

Durham E-Theses

The British archaeological association: its foundation and split

David Michael Wetherall

How to cite:

Wetherall, David Michael (1991) *The British archaeological association: its foundation and split*. Masters thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/6303/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

Abstract

**THE BRITISH ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION:
ITS FOUNDATION AND SPLIT**

David Michael Wetherall

Thesis submitted for Master of Arts degree.

Durham University, Department of Archaeology, 1991.

The thesis investigates the foundation of the British Archaeological Association (BAA) at the end of 1843, and its development over the next couple of years. In September 1844 the BAA held a week-long archaeological congress at Canterbury, the details of which are discussed. Although it was deemed a great success by those who participated, a number of influential antiquarians on the BAA's Central Committee did not attend. By the end of the year, a controversy had arisen amongst members of the Central Committee. This led to the Association splitting into two factions and ultimately resulted in the formation of the rival Archaeological Institute (AI) in 1845. The development of the split is followed in detail and the causes behind it assessed.

In order to put the BAA's foundation into perspective, other aspects of the antiquarian community in the 1840s are considered, together with wider movements in society. Particular attention is paid to parallels between the antiquarian and scientific communities in early Victorian Britain and the organisation of institutional bodies within them. Analogies are drawn between the Society of Antiquaries and the Royal Society, and between the establishment of the BAA and that of the British Association for the Advancement of Science (BAAS). Details of the formation of provincial and metropolitan learned societies and printing clubs in the first half of the nineteenth century are also considered. In particular, the Numismatic Society (founded 1836) and the Cambridge Camden Society (founded 1839) are looked at in order to throw light on factors behind the BAA's popularity.

The appendices include information about the BAA's Central Committee in 1844, and data on the membership of the BAA and AI in their first few years.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

T H E B R I T I S H
A R C H A E O L O G I C A L
A S S O C I A T I O N

I T S F O U N D A T I O N A N D S P L I T

DAVID MICHAEL WETHERALL

Thesis submitted for MASTER of ARTS Degree

University of Durham

Department of Archaeology

1991



- 8 SEP 1992

CONTENTS

Contents	i
Declaration and Statement of Copyright	v
Note on Abbreviations	vi
Note on Citations	vi
1 INTRODUCTION	1
Structure of the Thesis	
The Antiquarian Community	
Parallels Between Science and Antiquarianism	
The Concept of "Community"	
Outline of the Foundation and Split of the British Archaeological Association	
Note on Terminology	
2 SOURCES	11
Overview of the Contemporary Sources	
The Press and Coverage of Archaeological Matters	
3 ANTIQUARIANISM IN THE 1840s	21
Unfavourable Images yet Increasing Interest	
Nineteenth Century Geology	
The Antiquity of Man	
Prehistory and the Three Age System	
County Histories and Collections of Antiquities	
Archaeological Collections from Overseas	
Justification of Antiquarian Researches	
Archaeology as "Scientific"	
<i>The Archaeologist and Journal of Antiquarian Science</i>	
4 THE ORGANISATION OF THE ANTIQUARIAN AND SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITIES	35
The Society of Antiquaries	
The Royal Society	
The Geological Society	

The British Museum
The Department of Antiquities
Printing Clubs
Local Societies
The Cambridge Antiquarian Society
Lobbying for Government Support
Comparisons with Foreign Research

- 5 THE BRITISH ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE 55**
- The Decline of Science Debate
 - The Idea of a Meeting at York
 - Attendance at the York Congress
 - Harcourt and the Aims of the Association
 - The "Festival of Science"
 - The Future of the British Association
 - Critics of the British Association
 - Growth Not Decline
- 6 THE NUMISMATIC SOCIETY 70**
- The Desire for a Numismatic Society
 - Membership of the Numismatic Society
 - Numismatic Periodicals
 - The Assistant Secretary Dispute
 - Regulations for the Society
 - The State of Numismatic Science in Britain and Abroad
- 7 THE GOTHIC REVIVAL AND ECCLESIOLOGY 81**
- The Romantic Movement's Effect on Architecture
 - Pugin and the Gothic Revival
 - The Oxford Movement
 - The Cambridge Camden Society
 - The Decorated Style of Gothic
 - The "Science" of Ecclesiology
 - Ecclesiology and Antiquarianism

Other Architectural Societies
The 1845 Controversy within the CCS

- 8 THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE BRITISH
ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION 100
 The Idea of the British Archaeological Association
 The Aims of the Association
 The Central Committee
 Membership of the Association in 1844
 The Proceedings of the Central Committee
 The *Archaeological Journal*
- 9 THE CANTERBURY CONGRESS 112
 The Idea of an Archaeological Congress
 Attendance at the Canterbury Meeting
 The Meeting Itself
 The Reporting of the Canterbury Congress
 Publication of the Canterbury Proceedings
- 10 THE SPLIT 124
 Controversy over the *Archaeological Album*
 The Calling of the Special General Meeting
 The Results of the Special General Meeting
 The Dean of Hereford and Attempts at Mediation
 Controversy over Subscriptions
 Analysis of the Causes of the Split
- 11 THE BAA AND THE AI SUBSEQUENT TO
THE SPLIT 143
 The Strengths of the Two Factions
 The Support of the Clergy
 The Winchester Congresses
 Reporting of the Winchester Congresses
 The Two Journals after the Split
 Further Attempts at Reconciliation

12	CONCLUSION	156
	British Associations : for Science and for Archaeology	
	The Science - Antiquity Parallel	
	Causes and Effects	
	An Archaeological Parliament	

APPENDICES

A	Members of the 1844 Central Committee	164
	i Biographical Sketches	
	ii Comparison of Committee Membership Lists, Attendance at Canterbury, and Allegiance after the Split	
	iii Connections with Other Societies, 1842-1845	
B	Printing Clubs	179
C	Membership Statistics	182
	i The Growth of the British Archaeological Association in 1844	
	ii Breakdown of the British Archaeological Association by Letters and Occupation, September 1844	
	iii Breakdown of the British Archaeological Association and Archaeological Institute by Geographical Location, 1845	
	iv Division of the British Archaeological Association into the Wright and Way Factions	
	v Subscribers to the British Archaeological Association and Archaeological Institute, 1845-1849	
D	Article from the <i>Athenaeum</i> Concerning the Split	187
E	Resolutions Passed at the Special General Meeting, 5/3/1845	189

BIBLIOGRAPHY	192
Periodicals	
Circulars and Pamphlets	
Books and Articles	

Declaration

None of the material contained in this thesis has previously been submitted for a degree at Durham or any other university. All the research is the author's own.

Statement of Copyright

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without his prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

Note on Abbreviations

To avoid cumbersome repetitions of names, the following abbreviations have been used extensively in the text:

AI	Archaeological Institute
BAA	British Archaeological Association
BAAS	British Association for the Advancement of Science
BM	British Museum
CAS	Cambridge Antiquarian Society
CCS	Cambridge Camden Society
GS	Geological Society
NS	Numismatic Society
RS	Royal Society
SA	Society of Antiquaries

<i>Archaeol J</i>	<i>Archaeological Journal</i>
<i>A&JAS</i>	<i>The Archaeologist and Journal of Antiquarian Science</i>
<i>JBAA</i>	<i>Journal of the British Archaeological Association</i>

Note on Citations

A small number of my references do not conform strictly to the Harvard system since the context of many of the quotations is often of great importance. Giving just the author and date does not easily indicate the significance of a source without necessitating the reader making constant references to the bibliography. This is particularly the case when an author published a number of works in the same year, and when the specific source a quotation is taken from is of importance. By giving slightly more detailed references on occasion, it is possible for the reader to immediately perceive how widely read amongst contemporaries a quotation may have been.

Chapter 1**INTRODUCTION**

The British Archaeological Association was founded in December 1843. It rapidly gained substantial public support and proceeded to hold Britain's first archaeological congress. This highly successful meeting occurred in Canterbury in the summer of 1844. However, a year later, there existed two rival organisations, both calling themselves the British Archaeological Association, and both of which held congresses in Winchester. These two bodies had arisen from disagreements, within the governing Central Committee, which split the Association down the middle. This split is a prime example of a classic Victorian row. The protagonists indignantly denounced one another in pamphlets and the periodical press. The members of each side claimed that they alone represented the original Association and that their rivals had seceded. It was not until after the Winchester meetings that the confusion over two organisations bearing the same name was solved by one faction taking the title of "The Archaeological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland", whilst the other retained the original name.

The British Archaeological Association (BAA) and Archaeological Institute (AI) played a more significant role in early Victorian society than archaeology enjoys today, numbering politicians, prominent churchmen and polymaths such as Buckland and Whewell amongst their members. As with all historical research, the foundation of the BAA should be seen in the social context of the period. Thus the study of the British Archaeological Association's foundation is more than just an analysis of a mere antiquarian society, rather, it gives insights into the far wider Victorian culture within which it was set. The BAA was founded in the Age of Reform, after the Great Reform Bill of 1832, yet before the Chartist risings reached their peak in 1848. This period marked the rise of the middle classes, the prosperity of which

owed no small debt to the Industrial Revolution. The Great Exhibition of 1851 vividly indicated the industrial and technological advances of the preceding decade. The Industrial Revolution had affected the antiquarian community, not only by unearthing archaeological discoveries from industrial excavations, but also by its wider influences on society, such as improved communications and changing attitudes to work and leisure. Nineteenth century ideas of progress profoundly influenced the Victorian approach to studying the past. These ideas affected the way everything was seen by antiquarians, from the antiquity of Man to the development of architecture. Equally influential in shaping the perceptions of antiquarians were the social and intellectual networks within which they worked and the rigid class distinctions of their age. Even a cursory survey of Victorian Society and its attitudes to the past would be far beyond the scope of this thesis, but, in considering the influences behind the BAA and its early development, I hope to touch on some of these issues.

Structure of the Thesis

In this thesis I explore the establishment of the British Archaeological Association and a number of background factors behind its foundation. I also investigate the controversies within the Central Committee, and how they escalated into the rift which was to split the Association into two factions. The structure of the thesis falls into two main parts. Chapters 3-7 consider areas of thought directly relevant to the creation of the BAA, or which can be seen as illustrative of the format into which it developed. These chapters cover a number of different disciplines, but they are all relevant to the thesis as a whole because of similarities in their practitioners or subject-matter. My approach is one of analysing the institutions which governed the organisation of knowledge. This provides an understanding of the framework behind the structure of the BAA and the intellectual

climate in which it was founded. The approach involves a frequent use of analogy as a tool to highlight significant features within different organisations. The second main part of the thesis (Chapters 8-11), is an account and analysis of the actual founding of the BAA and AI and their first couple of years. An objective of this thesis is to add to modern knowledge of details of the BAA's foundation and split, which have received little modern attention, and to try to establish the real factors behind these matters. Chapter 2 is a discussion of contemporary sources which are used to investigate the development and split of the BAA. Another objective has been to bring the evidence together, since some of the sources are dispersed or uncommon (for instance, only a few copies of Dunkin's report on the Canterbury Congress were ever printed). The consequences of the early split within the British Archaeological Association are still with archaeology, for, despite several attempts at reconciliation and amalgamation over the last century and a half, the BAA and AI remain two distinct and separate societies today.

The Antiquarian Community

In her excellent *The Amateur and the Professional*, Phillipa Levine (1986) has distinguished between three distinct communities of Victorians interested in the past. These were Antiquarians, Historians, and Archaeologists; and the period she analysed was from 1838 to 1886. I believe, however, that it is only towards the end of this period that the separations between these communities can adequately be delineated. The historical community can be most easily defined by virtue of their dependence on written sources and their reasonably early development of a professional status based around academic studies at the universities. It is far less easy to demarcate a boundary between the antiquarian and the archaeologist in the 1840s, particularly since contemporaries used the terms almost interchangeably. The activities of antiquarians covered an enormous range of subjects,

spanning excavation, collection, translation of documents, topography, and ecclesiology.

"The true antiquary does not confine his researches to one single branch of archaeology; but in a comprehensive view surveys every fact; and aims to bring in every object to serve the great end and purpose of a knowledge of man and his habits and customs in past ages." (Dunkin, 1845).

To distinguish the archaeologist from the antiquarian is therefore no easy task. Levine has tried to define an identification for a separate archaeological community based on a concentration by archaeologists on artifacts and excavation; "they eschewed broad antiquarian concerns in favour of a more specific study of the material remains of the past." (Levine, 1986, 31). This definition for a separate community is too loose to serve any rigorous purpose for this thesis. Of greater value, is a distinction between the indigenous archaeology based on national antiquities and the more exotic archaeology centred around discoveries being made in the Middle East. Whilst both involved excavation, barrow digging in England was more akin to other antiquarian studies, than it was to the large-scale unearthing of remains in Mesopotamia. This study is on the whole concerned with the organisation of archaeology/antiquarianism within Britain rather than the Middle-Eastern archaeological discoveries - it is after all the *British* Archaeological Association which I am considering (but see Chapter 9).

I have made no rigid distinction between the terms "archaeological" and "antiquarian" in this thesis due to the points outlined above. The slight difference occasionally employed relates to the breadth of field. I have considered antiquarianism to imply a wider scope than archaeology. Thus, while most archaeologists were also antiquarians, not all antiquarians should be considered as archaeologists.

Parallels Between Science and Antiquarianism

My consideration of the background factors behind the establishment of the BAA is concerned not only with antiquarianism in the 1840s, but also with the scientific community of the time. There are several interesting parallels between the organisation of the scientific and antiquarian communities. Therefore I have discussed scientific learned societies in some detail to illustrate certain similarities with the development of archaeological societies. Many influential Victorians were involved in a wide range of intellectual disciplines. Those with an interest in science often also possessed an interest in the past. In fact, many antiquarians considered their studies to be "scientific", even in the increasingly specialised sense of the term. Thus I believe it is illuminating to investigate how the structures of scientific bodies were mirrored by the mechanisms through which discoveries of the past were communicated to those involved with antiquarian researches. A further link between science and antiquarianism was the changing perception of Time as a result of geological studies. As the antiquity of Man was extended back in time by scientific discovery, this inevitably had an effect on the development of archaeological thought.

Susan Cannon in her *Science in Culture* (1978) has identified a "Cambridge Network" which greatly influenced Victorian intellectual society. (Despite the name, a Cambridge affiliation is not a necessary qualification for determining the members of the network).

"The grouping was a loose convergence of scientists, historians, dons and other scholars, with a common acceptance of accuracy, intelligence and novelty. It was made up of persons, each of whom knew many but not all of the others intimately. Face-to-face contacts were sometimes regular, as with dons at the same college; sometimes often, as with the leading members of the council of a scientific society; and sometimes periodic, as with ... meetings of the British Association for the Advancement of Science." (Cannon, 1978, 30).

Cannon suggests that one node of this network consisted of Herschel, Babbage, Peacock, Airy, and Whewell; with Sedgwick, Willis, and Buckland also being linked in with it. Most of these names will crop up later in this thesis, both with regard to their activity in the scientific community and their interest in antiquity. All bar Willis are also identified by Morrell and Thackray (1981) as the "gentlemen of science" who shaped the early years of the British Association for the Advancement of Science (BAAS). Willis too was a key figure in the BAAS, being president of the Mechanical Science Section in 1839 and 1842.

A similar grouping to Cannon's "Cambridge Network" can be discerned in the antiquarian community. There were a number of prominent antiquaries who were heavily involved in several related societies and printing clubs (see Appendix A iii). Many of this network were to become involved in the British Archaeological Association.

There is no mistaking that the parallels between the BAA and the British Association for the Advancement of Science go far beyond the similarity of their names. As well as an overlap in key figures, their aims, concerns, and congresses all show close analogies (see Chapter 5). There are also significant parallels between the London Society of Antiquaries (SA) and the Royal Society (RS) (see Chapter 4). A third set of comparisons which I wish to make is between the relationships of the Numismatic Society (NS) and of the Geological Society (GS), to their parent bodies - the SA and the RS respectively, and also their relationships with the BAA or BAAS (see Chapters 4, 5 and 6). In each of these cases the antiquarian bodies seem to follow closely the behaviour of the scientific community a few years earlier. I explore the early development of the NS in detail (Chapter 6), because, as a newly-founded metropolitan antiquarian society, it foreshadows many of the features apparent in the BAA's establishment a few years later.

The other main subjects I discuss in the background material are ecclesiology and the Gothic Revival, which partly derived from the Romantic Movement, and were to profoundly effect architectural issues (Chapter 7). The ecclesiological movement was very closely related to antiquarian developments in the 1840s and was instrumental in the establishment of provincial architectural societies. Such local societies influenced the BAA and were, in turn, influenced themselves by it.

The Concept of "Community"

The term "community" has been extensively used above and throughout the thesis, thus some definition of it will be useful. At its broadest, I use it to include all those who saw themselves as connected, even if only loosely, with a general body of knowledge. More narrowly, it consists of those who published in specific fields and/or were active in relevant societies.

Shapin and Thackray have identified three categories for inclusion within the British scientific community from 1700 to 1900, and these can be modified to fit the antiquarian community.

- i "[Those] who published a scientific paper, book or pamphlet"
- ii "Those who formally and actively associated themselves with a scientifically-orientated society or institution, or themselves taught or disseminated scientific knowledge"
- iii "A large body of cultivators of science who patronized, applied or disseminated scientific knowledge and principles, but who themselves neither published science, taught science, nor actively associated themselves with scientifically-orientated institutions" (Shapin and Thackray, 1974, 12-13).

The phrase "cultivators of science", originally Bacon's, was used by contemporaries to refer to the wide body of people associated with scientific matters in the first half of the nineteenth century. Similarly, the antiquarian community can be seen to consist of "cultivators of antiquity", which group includes the antiquarian equivalents of Shapin and Thackray's categories,

together with collectors of manuscripts and antiquities, and those working with records or archives and in museums (Levine, 1986, 177).

Within the numerous body of cultivators, were a smaller number of the most active workers. In his *On the Constitution of the Church and State*, Coleridge had seen their role to be

"at the fountainheads of the humanities, in cultivating and enlarging the knowledge already possessed and in watching over the interests of physical and moral science" (Coleridge, 1839, 46).

Coleridge had envisaged a "clerisy" of the intelligentsia, forming a "national church of intellect". The clerisy consisted of both the larger body of cultivators and the smaller body of those "at the fountainheads". Although Coleridge's idea of a learned order directing the nation's knowledge never really existed as a conscious class, it was a popular concept and there were bodies which aspired to the role of a clerisy. Notably the "gentlemen of science", who provided the leadership of the BAAS, felt a responsibility to oversee British science (see Chapter 5). Similarly, the leaders of the BAA came to see their role as safeguarding and directing antiquarian researches for the benefit of a wider antiquarian community.

Outline of the Foundation and Split of the British Archaeological Association

The brief narrative outline below is given in order that the relevance of the background material, covered in the early chapters, can be seen to the establishment and split of the BAA. Appendix A gives some brief biographical details about the key personalities mentioned (these are noticed with "qv" when they first appear in the text). Chapters 8-11 discuss in far greater detail, with reference to various sources outlined in Chapter 2, the foundation of the Association, its first congress, and the split.

