1812; PC Ireland; Secretary of State, Home Department 1828-30; PM 1841-45
James Robinson Planche: advised Select Committee, Dramatic Literature 1832, led to 3 William IV c. 15 (1833) giving copyright to authors
Rt. Hon. Reginald Pole-Carew: PC 1805; Under Secretary of State, Home Department
Johnathon Frederick Pollock: Attorney-General 1835; Lord Chief Baron, Exchequer 1844-66
Algernon Percy 4 Duke Northumberland, Baron Prudhoe: PC 1852
Joseph Sabine: Inspector-General, Taxes 1808-35
Sir John St. Aubyn 5 Baronet: sheriff, Cornwall 1781
Henry Addington Lord Sidmouth: Speaker, House of Commons 1789-1800; Lord Privy Seal 1806; Lord President, PC 1812; Secretary, Home Department 1812-22; Lord High Stewart, Westminster 1812
Sir John Sinclair: First President, Board of Agriculture 1793-98, 1806-13; PC 1810; Commissioner, Excise 1811
Sir George Thomas Staunton: advised government on China 1829
Percy Clinton Sydney Smythe 6 Viscount Strangford: Ambassador, Lisbon 1806, Stockholm 1817, Constantinople 1820, St. Petersburg 1825
George John Spencer 2 Earl Spencer: Lord, Treasury; PC 1794; Lord Keeper, Privy Seal; Ambassador, Vienna; First Lord, Admiralty 1794-1801; Home Secretary 1806-07
Alleyne Fitzherbert 1 Baron St. Helens: Minister, Brussels 1777-82, Paris 1782-83; Envoy Extraordinary to Catherine Empress of Russia 1783-87; Secretary to Irish Lord-Lieutenant Buckingham 1787-89; PC 1787; Envoy Extraordinary, The Hague 1789 and 1794, St. Petersburg 1801-02
George Thomas Staunton: 1805 introduced vaccination to China through translators 1808; interpreter to East India Company; King's Commissioner of Embassy to Pekin 1816; Member, East India Committee 1830
Seth William Stevenson: Sheriff 1828; Mayor, Norwich 1832
William Scott 1 Lord Stowell; MP, Oxford University 1781-1822
Charles Chetwynd Talbot 2 Earl Talbot: Attaché, Russia 1797; Lord-Lieutenant, Staffordshire
1812-49; Lord-Lieutenant, Ireland 1817-18
Michael Angelo Taylor: PC 1831
Samuel Thornton: Director, Bank of England 1780-1833; MP, Kingston-on-Hull 1784-1806; MP Surrey 1807-1818; Member, Select Committee on Commercial Credit 1793
Charles Kemys Kemys-Tyte: High Sheriff, Somerset
Edward James Willson: Mayor, Lincoln 1852
Sir John Wrottesley; member of several scientific Royal Commisions; Poor Law Commissioner, 1832-34
Charles Philip Yorke: PC 1801; Secretary, War Department 1801; Secretary, Home Department 1803; Teller, Exchequer 1810-11
Appendix 2.A.10: Military Careers

George Robert Ainslie: Major-General 1814
Henry Edward Bunbury: Staff to Duke of York in North Holland 1799, Quartermaster-General to Mediterranean forces 1805-6, Major-General, Special Commissioner 1815 to Napoleon at St. Helena
Alexander Dickson: Commander of Artillery, South America 1807; Brigade-Major, Portugal; Commander, Portuguese Artillery, Busaco 1810, Commander, Reserve Artillery, Salamanca and Burgos 1812, Acting Lieutenant-General 1813-14, Commander, Artillery, Waterloo 1815; Inspector of Artillery 1822, Deputy Adjutant-General of Royal Artillery 1827; Director-General, Field Training 1838-40
Vincent Eyre: Commander, Artillery 1844; Commander, Artillery 1858; Lieutenant-Colonel 1857; Brevet Colonel 1858, Superintendent 1860, Member, Commission on the Army 1860; Inspector-General, Bengal Army Ordnance 1862; Major-General 1863
William Kier-Grant: Aide-de-Camp to the Prince of Wales, to Lord Moira 1804-06; Adjutant-General, Bengal 1806-10; Colonel 1810; Major-General 1813; Commander-in-Chief, Java 1815; Colonel, Scots Greys 1839; General 1841
George Thomas Keppel 4 Earl Albemarle: Aide-de-Campe to Marquis Hastings and Marquis Wellesley in Ireland; General 1774
Thomas Frankland Lewis: Lieutenant-Colonel 1797; Commander 1803; Second-in-Command, Chief of Command 1805
Algemon Percy 1 Baron Prudhoe 4 Duke Northumberland: Admiral RN 1862, First Lord Admiralty 1852-65
William Henry Smyth: Commander 1815; Rear-Admiral 1853; Vice-Admiral 1858; Admiral 1863
Sir Tompkyns Hilgrove Turner: Assistant Quartermaster 1803; Brigadier-General 1807; Major-General 1808; Commander 1813
James Wilson: Major-General 1838
John Drinkwater: Secretary to Major-General O'Hara and General Dundas 1793; Secretary, Military Department; Deputy Judge Advocate; Comptroller, Army Accounts 1811-36
William DeBlaquiere 3 Baron DeBlaquiere: Major 1798; Lieutenant-Colonel 1801; General 1841; Great Alnager of Ireland
Robert John Harvey: General 1859
Hon. William Fermor: Major-General 1812
Algemon Percy 4 Duke Northumberland, Baron Prudhoe: Rear Admiral 1850; Admiral 1862; First Lord of Admiralty 1852; promoted the new steam-powered, screw-driven ships, introduced improved lifeboats
Charles Neville: Major-General 1813
Sir Francis Thomas Hammond: Lieutenant-General
Henry Phipps 1 Earl Mulgrave & Viscount Normanby: Brigadier-General 1793
Appendix 2.A.11: Medical Careers
RCP: Royal College of Physicians
RCS: Royal College of Surgeons

Thomas Clifford Allbutt: Gulstonian Lecturer, Harveian Orator, Censor, RCP
Sir William Blizard: co-founder, London Hospital Medical School, notable anatomy and physiology lectures, progressive ward practices
Robert Bree: Censor 1810, 1819, 1830, Harveian Lecturer 1827, RCP
John Cooke: Physician, Royal General Dispensary 1784-1807, Croonian lecturer RCP 1819-21, Harveian Oration RCP 1832
Henry Halford: Physician Extraordinary to George III, attended George IV and William IV, President RCP 1820-44
Everard Home: succeeded John Hunter at St. George’s 1792, Examiner RCS 1809, Master Examiner RCS 1813, first President RCS 1821, Hunterian Orator RCS 1814-13, 1822, Surgeon to George III; Croonian Lecturer
James Johnson: Surgeon-in-Ordinary to Duke of Clarence 1830; Physician-Extraordinary to William IV, publisher, Medico-Chirurgical Review 1816-44
John Latham: Censor RCP 1790, Harveian Orator 1794, Gulstonian Lecturer 1793, Croonian Lecturer 1795, President RCP 1813-19, Physician-Extraordinary to Prince of Wales 1795
William George Maton, Gulstonian Lecturer 1803, Censor 1804, 1813, 1824, Treasurer 1814-20, Harveian Orator 1815 RCP; Physician-Extraordinary to Queen Charlotte and Princess Victoria
George Moore: RCP Fothergillian gold medal 1835
Lucas Pepys: Censor 1777, 1782, 1786, 1796, Treasurer 1788-98, President RCP 1804-10; Physician-Extraordinary 1777, Physician-in-Ordinary to George III 1792, gave evidence on George III’s health to House of Commons 1789; Physician-General, Army 1794; President, Army Medical Board, supporter of the National Vaccine Institution
Thoms Joseph Pettigrew: Secretary 1811, Registrar 1813, Medical Society of London; Secretary, medal 1818, Royal Humane Society; Surgeon-Extraordinary to Duke of Kent 1819; Medical Society Oration 1819
Richard Pearson: founded Birmingham Medical School
Richard Powell: Gulstonian Lecturer 1799; Censor RCP 1798, 1807, 1820, 1823; Lumleian Lecturer 1811-22; Harveian Orator 1808, Secretary to Commission Regulating Madhouses 1808
Samuel Thornton: President, Guy’s Hospital

Appendix 2.A.12: Financial Careers

Isaac Lyon Goldsmid: Partner, Mocatta & Goldsmid, Bullion brokers to East India Company
Benjamin Harrison: Deputy Governor, Hudson’s Bay and South Sea Companies
Samuel Thornton: Director, Bank of England 1780-1833
William Cotton: Director, Bank of England 1821-66; Governor, Bank of England 1843-45
John Galt: Canada Company secretary and agent 1823; secretary to British North American Land Company 1832
George Hibbert: Chair, West India Merchants
Appendix 2.B.1: University scholarship

Oxford:

John Leycester Adolphus: Chancellor’s medal, Newdegate prize
Miles Bland, Second Wrangler, Smith’s Prizeman 1808
Charles Joseph Faulkner: double first, maths and natural science, junior and senior math scholarships
William Wyndham Grenville: Collector’s prize 1779
Benjamin Harrison: Kennicott Hebrew Scholar 1831, Pusey and Ellington Hebrew Scholar 1832
William Henry Rich Jones: Boden Scholarship for Sanskrit 1837
George Henry Law: Second Wrangler, Chancellor’s medal
Thomas Lewin: scholarship, Trinity College 1825; first, classics, 1827
Charles Peers: Seatonian Prize 1805
Fletcher Raincock: Second Wrangler
George Richards: Chancellor’s medal 1787, Chancellor’s medal 1789, Harcourt’s poetry prize 1791
William Roberts: essay prize 1788
Henry Addington Lord Sidmouth: Chancellor’s medal 1779
John Sleath: Exhibitioner 1784, Hody Exhibitioner 1786-7
Arthur Penrhyn Stanley: Ireland scholar, Newdigate prize 1837
William Elias Taunton: Chancellor’s medal 1793
Charles Abbot 1 Lord Tenterden, Chancellor’s medal 1784, chancellor’s medal 1786
Sir James Earle Eardley Wilmot: Chancellor’s medal 1829
Richard Valpy, Morley scholar 73
John Webb, Pauline scholar 1795
John Wilson: Newdigate Prize 1806

Cambridge:

Richard Allott: Thirteenth Wrangler 1805
John Drinkwater-Bethune: Fourth Wrangler
Charles Smith Bird: Third Wrangler, Second Smith’s prizeman 1820
Henry Kaye Bonney: exhibitioner
George Adam Browne: Prizeman
George Butler: Senior Wrangler, Smith’s prizeman
Samuel Butler: Browne’s medal (three times), Craven scholarship 1793, gold medal, essay prize 1797, 1798
Benjamin Morgan Cowie: Senior Wrangler, Second Smith’s Prizeman 1839
Francis Henry Dickinson: Fifth wrangler 1835
Alexander John Ellis: Sixth wrangler 1837
John Hookham Frere: prizeman 1795
Joseph Goodall: Browne’s medals 1781, 1782, Craven scholarship 1782
John Septimus Grover: Member’s Prize
John Hewlett: sizar Magdalen College 1786
Charles James Hoare: Second Wrangler 1803, Second Smith’s prizeman, Second classical medallist, Seatonian prizeman 1807
Henry Hoare: Fifteenth Wrangler, Sixth Classic 1827
Thomas Smart Hughes: Browne medal 1806, 1807, Fourteenth Senior Optime 1809, prize essay 1809, 1810
Henry Jeremy: Norriss prize essay 1810
John Lee: Fifth wrangler 1806
Joseph Littledale, Senior Wrangler, Smith’s prizeman, 1887
Edward Maltby, Browne’s medal 1790, Greek medal 1790 and 1791, Craven scholarship 1791, chancellor’s medallist 1792, Eighth Wrangler 1792
Herbert Marsh: Second Wrangler, Smith’s prize, member’s prize
Thomas James Mathias: member’s prize 1775, Third, Second and First Bachelor 1777-80
Henry Phipps: Earl Mulgrave: President of the Union 1815
Richard Parkinson: Seatonian Prize
Charles Peers: Seatonian prize 1805
Thomas Pell Platt: Ninth Senior Optime
Sir Thomas Frederick Pollock: Perry exhibitioner 1803, Senior Wrangler, First Smith’s prizeman 1806
Fletcher Raincock: Second Wrangler
Thomas Rennell: 1878 Member’s prize for Latin essay
Alleyne Fitzherbert 1 Baron St. Helens: Second Senior Optime, Senior Chancellor’s medallist
John Barlow Seale: Craven scholar, Seventh Wrangler, Chancellor’s medal, Member’s Prize
Thomas Sheliford: Scholar, Sixth Wrangler
Thomas Hughes Smart: Seatonian prize
Bowyer Edward Sparke: Seventh Wrangler, Chancellor’s Medal, Member’s Prize
William Hepworth Thompson: Member’s Prize 1831, Tenth Senior Optime 1832, Chancellor’s Medal
Charles Augustus Tulk: King’s Scholar 1801