The Association was founded by Thomas Wright (qv) and Charles Roach Smith (qv), who were later joined by Albert Way (qv), the Director of the Society of Antiquaries. In the 1840s, the SA was widely perceived as moribund, and the BAA was formed to be a more active force in archaeological inquiry and preservation of antiquarian remains. It was intended to work in conjunction with the aims of the SA, and not to be a rival organisation. A Central Committee was set up to coordinate the Association, and correspondents from throughout the country were sought as members. A quarterly publication, the *Archaeological Journal* was begun to keep the members informed of the Association's activities. In September 1844, a week-long meeting was held at Canterbury. This was attended by about 150 people and consisted of lectures, conversaciones and archaeological excursions.

Towards the end of 1844, Wright published the first part of his *Archaeological Album*. This contained a report of the Canterbury Congress. Some of his colleagues on the Central Committee considered that it was improper of him to publish this as part of a private venture. This dispute in due course led to Lord Albert Denison Conyngham (qv), the president, resigning, and resulted in Thomas Joseph Pettigrew (qv), the treasurer, calling a Special General Meeting of the whole Association. This step was opposed by Way and a majority of the committee who declared the meeting invalid. Nevertheless the meeting went ahead, and it appointed a new committee. The old committee remained in existence, and around these two groups the two factions formed. Both factions met separately at Winchester in the summer of 1845, and thereafter it became clear that the split was permanent.

Note on Terminology

In discussing the split of the BAA, it can be confusing as to which group of people are meant when the Central Committee, or the Association as a whole, are referred to. This is because both

sides of the controversy persisted in calling themselves *the* Central Committee of *the* BAA. It was not until September 1845 that the Archaeological Institute adopted their new name. To avoid confusion, I have used the terms "Way faction" and "Wright faction" to distinguish between the two groups. This convention was used by the contemporary press to qualify references to *the* Committee. Whilst Way and Wright were clearly prominent on the different sides, this terminology is not meant to imply that the factions saw them as their leaders, although in Way's case this was largely so. "Wright faction" was adopted because its members supported Wright against what they perceived as personal attacks on his character, rather than saw themselves as his followers. In fact, Wright was on the whole less prominent in his party than Pettigrew (indeed, I have occasionally spoken of the Pettigrew faction), and no more prominent than Roach Smith, one of the original secretaries, and Wright's co-founder of the Association.

The two parties themselves tended not to use the term "faction" of the other, for to do so would imply almost equal status of their opponents with themselves, the *real* Central Committee. The Wright faction generally referred to the other party as "the seceders" and the Way faction spoke of the others as the "opposition Committee" or "Mr Pettigrew's Association".

The confusion over both parties using the same name was very real amongst contemporaries. For instance it resulted in subscriptions being paid to the wrong side, and people finding that they had unwittingly put their names down as supporters of the wrong body. It was also used by the Dean of Hereford as his excuse in trying to extricate himself from an embarrassing situation (see Chapter 10). The Way faction's decision to drop the contested title, thus ending the confusion, may be seen as a tacit concession to their rivals, but was also a sign of confidence in their strength as a body, no longer reliant upon the prestige of the original name.

Chapter 2

SOURCES

This Chapter gives an overview of the sources used to investigate the nature of the BAA, its foundation and split. The sources fall into a number of categories and are inevitably of varying value. Clearly, the period in which different accounts were written is of great importance in assessing their use. On the whole, I intend to confine myself to discussing the most contemporary sources, primarily those dating to 1844 and 1845, relating to the setting up of the BAA, its first congress, and the controversies which led to the split in its ranks and the breakaway of the Archaeological Institute. However, there are a couple of later accounts of these matters which were written by those directly involved several years after the events in question. Because I have quoted extensively from these throughout the thesis, it is important to explain their nature here in order that the context of their contribution can be understood.

I have used the writings of Charles Roach Smith extensively because they give an important, if personal, view of the early years of the BAA and those involved with it. Roach Smith was one of the key figures in the BAA and as such his later writings, if slightly altered from his original opinions with the benefit of hindsight, are a valuable guide to the workings of the BAA. I have particularly used his *Retrospections, Social and Archaeological*, published in three volumes between 1883 and 1891, which give an autobiographical account of aspects of his life, concentrating particularly on his acquaintances in the literary and antiquarian world. Roach Smith's private journal, *Collectanea Antiqua*, begun in 1843 and continuing through seven volumes until 1880, gives an insight into what he saw as important in archaeology. The last volume, in a biographical note of Thomas Wright, dwells on the foundation and split of the BAA. This provoked a letter from J H Parker in *The Antiquary* giving his (and

the Archaeological Institute's) side of the story (see Chapter 10).

Similar to Roach Smith's *Retrospections* is J R Planché's *Recollections and Reflections*, published in two volumes in 1872. This gives another autobiographical insight into the BAA, once again from a firm supporter of the Wright faction.

The controversy which led to the split resulted in several accounts of the actual foundation of the BAA and its subsequent development. The two rival sides both hoped to show on paper, both during and after the split, that their's was the legitimate continuation of the original Association, and so published pamphlets and articles to back up their claims. Inevitably these records, in places, fail to agree, and occasionally are directly contradictory. The schism in the Association became obvious in December 1844, although its main causes appear to lie with differences of opinion over the propriety of an archaeological congress, and the subsequent reporting of the first congress which had occurred at Canterbury in September 1844. Fortunately therefore the earliest documentary evidence relating to the Association's founding, which was written up until December 1844, can be judged to be reasonably accurate - or at least free from the partisan bias which forces interpretation of slightly later writings to be cautious.

Most of the conflicting statements by the rival factions disagree on details about how the split came about and escalated, rather than on the structure of the Association in its first year. However, since the roles of some of the Association's founders in its initial organisation were factors which led to the controversy, it should be borne in mind that documents written after or during the split, but relating to the BAA's origins, were being written with vested interests in mind. In the eyes of those outside the central antagonists, the legitimacy of the factions

depended, in part, on the actions of the key figures of the factions in the BAA's earliest days. For instance, the Dean of Hereford in his correspondence with Pettigrew subsequent to the split, writes how he joined the Central Committee of the Way faction due to his own high impression of Way who had personally persuaded him to join the original BAA in its earliest days. (Merewether to Pettigrew, 9/4/1845).

Overview of the Contemporary Sources

The following summaries are of articles or books relating to the foundation and split of the BAA. They are given in approximate order of composition. I have listed just the particularly relevant articles from the *Archaeol J* and the *JBAA* rather than considering the contents of the journals themselves, which is done specifically in Chapters 8 and 11, where the published proceedings of the Central Committee are also considered.

Introduction - Archaeological Journal 1, Number 1, March 1844, by Albert Way. This explains the reasons which led the founders to set up the BAA, and details its objects and the means proposed to attain them. Because of its early date it is the most reliable source giving a statement on the initial Association.

Circulars preceding the Canterbury Congress, including the initial notice and prospectus of the meeting, dated July 10th, 1844; and one entitled: *British Archaeological Association - Programme and list of the Committees for the First Annual Meeting, Canterbury, September 1844*. These set out the purposes behind holding a summer meeting, and give an indication of the extent to which the details of the congress were planned in advance.

Unpublished documentation concerning the *Proceedings of the Canterbury Congress*. In the library of the Society of Antiquaries there are large volumes for each of the summer meetings of the

BAA, 1844-1849. These were put together by Roach Smith and contain his correspondence pertaining to the organisation of the meetings. They also contain circulars and programmes of the congresses and newspaper clippings of the meetings. There are newspaper articles concerning the run-up to the Canterbury Congress and reporting its proceedings from fifteen different publications, both provincial and national. The presence of articles from so many different publications gives an extremely useful indication of the way the BAA's first congress was received by the media at large. Fortunately Roach Smith appears to have included adverse publicity (from the *Athenaeum* for instance) as well as the more favourable reports, so it is probable that his selection of clippings is not grossly biased to enhance his perception of the success of the meeting.

Proceedings of the Canterbury Meeting - *Archaeological Journal* 1, Number 3, September, 1844, 267-283. This is just a brief report by Wright on the first congress.

Suggestions for the Extension of the British Archaeological Association - *Archaeological Journal* 1, Number 4, December 1844, 297-300, by W Jerdan. This paper had been intended to be read at the Canterbury Congress, but was mislaid, and so was printed in the final number of the first volume of the journal. It was written before the discord within the Central Committee became apparent. The main suggestion was to establish a museum "to concentrate and arrange the products of [the BAA's] investigations".

Archaeological Album, or Museum of National Antiquities, published in early 1845, ed Wright. "The first part of [this] will be devoted to a detailed account of the proceedings of that [Canterbury] meeting and a description of the objects seen in the various excursions made on that occasion." (Taken from prospectus of the *Archaeological Album*, quoted in letter to *Gentleman's*

Magazine, N.S. 23, January 1845, 48). The proceedings of the congress occupied the first 42 pages. The final part of the album (published towards the end of 1845) was concerned with the Winchester Congress of the BAA.

A Report of the Proceedings of the British Archaeological Association at the First General Meeting held at Canterbury in the Month of September 1844. Ed A J Dunkin, early 1845. This volume was the unofficial proceedings of the first congress, published because the Central Committee refused to sanction an official volume. Only 174 copies were printed, with the intention that only those who attended the congress would be able to subscribe to the volume. The preface details the reasons for Dunkin publishing the proceedings, and sternly criticizes the bulk of the Central Committee.

A Verbatim Report of the Special General Meeting of the British Archaeological Association, Held at the Theatre of the Western Literary Institute, 5th March 1845. This record (which was taken in shorthand by T E Jones) of the Special General Meeting where the Wright faction asserted their claim as the upholders of the Association, includes a sketch of the history of the Association by Pettigrew, the treasurer of the Association who chaired the meeting. It is a detailed account and, since a number of those at the meeting were also in a position to be aware of the true facts, is likely to be a fairly trustworthy source for at least until the controversy began. However, all the speeches made at the meeting concerning the split were one-sided because the opponents of Wright and Pettigrew boycotted the meeting.

Statement, 19th March 1845, by Thomas Wright. This was apparently written in response to a request by Russell Smith in order that it should be published together with the Verbatim Report (qv) of the 5th March meeting. Wright had previously remained silent on the controversy which had originally been sparked by his publication

of the *Archaeological Album*. This statement gives his version of the events leading up to the split of the Council, and also refers, although only incidentally, to his and Roach Smith's original intentions concerning the ordering of the BAA.

A Report of the Substance of the several speeches at the Special General Meeting of the British Archaeological Association, Held ... 5th March 1845, ... appended to which are some Observations Upon the Proceedings. This report, which is similar to the Verbatim Report (qv), was written by A J Dunkin. The observations on the meeting are very much written from the Wright faction viewpoint.

A Narrative of Facts in reply to the ex-parte statements and representations of Mr Pettigrew and Mr Wright. Published in Oxford, printed by I Shrimpton. This is undated and does not bear any direct record of authorship, however from the text it is clear that it was written soon after the Special General Meeting report was circulated. It is also fairly certain that it represents a statement fully endorsed by that part of the Central Committee which followed Way. It touches on the initial foundation of the Association and the status of the *Archaeological Journal*, giving far greater prominence to the role played by Way than is recognised in accounts written by the Wright faction, but is mainly concerned with the background to the controversies in the Central Committee which led Pettigrew to call what, according to this document, was a null and void meeting, beyond the authority of the treasurer to call.

Preface to the first number of the *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, published on 30th April 1845. This statement was presented by the Central Committee appointed at the Special General Meeting of 5th March, and reiterates much of what was said by Pettigrew at that meeting.

Correspondence between John Merewether, the Dean of Hereford, and Thomas Pettigrew and Lord Conyngham. Published under the title of *The British Archaeological Association*, by Merewether, dated May 12th, 1845, in response to the publication of part of one of his letters to Pettigrew in the preface of the *JBAA*. In his introduction Merewether states: "I have felt it incumbent on me, having thus been brought into public notice, to print the correspondence which has arisen from the circular and notice which gave occasion to that letter [his first to Pettigrew, immediately before the Special General Meeting] and its consequences". By publishing this correspondence (which covers the period 26th February to 7th May 1845), Merewether hoped to show that the Wright faction, and in particular Pettigrew, had exacerbated the split and scorned his mediation.

Letter to the Very Reverend John Merewether, D.D., Dean of Hereford, in reply to the publication of his correspondence relating to the affairs of the British Archaeological Association, by T J Pettigrew, May 31st, 1845. This public letter answered the points and accusations made by Merewether and also defended the Wright faction from many of the claims made against it by the Athenaeum.

Presidential Address by the Marquis of Northampton and discussion at the Annual General Meeting of the (Way faction) Association in Winchester, 15th September 1845. Published in the report of the meeting in the *Archaeological Journal* 2, 314. It was at this meeting that the Way faction took to themselves the title of "The Archaeological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland". The president's speech runs over the grounds of the controversy once more. In such a speech he obviously has political points to make against the rival Association, though by this period the origins of the split are no longer quite so important, the split being apparently irreconcilable.

Preface to third number of *JBAA*, 8th October 1845. This response to remarks made in the *Archaeological Journal*, "the avowed Journal of the Archaeological Institute", and to parts of the presidential address at the Winchester meeting of the AI, was written by the Central Committee of the BAA in "justification of their own conduct".

The Press and Coverage of Archaeological Matters

At least ten national publications reported on the BAA's meeting at Canterbury. Not surprisingly, the daily press only usually reported particularly newsworthy events of an archaeological nature, whereas there were some periodicals which had regular columns covering antiquarian discoveries and meetings. The *Gentleman's Magazine* had contained a wealth of information on archaeology and antiquity since 1824, especially with Roach Smith's "Antiquarian Notes". Other upper middle class weekly publications such as the *Athenaeum* and the *Spectator* also frequently contained articles of antiquarian interest. The *Athenaeum*, a magazine "devoted to the arts, literature, and sciences", was highly scathing of the BAA at Canterbury, however the weekly *Illustrated London News*, which catered to a less exclusive class of readership, was more praiseworthy in its reporting, although it failed to provide illustrations of the meeting due to misunderstandings about the final form of the publication of the proceedings (see Chapter 9).

In addition to the general periodicals, there were some journals devoted entirely to antiquarian matters. *Collectanea Antiqua* was privately published by Charles Roach Smith from 1843 (although the title page of the first volume is dated 1848). It appeared irregularly and contained articles, which were often illustrated, covering a broad range of British and overseas antiquarian discoveries, for example, "Roman Glass Vessels in the Museum at Boulogne-Sur-Mer" and "Ancient Sepulchral Relics at Barming, Kent"

(*Collectanea Antiqua* 1, 1848, 1-2 and 183-203). The *Archaeologist and Journal of Antiquarian Science* was a highly ambitious periodical which aimed to concentrate exclusively on antiquarian researches. It began in 1841 but only lasted for ten monthly numbers despite the enthusiasm of Halliwell and Wright, its editors (see Chapter 3).

There were also a few periodicals which kept Victorians in the 1840s informed of developments in the world of architecture. The interest in architecture increased markedly after the Cambridge Camden Society (CCS) began publishing the *Ecclesiologist* (see Chapter 7). Weale's *Quarterly Papers on Architecture* was aimed more towards the professional architect than was the *Ecclesiologist*, and was often critical of the CCS which it saw as being dominated by amateurs. Aimed at a different class of readership was *The Builder* which began in 1843. This was "within the reach of art workmen and students" and took the form of

"an illustrated weekly record of professional news. Without pretending to an exclusive devotion to Gothic, it became the means as time went on of familiarising the general public with many a relic of antiquity" (Eastlake, 1872, 218).

Another publication of the 1840s was *Aunt Elinor's Lectures on Architecture* which aimed at informing young ladies of the general history of the Pointed Styles and other matters relating to ecclesiastical architecture. The popularity of this matches the interest shown by ladies in the new archaeological congresses and in local archaeological/architectural societies.

The sort of press coverage that antiquarian matters received in the 1840s is similar to that received by the scientific community. The periodicals which reported on the meetings of scientific societies also often reported antiquarian society meetings. This reflects how the upper and middle class Victorian interest in natural philosophy was often accompanied by an interest in antiquity and the arts (Knight, 1975, 101). Coverage by general

periodicals of scientific and antiquarian developments was important in raising public interest in both these areas (see Chapter 4).

Chapter 3

ANTIQUARIANISM IN THE 1840s

Unfavourable Images yet Increasing Interest

The public conception of antiquarians in the early nineteenth century was not always complementary. Their almost obsessive interest in seemingly worthless artifacts was often the subject of ridicule. Charles Dickens entertainingly caricatured the zeal of the antiquary with Pickwick's excitement at discovering an engraved stone. The antiquarians

"entered into a variety of ingenious and erudite speculations on the meaning of the inscription.... heart-burnings and jealousies without number, were created by rival controversies which were penned upon the subject - and Mr Pickwick himself wrote a Pamphlet, containing ninety-six pages of very small print, and twenty-seven different readings of the inscription." (Dickens, 1836-7, (World's Classics edition, 1988), 135).

The discovery resulted in Pickwick being elected an honorary member of seventeen native and foreign societies. Thus, when the down-to-earth Blottom tried to show the inscription read "Bil Stumps, his mark", his statement was received with contempt by the learned antiquaries. The volley of pamphlets Dickens then describes really did reflect the way the Victorian antiquarian community was liable to act. Blottom wrote one

"intimating his opinion that the seventeen learned societies aforesaid, were so many "humbugs". Hereupon the virtuous indignation of the seventeen learned societies being roused, several fresh pamphlets appeared; the foreign learned societies corresponded with the native learned societies, the native learned societies translated the pamphlets of the foreign learned societies into English, the foreign learned societies translated the pamphlets of the native learned societies into all sorts of languages; and thus commenced the celebrated scientific discussion so well known to all men, as the Pickwick controversy." (Ibid., 136).

It seems a shame Dickens did not poke fun at the BAA during its acrimonious split, of which little exaggeration would have been needed to produce a farce!

Dickens indicates the derision with which antiquaries could be treated, but he also reveals the commitment which they had for their studies. By the 1840s, public interest in antiquity was rapidly growing. The old-style "dry-as-dust" antiquaries were still to be found at the Society of Antiquaries (see Chapter 4), but the popular following which antiquarian researches were gaining was increasingly active. A number of contributory causes for the increase in antiquarian interest can be identified. These range from Romanticism to the Ecclesiological Movement, and from Victorian ideals of progress to the popularity of the new science of geology. The influence of the Romantic Movement on the Gothic Revival and Ecclesiology, and their effect on other antiquarian studies, is discussed in Chapter 7.

Views of progress were beginning to affect intellectual thought in many disciplines, and would later be instrumental behind the success of social evolutionary doctrines such as Spencerism. It should be noted, however, that Darwinian evolution avoided an inevitability in the direction of evolution which earlier progressive evolutionary theories (such as Lamarckism) had possessed. The anonymously published *Vestiges* (1844) was an extremely widely read synthesis of quasi-evolutionary ideas - from the creation of the World to Man's place in nature. This work, despite its generally scientific subject matter, was also concerned with the past, and thus came within the domain of the antiquarian.