Other:

John Doran: Ph.D., Marburg, Prussia
Leone Levi: honorary Ph.D. (economics, political science), Tübingen 1861
John Kenrick: Daniel Williams Trust exhibition, Glasgow University
George Stephens: Ph.D. Upsala 1877
Francis Cornelius Webb: 5 medals, University College medical school, London
John Wilson: Logic prize, Glasgow College
Appendix 2.B.2: Notable Scholarly Publications

John Adamson: catalogued library, SA Newcastle-on-Tyne; conchology
Thomas Amyot: editor, Shakespeare Society 1844
Charles Ansell: actuarial science
Robert Archibald Armstrong: first Gaelic-English dictionary; meteorology
Edmund Tyrrell Artis: phytology
John Baverstock: brewing, hydrometers
John Thomas Barber Beaumont: actuarial science
John Benett: work on agriculture
William Betham: Camden’s Britannia; indexed, catalogued collection of the Ulster King of Arms Office
Miles Bland: geometry, trigonometry, hydrostatics, mechanics
Sir William Blizard: medicine, pharmacy, circulation, hospital methods
Joseph Bosworth: translated King Aelfred’s Orosius, produced a parallel-column edition of the Gothic, Anglo-Saxon Wycliffe and Tyndale Gospels
John Bransby: astronomy, geography
Edward Wedlake Brayley: geology of Devon
Robert Bree: respiratory disorders, consumption, spleen attacks, cholera
John Britton: catalogued art works in great houses
John Trotter Brockett: catalogued George Allan’s collection
John Bruce: catalogued State Papers, domestic series (Charles I), 12 volumes; edited numerous volumes for the Camden and the Parker Societies; edited Archbishop Laud’s letters for the Berkshire Ashmolean Society, Cowper’s poems for the Aldine edition
Samuel Egerton Brydges: bibliography of Old English works; Catalogue of Old English works in 10 volumes; catalogues, libraries of Naples, Rome and Geneva
Charles Butler: bibliography of Old English books; bibliography of Catholic, Protestant and Greek Bibles
John Caley: edited 14 volumes of Record Commission works
Henry Campkin: General Index, Sussex Archaeological Collections volumes 1-25
William Chappell: edited volumes for the Roxburghe and Ballad Societies
John George Children: mechanics, mineralogy
Adam Clarke: edited Rymer’s State Papers; bibliography of works in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Coptic, Syriac, Chaldee, Ethiopic, Arabic, Persian, Armenian; editor, Royal Commission on State Papers, 1808
Charles Clarke: engineering
John Cooke: nervous diseases
Charles Purton Cooper: account of the state of public records
William Durrant Cooper: edited seventeenth century literature for the Camden and Shakespeare Society publications
Thomas Corser: bibliographic work on Early English poetry
Edward Cresy: civil engineering, bridge-building, sanitary engineering
Thomas Crofton Croker: catalogued Lady Londerborough’s collection of medieval rings and ornaments; edited numerous volumes for the Percy and the Camden Society
Thomas Gery Cullum: British flora
Peter Cunningham: edited works for Shakespeare, Percy Societies
William Cureton: catalogued Arabic and Syriac manuscripts at the British Library, discovered
Richard Daniel: mosses
William Daniell: zoography
Thomas Frognall Dibdin: catalogued Althorp library; bibliography of rare and early books, editions of Caxton, edition of typographical antiquities, works on the Decameron
Francis Douce: catalogue of Lansdowne and Harleian Manuscripts; edited volumes for the Roxburghe Club
Henry John Thomas Drury: edited volumes for the Roxburghe Club
John Duncumb: agriculture; Report on Herefordshire for Board of Agriculture and Internal Improvement
Richard Duppa: botany
Joseph Eaton: math
Henry Thomas Ellicombe: botany
George James Wellbore Agar-Ellis: catalogued art works in Flanders and Holland
Henry Ellis: catalogued SA manuscripts; guides to various British Museum department holdings
Josiah Forshall: catalogued various British Museum collections
Samuel Ferris: medicine; history of science
Robert Fitch: catalogued Norwich Museum collections
Edward Foss: editor, Record Commission publications, 9 volumes 1851-64
Richard Fowler: electricity, opium, the nervous system, sensory stimulation
John Thomas Gilbert: catalogued Irish manuscripts, Royal Irish Academy
Edward Griffith: vertebrate animals, translated Cuvier’s Animal Kingdom 1827-34
Henry Halford: epidemiological history, on medicine
James Orchard Halliwell (-Phillips): editions of sixteenth century literature for Percy, Shakespeare, Camden Societies; catalogued manuscripts of Chetham library; Shakespeare criticism
William Richard Hamilton: Greek version of the Rosetta stone
Thomas Duffus Hardy: edited Record Commission volumes, edited and catalogued Tower Rolls
Joseph Haslewood: husbandry
Charles Hatchett: chemistry; history of science
Edward Hawkins: guides to coins, medals, prints and antiquities at the British Museum; edited several volumes for the Chetham Society
Alexander Henderson: medicine
Thomas Heywood: edited volumes for the Chetham and the Historic Society of Lancashire & Cheshire
George Hibbert: edited Caxton’s Ovid for the Roxburghe Club 1819
Richard Colt Hoare; bibliography of works on British history and topography
John Holmes: catalogues for British Museum Manuscript collections; bibliography of oriental works, bibliography of works on the Battle Abbey charters
Everard Home: medicine, comparative anatomy
William Hoskings: civil engineering, architecture, drainage and sewers, soil types
Thomas Hartwell Horne: catalogues for the British Museum, Cambridge university, the Surrey Institution library; bibliography on biblical criticism; introduction to the science of bibliography; work on husbandry
Joseph Hunter: indexes for Record Commission, Shakespeare manuscripts, Bodleian and other manuscript collections; bibliography of works on English monastic libraries
William Jerdan: volumes for the Camden and Percy Societies
James Johnson: gout, rheumatism, liver, nervous system
James F.W. Johnston; chemistry, geology, mineralogy, agriculture
John Winter Jones: compiler, 91 Cataloguing Rules, British Library
Thomas Jones: catalogued Chetham Society Library
Edward Basil Jupp: catalogued, illustrated Royal Academy collections 1866-71
William Knight: catalogued Marischal College manuscripts; geology, botany
David Laing: edited sixteenth- and seventeenth-century works for the Bannatyne, Spalding, Wodrow, Abbotsford and Hunterian Societies
Aylmer Bourke Lambert: botany
John Latham: medicine
John Lee, catalogued College of Advocates library, catalogued Egyptian Antiquities in his own collection; astronomy
Richard Henry Major: editor, early exploration literature for the Hakluyt Society
Thomas Mantell: medicine
James Heywood Markland: edited volumes for the Roxburghe Club
William Marsden: philological works
William George Maton: botany, medicine, history of science
Charles Octavius Swinnerton Morgan: catalogued plate and assay marks
Samuel Rush Meyrick: edited volumes for the Welsh Manuscript Society; catalogued Francis Douce's medieval Ivories for the Gentleman's Magazine
John Murray: chemistry, electricity, plant physiology
George Nayler: catalogue of the manuscripts of the Order of the Bath
Joseph White Niblock: Greek, Hebrew, Syriac and English lexicon
Thomas Northmore: mechanics, telegraphy, gasses
William Ottley: catalogued National Gallery pictures
William Overall: catalogued art works, books, manuscripts and prints of the Corporation of the City of London, 1872-75
Francis Palgrave: edited parliamentary and other papers for Record Commission 1827-37; catalogued Norman-French chansons
Woodbine Parish: geology and paleontology
James Alan Park: marine insurance law
John Henry Parker: glossaries of terms in architectural history; historical photographs of Roman archaeology
Richard Pearson: medicine
Charles Spencer Perceval: catalogued SA seals, matrices
Thomas Joseph Pettigrew: catalogued Duke of Kent's library; edited volumes for the Percy Society; medicine, anatomy, history of science
Thomas Phillipps: catalogued his own books and manuscripts
William Pilkington: botany
James Robinson Planche: catalogued his collection of armour and antique clothing; catalogued the armour collection of Bernard Brocas
Thomas Pell Platt: catalogued Aethiopic Bibles and manuscripts in the Royal Library of Paris; translated the New Testament into various Arabic languages; catalogued the Syriac Gospels 1829, translated the Amharic Bible 1844
Sir J.F. Pollock: maths
Richard Powell: medicince, madness, neurology, history of science
William Owen Pughe: edited early Welsh texts for the Gwyneddigion, Cymreigyddion and
Cymrudorion Societies
Francis Robert Raines: edited volumes for the Chetham Society
Charles William Robinson: translated Leibniz’ System of Theology
Hastings Robinson: edited volumes for the Parker Society
John Gage Rokewode: edited volumes for the Camden Society
Edward Rudge: botany
Charles William Russell: catalogued Irish State papers
Joseph Sabine: horticulture
Charles St. Barbe: indexed Gentleman’s Magazine
William Sandys: edited volumes for the Percy Society
George Scharf: catalogued art work of the Fine Art Society
George Gabriel Sigmond: medicine
William Sparrow Simpson: catalogued bibles, rare books, St. Paul’s Library
Sir John Sinclair: work on agriculture, enclosure; statistical accounts of Scottish parishes
Robert Henry Soden Smith: catalogued South Kensington Museum Arts and Industries collections
Admiral William Henry Smyth: hydrography, geography, astronomy
Richard Horsman Solly: botany
Sir George Thomas Staunton: translated Chinese law codes
William Elias Taunton: catalogued State Papers for the Record Commission 1810-22
Thomas Thomson: important work on fossil mollusc beds on Firth of Clyde 1834
Dawson Turner: indexed the Macro Manuscripts; botany
Sharon Turner: translations of Early English, Anglo-Saxon and Icelandic works; English ecclesiastical history
William Jackson Turner: botany
Edward Upham: indexed parliamentary rolls 1200-1500
Edward Vernon Utterson: edited work for the Roxburghe Club
Nicholas Aylwards Vigors: ornithology, botany, zoology, entomology
Richard Warner: agriculture
Albert Way: edited a volume for the Camden Society
John Webb: edited volumes for the Camden Society
William Robert Whatton: surgery, history of science
Henry White: catalogued RS papers, 1858-1880
John Williams: indexed Royal Astronomical Society papers
Joseph Woods: geology, botany
Thomas Wright: edited works for the Percy, Camden and History of Science Societies
Sir John Wrottesley: astronomy, meteorology, maths
Sir Charles George Young: catalogued the Arundell Manuscripts
Appendix 2.B.3: Antiquaries’ Roles in Scholarly Associations

George Hamilton Gordon 4 Earl Aberdeen: founder, Athenian Society (f. 1803); Trustee, Sir John Soane’s Museum
John Adamson: founder, editor, Typographical Society; founder, secretary, SA Newcastle-on-Tyne; Secretary 1825-55, Newcastle-on-Tyne Literary-Philosophical Society
George James Wellbore Agar-Ellis: President 1832, Royal Society for Literature (f. 1788); Trustee British Museum; Trustee, National Gallery;
Thomas Amyot: co-founder, Director 1839-50, Camden Society
William Ayrton: original member, Athenaeum; original member, Royal Institution
John Thomas Barber Beaumont: founder, New Philosophical Institution (f. 1841); medal, Royal Academy; medal, Society of Arts
Sir William Betham: Secretary, member of Governing Body, Royal Irish Academy (f. 1785)
Sir William Blizard: President, Royal College of Surgeons
Edward Blore: founder, Royal Archaeological Institute
Edward Wedlake Brayley: librarian; secretary 1825-54, Russell Institution
Robert Bree: council member, VP, Medical and Chirurgical Society
Henry Hegart Breen: VP, African Institute of Paris 1842
John Trotter Brockett: editor, Typographical Society; council member, SA Newcastle-on-Tyne
Samuel Brown: President, Economic Section, BAAS Norwich 1868
John Bruce: co-founder, Director, editor 12 volumes, Treasurer, Camden Society; Trustee, Sir John Soane’s Museum; editor, Berkshire Ashmolean Society; editor, Parker Society
Decimus Burton: VP, Royal Institute of British Architects
Benjamin Bond Cabbell: VP, Royal Literary Fund
William Hookham Carpenter: Corresponding Member, Academy of Fine Arts Amsterdam; Trustee, National Portrait Gallery
Robert Smith 1 Baron Carrington: VP, Royal Literary Fund
Codrington Carrington: Honorary Member, Société Française Statistique Universelle
Thomas Chapman: VP, Institute of Naval Architects 1860
William Chappell: Co-founder, Percy Society 1840; Founder, Treasurer, Manager, Musical Antiquarian Society (fl. 1840-48); Hon. Treasurer, Ballad Society (f. 1868)
John George Children: Royal Institution Medal 1828; Secretary RS 1826-27 and 1837; founder member, President 1834-35, Entomological Society (f. 1833)
Henry Christmas: Co-Founder, Ecclesiastical History Society (f. 1847)
George Thomas Clark: Trustee, Cambrian Archaeological Association; first President, British Iron Trade Association 1876
Richard Clark: secretary, Glee Club 1805
Adam Clarke: Original Member, Royal Irish Academy
Charles Robert Cockerell: Secretary, RS 1826-7 and 1837; founder member 1833, President 1834-35, Entomological Society; President 1860-61, first gold medallist, Royal Institute of British Architects; President 1822-23, Medical and Chirurgical Society; foreign associate, Académie des Beaux-Arts de France
Charles Purton Cooper: Corresponding Member, Royal Academies of Lisbon, Munich, Berlin, Brussels
Henry Charles Coote: Co-founder, Folklore Society
George Richard Corner: Original Member, Numismatic Society (f. 1836); Original Member, British Archaeological Association (f. 1843)
Thomas Corser: Co-founder, Chetham Society (f. 1843)
William Cotton: Telford Medal 1838, Institute of Civil Engineers; prize medal in 1851 exhibition for weighing machine
William Coulson: Council Member, Royal College of Surgeons 1851; Hunterian Orator 1861
Henry Courbold: silver medal, Royal Academy
John Henry Cox: Co-founder, Ecclesiastical History Society (f. 1847)
Henry Crabb: Founder, Athenaeum 1830
Thomas Crofton Croker: co-founder, Camden Society; founder, Percy Society; founder, British Archaeological Association; Registrar, Royal Literary Fund 1837-45
James Crossley: President, Incorporated Law Association of Manchester 1840, 1857; President, Manchester Athenaeum 1847-50; President, Spencer Society 1866; VP Surtees Society 1858; President, Chetham Society 1848-83; member, library committee, Manchester Free Library
James Dodsley Cuff: Original Member 1836, council Member 1839, Treasurer 1840, Numismatic Society
Peter Cunningham: Treasurer, Shakespeare Society
William Cureton: Crown Trustee, British Museum
Hugh Welch Diamond: Secretary 1853, editor 1859-64, London Photographic Society
Thomas Frognall Dibdin: founder member, VP, Roxburghe Club
Alexander Dickson: Original Member, Royal Geographical Society (f. 1828-30)
William Hepworth Dixon: co-founder 1865, Chair, Palestine Exploration Fund
George James Welbore Agar Ellis 1 Baron Dover: Trustee, British Museum; Trustee, National Gallery; President, Royal Society for Literature 1832
William Richard Drake: Original Member 1866, Chair 1866-90, Burlington Fine Arts Club
Henry John Thomas Drury: founder member, Roxburghe Club
Henry George Moreton 2 Earl Ducie: President, Royal Agricultural Society 1851-52
John Duncumb: secretary, Herefordshire Agricultural Society
Fortunatis Dwarris: VP, Archaeological Association
George Wyndham 3 Earl Egremont: VP, British Institution
Alexander John Ellis: Council Member, RS 1872-74, 1880-82; Council Member, London Mathematical Society 1866-68; President, Philological Society 1872-74, 1880-82; Silver Medal, Society of Arts 1880
Edgar Edmund Estcourt: Member, London Library Committee
Charles Long 1 Baron Farnborough: Deputy-President, British Institution; Trustee British Museum; Trustee National Gallery
Thomas Godfrey Faussett: Secretary, Kent Archaeological Society 1863-73
Gore Ouseley Fenwicke: co-founder; Chair, Oriental Translation Committee; Royal Asiatic Society (f. 1823); President, Society for the Publication of Oriental Texts (f. 1842)
Benjamin Ferrey: Original Member, Architectural Society; Founder Member, Architectural Museum; VP, Gold Medal 1870, Royal Institute of British Architects
Samuel Ferris: Chair, Correspondence and Papers 1799, Society for Encouragement of Arts, Commerce and Manufactures; President 1784, Royal Medical Society; Harveian gold medal, 1782
John Fetherston: Founder 1859, Editor, Harleian Society
Robert Fitch: Original Member 1845, Secretary 1859-72, Treasurer 1872-90, Norfolk and Norwich Archaeological Society

Thomas Dudley Fosbroke: Honorary Associate, Royal Society for Literature

Edward Foss: Council Member 1850-53, 1865-70, Camden Society; founder, Royal Archaeological Institute; founder, Kent Archaeological Association; council member, Royal Literary Fund

George Grant Francis: Co-founder, Royal Institution of South Wales; Co-founder, Cambrian Archaeological Association 1846; Secretary, Department Ethnology, BAAS, Swansea 1851

Augustus Wollaston Franks: founder, Cambridge Architectural Society; Antiquary to the Royal Academy 1895-97

Francis Freeling: founder member, Roxburghe Club

Charles Frost: President, 1818, 1830-55, Hull Literary-Philosophical Society; VP, Hull BAAS 1853

John Frost: founder 1821, director, lecturer, Medico-Botanical Society

John Ribton Garstin: Treasurer, Royal Irish Academy

William Gell: member, Institute of France 1833-36

Davies Gilbert: President RS; founder member 1814, Geological Society of Cornwall

John Thomas Gilbert: Honorary Secretary, Irish Celtic and Archaeological Society 1855; Cunningham gold medal 1862

John Gillies: Corresponding Member, French Institute

John Glover: President 1815, gold medal 1817, Watercolour Society; Founder, Society of British Artists

John Hulbert Glover: original member 1805, President 1815, Royal Society of Painters in Water-Colours; gold medal from Louis XIX; founder member 1824 Society of British Artists

George Godwin: 1st medal 1835, gold medal 1881, VP, Royal Institute of British Architects; Co-founder 1836-37, Secretary, Art Union of London; Treasurer, Royal Literary Fund

Thomas Grenville: Trustee, British Museum

Edward Griffith: original member, Zoological Society


Hudson Gurney: VP Norfolk & Norwich Archaeological Society; founder, Norwich Museum, Norwich Literary Institute

Joseph Gwilt: silver medal Royal Academy 1801

Henry Halford: President 1820-44, College of Physicians

Henry Hallam: founder member, President, Statistical Society; Honorary Professor, RS; Foreign Associate, Institute of France; 1830 medal from George IV for history

James Orchard Halliwell (-Phillipps): founder, secretary Cambridge Antiquarian Society; founder, Historical Society of Science 1841

William Richard Hamilton: Trustee British Museum; founder member 1833, Royal Geographical Society

Alexander Hamilton 10 Duke Hamilton and Brandon: President, Royal Society of Edinburgh

James Astbury Hammersley: first President, Manchester Academy of Fine Arts 1857-61