Nineteenth Century Geology

Geology came into its own in the early nineteenth century, and was to have a profound effect on the development of archaeology. The factors behind the rise of Geology, especially as a pursuit for the new middle classes, were widespread and varied. Many of these, which have been identified by Porter, were also significant for the Romantic Movement (see Chapter 7) and in raising the

popularity of antiquarian researches.

"The spread of literacy, the commercialization of leisure, and the rise of consumerism in Enlightened England together created a demand, a market, and a supply, of popularized science, in the form of text-books, encyclopedias, lectures, and museums ... spurred by increased travel, better roads and inns, enhanced leisure, and the development of resorts, topographical writers and poets, landscape painters and engravers, tourist guides and souvenir vendors came forward to make a new living out of burgeoning scientific interest in the Earth. Provincial culture matured to serve local economic needs and clothe the first generation wealth - and thereby local pride provided a supply of regional geologists." (Porter, 1978, 815-6).

As well as links in the background causes behind their growth, geology and antiquity have other ties. Once geologists had accepted the principles of stratigraphic succession, it was only a matter of time before stratigraphy was adopted as a basis for archaeological excavation, and thus archaeology gained an extensive time dimension. However it was to be a number of years after the foundation of the BAA before this was accepted.

Geology was a highly popular and respectable science in which to be engaged. The Geological Society was founded in 1807 (see Chapter 4), and Section C (Geology and Physical Geography) of the BAAS was very active and well-attended. As a new science, there was much which the amateur could discover, and the continual theoretical debates over how to interpret geological findings made it a subject of great interest. The popularity of geology was enhanced by the entertaining lectures of men such as Sedgwick and Buckland. In 1838 Rev Adam Sedgwick, Professor of Geology at Cambridge, delivered an impromptu geological lecture at the Newcastle meeting of the BAAS. This was attentively listened to by over 3000 people. Rev William Buckland was an outgoing eccentric who had become Reader of Mineralogy at Oxford in 1813, and six years later became Oxford's first Reader in Geology. He played a prominent part at the Canterbury Congress of the BAA in 1844, and at meetings of the AI thereafter, and was also active at

BAAS congresses. In his geological views, he tried to reconcile evidence from fossils with his belief in the universal deluge of the Bible. He published these catastrophist ideas in *Reliquiae Diluvianae* (1823). By the time of his Bridgewater Treatise of 1836 (*Geology and Mineralogy considered in relation to Natural Theology*), his viewpoint had altered slightly and he postulated a whole series of catastrophies, but nevertheless still followed the natural theology approach. Buckland managed to combine his science with religion, and in 1845 he became Dean of Westminster.

Opposition to the catastrophism of geologists such as Buckland, Cuvier and Conybeare gradually gained ground. The uniformitarianism first advanced by Hutton at the end of the eighteenth century, was taken up by "Strata Smith" and later Lyell. They held that geological formations must be accounted for by processes which could be observed at the present time. If the agencies, and therefore rates, of deposition and erosion were no different from in the present, then a very great age was implied for the World. Lyell's highly influential *Principles of Geology* was published in the 1830s and helped fuel the debate into the age of the Earth and the antiquity of Man.

The Antiquity of Man

Archbishop Ussher's date of 4004 BC for the creation of the World (based on the Mosaic chronology) was still widely accepted in the 1840s, despite the recent advances in geology. Even those who had been convinced by geological evidence that the Earth was far older, still tended to accept the Bible's implication that the whole of mankind's history fitted into less than six thousand years. Work such as Father MacEnery's in Kent's Cavern (1825-1841), which indicated the coexistence of Man and extinct species at very remote times in the past, was either ignored by the antiquarian community or explained away. Buckland refused to accept MacEnery's evidence, firmly believing that it was possible

to reconcile the apparent evidence of the fossils with Biblical accounts of the creation of Man.

MacEnery died in 1841, and it was a number of years before his discoveries gained the recognition they deserved. In 1847 the *JBAA* contained an "Account of Some Ancient British Antiquities, discovered a few years ago in Kent's Cavern, Near Torquay, Devon." However, the author agreed with Buckland's Bridgewater Treatise that burial of human remains with extinct animals affords no proof of the time when the human remains were introduced.

"The circumstance in this instance, of a portion of the relics being covered by a crust of stalagmite two feet thick, points to a very high antiquity, but may undoubtedly be explained by the agency of natural causes, in operation since the period ordinarily assigned to the first settlement of the Celtic population of this island. Their antiquity is unquestionably very remote, but nevertheless incomparable with the superior antiquity of the bones of those extinct species of animals with which they were associated." (Smart, 1847, 174).

The Torquay Natural History Society (founded in 1844) appointed a committee under Pengelly to investigate the Cavern, but it was not until 1858 that conclusive evidence of Man's antiquity came to be accepted in scientific circles. This was mainly a result of further work conducted by Pengelly (funded by the BAAS and the Geological Society) at Brixham cave where undisturbed strata were painstakingly investigated. It is interesting to note that the archaeological community played no direct role in these matters, leaving such investigations in the hands of the those who saw themselves primarily as geologists.

Prehistory and The Three Age System

The lack of direct interest by most British antiquaries in the remains of ancient man was partly a result of their inadequate conception of prehistory. Their tendency was to class all antiquities which were pre-Roman together under the title of

Celtic. Thus reading Akerman's *Archaeological Index* of 1847 reveals

"on the whole, an attitude little different from that of Colt Hoare and Cunnington, and emphasises that, until the Danish antiquarian revolution had been assimilated, English antiquarianism had come to a dead end." (Daniel, 1975, 79).

Daniel is too sweeping in condemning the whole of English antiquarianism like this, but it is true that prehistoric archaeology was constrained by theories of the past which related artifacts to only those races whose existence was recorded historically.

The Danish antiquarian revolution began in 1819 with C J Thomsen developing his "three age" system for the classification of Scandinavian artifacts. By the 1830s this had been accepted as a useful method for classifying ancient remains by other Scandinavian and German antiquarians. The most important of these was J A A Worsaae who was to become Supreme Director of the Museums of Ethnology and Northern Antiquities. Daniel says of the northern antiquaries:

"They realised that taxonomy was at the basis of dealing with the intractable material before them. They were applying the methods of Linnaeus to artifacts." (Daniel, 1975, 47).

The three age system however had little influence in England until after Lord Ellesmere translated Thomsen's museum guide of 1836 into English in 1848 as *A Guide to Northern Antiquities*. Worsaae's most influential work (which was published in Denmark in 1843), was translated into *The Primeval Antiquities of Denmark* by Thoms in 1849. It was

"a small book which was to prove epoch-making in its grasp of the subject and its lucidity of style. Seven thousand copies were distributed, an unusually large number." (Klindt-Jenson, 1975, 70).

Daniel says of these two works: "To archaeology they were as important as was Lyell's *Principles* to geology." (Daniel, 1975, 45). But even once Thomsen's three age system was known in England it had strong opponents such as Thomas Wright, although

John Lubbock (later Lord Avebury) adopted it in his "Prehistoric Times" (1865). Wright never accepted the system, opposing it as "specious and attractive in appearance but without foundation in truth". (Wright, 1892 (preface of 1874), vi).

Thomsen's approach incorporated ideas of progress, although this was as a result of invasion rather than internal evolution within societies. The abrupt invasions he postulated are, in conception, reminiscent of the catastrophist interpretation of geology. His classification of artifacts into stone, bronze and iron periods, and the acceptance that these represented peoples of whom there was no historical record, constituted the basis of the antiquarian revolution. However,

"It is clear that, with a few exceptions, British antiquaries were not aware of, or not impressed by, the great impetus to research already provided by the Danish prehistorians." (Daniel, 1975, 81).

County Histories and Collections of Antiquities

British antiquarian work in the years before the establishment of the BAA was concentrated primarily in the form of county histories. These topographical and historical surveys were often life works, which could only be successfully undertaken with the assistance of others within the antiquarian network. Levine picks up on the mutual cooperation of antiquaries as one of the factors that bound them together as a self-conscious community, the members of which were almost all known to each other. (Levine, 1986, 19). The county histories included such works as Surtees' *History of Durham* (1816-1840), Richard Colt Hoare's *History of Modern Wiltshire* (1823-37), and John Rokewode Gage's various Suffolk histories.

The growth of local archaeological societies and natural history field clubs were in some ways a development from the earlier county histories.

"Many of the county societies saw their major function as being the collective organisations in which successful local history could come to fruition. John Britton, towards the end of a lifetime of antiquarian experience, maintained that a good county history had "never yet been written by one person; nor is it likely that it ever will". (Ibid., 20).

Another main channel of antiquarian activity was the accumulation of collections. Many of the key figures in the BAA's early years amassed large collections of antiquities. Charles Roach Smith built up an extensive collection of London antiquities which he acquired from workmen on building sites. This was sold to the British Museum in 1855 and now forms the core of the Romano-British collection. Other antiquarians specialised in collecting books and manuscripts. Most antiquarians were keen to show off their private collections to interested visitors. Thus, the Fausett collection of Saxon antiquities was visited by members of the BAA during the Canterbury Congress (see Chapter 9). The following year, at the AI's Winchester Congress, large numbers of antiquities were exhibited throughout the week in the Deanery. These ranged from "Egyptian and Etruscan Antiquities" through to "Decorative Pavements, Tiles, and Casts". (*Proceedings at AI Winchester Congress, 1846, xxxix-liv*).

Archaeological Collections from Overseas

The largest collection of antiquities was clearly the British Museum (BM). Yet the BM's collections grew piecemeal, generally due to insufficient funds to purchase antiquities and then insufficient space to house or display them (see Chapter 4). The trustees of the BM also showed a marked distaste for non-classical antiquities. However, the eighteenth century prejudice against anything other than Greek or Roman, slowly began to decrease as the Egyptian and Assyrian collections grew up. It was still to be a while before British antiquities were given attention or space, but by the 1840s Near and Middle Eastern archaeology were increasingly prominent in the eyes of the public.

During the 1820s the BM had received Egyptian antiquities from travellers and antiquaries such as Henry Salt. Another traveller, Claudius Rich, realised as early as 1815 the archaeological potential of the Euphratis-Tigris area, which was to be exploited in the 1840s by Austen Henry Layard. The Mesopotamian excavations at sites such as Nimrud, are among the most outstanding of the archaeological expeditions funded by the BM. Layard made many important discoveries about the Assyrian civilization in his excavations at Nineveh. The priceless treasures which he collected reached the British Museum in 1848, although it was several years before they could be properly housed. The work on Nineveh captured the public imagination and accounts of the progress of the excavations were widely read in the press, indicating the public interest in archaeology. Layard's *Nineveh and its Remains* (1848) "immediately became one of the earliest and most successful bestsellers - eight thousand copies were sold in one year." (Daniel, 1981, 75).

Justification of Antiquarian Researches

The antiquarians were aware of the ridicule of their pursuits from writers such as Dickens, and so repeatedly tried to justify their studies to their contemporaries. The Victorians felt a conscious need to employ their leisure time fruitfully.

"Recreation needed to include the Victorian attributes of being purposeful, utilitarian, fortifying and efficacious.... the true gentleman ... could not be seen to idle away his leisure hours but must add to his respectability by ... undertaking some form of earnest, self-improving education. Archaeology was just such a respectable pursuit." (Brookes, 1985, 203-4).

In studying nineteenth century archaeology, it is important to bear in mind that its practitioners were confident in the value of their subject as more than just an intellectual pastime. Roach Smith wrote:

"it must ever be borne in mind, that the science which these collections [of antiquities] promote is one of the highest consideration, that it might be made of great public utility,

and without which every system of education must be incomplete." (Preface to *Collectanea Antiqua* 1, 1848, vii).

John Yonge Akerman introduced his highly influential *Archaeological Index* by observing the increased interest in archaeology:

"With such evidence of an improved taste and zeal for the cultivation of Archaeological science, it would be needless to plead for its usefulness. To the reflecting mind the fact that Providence has veiled us from the future, and given us the past for retrospect and experience, is alone sufficient to justify the occupation of our leisure in the examination and elucidation of the remains of Antiquity, but more especially of those which pertain to our own country." (Akerman, 1847, vi).

Antiquarians believed that, like the physical sciences, their studies provided "useful knowledge" which could help maintain the fabric of society. This was partly achieved by reinforcing Victorian national ideals.

"The three historical communities all shared a strong sense of national duty and of national pride, revelling in the bygone feats of their country." (Levine, 1986, 4).

In addition, there was a strong sense that archaeology provided a common ground on which people of different beliefs could unite in what was otherwise a troubled period. In a similar way, the founders of the BAAS had stressed how the scientific disciplines straddled differences across society. In discussing the Canterbury Congress, Wright's comments echo those made about the British Association congresses for the previous dozen years:

"the Townhall (which had more frequently been the scene of municipal or political contention) was occupied almost daily with the peaceful discussion of subjects in which, for once, all differences of station and party were softened before the humanizing influence of science." (Wright, 1845, 2).

Archaeology as "Scientific"

A number of the quotations given above referred to archaeology as "science", for, like a great many other disciplines in the period, it aspired to the status of an exact science. Antiquarians

believed their methods to be sufficiently rigorous to join the body of organised knowledge headed by the natural sciences. Such beliefs were particularly prevalent amongst numismatists and ecclesiologists (see Chapters 6 and 7). The attitude was typified in a paper on "The Objects and Advantages of Architectural and Archaeological Societies":

"in scientific enquiry ... our studies may be placed on a level with those of any other science" (J Thompson, 1869, 154).

Although Wright more cautiously warned of the antiquarian:

"His science, however, is as yet but very imperfectly developed, but the difficulties which stood in the way of its advance are now in great measure cleared away, and we may hope it is making a steady and satisfactory progress." (Wright, 1892, (preface of 1874), vi).

A number of years later the principles for these claims were clearly stated:

"The basis of the physical sciences is exact measurement. Archaeology, then, may be said to be a science, the ultimate object of which is to deduce from the materials at its disposal a consistent theory of the history of man, as manifested in the works he has produced, and of the development of his civilization and culture in past ages." (Allen, 1884, 235-6).

The inductive ideal in science meant that a great emphasis was placed on facts as opposed to theorizing. The controversies which divided the geological community were generally over the different theoretical interpretations of generally accepted data. Over-reliance on hypotheses was suspect in the sciences, which paid at least lip-service to Baconian empirical ideals. Bacon's philosophy enjoyed a resurgence in the nineteenth century, although John Herschel believed it needed extending and Rev William Whewell rejected much of it as too naive. Whewell's philosophy of science owed much to Newton and the deductive methods of mathematics, which led him to believe that ideas were as important as facts. It took a while for Whewell's inductivism with its deductive element to gain ground against those who

believed in a simple Baconian inductive approach. Indeed many people seem not to have realised the deep differences between the two philosophies, but henceforth most people aimed to be more rigorous in their methodology. It was the inability of the phrenologists to indicate a firm foundation in fact for their discipline that prevented them gaining status as a recognized science within the BAAS. Statistics had managed to gain representation as a section within the BAAS due to the influence of Babbage, but this was only so long as it confined itself to numerical data and did not become embroiled in the political philosophy which might question the existing social order (Morrell and Thackray, 1981, Chapter 5). Archaeology was therefore keen to stress its empirical basis in order to maintain its claim to scientific status. Roach Smith writes:

"The notion that a record of *facts*, copiously illustrated but sparingly dilated with theory, would be acceptable to the antiquary and to the historical inquirer, is proved to have been well founded." (Preface to *Collectanea Antiqua* 1, 1848, v).

The same view was held by the press:

"we wish it to be understood that, holding a strong opinion of the relative value to FACTS and THEORIES in all antiquarian pursuits, we shall be found attaching infinitely more consequence to the former, however slight, than to the latter, however ingenious. In short, we consider ONE FACT to be worth TEN HYPOTHESES" (*Literary Gazette*, no 1444, 21/9/1844).

The *Archaeologist* and *Journal of Antiquarian Science*

To conclude this chapter, I wish to look in detail at an archaeological periodical which neatly illustrates the state of British antiquarianism in the early 1840s. *The Archaeologist and Journal of Antiquarian Science* was a monthly publication which began in September 1841 and lasted until its tenth number in June 1842. It was edited by James Orchard Halliwell and Thomas Wright. Halliwell (later Halliwell-Phillips) was a mathematician by origin, but had become interested in antiquity at Cambridge where,

like Wright, he was an undergraduate at Trinity. He had been elected both an FSA and FRS in 1839 at the age of only eighteen, being sponsored to the latter by Barnwell of the British Museum and supported by such distinguished names as Whewell, Peacock, Sedgwick, Hawkins, Ellis and Baden Powell (M W Thompson, 1990, 14 and *DNB*). Halliwell had been the original mover behind the Cambridge Antiquarian Society (see Chapter 4), and also contributed towards the BAA. In 1844 however, he was to fall into disrepute when it transpired that he had stolen papers from the Trinity library. Halliwell and Wright noticed a gap in the market of periodical literature which their new journal could fill as "the only one exclusively devoted to antiquarian subjects." This was not to disparage the *Gentleman's Magazine*

"which has been for years, and we hope will for ever continue to be the zealous advocate of antiquarian literature ... We entirely disavow any idea of rivalry, and, by our labours in a more confined sphere, hope in time to render this unpretending periodical a worthy companion to its excellent contemporary." (*A&JAS* 1, 1841, 4).

This desire not to tread on established toes anticipates the BAA's claim not to rival the Society of Antiquaries. Many of the aims of the new journal were also to be followed by the BAA. These aims were: to review new archaeological publications; to report on the proceedings of antiquarian societies, including foreign ones "which have not hitherto appeared in any English Journal"; to review little-known curious old books; and to publish original essays. The editors wished their journal "to become a depository for the preservation of notices of antiquarian studies". Of their reviewing policy they wrote:

"We shall endeavour to make our reviews fair, and in general our criticism shall be lenient; but we do not lose sight of the fact that we are unavoidably taking upon ourselves the office of censor, and we, therefore, feel ourselves to be severe, when severity is called for." (*Ibid*, preface, iii-iv).

The *A&JAS* followed its aims and is a very readable journal. It took particularly seriously the task of reporting on antiquarian

societies and printing clubs, having long articles on the Oxford Ashmolean Society, the Cambridge Antiquarian Society, and the Cambridge Camden Society; and short notices on the Percy, Camden, Oxford Architectural, and Anglo-Saxon Societies. In addition, the opportunity was not missed to point out the success of the French antiquarian community with its official patronage (see Chapter 4):

"The French government is doing much for the encouragement of archaeological and historical inquiries, and its enlightened exertions cannot fail to be productive of good results." (Ibid, 47).