George Perfect Harding: Co-founder 1840, Granger Society

Philip Hardwick: VP 1839 and 41, Queen’s gold medal 1854, Royal Institute of British Architects; Treasurer, Trustee Royal Academy 1850-61; Original Member 1791, Architects’ Club
George Harris: Originator, Historical Manuscripts Commission 1857; VP Anthropological Institute; President, Manchester Anthropological Institute
William Harrison: founder 1858, editor of 14 volumes, Manx Society
Henry Harrod: Secretary, Norfolk and Norwich Archaeological Association; Corresponding Member, New England Historical and Genealogical Society
Dudley Ryder 1 Earl Harrowby: Trustee, British Museum
Robert John Harvey: Original Member, Council Member, Botanic Society
Joseph Haslewood: Co-founder, Roxburghe Club
Charles Hatchett: Founder Member, Treasurer 1814, Literary Club
Edward Hawkins: President, Numismatic Society (f. 1826); VP, RS
Charles Forster Hayward: Secretary 1863; Secretary to Committee to Paris Exhibition 1867, Royal Institute of British Architects
Alfred Heales: founder 1879, Treasurer, St. Paul’s Ecclesiastical Society
James Heywood: Founder 1835, Manchester Athenaeum
Thomas Heywood: Founder member, Council member, Chetham Society
George Hibbert: Founder, President, Royal Institution (f. 1805)
Prince Hoare: Hon. Foreign Secretary, Royal Academy
Benjamin Hobhouse: President 1805-17, Bath and West of England Society; Chair, Royal Literary Fund Committee
Everard Home: Trustee, Hunterian Medical collection 1817; gold medal 1788, Lyceum Medicum Londinense
William Jackson Hooker: Founder, Wernerian Society of Edinburgh; Corresponding Member, Institute of France
Alexander James Beresford Hope: Trustee, British Museum; President 1865-67, Royal Institute of British Architects; President, Ecclesiastical Society; President, Architectural Society; Trustee, National Portrait Gallery
Thomas Hope: VP, Society for Encouragement of Arts, Commerce and Manufactures
William Hoskins: member, council 1842-43 Royal Institute of British Architects
Thomas McKenny Hughes: Lyell medal 1891, Geological Society; President, Cambridge Antiquarian Society 1879-80, 1889-90; President, Philosophical Society of Cambridge 1892
William Hughes Hughes (b. Hewitt): VP, Society for Encouragement of Arts, Commerce and Manufactures
Thomas Hugo: Founder 1855, London and Middlesex Archaeological Society
Abraham Hume: Co-founder, Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire; Secretary, BAAS, Liverpool 1870
Joseph Hunter: founder member, Bath Literary and Scientific Institution
James Ingram: Antiquary to the RA; President, Literary Club
William Jerdan: Founder Member Royal Society for Literature; Administrator, Royal Literary Fund; original member, Camden Society; founder member, Melodist’s Club; founder member, Garrick Club; founder member, Royal Geographical Society
Robert Harry Inglis: President, Literary Club; Antiquary to the Royal Academy 1850
Llewellyn Frederick William Jewitt: VP Derbyshire Archaeological Society
Samuel Johnson: Founder Member, Literary Club (f. 1809)
Alexander Johnston: Co-founder, Royal Asiatic Society; VP Royal Astronomical Society
John Winter Jones: president, Library Association 1877
William Henry Rich Jones: VP Wiltshire Archaeological Society 1882
John Kenrick: Founder, Yorkshire Philosophical Society
David Laing: Secretary 1823-61, Bannatyne Club
Aylmer Bourke Lambert; Original Member 1788; VP, 1796-1842 Royal Society for Literature
John Landseer: Lecturer on engraving, Royal Institution; Associate engraver, Royal Academy; Lecturer, Surrey Institution 1813
John Lee: original member 1820, President 1862 Royal Astronomical Society 1820; founder, Meteorological Society; President, Leicester BAAS 1862
Leone Levi: Hon. Secretary, Metrical Committee, BAAS; Council Member 1860, VP 1885, Statistical Society; Hon. Secretary, International Association for Promoting one Uniform System of Weights, Measures and Coins; Deputy of the Statistical Society to the Congress of European Statisticians, Rome 1887
Edward Levien: Hon. Secretary, editor, Proceedings of the British Archaeological Association
Thomas Hayter Lewis: Silver Medal 1837, Royal Academy; Secretary 1860-65, Royal Institute of British Architects
Mark Antony Lower: founder 1846, Secretary, Editor, Sussex Archaeological Society
John Lubbock: Treasurer 1830-35, VP 1830-35, 1838-47, RS; Treasurer, Great Exhibition 1851
William Collings Lukis: Original Member 1838, Camden Society
John MacLean: founder, Harleian Society 1869; founder, Bristol and Gloucester Archaeological Society 1876
Frederic Madden: original member, Athenaeum
Richard Henry Major: Secretary, Hakluyt Society 1849-58; Honorary Secretary 1861-81, VP 1881-84, Royal Geographical Society
William Marsden: treasurer, VP 1783, 80-95 RS; member of the "philosophical breakfasts“ of Joseph Banks; Original Member, Irish Academy 1785; Original Member, Royal Irish Academy; Treasurer, Royal Society Club
Thomas James Mathias: Royal Associate, Royal Society for Literature
Joseph Mayer: Co-Founder, President 1866-69, Historical Society of Lancashire and Cheshire
Samuel Rush Meyrick: founder; President, Gloucester Session, British Archaeological Association
James V. Millingen: Royal Associate, Honorary Member, Royal Society for Literature
George Moore: Fothergillian Gold Medal 1835, RCP
Charles Octavius Swinnerton Morgan: President, Caerleon Antiquarian Association
John Bacon Sawrey Morritt: founder, Travellers’ Club (f. 1819)
Robert William Mylne: Council Member 1854-68, 1879, Secretary 1856-57, Geological Society; Council Member, Treasuruer Smeatonian Society for Civil Engineers
John Newman: original fellow, founder, Travelling Fund, Royal Institute of British Architects
John Bowyer Nichols: Original Member, Royal Society for Literature; Registrar, Royal Literary Fund; original member, Athenaeum; original member, Numismatic Society; original member, Archaeological Institute
John Gough Nichols: Treasurer 1834, Surtees Society; Committee Member 1835, Royal Literary Fund; Co-founder, Camden Society
Hugh Percy 3 Duke Northumberland: VP, Society of Arts; Trustee, British Museum
Algernon Percy 4 Duke Northumberland, Lord Prudhoe: Trustee British Museum; President, Royal Institution
Gore Ouseley: Co-founder, Royal Asiatic Society; President 1842, Society for Publication of Oriental Texts
William Henry Overall: council member, Library Association 1879; council member, London and Middlesex Archaeological Society
Silas Palmer: Berkshire Secretary 1859, Congress of British Archaeological Association; Founder 1870, Newbury Field Club
Woodbine Parish, founder member, VP, Royal Geographical Society
James Alan Park: original member, Nobody's Club
John Henry Parker: VP, Oxford Architectural Society; VP, British and American Archaeological Society of Rome
Richard Parkinson: co-founder, VP 1843, Chetham Society
John Loughborough Pearson: gold medal 1880, Royal Institute of British Architects; gold medal, Paris Exhibition 1878
Richard Pearson: President, gold medal Royal Humane Society; President, Natural History Society of Edinburgh University; President, Royal Medical Society
Sir Robert Peel 2 Baronet: Trustee, British Museum
Lucas Pepys: Censor 1777, 1782, 1786 and 1796, Treasurer 1788-98, President 1804-10, RCP
John Louis Petiti: Founder 1844, British Archaeological Institute
Thomas Joseph Pettigrew: Founder, Philosophical Club, London 1808; Founder. Philosophical Society of London 1810; Original Member, Treasurer, British Archaeological Association
Richard Nathaniel Philipps: Chair, London Library Committee 1872-73
Thomas Phillipps: Trustee, British Museum
Charles John Philipp: Council Member, Royal Institute of British Architects
James Robinson Planche: Founder, British Archaeological Association
Thomas Pell Platt: Member, Translation Committee, Royal Asiatic Society
Lewis Pocock: co-founder 1837, Secretary 1837-82, Art Union of London; Treasurer, Graphic Society
Thomas Ponton: co-founder, Roxburghe Club
Robert Porrett: Original Fellow, Chemical Society
Richard Powell: Founder, Abernethian Society
Francis Robert Raines: co-founder 1843, Council Member, VP, Chetham Society
Charles Ratcliff: Originator 1857, National Association for the Promotion of Social Science
John Ratcliffe: Promoter, 1857 Social Science Conference, Birmingham
Thomas Rees: Trustee, Dr. Williams’ Foundation
Henry Reeve: Corresponding Member, French Institute 1865; Treasurer, Dr. Johnson’s Club 1868-94
John Rennie: President, 1845-48, Institute of Civil Engineers
Joshua Reynolds: Founder Member, Literary Club
Edward Roberts: Secretary 1862-75, British Archaeological Association
Henry Roberts: 2 Society of Arts medals, 1824
Peter Frederick Robinson: VP 1835-39, Royal Institute of British Architects
William Parsons 3 Earl Rosse: President 1848-54 RS; President, BAAS 1843
George Robert Rowe: President 1849, Abernethian Society
Charles William Russell: Member, Historical Manuscripts Commission 1869
John Fuller Russell: Committee member, Ecclesiological Society; Committee Member, Royal Archeological Institute
Joseph Sabine: Original Member, Royal Society for Literature; Treasurer, VP Zoological Society (f. 1826); Honorary secretary 1810, Gold Medal 1816, Horticultural Society
Alleyne Fitzherbert 1 Baron St. Helens 1805-37: Trustee, British Museum
Anthony Salvin: VP 1839; gold medallist 1863, Royal Institute of British Architects
George Gilbert Scott: gold medal 1859, President 1873-76, Royal Institute of British Architects
Richard Sharp: Original Member, Royal Society for Literature; original member, King of Clubs
George Scharf: Society of Arts medal; secretary, Manchester Exhibition 1857
Lancelot Sharpe: co-founder, Camden Society
Evelyn Philip Shirley: Trustee, National Portrait Gallery
George Gabriel Sigmond: President, Royal Physical Society
George Wharton Simpson: founder, Solar Club (photographers)
Sir John Sinclair: President, Highland Society; founder, British Wool Society (f. 1791); President, Committee on Breeds and Wool Merit, Highland Society
Sir Robert Smirke Junior: Treasurer 1820-50, gold medallist RA; gold medal 1853, Royal Institute of British Architects; gold medal Society of Arts
Sydney Smirke: Professor of Architecture 1861-65; Treasurer 1862-74, Professor of Architecture 1861-65, Royal Academy; gold medal 1819 and 1860, Royal Institute of British Architects
Charles Roach Smith: Co-founder 1843, British Archaeological Association; Secretary 1841-44, Numismatic Society
Sir John Soane: silver medal 1772, gold medal 1776, travelling studentship 1776; Royal Academy
Robert Henry Soden Smith: Juror, Porcelain, Exhibition of 1871
William Smith: Founder, Trustee, Chairman, National Portrait Gallery; Manager, Art Union of London
Edward Solly: Secretary 1852-53, Society of Arts; Treasurer, Index Society 1878-83; 1838 Chemist to the Royal Asiatic Society
William Henry Smyth: VP, Foreign Secretary RS 1826; President 1845-46 Royal Astronomical Society; Founder Member, President 1849-50, Royal Geographical Society
Richard Horsman Solly: Founder Member, Geological Society; Founder Member, Royal Institution 1800; Founder Member, Horticultural Society
Samuel Solly: Council Member 1856, VP, Examiner 1867, RCP; President, 1867-68 Royal Medical and Chirurgical Society
Edward Adolphus Seymour 11 Duke Somerset: President, Literary Fund 1801-38; VP Zoological Society 1826-31; President, Royal Institution; President 1834-37, Linnaean Society
George John Spencer 2 Earl Spencer: Founder Member, first President, Roxburghe Club; Trustee, British Museum; President, Royal Institution
Philip Henry Stanhope 5 Earl Stanhope: Trustee 1846, British Museum; Hon. Antiquary, Academy of Arts
Sir George Thomas Staunton: Co-founder, Royal Asiatic Society
Seth William Stevenson: Original Member, Numismatic Society
George Edmund Street: gold medal 1874, President 1881, Royal Institute of British Architects
Robert Surtees: Founder, Surtees Society (f. 1834)
Edward Tagart: Trustee, 1832-58, Dr. Williams' Foundation
James Talbot, 1 Baron Talbot de Malahide: President 1863-83, Royal Archaeological Institute; President, Royal Irish Academy; President, Anthropological Society
Richard Taylor: Secretary 1810 Royal Society for Literature; Original Member, BAAS; Secretary, Linnaean Society
Richard Cowling Taylor: Isis Medal, Society of Arts
William John Thoms: Secretary, Camden Society 1838-72
Mark Aloysius Tierney: Local Secretary 1846, Committee Member 1850, Sussex Archaeological Society
William Tite: President, Architectural Society 1838; President, Royal Institute of British
Architects 1861-63, 1867-70; President, Cambridge Society 1866; Hon. Secretary, London Institution 1824-69

Thomas Tobin: President, Cork Athenaeum
James Henthorn Todd: Founder 1840, Hon. Secretary, Irish Archaeological Society, Hon. Secretary, Royal Irish Academy 1847-55
Walter Calverley Trevelyen: President, United Kingdom Alliance
Edward Trollope: Secretary, VP, President, Associated Architectural Society; Chair, Lincolnshire Diocesan Architectural Society
Edward Vernon Utterson: Founder Member, Roxburghe Club
William Sandys Wright Vaux: Secretary 1852, President 1855, Numismatic Society; Secretary, Royal Asiatic Society 1875-85; Secretary, Royal Society for Literature
Nicholas Aylward Vigors: Founder Member 1826, Secretary 1826-33, Zoological Society, Editor Zoological Journal
Albert Way: Founder 1845, Archaeological Institute
William Robert Whatton: Librarian, Manchester Literary-Philosophical Society
John Whichcord; President 1879-81, Royal Institute of British Architects
Francis Whishaw: Secretary 1842-45, Society of Arts
John Williams: Secretary 1824-46, Spitalfields' Mathematical Society; Assistant Secretary 1847-74, Royal Astronomical Society; Assistant Secretary, Microscopical Society; Secretary, London Photographic Society
John Wilson (1812-1888): Juror, Great Exhibition 1851
George Woodfall: Committee member, Royal Literary Fund 1820-28; Council Member 1829-35 and 1838-44 Royal Society for Literature
Joseph Woods: founder 1806, President, London Architectural Society
George Robert Nicol Wright: Original Member, British Archaeological Society
Thomas Wright: Hon. Secretary, Camden Society; Treasurer, Secretary, Percy Society; Founder, Historical Society of Science; Co-Founder, British Archaeological Association
Sir John Wrottesley: President RS 1854-57; Founder, 1820, Secretary 1831-41, President 1841-43, Royal Astronomical Society; President BAAS 1860
Matthew Digby Wyatt: Telford Medal, Gold Medal 1866, Institute of Civil Engineers; Gold Medal, Great Exhibition; Juror, Paris Exhibition; President, Graphic Society
Richard Yates: Treasurer, Royal Literary Fund 1805-34
Charles Philip Yorke: VP, Royal Society for Literature
Appendix 2.B.4: Antiquaries Receiving Awards for Antiquarian Work

John Adamson: Knight of Christ and the Tower and Sword, Portugal, for his work on Portuguese literature
Charles Ansell: knighted, for actuarial science
Robert Archibald Armstrong: civil list, for work in Gaelic
William Beechey: knighted, for his painting
Sir William Betham: knighted for work with Irish state papers
Sir William Blizard: knighted for his medical work
Edward Blore: declined knighthood for his architectural work
John Britton: civil list pension for work on topography
Francis Legatt Chantrey: knighted for his sculpture
Charles Robert Cockerell: chevalier, Legion of Honour for architecture
Henry Ellis, Knight Hanover for his work at the British Museum
Thomas Dudley Fosbroke: pension from Royal Society of Literature for work in history, topography, archaeology
Augustus Wollaston Franks: Knight Commander of the Bath 1888, 1894 for work in archaeology, medieval art
John Thomas Gilbert: knighted for work in Irish history, 1897
Thomas Duffus Hardy: knighted for work in the Records Office
William Hardy: knighted for work in the Records Office
Frederic Madden: Knight of the Guelphic Order, Knight Bachelor, for his work at the British Museum
Richard Henry Major: Knight of the Tower and Sword, Knight of the Order of Santiago, Knight of the Order of the Rose of Brazil 1875 Portugal, Knight of the Crown of Italy 1875 for work on early Portuguese exploration
James V. Millingen: Civil List pension for work on literature and antiquities
Samuel Rush Meyrick: Knight Hanover for his services in the Armouries of the Tower of London and Windsor Castles
Francis Palgrave: knighted for his historical and literary work
John Henry Parker: knight, Italian Order of St. Maurice and Lazarus for his Roman research 1879; gold medal from Pius IX for same; Knight Commander of the Bath 1871 for work on the history of British architecture
Lucas Pepys: baronetcy for his medical services to George III
Thomas Phillipps: knighted for his work collecting early English manuscripts
Henry Reeve: Knight Commander of the Bath 1871; Knight Commander of the Order of Christ (Portugal) for his literary work
George Gilbert Scott: knighted 1872 for Cathedral restorations
Sir Robert Smirke Jr.: knighted for his architectural work
Sir John Soane: declined a baronetcy for his architect work
George Edmund Street: knighted, Legion of Honour 1878 for his architectural work
William Tite: Knight Commander of the Bath 1869 for his architectural work
Dawson Turner: Civil List pension for his history and topography
Matthew Digby Wyatt: French Legion of Honour 1855; knighted 1869 for his architectural work
Jeffry Wyatville: Knighthood, for his architectural work on Windsor Castle; Grand Cross of the Saxon Ernestine Order from Duke Saxe-Meningen for design of the Schloss Altenstein-Altenberg
Appendix 2.B.5: Scholarly Collections

Where a collection was given or bequeathed to an institution, its destination is noted. "Transferred to" is used where I cannot ascertain the circumstances of a collection passing into other hands. The institutions noted were in possession of these collections early in the Twentieth century. In most cases, this has remained unchanged, but readers should note that this information comes from the Dictionary of National Biography and so may not always identify the current location of the collection. "Purchased by" usually means a sale took place after the collector's death. The number of days a sale took is an indication of its size; auction houses are cited where known; if a sale was carried out by Christie's and Sotheby's this indicates that the collection was viewed as important.