Despite its appeal and the enthusiasm of its editors, the *A&JAS* did not survive a whole year, perhaps due to the over-ambitious monthly publication. However, the factors which had led to its establishment and which had given hope to its editors, were still present. These factors were to provide the basis for the foundation, also by Wright, of the Archaeological Association with its own journal, eighteen months later. Although originally part of the opening address of the first number of the *A&JAS*, the following passage about archaeology in the 1840s could equally well have served in the introduction to the *Archaeological Journal* of the BAA:

"Never, perhaps, in the history of learning, have more rapid and essential changes taken place in any one branch of knowledge than the last few years have produced in the study of antiquities. By the exertions of the modern school of antiquaries, a new face has been put on archaeology; and its professors, for a long while the ridicule of a majority, have taken their deserved station amongst the real scholars of the day.... we will ... endeavour to imbue the public mind with a more favourable feeling than it has hitherto had towards antiquarian researches, the utility and importance of which, *when properly directed*, are unquestioned by everyone who admits the value of HISTORY." (*A&JAS* 1, 1841, 2).

Chapter 4

**THE ORGANISATION OF THE ANTIQUARIAN
AND SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITIES**

The Society of Antiquaries

The prestigious London Society of Antiquaries, which dates from 1707 and received its Charter of Incorporation in 1751, was by the 1840s intellectually bankrupt. The meetings were almost always thinly attended, and the standard of papers (when there were any) tended to be poor in quality. With embarrassing frequency the secretary was forced to present papers which had already been delivered elsewhere, or else to just read manuscripts from the British Museum. Joan Evans says of the Antiquaries at this period:

"One of the great difficulties of the Society lay in the fact that its meetings were frequently extremely dull, and that their dullness was widely recognised." (Evans, 1956, 239).

Other aspects of the Society's internal organisation were appalling. This was especially true of its financial management. In 1827 Sir Nicholas Harris Nicolas objected to how the accounts were not even inspected let alone discussed before being accepted. He also criticized subsidies of society dinners, and the lack of attempts to recover money owed to the Society as subscriptions (*ibid.*, 243). From the 1820s to the mid 1840s much of the Society's investments were sold, mainly to meet the cost of its publications. As Nicolas had realised, one of the chief financial problems was the numbers of members in arrears with their subscriptions. In 1843 the Council finally decided to remove its defaulters, expelling 42 members - one of whom was 30 years behind in payments! At one stage even one of the auditors was seven years in arrears with his subscriptions! (*Ibid.*, 245).

In 1838 the SA had 708 members, of whom 14% were titled. But by 1844 the membership had fallen to 568. Many members of the

Council never attended, and even the president, the Earl of Aberdeen, took little interest in the Society, seeing it more as a social club. The inactivity of the Council was a matter for grave concern amongst some of the fellows such as Nicolas. But when he tried to encourage reform he was so thwarted by the officers of the Society that he resigned. Other fellows also resigned due to disillusionment with the Society and its Council. Aberdeen had become president in 1812, but his absorption in politics meant that he seldom attended the Society's meetings. He only presided twice in the 1838-9 session, and then never attended again. However it was not until 1845 that he finally resigned as president writing that,

"the present state of the Society requires from its President a degree of personal attention much greater than it would be possible for me to afford" (*Proceedings of the SA* 1, 26/3/1846, 129).

Viscount Mahon (later Lord Stanhope), one of the vice-presidents, was elected in Aberdeen's place, despite his belief that Hallam would make a better president. Mahon was primarily a historian, as opposed to being an antiquarian, but he did play a far more involved role in the Society than his predecessor. The composition of the Council was also gradually changing to those with greater interest in the past. From 1845 there were still serious problems, however, perhaps under the spur of the new Archaeological Association and Institute, the SA slowly became a serious learned society again.

The Society began to publish its *Proceedings* in 1843 under the superintendence of Albert Way, the Director. Way was one of the few competent antiquarians in the Society and played a key role in setting up the Archaeological Association (and in its subsequent split). It was the internal decay within the Society in the 1830s and early 1840s which prompted some of its members who were serious antiquarians to organise the BAA. They were careful to stress in their original foundation that the Association had been

devised wholly independent of the SA, yet wholly subsidiary to its efforts. "No kind of rivalry or interference with the recognised province and professed objects of that Society is contemplated." (*Archaeol J* 1, 1844, 3). It is interesting that, although in this period the SA was in decline, public interest in antiquarian matters was greater than ever before. The same trend can be identified with the Royal Society - arguably declining in 1830 at a time when interest in science paradoxically growing (see Chapter 5). This can be seen by the proliferation of local antiquarian societies, which was, of course, another factor which helped result in the foundation of the BAA.

The Royal Society

Ever since its foundation in the seventeenth century, the Royal Society had taken an interest in antiquarian matters as well as in natural philosophy. Following the death of Sir Joseph Banks in 1820 after 42 years as president, the RS began to concentrate on more specifically scientific matters than previously, but it continued to play some role in archaeology. In the early 19th century there was a considerable overlap between the Royal Society and the Society of Antiquaries. Sir Joseph Banks had been elected to the SA even before he became president of the RS, and other RS presidents were also elected to the Antiquaries - Sir Humphrey Davy became an FSA in 1821, and the Duke of Sussex likewise in 1830, the same year in which he was elected president of the Royal Society. Sussex was also an absentee member of the Council of the SA from 1836 to 1840. Of the Council of the Antiquaries in 1843, twelve out of 21 were FRS (including Aberdeen). By the time of Aberdeen's resignation in 1846, the Council of the SA was less dominated by FRS (only seven members of the Council were in the RS), although the Societies still had 79 fellows in common (Evans, 1956, 227). Like with the SA, critics were urging reform of the RS in this period and it was partly the RS's failure to reform itself which aided the foundation of the BAAS in 1831 (see Chapter 5).

Banks had approved of the Linnean Society (established in 1788 for the study of natural history), but otherwise opposed the setting up of new learned societies which would concentrate on specific scientific disciplines, because he believed that they would detract from the Royal Society. Soon after the Geological Society was founded in 1807, it "encountered such intense opposition from the leaders of the Royal Society that its future was for a time uncertain." (Rudwick, 1962, 326). However the Geological Society survived and was the spur for a number of others - the Astronomical (1820), the Zoological (1826), and the Geographical (1830).

The Geological Society

The Geological Society had begun as a London dining club for those interested in mineralogy and geology to meet one another and discuss their interests. However it soon took on the status of a learned society with the aim of

"inducing [geologists] to adopt one nomenclature, of facilitating the communication of new facts, and of ascertaining what is known of their science and what yet remains to be discovered" (ibid., 329).

In doing so it widened its membership to geologists all over the country, and produced a booklet entitled *Geological Inquiries*. This booklet reveals a Baconian stress on local observations forming part of large scale researches. The "belief in the importance of collecting and reporting geological facts, and in the value of co-operative research" (ibid., 335) foreshadows the inductive ecclesiological work of the Cambridge Camden Society (see Chapter 7) and the aim of the BAA to gather antiquarian facts (see Chapter 8).

Sir Humphrey Davy, one of the founders of the original geological dining club, had initially envisaged the Society as a small body, without funds, acting within the framework of the RS. However, others within the GS sought greater independence, and wished to

accumulate funds and to start their own periodical. This is probably from where their differences with the RS stem, for Banks feared that it would divert papers away from the *Philosophical Transactions*. In March 1809 matters came to a head. A proposal for the GS to become an assistant society within the RS, with a degree of autonomy but ultimately under the RS's control, was defeated by the membership. The dispute caused Davy, Banks, and a number of Fellows of the RS to resign from the GS, although the majority of the members remained.

By contrast, in the antiquarian community later in the century, the originators of the Numismatic Society and the BAA had hoped to remain within the SA to conduct their studies. They only founded organisations separate to the SA after that Society had refused to sanction semi-autonomous bodies, under its broad aegis, with aims of furthering particular antiquarian subjects (see Chapters 6 and 8).

The GS began publishing a journal in 1811 under the title of *Memoirs of the Geological Society*, although this was later changed to *Transactions*. This contained articles on such matters as structural geology, lithography and mineralogy (Woodward, 1907, 45). After five volumes, by which time sales were decreasing, a successful new series was begun in 1822. From 1827 the Society also published its *Proceedings*, the first volume reaching completion in 1834. The *Transactions* were expensive to produce, and so in 1844 the Council began a *Quarterly Journal* which was published at the risk and profits of an independent publisher. After a year the publisher withdrew due to it being unprofitable. Thereafter the Society discontinued the *Proceedings* and took over the *Quarterly Journal* themselves in what proved to be a far more satisfactory arrangement (*ibid.*, 155-7).

Meanwhile, the foundation of other societies, such as the Numismatic in 1836 (see Chapter 6), and the papers read at

meetings of the GS suggest a widespread interest in antiquity and archaeology - an interest which the Society of Antiquaries was doing little to cultivate. Many discoveries which seem to be most relevant to the Antiquaries were first reported to other learned societies such as the GS, partly due to the apathy of the SA. This was especially true of archaeological matters relating to the antiquity of Man. The major investigations by Pengelly in Devon were sponsored by the GS and British Association for the Advancement of Science (Daniel, 1975, 63). The BAAS dealt with prehistory through the Geological Section initially, although in 1851 Ethnology was formed as a distinct section (see Chapter 5). Even by 1859 it was to the Royal Society, rather than to any body of archaeologists, that Pengelly communicated a very important paper on flint implements being found in association with extinct animals.

Discoveries of an archaeological nature from abroad were not always reported directly to the antiquarian community. For instance in 1837 Rawlinson's translation of cuneiform writing on the Rock of Behistun into Old Persian was communicated to the Royal Asiatic Society rather than to the SA (Evans, 1956, 228). Most significantly, many overseas excavations and discoveries, such as Layard's at Nineveh (see Chapter 3), received little direct encouragement from the SA or the Trustees of the British Museum, even though the BM nominally directed Layard's work. Layard was never an FSA, and received little support from the Museum, which was, as always, loathe to spend money. However, the public interest and respect for such studies can be seen in the awarding of DCLs to both Layard and Rawlinson by Oxford University in recognition of their contributions to archaeology.

The British Museum

The collections of Sir Hans Sloane, which became the British Museum after his death in 1753, were originally organised into

three departments: Printed Books, Manuscripts (which included coins and drawings), and Natural History. The importance of antiquities within the collections was recognised with the creation of a separate department in 1807. The Museum was governed by a board of Trustees, headed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Speaker of the House of Commons and the Lord Chancellor, and including most of the great officers of state and the President of the Royal Society. The day-to-day running of the Museum was conducted by a group of officers - each department being run by a Keeper, and the whole being coordinated by the Principal Librarian. For much of the early Victorian period the administration of the Museum and its departments was dominated by a small body of men, many of whom held office for several decades. These men were the nearest any group in the early Victorian period came to forming a professional class of historians and antiquarians. Several of this group were to play a key role in the foundation of the BAA and the AI.

The Principal Librarian in the 1840s was Sir Henry Ellis (qv), who had held the post since 1827, prior to which he had been Keeper of Printed Books (1806-1812) and Keeper of Manuscripts (1812-1827). He finally retired after 29 years as Principal Librarian at the age of 79. Throughout this period there was constant strife and bitter rivalry between Sir Frederic Madden (qv), Keeper of Manuscripts (1837-1866), and Antonio Panizzi, Keeper of Printed Books (1837-1856) and Principal Librarian (1856-1866). We know a lot about the internal politics of the museum from a journal kept by Madden in which he poured forth abuse at his enemies.

"Hard-working and conscientious, a brilliant antiquarian, Madden was an exceptionally difficult man, whose obsessive hatred of Ellis and Panizzi amounted almost to mania." (Miller, 1973, 134).

Panizzi was a remarkable Italian who, by his boundless energy and influence with prominent Whig leaders, managed to acquire the money necessary for him to reform the BM library. This grew from 150,000 volumes in 1827 to more than 520,000 when he became

Principal Librarian, and exceeded a million volumes fifteen years later (*ibid.*, 162).

The Keeper of the Natural History Department since 1813 had been the prominent mineralogist Charles König. However, after the Royal Commission of 1836, his department was divided into a Botanical Branch under Robert Brown, a Zoological Branch under first J G Children and then John Gray, and a Mineralogical and Geological Branch under himself. These branches later became full Departments in 1856 under the supervision of Sir Richard Owen. As well as the discord between Madden and Panizzi, there was also rivalry between König and Gray over the limits of their responsibilities. Furthermore, throughout this period, despite a continuous building programme to replace Montague House, the Museum was always short of space. Thus there was pressure from other parts of the Museum for the Natural History collections to be moved elsewhere.

The Department of Antiquities

In 1826 Edward Hawkins (qv) became Keeper of the Department of Antiquities, a post which he held until he retired in 1860 at the age of 81. In building up his department, he was

"hampered by insufficient staff, lack of money, and by the perpetual shortage of space, Hawkins had also to contend with constant interference by the Trustees." (*Ibid.* 192).

This interference often involved imposing the ideas of the sculptor, Sir Richard Westmacott (qv), about the arrangement of exhibits, regardless of the judgement of Hawkins and his staff. Hawkins had a number of able assistants, one of whom, the Egyptologist and orientalist Samuel Birch (qv), became involved in the BAA and AI like Hawkins himself.

The main criticism of the Department by the new Archaeological Association was its lack of commitment towards British

antiquities. The only such artifacts on show were scattered round a few cases, intermingled with other antiquities. Wright voiced the increasing concern over this state of affairs in his *Archaeological Album*:

"In the British Museum our native antiquities appear to be held in little esteem, and, in general, articles sent there are lost to public view. It is discreditable to the Government of this country that we have no museum of national antiquities." (Wright, 1845, 149).

In 1845 Lord Prudhoe (later the Duke of Northumberland) offered the remarkable Stanwick Bronzes to the BM on condition that two rooms be set aside for British antiquities. However, little was done concerning this until 1850 (Kendrick, 1954, 132-3). In 1849 a Royal Commission, set up to inquire into the affairs of the BM, asked some of the Trustees about their attitude to British antiquities. Not even Viscount Mahon, president of the SA, had given thought to the development of a separate department for British antiquities. Despite the pressure from the BAA and AI, the acceptance of British and other non-classical antiquities by the authorities of the BM was a slow process.

"For long, the men of the older generation, such as Hamilton and Panizzi, brought up in the traditions of the eighteenth century, showed a marked distaste for all non-classical antiquities and would willingly have purged the Museum of such unworthy accretions. As late as 1857, Panizzi was strongly urging "limiting the British Museum collections of antiquities to classical or pagan art, as was in a great measure the case a few years ago" and the valuable space now occupied by medieval antiquities, "by what are called British or Irish Antiquities, and by the ethnological collection, might thus be turned to better account". (Miller, 1973, 191).

A change in the status of British collections only began with the appointment of Augustus Wollaston Franks in 1851 as an Assistant specifically to take charge of British and Medieval antiquities. After the retirement of Hawkins in 1860, the Department of Antiquities was divided into three: Oriental Antiquities; Greek and Roman Antiquities; and Coins and Medals. Oriental

Antiquities, under Birch's Keepership, included British and Medieval Antiquities, with Franks as Assistant Keeper. Despite the interest and the growing popularity of British archaeology, it was not until 1866 that British and Medieval Antiquities became a full department in its own right.

Printing Clubs

The 1830s and 1840s were active decades for the formation of printing clubs. Their publications made available relatively inexpensive editions of manuscripts and rare books. These clubs consisted of members voluntarily associated together as subscribers, thus guaranteeing the circulation of works whose publication might otherwise be too risky. Initially the printing clubs tended to concentrate on publications of an antiquarian nature, however, as this means of publication became established, the number of clubs proliferated and their fields widened (see Appendix B). By the end of the 1840s there were clubs devoted to ancient music, early medical literature, and chemistry. However the printing clubs devoted to scientific concerns were far less common than those on antiquarian subjects.

The models for these popular societies were the Bannatyne Club (founded by Sir Walter Scott in 1823) and the Maitland Club (founded in 1828), which aimed to print works illustrative of the History, Literature and Antiquities of Scotland. These were followed in 1834 by the Surtees Society, based in Durham, which concentrated on manuscripts relating to the area constituting the ancient Kingdom of Northumberland. More than half of its original 101 members were resident in the north-east of England. The Surtees Society's first couple of publications were typical of those to be produced by the new printing clubs in the coming years. The first was a collection of legends relating to St Cuthbert's miracles, taken from a thirteenth century transcript of a twelfth century work by Reginald of Durham. And the second was

a selection of

"Wills and Inventories Illustrative of the History, Manners, Language, Statistics, &c. of the Northern Counties of England, from the Eleventh Century downwards." (A H Thompson, 1939, 101).

One of the larger and most active clubs was the Camden Society, formed in 1838 by Thomas Wright, Thomas Gough Nichols and John Bruce. To an extent, this carried on privately the publication of documents which had ceased with the disbandment of the Record Commission in 1836. The Record Commission had been established in 1800 to increase the accessibility of public records, and also to publish some of these records. However the Commission was unsuccessful in rationalizing the historical archives scattered around the country, and also failed to produce publications which sold.

"Experts claimed that some of the works the Commission undertook were irrelevant and that others were so badly edited that they were virtually useless." (Levy, 1964, 297).

Furthermore, the Select Committee which investigated the Record Commission revealed that its publications had also been dogged by financial incompetence. Despite the Public Record Office Act of 1838, it was to be many years before Government again took the initiative in publishing records and documents with the Rolls Series and Historical Manuscripts Commission. Therefore it was left to private ventures such as the Camden Society to show that there was a desire for the publication of otherwise inaccessible documents. Levy suggests that, although most of its members were unaware of the fact, the Camden Society was in this way a pressure group. At Wright's instigation, no size limit was placed on the membership of the Society, thereby increasing its chance to become "powerful and influential" (ibid., 301).

The Camden Society drew much of its support from members of the SA. Of the 547 members listed at the end of its first volume, 150 were FSA. There were also a significant number of lawyers (at least 58) which reflects the legal interest in the publication of

records. The membership was not however confined to these groups or to London, and the bulk of the provincial members were introduced to the Society by a network of local secretaries. A few years later, both the BAA and the AI were to find local secretaries invaluable in recruiting and retaining their members.

The early Victorian printing clubs ranged in the number of subscribers from fifty to over 7000 members. Unlike the Camden Society, many of them placed a ceiling on the number of members. This was normally for practical reasons in order to minimise logistical difficulties, although others kept their membership down to increase their selectiveness. Hume suggests that in total about 15,000 individuals subscribed to one or more printing clubs in 1847, and that the clubs had published about 600 different volumes between themselves (Hume, 1847, 60-1).

The proliferation of printing clubs at the start of the 1840s was so great that it was unclear whether they could all exist drawing support from the same body of subscribers. The *Archaeologist and Journal of Antiquarian Science* voiced concern over a plan to start the Anglo-Saxon Society, a new printing club on the plan of the Camden Society, which was to specialise in the publication of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts.

"We wish it every success, although we cannot close our eyes to the fact that societies for the publication are already too many, and we are afraid that some of them will ere long fall to the ground." (*A&JAS* 1, 1841, 47).

A few printing clubs did fail, and others either merged or voluntarily discontinued their publications, but on the whole the movement was remarkably successful, and laid the ground for the establishment of local antiquarian societies.

Several of the clubs were, like the Surtees Society, regional in nature. The Chetham Society was concerned with the Counties Palatine of Chester and Lancaster, and drew 91% of its members from the immediate locality. Levine says:

"it commanded the support and influence of a considerable proportion of Manchester's business and professional classes whose reasons for subscribing often rested more on a sense of local pride and duty than a penchant for antiquarianism." (Levine, 1986, 42).

Where the printing clubs differed from the local antiquarian societies which were soon to grow up, was that the contact with the membership extended no further than the paying of subscriptions and the receiving of texts. The county archaeological and architectural societies depended upon a more active and participatory membership which would meet face-to-face.

Of the more nationally orientated printing clubs, the bulk of their membership came from London and the South-East. For example, 74% of the Percy Society were from London, and 62% of the Hakluyt Society came from London and the South-East. This is similar to the significant support the BAA and AI drew from the region (see Appendix C iii). The only contacts between members were at the annual meetings when the Councils were elected. Frequently the same antiquarians sat on the Councils of several of these printing clubs. For instance, in 1842, Thomas Amyot (qv), Collier and Wright were on the Councils of each of the Camden, Percy and Shakespeare Societies. Even more prominent was Lord Braybrooke, the editor of *Pepys*, who in 1842 was on the Council of the SA and the Camden Society, a vice-president of the Shakespeare, and president of both the Percy and Surtees Societies, and became president of the Camden Society as well the following year! The anniversary meetings of the Camden and Percy Societies occurred on the same day, and no less than six men were elected to both Councils. The experience of printing clubs bound together some of the most active members of the BAA's first Central Committee. In addition to Amyot and Wright being on all three societies' councils, Thomas Crofton Croker (qv), Madden, and Pettigrew each sat on the Councils of two of the Camden, Percy and Shakespeare Societies (see Appendix A iii).

As well as the regional societies, another grouping can be identified in the printing clubs, namely a religious one. There were several clubs specifically concerned with the publication of ecclesiastical texts. Most prominent of these was the Parker Society, with over 7000 members. The constitution required that at least sixteen out of the council of 24 should be Anglican clergy. Before finishing its publications in 1853, it issued 54 volumes to erect "a bulwark against Popish Error". (Parker Society Prospectus of 1840, quoted in Levine, 1986, 43). Many Victorian churchmen were at this time concerned by the Tractarian movement in the Church of England which was seen by its critics as dangerously close to Catholicism (see Chapter 7) and also by Roman Catholic Emancipation. The Roman Catholic Relief Act of 1829 had removed almost all the disabilities Catholics had previously faced, such as restrictions on holding public office (although the universities of Oxford and Cambridge were to remain closed to Catholics, and also Dissenters, until later in the century). Unhappy with the climate of reform, some churchmen felt the need to more consciously assert their Anglican roots. Although not their primary purpose, the Parker Society and the newly formed diocesan architectural societies could provide a means of reaffirming tenets of the Church of England.

Local Societies

The 19th century saw the foundation of many local societies. Most of those formed in the 1820s and 1830s were Literary and Philosophical Societies with a broad interest in the sciences. They were often based in the growing manufacturing towns and many of their members were to participate in the BAAS (see Chapter 5). A decade or two later, many other societies, often interested in antiquity and architecture were established. Durham, Lichfield, Exeter and Bristol Architectural Societies were all founded in 1841, and a few county natural history and antiquarian societies had been founded in the late 1830s. This growth of new societies

continued after the foundation of the BAA. Clearly there was widespread provincial support for the development of antiquarian researches outside the London Circle. Prior to the BAA's success, the driving influence behind the creation of architectural societies was the ecclesiological movement led by the Cambridge Camden Society (see Chapter 7). In 1850 six architectural societies began publishing their reports and papers in a single volume. The first volume lists 17 other such societies which the Associated Architectural Societies were in union with. Many of these were involved with archaeology or natural history as well as architecture and ecclesiology.

Almost all these county societies show distinct similarities. Generally, either the local bishop or the lord lieutenant of the county was the president, and the other would almost always be a patron. The councils of these societies tended to involve local peers, baronets and MPs, as well as large numbers of clergymen. For example, the Yorkshire Architectural Society had the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of Ripon as patrons, and the Lord Lieutenants of the North and East Ridings as presidents. The vice-presidents included nine peers, five baronets, five MPs, six "The Honourables", four archdeacons, one dean, and seven other clergymen. The Yorkshire Society was one of the bigger ones with over 300 members, but even smaller ones like the Lincolnshire Architectural Society were dominated by the clergy. Thirteen out of its nineteen vice-presidents were clergymen as were 64% of its 112 members in 1850. Similarly, clergy made up 77% of the original 120 members of the Architectural Society of the Archdeaconry of Northampton which was founded in 1844 (Levine, 1986, 48). The Associated Architectural Societies were modelled on the same lines in terms of their objectives (which mirrored those of the Cambridge Camden Society) as well as their structure. The objects of the Architectural Society of the Archdeaconry of Northampton were:

"to promote the study of ecclesiastical architecture, antiquities and design, and the restoration of mutilated architectural remains within the archdeaconry; and to furnish suggestions, as far as may be within its province, for improving the character of ecclesiastical edifices hereafter to be erected." (*Assoc Arch Reports* 1, 1850).

The other societies had identical or highly similar terms of reference.

Levine suggests that a distinction can be drawn between the societies which concentrated exclusively on architecture and maintained ecclesiological principles, and those which combined their architectural interests with archaeological ones in a more secular manner (Levine, 1986, 47). Those which remained ecclesiological in nature tended to restrict their membership to Anglicans and drew most of their officers from the clergy. The other class of archaeological and architectural societies were generally founded slightly later than the purely architectural societies and, to judge by their aims and objects, were influenced as much by the BAA as the CCS. The objects of the later societies tended to be broader, speaking of examining, preserving, and illustrating *all* Ancient Monuments and Remains. (This wording based upon the Cambrian Archaeological Association, founded 1846). Although they were interested in the restoration of ancient remains, they were less concerned with advising architects over the building of contemporary structures. A feature which was shared by both sorts of local societies was the overwhelming influence of the Establishment, both in terms of the predominantly Anglican clergy and the local aristocracy and gentry.

The Cambridge Antiquarian Society

An example of a local antiquarian society which was not dominated by ecclesiological concerns was the Cambridge Antiquarian Society (CAS) (not to be confused with the Cambridge Camden Society). This was founded in May 1840,

"for the encouragement of the study of the History, Architecture and Antiquities of the University, County, and Town of Cambridge ... [and] to collect and print information relative to the above-mentioned subjects" (*Report of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society*, 1851, 13).

The CAS differed from most local antiquarian societies in that it was dominated by the University. Thompson suggests it

"was essentially an association of senior members of the University drawn together by a common interest in antiquity." (M W Thompson, 1990, 9).

By 1846 it had 106 members, of whom 58 were dons, seven were Heads of Houses, and five were professors. By comparison, the CCS had over 700 members, drawn from further afield than the CAS, whose membership tended to be local in its early years. The CAS had no particular interest in the Gothic architecture which dominated the outlook of the CCS.

There was some overlap between the CCS and the CAS. For instance Rev J J Smith, a founder of the CAS, was a vice-president of the CCS, and Professor Willis, president of the CAS 1845-6 and 1850-1, had also been a vice-president of the CCS until he withdrew from the Camdenians in 1841 due to their theological stance. Both J J Smith and Cardale Babington, who helped found the CAS, had been involved in establishing the Cambridge Ray Society in 1837 - a small exclusive club for scientists. Babington and Willis also both held office within the Cambridge Philosophical Society. Thus, as with the founders of the BAA, the key figures within the CAS were involved in other Victorian learned societies.

Halliwell, the only non-graduate among the founders of the CAS, appears to have envisaged the society as primarily a printing club. Indeed publication was a prime objective of the CAS, and Halliwell published lists of manuscript sources in the first annual reports. Despite his enthusiasm for the Society, Halliwell was forced to give up as secretary after leaving Cambridge for London in 1841 due to financial difficulties. The

Society originally aimed to meet three times a term, although this proved to be too ambitious. However, sufficient communications were made to the Society to enable it to publish fifteen "miscellaneous tracts" from 1840-49. This quarto series was later replaced by an octavo series which combined *Reports* with *Communications*.

Lobbying for Government Support

One of the aims of both antiquarian and scientific bodies in the early Victorian period was to gain increased acknowledgement and financial support from the government. The debate over the decline of science had been a key factor leading to the establishment of the BAAS which sought greater public commitment to the sciences (see Chapter 5). Likewise, the BAA aimed at persuading the government to help protect and preserve antiquities. It was in this period that the Record Commissions, Public Record Office, and British Museum were coming under greater public scrutiny. The BAA joined its voice to the constant call for greater funds for such bodies to carry out their duties adequately. In the Introduction to the first volume of the *Archaeological Journal*, Way spoke for the whole antiquarian community in stating:

"To preserve from demolition or decay works of ancient times which still exist, is an object that should merit the attention of government." (*Archaeol J* 1, 1844, 2).

It was an aim in founding the BAA to lobby for the government to accept such responsibilities, and to seek greater patronage in all areas of antiquarian research.

The disbandment of the Record Commission in 1836, although attended by hopes of improving the system of preserving public records, caused concern amongst the antiquarian community similar to that within the scientific community caused by the abolition of the Board of Longitude in 1828 (see Chapter 5). Both communities

repeatedly stressed the poor state of government patronage in Britain by comparing it to the situation abroad.

Comparisons with Foreign Research

I have already discussed the Scandinavian developments in prehistory (Chapter 3), and suggested that these had little influence on British archaeology until some time after the foundation of the BAA. However, in the early 1840s, British antiquarians were becoming interested in the state of antiquarian studies elsewhere on the continent. The Declinist debate in scientific circles in the late 1820s and early 1830s had stressed the aid given to the sciences on the continent, whilst in Britain they were reputedly falling into neglect. Likewise, antiquarians pointed to advances abroad to encourage improvements in their discipline at home. For instance, British numismatists made unfavourable comparisons with the French organisation of numismatic research (see Chapter 6). Pettigrew regretfully observed:

"As in the arrangement of their museums foreign nations must be admitted to have excelled us, we cannot be surprised that we should also have been preceded in the establishment of congresses." (Pettigrew, 1850, 169).

Just as the BAAS had followed the German example in holding peripatetic scientific congresses, so too the BAA had followed a French example in holding a large-scale archaeological meeting. France seems to have been ahead of Britain in almost all branches of antiquarian study. The founders of the BAA recognised this, and tried to learn from the experiences of the French, whereas previously the SA seems to have been loathe to forge contacts with foreign antiquaries. The Académie Celtique (which later became the Société Royale des Antiquaires de France) had been founded in 1804, and in 1831 the Société Française d'Archéologie was founded. The *Bulletin Monumental* was first issued in 1834, but it was not until 1838 that the SA agreed to enter into correspondence with

the French societies. In 1837 the Commission des Monuments Historique was founded by the French government to supervise maintenance and restoration of monuments. It was the foundation of a body similar to this which the more active British antiquarians hoped, but failed, to achieve in their lobbying of the government.

The advanced state of French archaeology, and the BAA's hopes for government patronage on a similar scale in Britain, was outlined by Charles Roach Smith in the opening address to the Canterbury Congress. To the satisfaction of the antiquarians, but unfortunately with few tangible dividends, the content of this paper was widely reported by the press:

"In 1833, a committee had been instituted in France for Archaeological research, under the superintendence of the Minister of Public Instruction, which had rendered most efficient service. The clergy had also used their utmost power to forward inquiries. A series of questions had been printed, and 30,000 copies thereof circulated, by means of which a vast amount of information had been collected. Ample funds had been afforded by the government, and the happiest results had followed their exertions. After advising as to the future course of the Society, the paper expressed a hope that the government of this country would be induced to imitate the example of that of the French, and devote an ample fund to accomplish a purpose to truly English." (Illustrated London News 5, 21/9/1844, 191).

Chapter 5

THE BRITISH ASSOCIATION FOR THE
ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE

The Decline of Science Debate

In 1830 Charles Babbage published his controversial *Reflections on the Decline of Science in England*. In it he attacked the state of the Royal Society, the decision to abolish the Board of Longitude, and the lack of government support for science. A year earlier, Sir Humphrey Davy's *Consolations in Travel* had been published posthumously, setting out his concerns about a decline in British science. Then, in February 1830, just a few months before Babbage's *Decline of Science* was published, John Herschel, probably the most prominent natural philosopher of the period,

"appended to his article on sound in the *Encyclopedia Metropolitana* the melancholy verdict that in mathematics, in chemistry, and in most of the sciences, Britain was "fast dropping behind" other countries such as France and Germany." (Orange, 1972, 153).

Meanwhile, from Scotland, David Brewster was making similar warnings through the *Edinburgh Journal of Science*. It was in this climate of deep concern about the state of British science that natural philosophers began to seek a way of revitalizing scientific research. However, not all natural philosophers of the period were quite so pessimistic about the situation, and Whewell was extremely hostile to Brewster, whose allegations had publicly criticised the state of science at the universities. Nevertheless, the debate these publications sparked off and the concerns they raised, were to motivate those who founded the British Association for the Advancement of Science in 1831.

Babbage believed that the entrenched and venerable Royal Society urgently needed reform. He highlighted abuses and questioned the system of management in it and other learned societies, although he did have praise for the Geological and Astronomical Societies.

His criticisms included the black-balling system, the role of Davies Gilbert as president, ill-considered spending of money by the RS, and the nomination to the Council of the president's "party" which dominated the Society. To remedy some of the abuses he suggested:

"full *publicity*, *printed statements* of accounts, and occasional *discussions* and inquiries at *general meetings*, are the only safeguards; and a due degree of *vigilance* should be exercised on those who *discourage* these principles." (Babbage, 1830, 44. The italics are his own).

Similar concerns were being raised at the same time about the SA by Sir Nicholas Harris Nicolas (see Chapter 4).

Another reform Babbage believed was required involved limiting the president's term of office:

"the office of President be continued only during two sessions. There may be inconveniences attending the arrangement; but the advantages are conspicuous, both in the Astronomical and Geological Societies. Each President is ambitious of rendering the period of his reign remarkable for some improvement in the Society over which he presides; and the sacrifice of time which is made by the officers of those societies, would be impossible if it were required to be continued for a much longer period." (Ibid., 186-7).

The SA could likewise have benefited from such a reform, and thus avoided being saddled with the inactive Aberdeen as president for so many years. The founders of the Numismatic Society followed the example of the Astronomical and Geological Societies in drawing up clauses in their Institutes:

"No member who has filled the office of President or Vice President for two successive years, shall again be eligible to the same situation, until the expiration of one year from the termination of his office." (Institutes of the Numismatic Society, 1838, 4).

Babbage's main concerns were the lack of financial support for science and the inability of the scientific community to effectively lobby the government. This had become blatantly apparent when the Government, in an attempt to save money, had abolished the Admiralty's Board of Longitude in 1828. The Board

was one of the few state funded agencies of applied science. Its work had been criticised from both within and without, and the suggestion that it offered sinecures was politically embarrassing. Like the Record Commission in 1836, it certainly needed reform, but its critics had had no desire to see it completely abolished, for this meant the loss of valuable patronage. However, the scientific community was unable to react effectively to its disappearance.

"Important figures in the Royal Society were far from unconcerned; yet the Society was simply not organized to lobby or to make a convincing display on behalf of those many and various other individuals and organizations connected with natural knowledge. The Royal Society in its somnolence denied rather than expressed the vitality of science." (Morrell and Thackray, 1981, 42).

The parallel with the Society of Antiquaries' inaction over the disbanding of the Record Commission is evident (see Chapter 3). Just as this encouraged antiquarians to think more about their representation, so too the abolition of the Board of Longitude had provoked men of science to consider how best to further their interests.

Although Whewell and others disapproved of the Declinists' pessimistic views, they closed ranks together in an attempt to elect Herschel to the presidency of the Royal Society in November 1830. Davies Gilbert had decided to retire as president in favour of the Duke of Sussex, who, in the context of the Royal Society, "symbolized reaction rather than reform" (Morrell and Thackray, 1981, 53). Despite the opposition of those most active in the sciences, Sussex was narrowly elected, due to the Court "interest" amongst members of the RS.

"The "Royal toadies", the court clique led by [Thomas] Pettigrew, Granville, and the antiquaries, defeated the self-appointed "real men" of science" (ibid., 56).

It is ironic that Pettigrew, Sussex's surgeon, was to oppose reform in the RS yet fourteen years later play a key role in the BAA, set up partly because of rigidity within the unreformed SA.

The Idea of a Meeting at York

The failure of the RS to reform itself encouraged Brewster in his plan to establish an alternative body to raise the status of the sciences. He was influenced by reports of annual gatherings of natural philosophers and medical men held each year in different German cities, and hoped to engineer such a meeting in Britain. Babbage was also aware of the success of these German congresses, having attended the 1828 one at Berlin, a report of which he wrote for the *Edinburgh Journal of Science* (1829, 225-234) and also published as an appendix to his *Decline of Science*. This congress had been patronized by the Prussian Royal Family and attended by 378 members (all who had published a certain amount on particular subjects were considered members). Furthermore, attendance at the evening soirées had reached as high as 1200 (Babbage, 1830, 214). Brewster and Babbage were not slow to point out the differences between Germany where "Princes of the blood mingle with the cultivators of science" while in England "not a single philosopher" enjoyed "the favour of his sovereign or the friendship of his ministers" (ibid). The first of these "Deutcher Naturforscher" had occurred in Leipzig in 1822, and they continued to meet each year, visiting Heidleberg in 1829 (which was attended by Whewell) and Hamburg in 1830 (Morrell and Thackray, 1981, 44-45). An awareness of the state of overseas research was also a factor noticeable among the founders of the British Archaeological Association, although in the case of antiquity, it was France rather than Germany which was most clearly in advance of British interests (see Chapter 4).

Brewster suggested holding a British scientific meeting at York in the summer of 1831 along similar lines to the German congresses. He enlisted the support of his friend J F W Johnston who had attended the Hamburg Congress, and approached John Phillips, secretary of the Yorkshire Philosophical Society. The advantages of York were that it was geographically central, had a thriving

Philosophical Society, a tradition of polite learning, was the seat of an archbishop, and was sufficiently far away from Oxford, Cambridge and London to be acceptable to the Scottish and provincial philosophers. Brewster proposed that

"The principal objects of the society would be to make the cultivators of science acquainted with each other; to stimulate one another to new exertions; to bring the objects of science more before the public eye; and to take measures for advancing its interests and accelerating its progress. The society would possess no funds - make no collections and hold no money" (letter, Brewster to Phillips, 23/2/1831, quoted in Morrell and Thackray, 1981, 59).

It was originally planned for the British Archaeological Association likewise to do without subscriptions (see Chapter 8), but neither association managed to keep to this initial aim. The objects Brewster originally envisaged were also to be modified before the BAAS came into existence. Orange, Morrell and Thackray, suggest that Brewster's contribution to the foundation of the BAAS lay in initiating the idea of a meeting at York, and that his role thereafter was minimal. Instead Rev William Vernon Harcourt was to take the lead in organising the congress (see below).