John Adamson: conches, fossils, minerals given to Newcastle-on-Tyne Museum and Durham University
Francis Vvyyyan Jago Arundel: near eastern antiquities, coins and manuscripts, given to British Museum
Thomas Amyot: books
William Betham: Irish manuscripts, sold to the Irish Academy, genealogical and heraldic manuscripts, parts sold by Sotheby's, parts given to British Museum, parts given to the Office of Ulster King of Arms in Dublin
John Trotter Brockett: north country/Borders manuscripts, parts sold over 14 days by Sotheby's, some given to John George Lambton Lord Durham
John Bruce: books and manuscripts, sold by Sotheby's over 5 days
James Buckman: Roman antiquities, fossils; given to Cirencester Museum
Samuel Butler: Greek and Latin manuscripts, Aldine editions
John Caley: manuscripts, some given to British Museum
Charles Purton Cooper: books, 2,000+ volumes of civil and foreign legal works, given to Lincoln's Inn library
Thomas Corser: books, sold for £20,000
John Marten Cripps: oriental flora, statues, antiques, some given to University of Cambridge
Thomas Crofton Croker: Irish antiquities
James Crossley: books, 100,000 volumes given to the Chetham library; parts sold by Sotheby's
James Dodsley Cuff: coins, sold by Sotheby's; sale catalogue was 193 pages, the collection sold for £7,000, going to the Bank of England and British Museum
Richard Daniel: mosses
Edward Dodwell: Greek antiquities including a Parthenon marble, purchased by Glyptothek, Munich
Francis Douce: books, coins, manuscripts, art, given to Boedleian library, ivories bequeathed to Samuel Rush Meyrick
Henry J.T. Drury: manuscripts and books, sold for £10,000
Henry George Moreton 2 Earl Ducie: short-horn cattle, products of breeding experiments, sold in 1853 for £9,000
John Duncumb: manuscripts
George Wyndham 3 Earl Egremont: the owner of Petworth, collected art including works by Turner, Constable, Haydon, Flaxman, others
Charles Long 1 Baron Farnborough: paintings and sculpture
George Ouseley Fenwicke: books (10,000 volumes)
Robert Finch: books, art, coins, medals, given to Ashmolean
George Grant Francis: fossils, antiquities, coins, given to Royal Institution of South Wales
Augustus Wollaston Franks: books, medieval ivories, ceramics, bequeathed to SA and British Museum
Francis Freeling: books
William Gell: archaeological drawings from Greece, Italy, Asia Minor, bequeathed to British Museum
Thomas Grenville: 20,000+ volumes worth £50,000 including the first folio of Shakespeare: bequeathed to the British Museum
Hudson Gurney: 15,000 volumes including Jermyn's manuscript collection, plus Anglo-Saxon and Roman British antiquities, bequeathed to British Museum
George Gwilt: antiquities, art, given to St Saviour's Church London
Spencer Hall: books, sold by Sotheby's
James Orchard Halliwell (-Philipps): Shakespeare-related books, given to Edinburgh University; also owned Shakespeare's house in Stratford-on-Avon, given to Corporation of Stratford
William Hamper: books and manuscripts especially relating to Dugdale, now in British Museum and Birmingham library
Joseph Haslewood: proclamations and theatre history, transferred to the library of the Duke of Buccleugh at Dalkeith and British Museum
Edward Hawkins: books and prints about Chester; British medals and political cartoons, given to British Museum
Robert Hay: Egyptian antiquities, archaeological drawings and notes, given to the British Museum
John Henderson: books and antiquities; Greek, Roman and Egyptian collection bequeathed to Oxford University; art works by Canaletto and Turner, plus European antiquities and manuscripts bequeathed to British Museum; other art works bequeathed to National Gallery; Christie's sold the remaining collection for £111,000
Thomas Heywood: books, antiquities
George Hibbert: books, art, exotic plants
Prince Hoare: music library, books, bequeathed to Royal Society for Literature
Richard Colt Hoare: Italian books, given to British Museum
Thomas Hope: books, art, antiquities including marbles and vases
William Howley: books, bequeathed to Canterbury Diocesan library
Joseph Hunter: manuscripts, purchased by British Museum
James Ingram: books and coins, given to Trinity College and Bodleian
Henry William Inwood: Greek antiquities, purchased by British Museum
Michael Jones: Italian, French, German manuscripts
John Kenrick: antiquities, given to Yorkshire Philosophical Society Museum
Samuel William King: fossils, minerals, bequeathed to Museum of Practical Geology
Aylmer Bourke Lambert: 30,000-plant herbarium; some transferred to British Museum
John Edward Lee: fossils, given to British Museum
William Lowther 2 Earl Lonsdale: arts, porcelain, opera manuscripts
William Marsden: oriental coins, unique in Britain in his time, presented to British Museum
Joseph Mayer: art, antiquities worth £80,000, given to Liverpool City Corporation
Samuel Rush Meyrick: armour, sold to a French collector
William Henry Miller: owner, Britwell Collection of books, including Richard Heber's rare book collection, unrivalled for early English and Scottish works including Caxton, Wynkyn de
Worde, and Pynson

George Nayler: 39 volumes of Acts of Parliament, given to Guildhall library
John Newman: Roman British antiquities including notable bronzes; sold by Sotheby’s
John Bowyer Nichols: books and manuscripts, library sold by Sotheby’s for £6,000+
George Frederick Nott: art, 12,000 volumes, coins, gems, bronzes, sold over 13 days
George Ormerod: books, manuscripts, antiquities, some books to Bodleian library
William Otley: art, especially Italian masters sold to Sir Thomas Lawrence
Gore Ouseley: oriental manuscripts
Woodbine Parish: fossils
Thomas Lister Parker, art including works by Flemish masters and Gainsborough, antiquities, manuscripts
Thomas Phillipps: books and manuscripts including most of the Meerman collection (9th century German monastic manuscripts important for the study of early German); portions of the Chardin and Celotti sales in Paris (medieval Italian manuscripts); the Muschenbroek collection of Dutch charters, chronicles and cartularies; 1600 manuscripts from the Drury collection; medieval French romances from the Lang collection; Sir Gregory Page Turner’s Battleden collection; the Williams collection including Bishop Gundulph’s Bible; Craven Ord’s collection of chronicles, cartularies and royal household books; the Earl of Guildford’s collection of early Italian manuscripts; Lord Kingsborough’s Mexici manuscript collection; 800 volumes of French Revolution papers; 400 volumes from the Heber collection of Early English and French poetry; 97 volumes of rolls, cartularies, charters, and grants relating to Battle Abbey; Irish manuscripts from the collections of Cooper, O’Reilly, Betham, Monck, Mason and Todd, the 12th century manuscript of Giraldus Cambrensis; Welsh collections including a 12th century vellum manuscript of Aneurin’s Godonin and early Welsh poetry manuscripts; 500 volumes of classical and oriental works including a 10th century copy of Dioscorides; illuminated manuscripts of the Medici, Charles VIII of France, Pope Nicholas V, Ferdinand and Isabella, and Corvinus; in toto about 60,000+ manuscripts and incunabula, coins and art; Phillips owned a printing press to print editions of some of these; his collection was sold to the Bodleian, the British Museum, various European governments and private collectors by Sotheby’s in nine different sales over 17 years
John Newman: antiquities of Roman London, sold by Sotheby’s, some, including the bronze head of Hadrian, purchased by the British Museum
Alexander McInnes Nicholson: books, sold over 2 months for £3000+
Henry Phipps 1 Earl Mulgrave & Viscount Normanby: art, including works by Rembrandt, Titian, Reubens and Turner, some sold by Christie’s
Algernon Percy 4 Duke Northumberland Lord Prudhoe: purchased the Carnuccini collection of Italian art, also Egyptian antiquities at Alnwick Castle
Craven Ord: manuscripts and books
Edward Richard Poole: classical manuscripts and books
Francis Robert Raines: books, manuscripts, bequeathed to the Chetham Library, Manchester
Thomas Rees: sixteenth century antitrinitarian literature
Thomas Rickman: drawings and notes on English churches, given to Oxford Architectural Society
Henry Crabb Robinson: art, sculpture, given to University of London
Samuel Rogers: art, books, sold by Christie’s for £50,000+
John Gage Rokewode: manuscripts, books
John Fuller Russell: 14th century Italian art
Samuel Weller Singer: manuscripts, some sold by Sotheby's
John Skinner: Roman British and Celtic antiquities, books, some to British Museum
Sir John Soane: books, manuscripts, art, antiquities, gems; Soane founded his own Museum, still in Lincoln's Inn Fields
George John Spencer 2 Earl Spencer; owner, Althorp library; collected art, books and manuscripts, especially 15th century books and Caxtons: became the Rylands collection at Manchester University
Alleyne Fitzherbert 1 Baron St Helens; manuscripts, books, art, which perished in fire 1797; some papal manuscripts and political papers passed to Sir Henry Fitzherbert, some to Thomas Crofton Croker
George Scharf: books, engravings, sold by Sotheby's
Richard Simmons: minerals, bequeathed Oxford University; paintings bequeathed to the National Gallery
Charles Roach Smith: London antiquities: bought by British Museum, 1856, for £2,000
William Smith: Dutch and Flemish engravings, sold to the British Museum for £5,000; art, given to National Portrait Gallery, South Kensington Museum, National Gallery of Ireland
Edward Solly: books, sold by Sotheby's
William Scott 1 Lord Stowell: manuscripts from the Pinelli and Crevenna sales
Thomas Streatfield: books, manuscripts, paintings and engravings
Robert Surtees: manuscripts, books, engravings about the history of Durham and Northumbria
James Talbot 1 Baron de Malahide: Irish antiquities, given to Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge
William Tite: early English books, bibles and liturgies, historical autographs, art; sold by Sotheby's
Dawson Turner: algae and cryptogramic plants, transferred to Kew Gardens; with Hudson Gurney
Turner purchased the Macro manuscript collection including Henry Spelman's collection and library of 8000+ volumes, sold to the British Museum; collection of missals, 150 volumes of manuscripts and sold for £6500
Charles Turnor: Newton manuscripts, presented to the RS
Robert Studley Vidal: coins and medals, sold by Sotheby's
Nicholas Aylward Vigors: birds and insects, given to the Zoological Society
Albert Way: books, drawings, medieval seals, presented to SA
George Woodfall: manuscripts of Junius, transferred to the British Museum
Joseph Woods: plants, herbs, given to Royal Institution
Appendix 2.B.6: Antiquaries Supporting Scholarship