Brewster had originally intended the congress to meet in July 1831, but this was postponed until the end of September, both to allow more time for its organisation and because of the political situation in the country. In March the first Reform Bill was carried in the Commons by just one vote, and in May Parliament was dissolved after the announcement of an election with Reform as the key issue. Violent agitation was a very real risk, and the political situation was thwart with difficulties for anyone arranging a public assembly. However, despite opinions to the contrary, it was decided to persist with the September meeting. Fortunately the political problems did not disrupt the meeting, although later, in May 1832, the Archbishop of York was burnt in effigy on the steps of his palace after voting against the third Reform Bill (Morrell and Thackray, 1981, 7).

In 1844 several members of the BAA began to doubt the wisdom of holding an archaeological congress that summer (see Chapter 9). The political situation, although still tense as it remained throughout the 1840s, was less disturbing than it had been for the BAAS's first congress. But, like some of the originators of the BAAS, members of the BAA Central Committee doubted their ability to make a success of the meeting. Nevertheless the meeting went ahead as planned.

Attendance at the York Congress

Although it can be argued that the Declinists triggered the foundation of the BAAS, they were to play little further direct role. Neither Babbage nor Herschel, despite repeated appeals from Brewster, attended the York Congress, and Brewster's position was eclipsed by Harcourt. However, the suspicion that the congress might provide a platform for the Declinists, meant that most of the university and metropolitan savants stood aloof. Commendable though the Association's aims may have been, Whewell, who was not able to attend the congress, was wary of the BAAS performing the role of a pressure group.

"I should not wish to share in any Association which had for one of its objects to influence Government in its proceedings with regard to science and its cultivators. I believe that, in England at least, men of science, as a body, will secure their dignity and utility best by abstaining from any systematic connection or relation with the Government of the country, and depending on their own excursions." (Public letter, Whewell to Harcourt, 22/9/1831, quoted in Morrell and Thackray, 1981, 83).

Herschel too, despite his reputation as a Declinist, was opposed to the setting up of an assembly such as the BAAS in order to direct scientific research. He feared that it might shackle the efforts of individual men of science and unnecessarily compartmentalise areas of scientific knowledge.

Thus many of the most notable practitioners of science did not

attend the BAAS's first meeting. Daubeny was the only significant figure from Oxford to participate, with Sedgwick, Baden Powell and Buckland being either unwilling or unable to attend. Without the lead of Whewell, only three Cambridge academics attended, none of whom were of much scientific note. Apart from a number of savants from the Geological Society, headed by their president, Roderick Murchison, few other metropolitan men of science took part in the proceedings at York. Without the leading lights from London and the universities, provincial natural philosophers played a more prominent part at York than they were to in future congresses. The bulk of the 353 people who attended the congress came from York or its immediate environs, yet they laid the foundation for a truly national association.

The support for and objections to the York Congress foreshadowed the situation which later faced the BAA with its Canterbury Congress.

"When the Congress was first proposed, philosophers of real acquirements, whom no sectarian or corporate spirit had infected, came forward to unite their hands and hearts in the cause of science. But human nature is composed of various elements. Its little jealousies and private views were soon in a state of insurrection and they came forth in a thousand and one objections to the purposes of the Congress. As these objections, however, speedily disappeared,... the very persons who urged them soon joined the Association." (Brewster, 1835, 387).

The reluctance amongst leading men of science to attend the BAAS's first congress was echoed when leading antiquarians avoided the BAA's first congress (see Chapter 9). Many prominent natural philosophers were wary of popularising their pursuits and thereby destroying the dignity of science, so too, many members of the SA were dubious about the aims of the Canterbury meeting, and hence did not attend. For both associations, however, their initial congress was a success, and this assured them the support of the doubters for subsequent meetings.

Harcourt and the Aims of the Association

The success of the BAAS owed much to the Rev William Vernon Harcourt who crystallised Brewster's plans and masterminded the York Congress. He arranged an agenda and constitution for this, the first meeting of the British Association, and then continued to run the Association as its secretary for many years. Harcourt, the fourth son of the Archbishop of York, had a comfortable living as a canon residentiary of York, from which he could pursue his keen interest in geology and chemistry. In 1822 he had been instrumental in founding the Yorkshire Philosophical Society of which he was president for eight years. It was his extensive connections which acquired for the Society the land for their impressive Yorkshire Museum, which had grown up from collections of fossil bones found at Kirkdale Cavern. The Museum was opened in 1830 and provided a focus for much of the BAAS congress.

Harcourt proposed that there be no barrier to membership of the new Association "except that of a respectable character, and the being a contributor in any manner to the promotion of Science." (Letter, Harcourt to Babbage, 16/9/1831, quoted in Orange, 1972, 164). He hoped that by creating a broad membership, the BAAS's influence would be sufficient to achieve its aims. He saw three main aims:

"To give a stronger impetus and more systematic direction to scientific enquiry;

To obtain a greater degree of national attention to the objects of science, and a removal of those disadvantages which impede its progress;

To promote the intercourse of the cultivators of science with one another, and with foreign philosophers."

(*Report of the British Association, 1831*, 9, quoted in Orange, 1972, 168-9).

The similarity between these and the British Archaeological Association's aims (see Chapter 8) a dozen years later is no mere coincidence, for archaeology and science occupied similar positions in nineteenth century society, and both communities

desired a means of increasing their activity and influence. The BAA hoped to encourage archaeological work; to lobby for the preservation of antiquities; and to provide a focus at which provincial antiquarians could meet away from the metropolis. Another analogy between the two associations was their stated desire to avoid rivalry with already established bodies. The BAA consciously stressed its support for the SA and explained that there would be no conflict of interests (see Chapter 4). Harcourt's constitution also carefully stated that the BAAS "contemplates no interference with the ground occupied by other institutes" (Brewster, 1835, 377).

The "Festival of Science"

Harcourt approached the Duke of Sussex to be president of the York meeting, but was unsuccessful in enlisting his aid. Instead he managed to persuade Lord Milton, president of the Yorkshire Philosophical Society, to preside at the BAAS's first congress. The support of the aristocracy was important to provide the pomp and display that drew attention to the BAAS and gave to it a style of festive feasting. Seven of the first fourteen presidents were aristocrats, and their support was to prove central to the BAAS's success. Eventually, in 1859, Prince Albert himself presided at the congress in Aberdeen. Even more so than the BAAS, the antiquarian community relied heavily on the reflected glory of the nobility to give lustre to its proceedings. Both the BAA and the AI sought aristocrats as presidents, vice presidents and patrons (see Chapter 11).

The York meeting was subdivided into several sections to enable practitioners in different disciplines to meet and attend lectures on subjects of most interest to them. By the 1840s there were seven sections (Macleod and Collins, 1981, 277):

- Section A: Mathematical and physical science
- Section B: Chemical science and mineralogy
- Section C: Geology and physical geography

Section D: Zoology, botany, physiology, anatomy
Section E: Anatomy and medicine, then Physiology
Section F: Statistics
Section G: Mechanical Science

Of these, Section C was the most popular, although Section A received 57% of the money distributed for research grants from 1833 to 1844 (Morrell and Thackray, 1981, 551). Acceptance within a British Association section gave status to a discipline. Hence supporters of particular subjects campaigned for recognition by the BAAS. There tended to be a greater emphasis on the physical sciences by the managers of the BAAS, who believed that all sciences should aspire to rigorous methodologies and laws like astronomy. Therefore most of the studies coming within the domain of antiquarian researches did not have the opportunity of being presented to the BAAS, other than as an occasional paper. The subject most closely allied to archaeology which gained recognition within the BAAS was ethnology. This was accepted as a subsection of Section D in 1844, becoming a distinct section in 1851 (with geography as Section E). Archaeology appears to have never been seriously considered as a potential section within the British Association, despite the claims of its practitioners that it was a science.

The strategy of dividing the business of the BAAS into sections was followed, to a slightly lesser extent, by the BAA and AI in their congresses (see Chapters 9 and 11). Most mornings of the week were devoted to serious business and lectures, whereas the afternoons and evenings were taken up with excursions, dinners, concerts and conversazioni.

"The Meeting revealed that scientific work could be combined with spectacle, feasting and gossip.... the British Association for the Advancement of Science had already become a vehicle for social intercourse, rational amusement, intellectual improvement, personal advertisement, and civic pride." (Morrell and Thackray, 1981, 90, 89).

In 1844 the BAA managed to show that an antiquarian congress could likewise combine such features.

The Future of the British Association

The constitution of the BAAS was framed at York, primarily along the lines envisaged by Harcourt. The membership fee was kept to just one pound in order to enable accessibility by as many potential members as possible. By comparison, the Royal Society required ten pounds on admission and four pounds per annum thereafter, and the Society of Antiquaries had an admission fee of eight guineas followed by four guineas annually (Hume, 1847, 70, 75). Membership fees brought in sufficient money for the BAAS to award research grants. Thus as well as indicating areas where research could profitably be conducted, the Association also helped fund such work. Grants as a form of patronage were quite distinct from the rewarding of prizes or medals for past achievements, and were later adopted by the Royal Society and the government.

The constitution agreed at York vested the overall government of the Association in a large General Committee consisting primarily of all those who had published scientific papers. Since such a body could only meet during or immediately after the annual congresses, it was little more than a ratifying body. Therefore, much of the real authority was initially retained by Harcourt, although later a Council was established. The sectional committees, which had been appointed to take charge of the affairs of the sections, also came to wield influence in the development of their disciplines, partly because of the research grants which they allocated.

After the success of York, the BAAS met at Oxford the following year and at Cambridge the year after. These meetings were attended by Whewell and the "Constellation of Trinity" and other leading academics. The principle had been laid down at York that the Association was to be peripatetic in its summer meetings. Future congresses involved visiting the university towns of

Edinburgh and Dublin and then a series of major industrial cities, but steering clear of London. This peripatetic aspect had been alluded to by Bacon as forming part of the scientific exercise in his *New Atlantis*. It had the advantage of making science visible as a cultural resource throughout the country, and preventing any one body gaining dominance within the Association. Furthermore, it meant that academic scientists (the term "scientist" was coined by Whewell at the 1834 meeting) came into contact with the applied science found in the manufacturing districts. The idea of peripatetic annual meetings was also adopted by the BAA and AI, although their criteria for choosing venues was obviously antiquarian rather than scientific or technological (see Chapter 11).

If the first congress had showed the potential of the British Association, it was at its second congress that it truly gained public recognition. In addition to gaining the support of the scientific clerisy, the attendance nearly doubled to around 600. Attendance at BAAS meetings continued to rise steadily for several years, reaching a peak of 2403 members at the Newcastle meeting in 1838, which was not to be bettered until 1859, the year of Prince Albert's presidency. Much of the membership was made up of members of provincial Literary and Philosophical Societies. One of the most active of these societies was the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society (MLPS), of which John Dalton was president from 1817 to 1844. 67 members of the MLPS were members of the BAAS in 1844 (Morrell and Thackray, 1981, 553).

Dalton was a Quaker, but twenty of the 23 "gentlemen of science" which Morrell and Thackray identify as dominating the early years of the BAAS were Anglicans, ten of whom were clergymen. Six out of the Association's first fourteen presidents were liberal Anglican clergy (namely: Buckland, Sedgwick, Lloyd, Harcourt, Whewell and Peacock). Their Broad Church position involved a deep belief in the value of natural theology. They held that God's

Book of Nature was in accordance with His Book of the Bible, and that therefore science (and also antiquarian researches) would not undermine revealed religion. The immensely successful *Bridgewater Treatises* (commissioned in 1829) were written from this liberal Anglican viewpoint, and in fact all eight authors were involved in the BAAS to varying extents. Their natural theology was accepted by the bulk of the Association's membership, which consisted of substantial numbers of Quakers and Unitarians as well as liberal Anglicans.

Critics of the British Association

The BAAS's liberal Anglican support for natural theology came under attack from a number of sources. One source of criticism were the Scriptural Geologists, notably William Cockburn, Dean of York, and Frederick Nolan. They feared that the geological studies of men such as Buckland would lead to materialistic atheism, by not accepting the literal truth of Genesis. The BAAS was also denounced for different reasons by Newman and the Tractarians (see Chapter 7). They feared that the emphasis on natural theology rather than on revealed religion risked obscuring the Christian God with a Deistic Author of Nature. The Tractarians were also concerned that some supporters of the BAAS wished to do away with the religious tests for the universities. Sedgwick, Baden Powell, Babbage and Airy had all made representations to Parliament that Dissenters be admitted to Oxford and Cambridge (Macleod and Collins, 1981, 58). As worrying to the Tractarians was the bestowal of honorary degrees by Oxford University on four Dissenters at the 1832 BAAS meeting (namely: Brewster, Dalton, Faraday and Brown).

Aside from the religious concerns, there were also criticisms over the popular display of pageantry and pretension at British Association congresses. The spectacle of gourmandising savants was seen by some, especially the *Times*, as incompatible with the

dignity of science. Dickens mocked the pompous and self-indulgent annual assemblies in his satire on "The Mudfog Association for the Advancement of Everything" (*Bentley's Miscellany*, 1837, quoted in Morrell and Thackray, 1981, 162). *Punch* also poked fun at the displays of "The British Association for the Advancement of Everything in General and Nothing in Particular" (*Punch* 3, 1842, 6, 20).

Growth Not Decline

The extent to which the Declinist debate "caused" the foundation of the BAAS has been much discussed by historians of the British Association (for a detailed discussion on this, see Cannon, 1978, 167-196). The view has also been proposed that the BAAS's creation was a direct result of the failure of Royal Society reformers to achieve the election of Herschel as president in 1830. However, those directly involved in the 1830 election were not, on the whole, deeply involved with the Congress at York. Therefore such arguments have been rejected by recent scholars (such as Orange and Morrell), who have also questioned the extent to which there really was a decline in the science of the period. Apart from Brewster, few of the founders of the BAAS subscribed to the Declinist viewpoint. Notably, Harcourt was a non-declinist, believing that science had grown beyond the resources of the Royal Society. It was the very increase in scientific interest, rather than a general decline, which made the foundation of a body like the BAAS desirable. The controversy then, was symptomatic of factors resulting in the BAAS's foundation rather than directly causal. Babbage's *Decline of Science* was really "evidence of interest not of apathy" in the nation's science (Cannon, 1978, 170).

To continue the analogy with the BAA, it would appear that the criticism of the Society of Antiquaries resulted from the growth of a widespread interest in antiquity rather than being evidence

of a decline in antiquarian research. The founders of the BAA were certainly conscious of the faults of the SA, but they wished to work with it rather than attack it. The nearest antiquarian equivalent to scientific declinists like Babbage was perhaps Sir Nicholas Harris Nicolas. In his reforming zeal he criticised the SA, the Record Commission and the British Museum. However he was not involved in the establishment of the BAA, just as Babbage remained separate from the beginnings of the BAAS.

This chapter has illustrated many similarities between the BAA and the BAAS. One main difference between the establishment of the two bodies is that the BAAS grew up from the Congress at York and always revolved around its annual summer meeting, whereas the BAA was formed as a society with regular meetings throughout the year, which only incidentally decided to hold major summer congresses. Aside from this point, antiquarians were aware of the parallels between the two associations, and drew confidence from the widespread acceptance of the BAAS's utility. In writing on the prospects of English antiquarianism, Wright argued for the value an antiquarian body analogous to the BAAS.

"While the British Association acts as a flying army of observation for the Royal Society itself, it may readily be understood how a far wider range of outlying services on behalf of the Society of Antiquaries may be advantageously left to a roving commission of a somewhat similar description." (Wright, 1847, 327).

The body Wright had in mind was the British Archaeological Association. Whilst neither Association worked directly for its parent Society, both helped raise the public status of their disciplines.

Chapter 6

THE NUMISMATIC SOCIETY

The Royal Numismatic Society was founded in December 1836 as the Numismatic Society of London, seven years before the foundation of the BAA. In many ways the Numismatic Society can be seen as a forerunner of the BAA. Their early histories have much in common, however there were also substantial differences between the development of the two societies, and an analysis of these will be helpful in understanding the factors behind the successes and problems faced by the BAA.

The Desire for a Numismatic Society

Roach Smith, one of the original members of the Numismatic Society, recalls in his *Retrospections* that the NS, like the BAA, owed its origin, at least in part, to the lethargy of the Society of Antiquaries.

"It was from another oversight of the Society of Antiquaries that the Numismatic Society was formed. The study of Numismatics is an essential part of the science of antiquities, and it could have been promoted by a committee of the Society of Antiquaries, with certain independent powers to give it unrestrained action and free scope to hold separate meetings, to elect members, etc." (Smith, 1883, 277).

The unwillingness on the part of the SA to sanction the creation of active bodies within itself such as a numismatic committee was repeated in 1843 when the Council refused to directly sponsor the creation of a committee of its active antiquarians to work to promote the preservation of national antiquities. As a result, the BAA, like the NS before it, was formed as a separate body from the SA.

The behaviour of the SA in failing to give sufficient support to studies under its broad antiquarian aegis and thereby provoking the foundation of a separate Numismatic society, is similar to the

Royal Society and its treatment of the various sciences which it nominally represented. However the RS was more willing than the SA to sanction active bodies within itself, and even tried to force the GS to become one rather than develop as an independent society (see Chapter 4). The prestigious, but hindbound, RS had ceased to be at the forefront of scientific discovery in the first half of the 19th century, its role being superseded by the more specialised scientific societies such as the Geological and Astronomical ones (see Chapter 4). In the same way, the Numismatic Society can be seen as performing a specialist antiquarian role which the staid and near-moribund SA was unable to advance. Roach Smith writes:

"Had the Society of Antiquaries been awake to its duties and interest, it would have anticipated this institution by the appointment of a Numismatic Committee with proper and full powers; but, not understanding the high position it held and its unlimited resources, it allowed society after society to branch off from it until it was seriously weakened by the independent activity of its offshoots." (Smith, 1883, 119).

Membership of the Numismatic Society

The Numismatic Society owes its formation to a couple of meetings of "Friends of Numismatic science" which took place in 1836 at Dr John Lee's house. The Society was formally constituted at a General Meeting on 22nd December 1836 when Lee was elected president and treasurer, and John Yonge Akerman and Isaac Cullimore were elected as secretaries. This first meeting was attended by 21 people, and by the end of the first session in June 1837 the Society had 132 members. The membership slowly grew over the next few years, reaching 197 in July 1840. Those that joined the NS tended to be fairly committed to numismatic studies and a large proportion were active in the field. The BAA had a far wider and more popular appeal, not only because it covered a larger field of study, but also because the vast majority of its members were only interested on a primarily amateurish level. One result of the exclusiveness of the NS membership is approvingly

noted by Smith:

"it has never ceased to be directed by the most eminent men; and it has never been controlled by a council composed chiefly of members distinguished only by their worldly position." (Smith, 1883, 119).