Robert Henry Allan: bequeathed funds for finishing Surtees' history of Durham
Joseph Bosworth: £10,000 to Cambridge to found an Anglo-Saxon Professorship
Samuel Brown: founded the Brown Prize for Economic History, Institute of Actuaries 1884, worth £50 annually
Thomas Burgess: founded St David's College, Lampeter for educating Welsh clergy
John Jeffreys Pratt 2 Earl 1 Marquis Camden: founder, Maynooth College
Francis Legatt Chantrey: left £150,000 to Royal Academy to purchase paintings and sculpture
William Coulson: founder, Aldersgate Medical School 1826
James Crossley: founded Chetham Library
Robert Fitch: bequeathed his geological and antiquarian collections, books and manuscripts to Morwich Museum
George Godwin: co-founder, Hellenic Society School in Athens; Godwin Bursary at the Royal Institute of British Architects
Hudson Gurney: contributed hundreds of pounds to SA to publish Anglo-Saxon works
James Heywood: Originator, London Library movement; funded Free Public Library, Notting Hill 1874; Original Trustee, Owens College Manchester
Thomas Hughes: Founder, Working Men's College 1854
George Henry Law: founded St Bees College for poor men to train as clergy
John Lee: gave the Royal Astronomical Society 2 advowsons to vicarages to promoting theological and astronomical work
Leone Levi: founder, lectureship on commercial law, founder, science library, Technical Institute of Ancona
Edward Hawk Locker: established the Naval Portrait Gallery, 1795
Edward Maltby: founded, bequeathed his library to Durham University; senator, London University; founder, King's College London
Joseph Mayer: established, endowed a Free Library, Cheshire, 1866
George Nicholl: Member, Provisional Committee, King’s College, London
John Nicholl: helped found King’s College, London
Hugh Percy: established a diocesan educational society
Hastings Robinson: founded a prize in theology at Rugby
Henry Crabb Robinson: founder, University College London, legacy to University of London
Sir John Soane: founded, endowed the Soane Museum
Philip Henry Stanhope 5 Earl Stanhope: Founder, Stanhope Prize in Modern History, Oxford
George Thomas Staunton: founded, provided 3000 Chinese volumes to the Royal Asiatic Society library
Richard Taylor: Founder, City of London School; Founder, Corporation of the City of London Library; Promoter, University of London
William Tite: Tite Scholarship, City of London School
James Henthorn Todd: Co-founder, St. Colomba's College, Rathfarnham, Dublin
Richard Studley Vidal: founded a scholarship for £20 yearly at St. John's College, Cambridge
William Rae Wilson: bequeathed £300 to University of Glasgow for an annual prize essay on Christianity
Appendix 2.C.1: Antiquaries' Charitable Work

Some of the deeds listed here and viewed as charitable in the Victorian era are viewed quite differently now, for example the building of Christian churches in India. Similarly, some of these deeds may perhaps suggest uncharitable purposes, for example the building of orphanages for girls. However, all are listed here as part of the full and complex reality of the antiquarian community. Antiquaries who were known to have committed illegal or unethical offenses are listed immediately following this list.

Robert Henry Allan: endowed Durham area churches for communion silverware and bells
William Bray: funded charities and civil trusts in Surrey
Charles Parr Burney: bequeathed £6000 for a Clergy Relief Fund
Benjamin Bond Cabbell: President, City of London General Pension Society; obtained charter for the Artists' Benevolent Fund; Treasurer, Lock Hospital and Infant Orphan Asylum
John Leycester Adolphus: Member, General Literature Cttee, Christian Knowledge Society
Frederick Henry Turner Bamwell: benefactor to Suffolk and Norfolk Clerical Institutions
Nicholas Carlisle: indexed reports of Charity Commission
William Hookham Carpenter: secretary, Artist's Benevolent Fund
Robert Smith 1 Lord Carrington: gave funds for the poor at Olney
Adam Clarke: gave translation assistance to British and Foreign Bible Society
Charles Robert Cockerell: worked for the Artists’ Benevolent Society, founded Architect’s Benevolent Society
Edward Copplestone: funded restoration of 20 Welsh churches and 53 Glebe houses
William Cotton: worked with poor east Londoners; stopped the practice of payment through pubs; Chair of Administration Committee for London Hospital; funded the building of churches; founder, Church Building Societies; organiser, Metropolis Churches Fund; assisted landlords to define and perform their duties; founder, National Society for Church of England schools; governor of Christ’s Hospital 1821-66; Treasurer, Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge; supported the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel; aided the Colonial Bishopric’s Fund and Additional Curate’s Society; helped build public baths, washhouses, model lodging houses
John Drinkwater-Bethune: President, Council for Education in Calcutta 1848-51; drafted bills for Indian legislation for freedom of religion; founded and endowed Bethune’s Girl’s School of Calcutta
George Wyndham 3 Earl Egremont: built schools, restored churches, spent £20,000 annually for 60 years on charity
Henry Thomas Ellacombe: notable for restoring and building churches and church schools
Vincent Eyre: built roads, schools and churches in India for Portuguese refugees; organised and ran the Red Cross Ambulance during the Prussian war
Josiah Forshall: founder, Foundling Hospital
William Stanley Goddard: rebuilt Foxcote church; gave Winchester School £5,000 to improve masters’ salaries
Isaac Lyon Goldsmid: helped found University College; bought the Gower Street location for it; helped found North London Hospital in 1834; treasurer 1839-57; worked to reform penal code and improve prisons
Sir Sandford Graham: gave £500 to build a church at Kirkstall
Richard Gregory: endowed library, founded a scholarship, Harrow
Daniel Gurney: helped establish West Norfolk and Lynn Hospital
Edward Hawkins: Treasurer, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge
James Heywood: 1st President 1875, Sunday Society
Godfrey Higgins: worked to improve treatment of the insane, built a home for pauper lunatics
Charles Longuet Higgins: restored the local church; built a school, museum and model cottages in Turvey Bedfordshire, involved in New Hymn Book; member, Church Congress 1871
Charles Jame Hoare: did educational and missionary work; helped provide church accommodation in South London
Henry Hoare: gave £2000 to cost of restoring St. John’s Cambridge Chapel Tower; gave £1000 to the Bishop of London’s Fund for the poor
William Hughes Hughes (b. Hewitt): Governor, Christ’s Hospital
Abraham Hume: member of surveying tour for the South American Missionary Society
James Ingram: funded a school at Garsington, Oxfordshire
Edmund Knowles Lacon: gave £50 for rebuilding Emmanuel College Cambridge after fire
George Kenyon 2 Baron Kenyon: Trustee, Theological Seminary of Ohio
George Henry Law: improved churches and livings in Carlisle, established a Church Building Society in Bath and Wells diocese; established a system of cottage allotments
James Heywood Markland: treasurer for £14,000+ for missionary work in colonies
John Merewether: gave £500 for restoration, Hereford Cathedral
Sir Charles Morgan: spent hundred of pounds annually improving Welsh agriculture; liberally supported Welsh poets and scholars
Joseph Neeld: founded two scholarships, gold medal for maths at Harrow; funded the rebuilding of Leigh Delamere Church
John Newman: Honorary Architect to the childrens’ charities of St. Paul’s; built a school for the blind
Algernon Percy 4 Duke Northumberland, Lord Prudhoe: President, Royal National Lifeboat Institution; gave premiums for improved lifeboats, built a tank at Sion house to test innovations; built Old Sailors’ Home, North Shields
George Frederick Nott: built schools and rectories and restored churches
Charles John Palmer: endowed reading rooms in Yarmouth
Hugh Percy: established the Clergy Aid Society, restored the Episcopal Palace with his own funds
Thomas Philipps and Francis Chantrey: founders, Artist’s General Benevolent Association
John Tidd Pratt: worked to disclose the unsound condition of some Friendly Societies, advised on these as a public service to the poor
Thomas Rees: Secretary, Unitarian Society; Secretary 1825-53, Presbyterian Board
George Richards: funded the building of a vicarage for St. Martin’s in the Fields and St. Michael’s in Burleigh Street, founder, gold medal for Latin verse, Christ’s Hospital
Daniel Rowland: built, endowed Holy Cross Hospital for poor women; Governor, Guildford Street Foundling Hospital, London
John Russell: Treasurer, Society for Propagation of the Gospel
John St. Aubyn: built, endowed Devonport Town Hall
Sydney Smirke: founder, first President, Architects’ Benevolent Society
George John Spencer 2 Earl Spencer: built, endowed Northampton Infirmary
Edward Tagart: Foreign Secretary 1832, Secretary 1842, British and Foreign Unitarian Society
Charles Chetwynd Talbot 2 Earl Talbot: improved agriculture in Suffolk and Ireland; built a church at Salt
Richard Taylor: helped found the City of London School, Corporation of London Library, University College, University of London
Samuel Thornton: Governor, Greenwich Hospital; President, Guy’s Hospital
Edward Trollope: raised £10,000 for new episcopacy of Southwell 1884; restored Southwell Palace for £4,000
Charles Augustus Tulk: worked to improve factory conditions
Edward Upham: trustee for Dawlish charities
Richard Valpy: funded the building of a boardinghouse for boys at Reading School
John Webb: funded the rebuilding of Tretire church
Richard Yates: helped manage many charities; Secretary, Asylum for the deaf and dumb

Appendix 2.C.2: Criminal and Immoral Antiquaries

George Robert Ainslie: his cruel repression of rebel slaves in Eustatius, West Indies led to an outcry in Parliament
Stephen Hyde Cassan: ran away with the daughter of his vicar, which led to legal proceedings
John Payne Collier: forged the "Perkins Folio," allegedly in Shakespeare’s hand
James Dallaway: failed to get a fellowship at Trinity College Oxford because of some satirical verses he published about a prominent College member
James Orchard Halliwell (Phillipps): strong evidence suggested he stole mss from Trinity College Cambridge library; was forbidden to enter British library by Henry Ellis FSA
Everard Home: was Hunter’s executor, did not allow others to see Hunter’s papers, would not publish them, used Hunter’s work for his own publications
John Soane: was censured by the Royal Academy for criticising another architect, 1810
Appendix 2.C.3: Family Connections Among Antiquaries

fathers and sons:

John Leycester Adolphus, John Adolphus
William Ayrton, William Scrope Ayrton
Sir William Beechey, Henry William Beechy
Edward Bray, Reginald Bray and William Bray
Henry Conyngham 1st Marquis Conyngham, Lord Albert Conyngham Lord Londesborough
John Drinkwater, John Drinkwater-Bethune
Thomas Grimston Bucknall Estcourt, Thomas Henry Sutton Sotherton Estcourt
Benjamin Hawes, Sir Benjamin Hawes
John Holmes, Richard Rivington Holmes
James Everard Home, Everard Home
Henry Howard, Philip Henry Howard
Ebenezer Fuller Maitland, William Fuller Maitland
Llewelyn Meyrick, Samuel Rush Meyrick
William Monson, William John 6th Baron Monson
John Bowyer Nichols, John Gough Nichols and Robert Cradock Nichols and Francis Morgan Nichols
Thomas Rickman, Thomas Miller Rickman
Edward Rudge, Edward John Rudge
Robert Smirke, Robert Smirke Jr. and Sydney Smirke
Edward Frederick Smyth Pigott, John Hugh Smythe Pigott
Granville Penn, William Penn
William Stevenson, Seth William Stevenson
Sir Robert Wigram, Sir James Wigram
Sir Sandford Graham, Sir James Graham
William 1 Earl Lonsdale of Whitehaven (2nd creation), William Viscount Lowther 2 Earl Lonsdale
Henry Welbore Agar-Ellis 2nd Viscount Clifden, George James Agar-Ellis 1 Baron Dover

other blood and marriage links:

Robert Smith 1 Baron Carrington: grandfather to Philip Henry 5 Earl Stanhope
Charles Robert Cockerell m. Catherine d. of Sir John Rennie
Isaac Disraeli m. Maria d. of George Basevi
Charles Long 1 Baron Farnborough m. Amelia d. Abraham Hume
William Fitzhugh m. relative of Dudley Ryder Lord Harrowby
brothers Joseph Gwilt and George Gwilt
James Orchard Halliwell m. Henrietta d. Thomas Phillipps
William Jackson Hooker m. d. of Dawson Turner
Henry Howard m. Catherine d. Sir Richard Neave
James Ingram m. Mary d. of Joseph Seymour Biscoe
brothers Daniel Lysons and Samuel Lysons
James Heywood Markland m. d. Francis Freeling
Thomas Phillipp m. d. W.J. Mansell
Frederic Madden m. d. of William Robinson
Henry Addinton Lord Sidmouth m. Mary Anne d. Lord Townsend
brothers John Sleath and William Boulby Sleath
Francis Cohen Palgrave: m. Elizabeth d. of Dawson Turner
Philip Yorke Earl Hardwicke and half-brother Charles Philip Yorke
George Ashurnham Lord Ashburnham m. Sophia d. Thomas Thynne, Marquis Bath
Charles Clifford 6 Baron Clifford of Chudleigh m. Eleanor d. of James Everard Arundell 8 Baron Arundell of Wardour
Henry Addington Viscount Sidmouth m. Mary Anne d. of William Scott 1 Lord Stowell
Charles Clifford 7 Baron Clifford of Chudleigh m. Mary d. Henry 8 Lord Arundell and sister to James Everard Baron Arundell
Thomas Lennard Barret, nephew of Sir John St. Aubyn
Henry Gally Knight, nephew of Alleyne Fitzherbert Lord St Helens George Kenyon 2 Baron Kenyon m. aunt of Sir John Hanmer
Hugh Earl Fortescue m. aunt of Richard Grenville Plantagenet Duke of Buckingham
William Fitzhugh m. relative of Dudley Ryder Earl Harrowby
Joseph Neeld, first cousin of Marquis Blandford
Rt. Hon. Reginald Pole-Carew m. niece of Earl Hardwicke
Henry Welbore Agar-Ellis 2nd Viscount Clifden m. Lady Caroline Spencer d. George Duke of Marlborough
Appendix 2.C.4: Antiquaries Working Together

William Alexander, John George Children, Francis Douce, Henry Ellis, Josiah Forshall, Thomas Duffus Hardy, Edward Hawkins, John Holmes, Thomas Hartwell Horne, Frederick Madden, James V. Millingen, William Ottley and Francis Palgrave worked at the British Museum and Library

William Alexander: artist to Sir George Staunton's expedition to China

Samuel James Arnold (Director), William Ayrton (operaic agent), Thomas Cooke (Music Director), James Robinson Planche (Manager), and George Cappel Coningsby 5 Earl Essex (Director) worked together at Drury Lane Theatre

Edmund Tyrrell Arts: house steward to Charles Earl Fitzwilliam

James Everard Arundell 10 Baron Arundell: contributed to Richard Colt Hoare's History of Modern Wiltshire

Francis Vyvyan Jago Arundell: with Samuel and Daniel Lysons published on the history of Cornwall; Arundell with Davies Gilbert published on the Arundell manuscripts

Henry William Beechey: appointed by Henry Earl Bathurst to examine and report on the antiquities of Cyrenaica

Sir William Beechey: painted the portrait of Everard Home

Henry Beeke, advised Nicholas Vansittart Lord Bexley on income tax and the duties of the Chancellor of Exchequer

William Betham, Philip Henry Stanhope Viscount Mahon organised the records of the Office of the Garter king of Arms, Dublin; Mahon, Keeper of Records, appointed Betham deputy keeper of Records

Edward Blore, Thomas Rickman: studied Gothic language and style; worked jointly as architects on some buildings; illustrated for Walter Scott's novels

Henry Kaye Bonney, Edward Maltby, George S. Griffin Stonestreet, Charles Turnor, Charles Smith Bird held clerical positions at Lincoln Cathedral

John Brereton, Thomas Burgess, William Stanley Goddard, George Frederick Nott, Hugh Percy held clerical positions at Salisbury Cathedral

John Trotter Brockett, John Adamson, council members, secretaries and editors for SA Newcastle-on-Tyne and Newcastle-on-Tyne Literary-Philosophical Society

John Trotter Brockett, John Dawson; worked, edited for the Typographical Society

George Frederick Beltz: did pedigrees for Richard Colt Hoare's History of South Wiltshire 1834

Edward Wedlake Brayley, John Britton, walked through Britain together, published together on literature, topography, antiquities

John Britton: wrote a biography of Edmund Tyrrell Arts

Samuel Egerton Brydges, Joseph Haslewood: produced 1813-22 The British Bibliographer, a 4-volume work on old English works

Charles Butler: friends with John Scott 1 Lord Eldon; Butler agitated for Catholic rights, Eldon was a strong supporter of the Catholic relief law when he became Solicitor-General; edited work by John Gage Rokewode

Thomas Byrth: taught by Richard Cope

John Caley, Bulkeley Bandinel, Henry Ellis: jointly reprinted Dugdale's Monasticon, 6 volumes, 1817-30

John Caley, Charles Purton Cooper, Thomas Duffus Hardy, Henry Hobhouse, Thomas Hartwell Horne, Joseph Hunter, Robert Harry Inglis, Rowley Lascelles, Robert Lemon, Henry Petrie, Edward Davis Protheroe worked for the Record Commissions
Edward Cardwell: private secretary to Oxford University Chancellor William Wyndham Lord Grenville

John Carter: illustrated the *Specimens of Ancient Sculpture* by Francis Douce SA, Samuel Rush Meyrick, Dawson Turner, John Britton with Richard Gough, John Bray and Edward Hawkins; did illustrations for Richard Gough's *Croyland Abbey* and *Sepulchral Monuments*; originator of the architectural periodization popularised by John Britton;

Edmund Cartwright: friend to Charles Spencer Perceval. Perceval was Chancellor of Exchequer when Cartwright asked parliament for a financial reward for his power loom invention. Perceval presented the proposal, which was successful

Stephen Hyde Cassan: got a living at Bruton, Dorset through Richard Colt Hoare

Francis Legatt Chantrey: did bust of Francis Burdett, of Benjamin Heath Malkin; often a guest of Lord Egremont at Petworth; did several portraits of John Soane, Soane's friend William Jerdan destroyed one at Soane's request; painted the portrait of Sir Jeffrey Wyatville

Robert Clutterbuck: hired Edward Blore to illustrate his county history of Hertfordshire

Charles Robert Cockerell: assisted Sir Robert Smirke in rebuilding Covent Garden Theatre; architect for the London and Westminster Bank with William Tite; engraved for the travel publications of Thomas Smart Hughes

Austin Cooper: friend to William Conyngham

Edward Cresy: went on walking tour of England with George Ledwell Taylor to study architecture; walking tour of France, Italy, Switzerland, Greece, Malta & Sicily to study architecture, published jointly

Alexander Croke: friends with William Scott, Lord Stowell while students at Oriel College Oxford; Stowell later employed Croke to write the legal report which made Croke's career

Thomas Crofton Croker: his publications on Irish poetry brought him to the attention of Thomas Moore, author on Irish poetry; Moore brought Croker to England, helped him get published, encouraged his talents, introduced him to others; with A.J. Kempe published on the antiquities at Keston, founded the antiquaries' dining club The Noviomagians together; friend to Thomas Wright SA, Albert Denison 1 Lord Londesborough; edited Boswell's life of Johnson with reminiscences of William Scott Lord Stowell (Johnson's friend and executor)

William Henry Brooke: employed by Thomas Crofton Croker's to illustrate his *Fairy Legends and Traditions of the South of Ireland* 1825

William Thomas Parr Brymer: performed diocesan business for Bishop George Henry Law during his illness

James Dallaway, Edmund Cartwright: worked on a the history of Bramber Rape, Sussex

Thomas Daniells: took nephew William Daniells to India 1784-94

William Daniells: published on zoography of India with William Wood

Samuel Deane: introduced Charles Clarke's work on church archaeology work to numerous antiquaries

Isaac Disraeli: Samuel Rogers helped launch his literary career, was aided in the British Library by Francis Douce; published with Douce; friend of Charles Purton Cooper SA; worked with John Nichols on literary subjects; friend of and published with John Murray

Francis Douce: bequeathed his collection of books, coins, manuscripts and art to the Bodleian library because when he had visited the library with Isaac Disraeli in 1830 he had been courteously received by Bulkeley Bandinel; Douce left his ivory carvings and art to friend
Samuel Rush Meyrick
Thomas Frognal Dibdin: was assisted by Francis Douce in his research; was supported financially by Thomas Phillipps; was employed by the Duke of Spencer at Althorp library; wrote biography of George Woodfall
Samuel Drummond: painted the portrait of Richard Yates
Henry J.T. Drury: edited manuscripts with Joseph Haslewood for the Roxburgh Club; friend of Thomas Frognall Dibdin
Edward Duke: opened tumuli, other archaeological projects with Richard Colt Hoare; published on this in Hoare’s *Wiltshire*
John Duncumb: worked on volumes 1 and 2 of Herefordshire county history, William Henry Cooke completed volume 3
John William Scott Lord Eldon: friend to Henry Addington Viscount Sidmouth
William Fitzhugh: worked with Dudley Ryder Lord Harrowby
Josiah Forshall: worked on Wycliffe’s *New Testament* with Frederic Madden
Samuel Fox: publisher for work on English churches by J.H. Markland
John Hookham Frere: published by John Murray
William Windham, Lord Grenville: employed John Buckler as an engraver for his works on Buckinghamshire
Hudson Gurney: travelled Europe with George Earl of Aberdeen
George Gwilt: restored the Ladye Chapel, St. Saviour’s Southwark which Thomas Saunders had agitated to have restored rather than pulled down
William Hamper (1): Anglo-Saxon expert who helped John Bowyer Nichols with his history of Leicestershire, George Ormerod with his history of Cheshire, Reginald Bray with his history of Surrey, Samuel Cartwright with his history of Sussex
William Hamper (2): worked with Dibdin on his *Bibliomania* and his *Bibliographical Decameron*
William Hamper (3): friend of John Britton, helped with Britton’s works on topography and antiquities
Philip Hardiwck: refereed the work of Robert Smirke and Joseph Gwilt in the 1840 competition for the design of the Royal Exchange
Joseph Haslewood: supplied Samuel Egerton Brydges with material for his *Censura Literaria* 1807-09
Edward Hawkins: was tutored in childhood by George Ormerod; Hawkins did the engravings for Ormerod’s history of Cheshire; Hawkins’ guide to British Museum coins and medals was edited by Augustus Wollaston Franks
Richard Colt Hoare: was aided in his 6 volume history of Wiltshire J.E. Arundell Lord Arundell and William Henry Black; Hoare published on Anglo-Saxon manuscripts with Thomas Dudley Fosbroke, Thomas Phillipps, Sharon Turner, James Ingram; Hoare’s work on Roman pavements was edited by John Bowyer Nichols; Nichols was printer for the catalogue of Hoare’s library; Hoare SA paid for the publication of William Henry Black’s edition of an Anglo-Saxon manuscript; employed John Buckler as engraver for his Wiltshire topographical works
Benjamin Hobhouse: his portrait was painted by Thomas Phillips
John Holmes: his bibliographies attracted attention of Nicholas Vansittart Baron Bexley, Chancellor of the Exchequer, who got him a job in Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum 1830
Thomas Hope: purchased the vase collection of William Hamilton; was patron of sculptor Francis Legatt Chantrey; had his portrait painted by Sir William Beechey
Thomas Hartwell Horne; was assistant clerk to Charles Butler; was assisted in publishing on Spanish history by John Gillies

John Russell 5 Duke Bedford: worked at Kew with William Jackson Hooker; Russell’s son became Director when Kew became a national institution

Thomas Walker Horsfield: worked with W.D. Cooper on Sussex history and topography

William Hoskins, John Britton: restored St. Mary Redcliffe, Bristol

Archbishop Howley appointed Samuel Roffey Maitland Keeper of Manuscripts and librarian at Lambeth, 1838

Thomas Smart Hughes: at Shrewsbury under Samuel Butler; Assistant-master at Harrow under George Butler; worked on English edition of Strabo with John Yonge Akerman and John Lee; presented to a perpetual curacy of Edgeware, Middlesex by John Lee

Richard Colt Hoare: founded the Stourhead Circle for Wiltshire and Somersetshire men to discuss antiquities; included Joseph Hunter Mackensie

James Ingram: his portrait was painted by George Richmond

William Jerdan: published on Joseph Jekyll’s political thought in Men I Have Known; friend to Frederick Pollock; worked on Literary Gazette 1817-50 with W.R. Crabbe

Aylmer Bourke Lambert: at St. Mary’s Hall Oxford with Daniel Lysons, pursued botany and collecting together; botanical collections catalogued by Richard Colt Hoare, and discussed in his Wiltshire; Lambert dedicated his botanical work to Hoare

John Landseer: did the engravings for William Scrope work on Scotland

Rowley Lascelles: when Lascelles lost his job with the Irish Record Commission, he got a Record Commission job in London through Lord Redesdale