The domination of the SA in particular at this time by Fellows with little real interest in Antiquity rankled rather with serious antiquarians such as Smith. Many of those on the SA's Council, most notably its president, the Earl of Aberdeen, hardly ever attended its meetings. For the majority of the 14% of the SA who were titled, the initials FSA were just another symbol of social status (see Chapter 4). The Numismatic Society on the other hand could boast that the majority of its members were real numismatists.

The similarity of interest between the NS and the BAA can be seen by the overlap in membership. All ten of the original Council of the NS became members of the BAA in September 1844, and of the 132 original members in July 1837, 33 (exactly 25%) joined the BAA seven years later, and seven of these were members of its Central Committee in 1844. In addition, Lord Albert Conyngham was already president of the NS when he was asked to be the first president of the BAA. In his *History of the Royal Numismatic Society*, Carson suggests (1986, 9) that Conyngham was more of a figurehead president of the NS than his predecessors, but nevertheless he was interested in antiquarian research, and he played an active role in the BAA. Conyngham was president of the NS from 1843 to 1845 and also from 1851 to 1855, after becoming Lord Londesborough. Unlike the BAA and the SA, the NS could not boast large numbers of noble members or higher clergy. The only peer listed as a member in 1837 was the Duke of Devonshire. By 1840 he had been joined by Lord Prudhoe, Lord Carington, the Marquis of Bute, and Lord Conyngham. On the other hand, the BAA's membership list of 1844 shows 23 peers, the Archbishop of Canterbury and twelve bishops, and soon after the split the AI boasted 36 peers (see Appendix C v).

Many of the NS's members were also Fellows of the Society of Antiquaries or the Royal Society or both. Of the 132 members at the end of the first session, 27 were FSA and eight were FRS. Nine of the members in the first year were involved with the British Museum, including Sir Henry Ellis and Edward Hawkins. As Keeper of Antiquities, Hawkins, who was a keen numismatist himself, was responsible for the BM's collection of coins and medals. In 1839 he succeeded Lee as president of the NS.

The Numismatic Society owed much to Dr John Lee, its first president. Lee was later an active member of the BAA, strongly supporting the Wright faction during the split and in due course becoming one of its vice-presidents. As well as being instrumental in the formation of the NS, he had also been involved with the founding of the Royal Astronomical Society in 1820, and it was presumably his influence which enabled the NS to hold its regular meetings in the Astronomical Society's rooms for the first few years. As part of his third presidential address he linked his interests by

"shewing how far in various ages numismatic science has lent its humble aid to register and commemorate the events and discoveries of its glorious sister Astronomy" (*Proceedings of the NS*, 18/7/1839, 401).

Important though Lee was, Carson suggests that "his role was that of a generous and influential patron rather than an active numismatist." (Carson, 1986, 4). According to Carson, "the real father of the Society was John Yonge Akerman", one of the original secretaries and editor of what was first the *Numismatic Journal* and then became the *Numismatic Chronicle*. Akerman also became secretary of the SA and was active in the BAA. He published many articles and volumes on coins and numismatics, but was most widely known for his *Archaeological Index* of 1847. An interesting link in these antiquarian circles is that Akerman was, at one stage, Lord Conyngham's private secretary.

Numismatic Periodicals

Initially, members were kept informed of the activity of the NS by the publication of its *Proceedings*. In addition, many members of the Society subscribed to the *Numismatic Journal* (2 volumes 1836 - April 1838) and the *Numismatic Chronicle* (from June 1838 onwards) which were produced by Akerman as a private venture, but were always very closely linked with the Society. They included the transactions of the Society and some of the papers read at meetings were published in full. In December 1839 the Council discontinued publishing the *Proceedings* separately and instead laid down conditions for a closer association of the *Numismatic Chronicle* with the Society. In particular, the connection was to continue only if the *Chronicle* was conducted by an officer of the Society.

The parallels with the *Archaeological Journal* are interesting. Both periodicals were conducted by a secretary of the society they were associated with, and neither were originally published by their societies. In John Evans' presidential address to the NS in 1881 he referred to the loose connection between the *Numismatic Chronicle* and the Society and said "this arrangement does not seem to have worked well for the Society" (quoted in Carson, 1986, 8). Following the split of the BAA, it was also suggested by the Wright faction that the arrangement of the *Archaeological Journal* being published privately by Parker was not in the Association's interests (see Chapter 10). It seems that, according to the Wright faction, the Central Committee had had difficulty maintaining control over the conduct of the journal. The preface to the first issue of the *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* claims that Parker had inserted papers and illustrations on his own authority without the Committee's approval and had so subjected the Association to a loss (*JBAA* 1, xii). Therefore the General Meeting of 5th March 1845 decided that henceforth their Journal would be "published at the expense

of, and subject to the entire control of the Committee, who will hold themselves responsible to the Association for its proper management." (Ibid., xiii). This is akin to the decision of the GS the following year to take over direct control of their *Quarterly Journal* (see Chapter 4). The *Numismatic Chronicle*, although subtitled "Journal of the Numismatic Society" from its fifth volume, was not taken over officially by the Society until December 1858.

The problems which the NS faced with the *Numismatic Chronicle* only became apparent after several years when the Society's membership began to drop, partly because receiving the Chronicle was an additional expense unrelated to membership. The connection with the *Chronicle* was also financially undesirable for the Society as a meeting of the Council in December 1839 had agreed to acquire 150 copies of the *Chronicle* direct from the publishers. However it was reported in 1842 (*Numismatic Chronicle* 5, 68) that only 17 of these copies had been subscribed for by members, and thus the Society was making a significant loss. Even after trying hard to encourage members to take out subscriptions for the *Chronicle*, only 38 had done so by June 1842. Therefore it was decided to investigate increasing the annual membership fee for future members, and to provide them with copies of the periodical at no extra cost.

The Assistant Secretary Dispute

The NS faced another problem in its early years, although this did not approach the severity of the controversy which was to tear the BAA apart. A degree of discord in the NS arose over the appointment of an Assistant Secretary. The Council had agreed to appoint an assistant secretary to be paid sixty pounds per annum at a meeting in December 1837, and this was agreed by the Second General Meeting in July 1838 (*Proceedings of the NS*, 198). Cullimore accepted the post and fulfilled it satisfactorily.

However in November 1838 the Council suspended the post. Then, at a Special General Meeting held on 14th February 1839, for the resolution: "That it was inexpedient to appoint any officer with a salary", the suspension of the post was confirmed by 26 votes to 24.

Lee, the president, and others including Hamilton, the president of the Geographical Society, and Thomas Pettigrew, argued: "that the experience of public bodies had proved that business of this complicated nature could not proceed without being combined with duty." (Ibid., 286). However these arguments were opposed by Hawkins, Birch, Roach Smith, and others. Lee clearly felt very strongly on the issue but was persuaded not to resign until the following Annual General Meeting. In his presidential address on that occasion, he referred to the matter again:

"the appointment of an assistant-secretary, with a stipend, having appeared to me indispensable, and having been adopted chiefly at my suggestion, the rescinding of that measure on the part of the Council and afterwards by the general body, was contrary to my opinion and wishes; and that since the month of November 1838, a great deal of additional labour and responsibility have fallen upon the President.... the duties of the President, in my opinion, cannot be properly executed without the re-appointment of an assistant-secretary.

The motive for annulling the appointment, namely, the want of funds, has proved to be fallacious." (Ibid., 359)

Lee's successor as president, Hawkins, had been one of those who had argued for the abolition of the post, so if indeed it did place an unacceptable burden on the president, he was the one who would suffer.

Regardless of the result of the issue, or even of the nature of the issue itself, what is worth noticing about this episode in the NS's history is that the Society came through it without a major rift, despite the Council being divided in opinion and the president's wishes being opposed by the membership at large. By contrast, the BAA fell into serious difficulties when it was faced

with differences in opinion amongst members of its Council. At this stage in time it is difficult to investigate the true nature of the NS assistant secretary dispute beyond the content of the *Proceedings* and the president's address, whereas the BAA's controversy is reasonably well documented. I have been unable to discover whether any personal animosities were involved in the NS's dispute, although these appear to have been a significant factor underlying the BAA's split. But what I believe to be of importance in comparing the two incidents is the state of the respective societies' rules at the time of controversy. The NS had in place a set of institutes which allowed for Special General Meetings and gave the procedure to be followed in resolving disputes, whereas many of the BAA's troubles sprang from the Association not having a clear constitution to govern the relationship between the Central Committee and the Association's ordinary members.

Regulations for the Society

At the Second General Meeting, a year and a half after the Society's formation, members of the NS accepted a "Code of Institutes for their government as a public body", drawn up by a committee appointed for the purpose (*Proceedings of the NS*, 19/7/1838, 205). These Institutes, which with 74 different points are very extensive, range from the Society's Objects through to procedures for dealing with Donations and Bequests. These rules appear to have worked well in regulating the Special General Meeting concerning the assistant secretary and in other matters. In his third presidential address, Lee stated:

"our Institutes, which have been in force for a year, appear to have operated beneficially for the interests of the Society, and have relieved the Council from that state of responsibility in which their proceedings were necessarily involved, during the patriarchal age, if I may so speak, of their government." (*Proceedings of the NS*, 18/7/1839, 358).

The speed with which the BAA had grown in its first year meant

that a formal set of regulations were needed sooner than had been the case with the NS. However a revision to the constitution had not been worked out by the time of the controversy at the end of 1844. Therefore, when Pettigrew, the treasurer, called a Special General Meeting in March 1845 in response to requests from the membership, there was actually no procedure in place to follow (see Chapter 10). The Wright faction passed a number of resolutions at the Special General Meeting concerning membership and other rules of the Association, in particular relating to the election of the officers and Committee who had previously been self-appointed. A few months later, at the meeting of the Way faction at Winchester in September, they too adopted some formal "Regulations for the government of the Archaeological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland." (*Archaeol J* 2, 1845, 317).

The State of Numismatic Science in Britain and Abroad

I have discussed how the NS and the BAA had a number of similarities as well as differences in the conduct of their affairs, concerning their membership, periodicals, and regulations. They also show similarities in the way they perceived their roles as public bodies. Both societies valued their overseas links, believed they had an important public role, and were confident in the importance of their discipline as scientific knowledge (see Chapters 3 and 4).

The NS was originally formed with the category of Associate Member for persons "eminent in numismatic science, not being a British subject, nor having a permanent residence in the United Kingdom". (Pagan, 1986, 52). Initially there were seven members in this category, however this had increased to 29 associates by July 1840. The BAA also had strong overseas links, especially through Thomas Wright, who was a corresponding member of the French Institute.

Members of the NS, like other antiquarians, frequently compared the state of their studies abroad to the inferior public position of such researches in Britain (see Chapter 4). In a presidential address, Lee referred to the general dissatisfaction with the British government's support of antiquities:

"The respect paid to the study of Numismatics in France appears to be greater than that which exists amongst us (where the royal patronage is also inferior); and more facility is given to the public to inspect and examine works of numismatic art and talent." (*Proceedings of the NS*, 18/7/1839, 387).

Lee goes on to explain how in France seven eminent men were responsible for superintending their national numismatics,

"whereas, in Great Britain, so little is the science of antiquities held in respect by the government, that to guard, systematise, and explain the numismatic treasures of the British Museum, only two gentlemen are at present appointed." (*Ibid.*, 388).

Similarly, presidential addresses for the BAA and AI often contained calls for greater governmental support. One aim in founding the BAA had been to set up a body which could lobby the government for antiquarian interests, and in addition could help actively in the protection of ancient monuments (see Chapter 8). The NS also saw itself as having a useful role, for instance in making suggestions concerning the coinage of the realm. For example, a letter was read before the NS in November 1837 "On a method of stamping the Coinage, with a view to protecting the Royal Effigy from Obliteration", and in May 1838 a detailed paper was read giving a proposal on how to introduce "the Decimal Division in Money" (*ibid.*, 100 and 179-182). Perhaps it is significant that neither of these proposals were adopted by the Royal Mint.

The confidence of the numismatists in their pursuits was expressed by Lee in his first presidential address:

"Should our success prove equal to our wishes, we shall have the satisfaction of being the first to render universally available ... one of the most important branches of the

history of nations, of literature and of the arts." (Ibid., 15/6/1837, 55).

Similar sentiments on the importance of antiquarian researches were expressed by the founders of the BAA, who likewise wanted to open out their field to a wider public. That the NS was successful in its aims was testified to by Roach Smith who wrote of it:

"It would be difficult to point to any other Society that has fulfilled its purposes more completely than the Numismatic Society." (Smith, 1883, 119).

Chapter 7**THE GOTHIC REVIVAL AND ECCLESIOLOGY**

The increase in public interest in antiquarian matters which enabled the BAA to be so successful, was closely linked with a similar interest in architecture, especially of church buildings. Many of the local and county societies which grew up in the 1840s had gothic architecture as their principle concern, although often they were also archaeological in nature. Most of these societies owed their origin to the Ecclesiological Movement which was dominated by the Cambridge Camden Society, founded in 1839 (see below). Although ostensibly concerned with architectural matters, the CCS was also involved with the ritualistic revival in the Church of England at this time, and was seen by many as closely linked with the Tractarian or Oxford Movement (see below). The link between this movement and archaeology was identified by Haverfield in his *The Roman Occupation of Britain* (1924):

"In archaeological matters the new growth was perhaps most closely connected with the new religious movement. The antiquarian and the tractarian have much in common.... the two movements, though not in origin the same, probably helped one another." (Quoted in Piggott, 1976, 171).

The Romantic Movement's Effect on Architecture

A taste for gothic architecture had grown out of the glorification of the Middle Ages by the Romantic Movement. Romanticism, although essentially a literary movement, touched all branches of art, and of these architecture was not the least. The most prominent of the Romantics who affected architecture was Sir Walter Scott, whose poetry and historic novels abound with allusions to the military and ecclesiastical architecture of earlier periods. Eastlake claims that

"it would be difficult to overrate the influence which Scott's poetry has had ... in encouraging a national taste for medieval architecture." (Eastlake, 1872, 115).

Scott's *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border* was published in 1802

and 1803, and followed by *The Lay of the Last Minstrel* (1805) and several other ballads. Among the most significant of his romantic Waverley novels which exploited the medieval genre were *Ivanhoe* (1819), *The Monastery* (1820), *The Abbott* (1820), and *The Talisman* (1825). As well as his own works, Scott's legacy includes the foundation of the Bannatyne printing club in 1823 (see Chapter 4). The widespread appeal of this literature was most important in fostering the Gothic Revival which was to dominate nineteenth century architecture.

Whilst the literary works of Scott were indirectly feeding the interest of the public in medieval ecclesiastical architecture, John Britton was publishing a series of elaborately illustrated and highly popular books bearing more directly on the subject. His *Beauties of England* (published from 1800-1816), a series of books which exploited the public interest in architecture, topography and local antiquity, was followed by *Architectural Antiquities of Great Britain* (published in forty quarterly parts from 1805-1814), and *Cathedral Antiquities*, (published up until 1835). Also influential in the development of the nineteenth century appreciation of medieval architecture was Thomas Rickman's *An Attempt to Discriminate the Styles of Architecture in England* (1819).

Pugin and the Gothic Revival

Probably the most significant figure in the Gothic Revival was Augustus Welby Northmore Pugin whose almost fanatical medievalism was a spur to ecclesiastical antiquarian research, yet whose Roman Catholicism risked bringing the study of Church architecture into disrepute amongst the Anglican Establishment. Pugin's *Contrasts* (1836) blamed the Protestant Reformation and the Renaissance for the "decay in taste" in church buildings. In it he argued that Gothic, or Pointed Architecture was the one true "Christian" style:

"Pointed or Christian Architecture has far higher claim on our admiration than mere beauty or antiquity; the former may be regarded as a matter of opinion, - the latter, in the abstract, is no proof of excellence, but in it alone we find *the faith of Christianity* embodied, and its practices illustrated." (*Contrasts*, 3-4, quoted in White, 1962, 12).

Pugin forced architects, politicians, thinkers, and religious leaders alike to ask whether architectural style - in particular Gothic architecture - could act as a tool for moral and spiritual renewal in modern society (Saint, 1988, xiii). The social importance of architecture was discussed 12 years later by Ruskin in his *Lamp of Sacrifice*:

"Architecture is the art which so disposes and adorns the edifices raised by man, for whatever uses, that the sight of them may contribute to his mental health and pleasure." (Ruskin, 1849, Century edition (1988), 8).

Pugin had become a Roman Catholic in 1834 and believed that it was Catholicism which gave Gothic its moral and aesthetic potency. Other Catholics (with the exception of Lord Shrewsbury, Pugin's patron) showed little interest in Gothic, however his views were soon widely reflected in the Church of England, though few Anglicans wished to acknowledge his influence. Ruskin claimed not to have been influenced by Pugin, and the *Ecclesiologist* also claimed that the CCS originally had no knowledge of his works when it was founded. However both these claims probably fail to do justice to the key role Pugin played in setting in motion the Ethical stage of the Gothic Revival.

Clark (1928, 150) divides the Gothic Revival into a Picturesque and an Ethical period. The Picturesque period of Gothic was motivated by the Romantic desire to recreate the atmosphere of a bygone age. The Ethical stage, on the other hand, was far more about the Christian symbology and moral value of Gothic architecture independent of mere aesthetic concerns. This was to have an immense affect on ecclesiastical architecture in the 1840s. The Gothic style in the Picturesque sense was extensively used in secular architecture, such as Scott's Abbotsford and Lord

Shrewsbury's Alton Towers (designed by Pugin). The clearest example of its popularity came following the burning down of the Old Palace of Westminster in 1834. The competition to design the new Houses of Parliament resulted in a Gothic style (the details of which owed much to Pugin), which indicates the increasing attraction of this style of architecture.

Whilst Pugin was involved with secular architecture, the main thrust of *Contrasts* was directed against the contemporary religious buildings of which he strongly disapproved. In the early years of the nineteenth century there were insufficient churches in the growing industrial towns to house the rapidly increasing urban population. In an attempt to avoid social discontent amongst the poor which might lead to revolutionary activity, those in authority wished to encourage church attendance amongst the labouring classes. This concern had resulted in the formation of the Church Building Society, and soon afterwards Parliament passed the Church Building Act of 1818. The Act initiated a programme of extensive Church Building which resulted in over 200 new churches being built. Many of these were erected in Gothic styles because it was considered cheap. However these Commissioner's Churches

"possess, as a rule, little or no merit in the way of architectural design, having been chiefly built for the purpose of providing as speedily and cheaply as possible church accommodation for manufacturing districts, which of late years were rapidly increasing in population." (Eastlake, 1872, 189).

Pugin believed that although these churches were nominally Gothic in details, their overall execution failed miserably to come up to the standards of true Christian Architecture. For Pugin, a large part of the blame lay in the Protestant nature of these buildings.

The Oxford Movement

At the same time as Pugin was developing his architectural ideas, the Oxford Movement was causing a stir in the Church of England.