Thomas Lawrence: painted John Nash

John Lee: with William Henry Smyth, built an observatory in his house and hired a permanent assistant astronomer; paid for William Henry Smyth publication on Roman medals

Daniel Lysons, Samuel Lysons: published on topography of most British counties

Frederic Madden: as an expert palaeographer, worked with John Payne Collier on the Shakespeare manuscripts

J.H. Markland: was published on English churches by Samuel Fox; aided John Britton with his Beauties of England; aided John Bowyer Nichols with his Literary Anecdotes; aided Thomas Frognall Dibdin with his Reminiscences

William Marsden: purchased the oriental coin collection of Robert Ainslie; was the anonymous author of the satirical Pursuits of Literature; was discovered by Dawson Turner

Thomas James Mathias: worked with John Bowyer Nichols on Illustrations of Literature

Samuel Rush Meyrick: friend of James Robinson Planché, Francis Douce; Planché helped Meyrick arrange his armour collection for public exhibitions; Edward Blore built Meyrick’s country house including a specially constructed armoury; Meyrick, Albert Way and Douce produced a lavishly illustrated, authoritative publication on the history of armour from the Conquest to Charles I; Meyrick’s book was promoted by Joseph Skelton; Meyrick assisted Thomas Dudley Fosbroke with his encyclopedia of antiquities, assisted Henry Shaw with Specimens of Ancient Furniture, Planché with his history of theatrical costume, Edward Wedlake Brayley with the Graphic & Historical Illustrator

John Bacon Sawrey Morritt: with James Dallaway travelled Greece and Asia Minor to survey Lecum and look for Troy

John Murray: worked on the 43 volume Family Library with Francis Palgrave

John Newman: employed by Robert Smirke on Covent Garden renovations, on General Post
Office
John Nicholl: succeeded William Scott Lord Stowell as King's Advocate in 1798
John Bowyer Nichols: with John Gough edited a history of Dorset; edited George Ormerod’s *Cheshire*, Hoare’s *Wiltshire*, Raine’s *North Durham*, Whitaker’s *Whalley*, Richard Yates’s work on St. Edmunds Bury Abbey; was printer to the SA; used John Britton’s work on Wiltshire in his work on Fonthill Abbey
John Gough Nichols: edited John Stockdale Hardy’s work on ecclesiastical law
Bernard Edward Howard 12 Duke Norfolk: gave a military commission to George Nayler for his interest in genealogy
Craven Ord: assisted Richard Gough with his *Sepulchral Monuments*; travelled with Gough; assisted John Nichols with his history of Leicestershire; assisted William Bray with his history of Surrey
Francis Palgrave: friend of Henry Hallam
Charles John Palmer: articulated to Robert Cory
Thomas Lister Parker: his sixteenth century home Browsholme was landscaped by Jeffrey Wyatville; friend to Charles Towneley; Parker’s letters were edited by Francis Robert Raines
Henry Petrie: taught dancing to Thomas Frognall Dibdin; Dibdin introduced Petrie to George 2 Earl Spencer; Petrie trained Thomas Duffus Hardy in historical research; Petrie, 2 Earl Spencer, and John Sharpe drew up the *corpus historicum*
Thomas Phillips: bought the house of Lord Northwick at his death (Thirlstane, Cheltenham) for his printing press and library
Thomas Phillips: painted portraits of Thomas Phillipps, William Jackson Hooker, Francis Chantrey, Samuel Thornton; painted literary figures for John Murray; contributed to John Nichols’ biography of Hogarth; Phillips and Chantrey founded the Artist’s General Benevolent Association; lived at Petworth; painted for George Wyndham 3 Earl Egremont
John Hugh Smyth Pigott: employed John Buckler as engraver for his works on Somersetshire
James Robinson Planché: worked with Charles Mitchell Kemble and Samuel James Arnold on historical dramas; Planché was friend to Henry Hallam, Hudson Gurney, Henry Crabb Robinson; Planché was encouraged by Francis Douce and Samuel Rush Meyrick to publish on the history of costume; Planché and Charles George Young accompanied diplomatic missions together to Portugal, 1858
Richard Powell: with William George Maton wrote a history of Rahere’s charter and St. Bartholomew’s Hospital
Samuel Prout: friend to John Britton as teens; walking tour of Cornwall; Prout illustrated Britton’s * Beauties of England and Wales*; lived together in London; Prout SA published books on art through John Yonge Akermann’s press
Thomas Rennell: contributed to Thomas James Mathias’ publication *Pursuits of Literature*; a friend to William Scott Lord Stowell and George Lord Kenyon
George Richmond: painted portrait of Francis Palgrave
Thomas Rickman: worked as an architect with William Whewell on the New Court of St. John’s Cambridge; partners with R.C. Hussey; competed for the Houses Parliament and Fitzwilliam Museum against Charles Robert Cockerell, Anthony Salvin, John Adey Repton, and Robert Smirke Jr.; published an analysis of Dawson Turner’s work on British architecture; was published by John Henry Parker; illustrated for Richard Colt Hoare’s publications
William Roberts: Commissioner into the Condition of Gaols with Benjamin Hobhouse, 1812
Samuel Rogers: hired Henry Stothard and Dawson Turner to illustrate his poetry books; Rogers’ extensive art and book collections were catalogued by Matthew Holbeche Bloxam; Rogers was a friend of Henry Crabb Robinson; and Richard “Conversation” Sharp
Charles St. Barbe: contributed to Richard Colt Hoare’s *Modern Wiltshire*
William Salt: employed John Buckler as engraver for his works on Staffordshire
John Shaw: articled to George Gwilt
William Shaw: given the living at Chelvey, Somerset by Charles Kemys Tynte
Henry Shaw: did the engravings for Charles John Palmer’s history of Yarmouth
Samuel Weller Singer: London bookseller; his customer Francis Douce became a friend; Douce left him an annuity when he died 1836; Richard Colt Hoare commissioned a portrait of Singer
Robert Smirke: collaborated on an English literature and history series with John Landseer; did engravings for the works of Benjamin Heath Malkin; teacher and employer of Charles Robt Cockerell
Sydney Smirke: restored Temple church with Decimus Burton; Conservative Club, St. James Street with George Basevi
Sir John Soane: employed George Basevi as apprentice; Robert Smirke Jr., David Laing were Smirke’s pupils; worked with Charles Robert Cockerell; John Bruce was Trustee for Soane’s Museum, John Britton catalogued Soane collections
William Sotheby: his guardian Charles Yorke 4 Earl Hardwicke, was friend to Samuel Rogers
Seth William Stevenson: his dictionary of Roman coins revised by Charles Roach Smith, illustrated by Frederic William Fairholt, completed by Frederic Madden SA
Henry Stothard: engraver for the works of Samuel Weller Singer
William Scott 1 Lord Stowell: friend to Henry Addington Viscount Sidmouth
George Sumner: made Bishop of Winchester by the influence of Henry 1 Marquis Conyngham’s wife who was a friend of George IV
George Ledwell Taylor: wrote biography of Robert Surtees; friend of Edward Cresy; walking tour of Europe with Cresy, partners in architect firm with Cresy
Charles Abbot 1 Lord Tenterden: at school with Samuel Egerton Brydges SA; rose to Chief Justice under Lord Eldon
Thomas Thomson: travelled, worked on botany and geology with Joseph Dalton Hooker
Arthur Trevor-Hill 3 Viscount Dungannon: wrote a history of William III with Henry John Todd Dawson Turner with Hudson Gurney bought the Macro and the Spelman manuscript collections; published on British architecture with Thomas Rickman; published on Samuel Woodward’s topographical drawings; William Jerdan and John Britton wrote biographies of Turner; Turner was business associate of John Murray; Murray got legal opinions about literary property from Turner; friend to Isaac and godfather to Benjamin Disraeli
Edward Vernon Utteron: friend to Thomas Frognall Dibdin who wrote a biography of him
E.C. Walcott: published on Medieval English Words using notes by J. Hunter
Richard Westmacott: did sculpture of Archbishop Howley
Edward James Willson: friend to Thomas Rickman and John Britton; Britton encouraged Willson to write about architecture; Willson contributed to Britton’s *Architectural Remains* and *Cathedral Antiquities*
Sir Jeffry Wyatville: did renovations to the houses of Marquis of Bath, Duke of Bedford, Earl Brownlow, Lord Gower, William Windham
Richard Yates: his pamphlet church building was praised by Nicholas Vansittart
Sir Charles George Young: helped Lord Braybrooke with an edition of Pepys
Appendix 2.C.5: Antiquaries Involved in Conflicts

George Frederick Beltz: as an expert in British genealogy, Beltz disproved Samuel Egerton Bryde's claim to title of Baron Chandos of Sudeley, and showed that parish registers had been tampered with to support this claim, no charges were laid

John Caley: as Subcommissioner of the Records Office he neglected his duties and mistreated medieval documents, received strong public criticism by William Illingworth

John Payne Collier: was very critical of Thomas Crofton Croker's Shakespeare Society edition of Massinger's play; numerous antiquaries including Henry Ellis and Frederic Madden asserted that the "Perkins Folio," alleged by Collins to be in the hand of Shakespeare, was in fact a forgery

Charles Wentworth Dilke: disagreed in print with John Britton about the authorship of the "Junius" letters; Dilke also criticised in print the antiquarian Trustees of the Royal Literary Fund for poor management

Isaac Disraeli: engaged in scholarly argument with George Nugent Grenville, Lord Nugent, over the royalist conclusion of Disraeli's life of Charles I; engaged in a print war with John Sidney Hawkins about details printed in Hawkins' history of music

James Orchard Halliwell (-Phillipps): married Henrietta d. Thomas Phillipps; Phillipps Sr. disowned both; Halliwell was accused of stealing manuscripts from Trinity College Library, Cambridge and forbidden to enter the British Library by Henry Ellis, Frederic Madden, and SA trustees

Godfrey Higgins: his writings on world religions were criticised by Thomas Smart Hughes; his work on Islam was criticised by Edward Upham, author on Buddhism, and by Thomas Smart Hughes

John Skinner: published on the location of Roman Camalodunum: Richard Colt Hoare published a book disagreeing and placing it elsewhere

William Jerdan: as editor of the Literary Gazette he published criticism of William Whewell; Whewell replied in print

Thomas Phillipps: declined membership in the Roxburghe Club, most of whose members were antiquaries, because it did not publish good work

Richard Sharp: published a critique of the 1808 Copenhagen expedition, Henry Crabb Robinson as Times correspondent argued for its justification

Sir John Sinclair: was President of the committee that published the false Gaelic odes of "Ossian;" William Shaw was among those who proved that they were forged

Samuel Weller Singer: argued in print about Shakespeare manuscripts with John Payne Collier; wrote a work on Anglo-Saxon which was critical of the work of Frederic Madden, Madden replied in print

Robert Smirke: his pro-revolutionary sentiments were disapproved of by the Royal Academy Council members, some of whom were antiquaries, which prevented him from being appointed Keeper in 1804

William Tite: objected in the House of Commons to George Gilbert Scott's Gothic-style plans for the New government Offices

Dawson Turner: wrote a verse vindication of Richard III which was turned down for publication by John Murray

John Wilson: criticised William Hamilton repeatedly in Blackwood's Magazine; Hamilton gave Wilson a pension of £300 yearly on retiring
APPENDIX THREE

Roman Tomb in the Necropolis of Cumae.

Transverse Section of the Wall.

Rough Kentish Ragstone / Green Sandstone

Two courses of Illas, 18½ x 12 and 14½ thick.

Rough Kentish Ragstone.

Two courses of Illas similar to those above.

Rough Kentish Ragstone, with
38 Ferruginous Sandstone interspersed irregularly.

Small rough Flints resting on a fine Loam.
Appendix Three, Number 4; C.R. Smith, *Archaeologia* 33(1849), No. XXV, "An Account of a Discovery of Early Saxon Remains at Barrow Furlong, on the Hill Farm, in the parish of Marston St. Lawrence, in the County of Northampton," pp. 326-34.
No. 1. Cist, showing position of skeleton, cover, &c.

2. Sand-stones set round the vault.

3. Large skeleton.

4. Traces of fire, with a skeleton laid at full length across.

No. 5. Two skeletons, with urn, spear, and piece of bone, &c.

6. Fragments of Roman, British, or Saxon pottery.

7. Several skeletons, with spear, fibula, &c.

TOMBS AT CHAIN TIFFIKA, MALTA.
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