The Movement began with Keble's famous Assizes Sermon in July 1833, and this was soon followed by the publication of *Tracts for the Times* which gave the movement's followers their title of Tractarians. These tracts were ostensibly "against Popery and dissent" but became very unpopular in many quarters of the Church of England as their proponents were associated with Catholicism. The chief interest of the movement was in teaching correct doctrine, especially with regard to the apostolic succession. It aimed to reinvigorate the Anglican Church and, by turning back to the early Christian fathers as the custodians of doctrine, to reconcile the Anglican and Roman branches of the Catholic Church.

John Newman played a pre-eminent role in the Tractarian Movement and it was his Ninetieth Tract in 1841 which provoked the greatest controversy. In it he tried to show that the 39 Articles could be interpreted in a Catholic light. This was an attempt to dissuade followers of the movement from seceding from the Church of England in favour of Rome. But this went too far for much of the Church and thereafter the Bishop of Oxford banned further such publications. In due course Newman himself became a Catholic in 1845.

Tractarianism was primarily concerned with doctrinal issues, but it also sparked off a revival in High Church ritual and practices in which the Cambridge Camden Society took the lead. The Tractarians were not themselves directly involved with ritualistic matters (in fact Pusey was disturbed by many ritualistic innovations of the period) or interested in aesthetics. Keble never wore vestments, and Pusey and Newman both declared their feeling that inner things were more important than superficial outward show. However at this time the Gothic revival was turning towards a more moral view on architecture and a belief in exclusively Christian styles. The CCS was concerned with worship as well as architecture, and its founders and most vigorous supporters were strongly sympathetic to the Oxford Movement.

Therefore it is not surprising that the two movements became associated.

"It is a mistake, though a very common one, to think that the change in worship and architecture occurring in Victoria's reign was engineered at Oxford.... It was the Cambridge Ecclesiological Society which led the way in changes in worship expressive of the changes in theology advocated at Oxford." (White, 1962, 19).

This confusion associating the Oxford Movement with ritualism and Gothic architecture was even present at the time. Clark (1928, 214) quotes from Weale's *Quarterly Papers on Architecture*:

"The matter, *architecturally* not less *spiritually*, seems to have originated with certain "clerkes of OXENFORD". As the tracts theological, so have the treatises church-gothical, swarmed upon us." (*Quarterly Papers on Architecture* 2, July 1844, 1).

Despite their opponents, both the Oxford Tractarian Movement and the Cambridge Ecclesiological Movement were to have wide-reaching effects throughout the Church. Previous to these movements, there was little reverence for church buildings or their contents and many medieval churches were in very poor repair. A paper read at the Exeter Diocesan Architectural Society in 1842 described the neglect and lack of respect for churches which people were suddenly becoming aware of:

"we may now see in most of our rural churches a rabble of boors and boys seated on the very steps and rails of the altar, and the altar itself is used to place their hats on ... This extreme irreverence, and shocking desecration of holy things is capable of no excuse." (Quoted in White, 1962, 4).

White also gives instances of servants bringing luncheon to the squire during sermons, and of a churchwarden climbing on the altar to open windows during a service! However, very rapidly after the foundation of the CCS, the reforms it initiated were adopted almost universally across the country, leading to greater reverence in worship.

The Cambridge Camden Society

The CCS was founded in 1839 by John Mason Neale and Benjamin Webb, a couple of undergraduates who both went on to become clergymen. It took the name "Camden" from the famous sixteenth century antiquary, and "Cambridge" was added to distinguish it from the Camden Society printing club. From the very start it grew rapidly, and by May 1841 it had about 300 members. By 1843 its membership had risen to over 700, including 2 archbishops and 16 bishops. Its influence was even wider than its large membership suggests. This was largely due to its highly popular pamphlets. For instance, *A Few Words to Churchwardens on Churches and Church Ornaments* (1841) sold about 5000 copies within six weeks of its initial publication, necessitating ten editions in its first year and a further three by 1843 when it was reported that 13,000 copies had been circulated (White, 1962, 115).

Despite its rapid growth, the underlying principles behind the Society remained the same as when it had been confined to members of the University. The first law of the Society stated:

"The object of the Society shall be, to promote the study of Ecclesiastical Architecture and Antiquities, and the restoration of mutilated architectural remains."

But in addition to these stated architectural aims, Briggs suggests that the founders' original intentions were "to ensure dignified and decent forms of worship" (Briggs, 1952, 160), and to promote their concerns with church ritual. One of these concerns was to restore the use of the chancel in parish churches. Previous to the CCS's campaigns on the subject, many chancels were left unused or even boarded up, and new churches had often been built without them. However, so effective was the evangelising of the CCS that, within a few years, chancels were once again in use throughout the country. Another major concern of the ecclesiologists to do with church furnishings was the removal of box pews. The pew system not only encouraged irreverence since

the preacher and congregation could not see each other, but also alienated the poorer members of the congregation who were forced to sit in far less comfort at the back of the church. Pews were often completely enclosed with wood panelling to a height of five feet or more, and were occasionally fitted up like drawing rooms with carpets, fireplace, chimney and chairs! The pew system reflected the rigid class structure and snobbery of the day and was probably a significant factor behind the decline in church attendance. The CCS argued continuously in pamphlet after pamphlet for the removal of pews, and within a few years they were almost completely destroyed. In matters like these the Society made its influence felt far beyond the bounds of Cambridge.

The Society was always controlled by its committee. The most prominent members of the Committee, Neale, Webb and A J B Hope, were all strong supporters of the Oxford Movement (although Neale found Newman's Tract XC an "obnoxious book" and a "tragedy" (White, 1962, 26)). Many of the other younger and more active members of the Society were also followers of Tractarian views, especially their doctrines relating to the ministry and the sacraments. Despite these views, the CCS claimed to have no theological standpoint and forbade theological debates, thus effectively concealing the real theological positions of the main ecclesiologists from the public for several years. White observes that "even some members did not realise that their organisation was in actuality a very effective machine for theological propaganda." (Ibid., 36). The apparently non-controversial nature of the CCS was one of the factors which had enabled it to increase its membership so quickly in its early years.

"Evidently, a large number of people, especially those occupying positions of authority in the University and Church, had joined thinking they were merely encouraging an antiquarian and artistic society with a commendable practical interest in building churches." (Ibid., 28)

Following its success in attracting so many new members, the

Society began to publish the *Ecclesiologist*, a monthly journal. The opening address of the first number in November 1841 explains that its purpose was to enable members of the Society living away from Cambridge to keep in touch with its proceedings and researches. Although primarily intended as a periodical report of the Society's business, it was also hoped to

"convey both interesting and useful information to all connected with, or in any way engaged-in, church-building, or the study of ecclesiastical architecture or antiquities.... to give publicity to projects of church building ... to describe accurately and impartially the restorations of ancient churches ... and to supply notices and reviews of any antiquarian researches, books, or essays, relating to the subject of Ecclesiology." (*Ecclesiologist* 1, 1843, 1-2).

The periodical was also intended to enable communication between clergy, architects and ecclesiologists on matters of "taste or architectural propriety", and in addition to strengthen communication between the CCS and other architectural societies which were beginning to be established elsewhere (see Chapter 4).

The *Ecclesiologist* was edited by the Committee of the Society and articles were anonymous. Due to the radical nature of those on the Committee, this meant that the periodical was often outspoken in condemning new churches or restorations of which it did not approve. In fact the first number was republished at the request of several influential members of the university (including Professor Willis, a vice-president of the CCS) to tone down an extremely hostile review of St Paul's Church, Cambridge (*Ecclesiologist* 1, 1843, 25-28).

The Decorated Style of Gothic

The Tractarians were little interested in the past, however the Ecclesiologists were influenced by Romanticism as well as by the Oxford Movement. The Romantic interest in the Middle Ages had been popularised by writers such as Wordsworth, Coleridge and Scott (see above), and of course Pugin's obsession with the past

has already been referred to. The Ecclesiologists believed the men of the Middle Ages were "more spiritually-minded and less worldly-minded" than the nineteenth century (Report of CCS for 1842, 16), and that, as a result, their architecture was better than modern work. As the Ecclesiological Movement developed, its followers became increasingly intolerant and insisted on one particular type of Gothic - the Decorated style from the 13th century.

"Decorated was more moral and more holy than Perpendicular, just as any Gothic style was more moral and holy than Norman or Renaissance." (Briggs, 1952, 167).

These two influences of theology and the Romantics' interest in the past, meant that

"throughout its career the Cambridge Camden Society was to be torn ... between ecclesiology and antiquarianism, between rigid rules of architectural correctness, and the expression of artistic originality." (White, 1962, 26).

At times, the ecclesiologists' conception of there being deep principles underlying medieval church building led them to reject old and beautiful work which failed to fit into their understanding of Medieval Christian Architecture. Ultimately antiquity and beauty were subordinate to dogmatic laws of church architecture - by which the ecclesiologists believed medieval architects had been bound.

"Neale and Webb believed the ancient builders possessed "some canons of church symbolism, now unknown to us", but which had been "a rule and precedent" to architects of the past." (White, 1962, 81-82, referring to *Durandus*).

These rules were to be understood by inductively studying as many medieval churches as possible. The problem was that this dogmatism could lead to the ecclesiologists disregarding and even destroying features unique to certain buildings which failed to fit into the overall pattern.

The "Science" of Ecclesiology

Ecclesiology was seen by its practitioners as an inductive science

- the science of church architecture (ibid., 49-53). As ecclesiology developed, this "liturgical science" also took in other concerns such as Church music and Christian Aesthetics. This was the period that William Whewell was publishing his influential *History and Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences* (1840 and 1838), and, like many other disciplines, ecclesiology aspired to Whewell's inductive ideal. J S Howson, a member of the Committee and also a member of Trinity College (of which Whewell was by then Master), wrote to the *Ecclesiologist* saying:

"It must be remembered, that Ecclesiology, like Astronomy and Geology, is an Inductive Science. No sound and truthful generalisations can be hoped for without a careful examination of particulars; and for this work our Society is peculiarly adapted." (*Ecclesiologist* 1, 1843, 56).

Here can be seen another another indication of the close links between the disciplines of archaeology and ecclesiology, for other antiquarians also saw themselves as engaged in a scientific enterprise (see Chapter 3). The ecclesiologists would readily have said of their subject that which Allen wrote of archaeology:

"what was in the first instance little more than an intellectual pastime, has in the end taken its place amongst the exact sciences." (Allen, 1884, 232).

The CCS inductive programme involved observing and studying large numbers of original church buildings and details of their fabric, collating this information, and then endeavouring to construct general laws regarding the underlying principles which had guided the medieval builders. The Society published several editions of *A Few Hints on the Practical Study of Ecclesiastical Antiquities for the Use of the Cambridge Camden Society* (1st edition: 1839, 4th edition: 1843) and a *Hand-Book of English Ecclesiology* (1847) which explained how to "take" a church. "Taking" a church involved using a Church Scheme (a checklist of the fabric and furnishings liable to be present in a parish church) in order to make a detailed description of the building and its contents. Hundreds of the Society's members visited churches throughout the country filling in these Church Schemes, and then returned the

completed details to Cambridge. This national survey of churches collected vast amounts of data on church architecture which then provided the raw material for much scholarly work. The results of this work were published in the *Ecclesiologist*, or read at meetings of the Society, the most important papers being published in the *Transactions of the Cambridge Camden Society* (3 vols: 1841-1845).

Ecclesiology and Antiquarianism

The works of the CCS and the ecclesiologists connected with it were frequently of great antiquarian interest. One of the great strengths of the CCS was in the sheer activity of its members which enabled particular features to be looked at in large numbers of churches. The Society of Antiquaries had never been active on a corporate scale, and the new archaeological associations, although having similar numbers of members to the CCS, were never able to mobilise such widespread interest to conduct surveys of this nature. The researches of the CCS not only produced large quantities of antiquarian information, but also helped spread an interest in such matters.

~~"It was the proselytising vigour of the Camdenians that brought an appreciation of ancient buildings - and by an easy extension, ancient monuments in general - into the lives of the English upper and middle classes in the 1840s as never before.... Churches were lively objects of discussion, and so automatically was medieval architecture, and the whole question of the preservation and conservation of ancient buildings." (Piggott, 1976, 181-2).~~

By the time the British Archaeological Association was begun, the CCS and the Ecclesiological Movement had, in just a very few years, succeeded in raising public awareness of antiquarian matters. Without doubt, the BAA owed a substantial debt to ecclesiology for spreading an interest in investigating the past.

There were never clear dividing lines between ecclesiology and other antiquarian studies. As well as studying actual buildings,

some of the leaders of the Cambridge Movement pursued the antiquarian exploit of translating ancient documents, especially those relating to their interests in ecclesiology. Amongst these was *Hierugia Anglicana or Documents and Extracts Illustrative of the Ritual of the Church of England after the Reformation* (published in serial form from 1843-1848). White (1962, 67) believes this to be the most scholarly work published by the CCS. It was an attempt to advocate a change in ritual by using documentary sources. White suggests it represents a landmark in the development of Ritualism, setting a precedent for much further work of its kind in the nineteenth century. *Hierugia* was controversial, but far more so was a translation of a thirteenth century work on symbolism by Neale and Webb. This was *The Symbolism of Churches and Church Ornaments: A Translation of the First Book of the Rationale Divinorum Officiorum, Written by William Durandus, Sometime Bishop of Mende* (1843).

"It is difficult to overestimate the importance of this work for it materially changed the course of ecclesiology.... the publication of *Durandus* ... marked the real adoption of symbolism as a significant feature of ecclesiology. The consequences for church building and restoration were enormous." (White, 1962, 68).

Durandus, and the translators' introduction to it, were to firmly suggest that ecclesiology had an unmistakable religious significance. The symbolism and ritual advocated were seen by many churchmen as instinct with Roman Catholic feeling. The work caused great controversy and precipitated the disbandment of the CCS in 1845 (see below).

Most ecclesiologists were deeply interested in the past, but as a result of their belief in the essentially Christian nature of their enterprise, they sometimes felt themselves superior to mere antiquarians.

"A most useful and meritorious body of men they are, though of course in many respects behind the requirements which are now necessary to constitute an 'Ecclesiologist' or even an 'Archaeologist'." (*Ecclesiologist* 6, 1846, 231).

There was a practical side to ecclesiology which antiquarianism did not possess. This was its encouragement of building new churches in line with ecclesiological principles, as well as the restoring of existing old buildings to their original appearance. This practical aspect of the Victorian interest in architecture and its history was echoed in Ruskin's *Lamp of Memory*:

"And if there be any profit in our knowledge of the past ... there are two duties respecting national architecture whose importance it is impossible to overrate: the first, to render the architecture of the day, historical; and the second, to preserve, as the most precious of inheritances, that of past ages." (Ruskin, 1849, Century edition (1988), 178).

The CCS was certainly instrumental both in rendering contemporary architecture historical, and in working for the preservation of ancient architecture, even if this preservation was all too often in just the one particular style.

Ecclesiologists may have considered themselves superior to antiquarians, but it should be noted that the opposite view was also held. Thomas Wright argued that the very widespread appeal of ecclesiology of which its proponents were so proud, detracted from "the higher claims of the science [of archaeological researches]." It takes more than "measuring windows and rubbing brasses" to obtain "sufficient claim to the title of antiquary." Wright refers to ecclesiology as "a late morbid religious movement" and deplors that "Church architecture has been set up under our own eyes as the banner of a more than semi-Romanism." He also takes the opportunity to attack the ecclesiologists' undue concern with one particular period in history and their "ill-grounded admiration for the Middle Ages." (Wright, 1847, 325-6)

The obsession, particularly as the Ecclesiological Movement developed, with the early English 'Decorated' style was most unfortunate. It led to excesses such as those of Gilbert Scott in the restoration of cathedrals from 1847, and had previously

encouraged well-meaning churchwardens and clergy in the destruction of church furnishings which were not of the "correct" period.

"The Revival of Medieval Art had all the charm of novelty to amateurs, many of whom took up the cause with more enthusiasm than discretion, and who were inclined to make short work of any relics which did not exactly fulfil their notions of architectural propriety." (Eastlake, 1872, 204).

There is a distinct similarity here to the lack of discretion by early Victorian barrow-diggers. Many of these were enthusiastic amateurs with little conception of the damage they caused in pursuing a hobby which they believed to be one of preserving ancient relics but actually involved destroying much of the evidence from the past.

Around the time of the foundation of the BAA there were a few warning voices about the threat of destruction to ancient monuments by over-zealous antiquaries. Likewise there were those too who warned about the dangers of dogmatic restoration in particular styles. Rev H G Liddle read a timely paper to the Oxford Architectural Society in 1841 which would perhaps have best been directed at the CCS.

"We must remember how liable every man's mind is to be biased and warped by systems of excessive study, and that antiquarians are peculiarly open to this failing. Let us therefore take warning, and not set our affections on one style only, or on absolute uniformity in each style. This is the pedantry of architecture; this is the one-sidedness we must guard against.... the alterations of old buildings are in great part their history, and however much you may restore, you cannot recover the original work; and so you may be removing what is of the highest possible interest" (quoted in Eastlake, 1872, 204).

Other Architectural Societies

The Oxford Architectural Society was similar to the Cambridge Camden Society in its aims but tended to be less fervent and controversial than its Cambridge counterpart in its promotion of Gothic Architecture.

"Gothic was an antiquarian pastime for Oxonians rather than the religious crusade which it became at Cambridge." (White, 1962, 24).

The Oxford Society had been founded almost simultaneously with the CCS in March 1839. It was originally called "The Oxford Society for Promoting the Study of Gothic Architecture", and had soon merged with the "Oxford University Genealogical and Heraldic Society", before changing its name to the Oxford Architectural Society. It had an impressive list of members which included Buckland, Ellis, E A Freeman, Newman, Pusey, Ruskin, Chevalier Bunsen, Sir Francis Palgrave, and a number of notable architects such as A Salvin. Many of these men were later to join the BAA. As well as investigating religious architecture, the Oxford Society also enquired into the condition of other ancient structures. For instance in 1841 it published a list of old English bridges for which pontage-charters had been granted (Eastlake, 1872, 204), and papers were read about such matters as military architecture in the Middle Ages (*Ecclesiologist* 1, 1843, 123).

The Oxford Architectural Society and the CCS established a mutual relationship in 1840, and later the *Ecclesiologist* frequently carried articles from the Oxford Society. Unlike at Oxford though, the Cambridge Society confined itself to *ecclesiastical* architecture and antiquities. This was mainly due to the existence of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society which covered the broader interests (see Chapter 4).

The CCS provoked the foundation of other architectural societies throughout Britain which were concerned with ecclesiology. The opening address of the first number of the *Ecclesiologist* hopes that it

"may be made an important means of strengthening the connection and increasing the co-operation between the Cambridge Camden and the Oxford Architectural, and other Societies of kindred character and pursuits now beginning to be established in several parts of the kingdom" (*Ecclesiologist* 1, 1843, 2)

Many were founded along diocesan lines and, like the Cambridge Camden, were primarily involved with ecclesiastical architecture, often with a doctrinal element being important in their development. Although this was less of a factor in societies founded after the BAA's foundation (see Chapter 4).

The 1845 Controversy within the CCS

An important factor in the shift from the foundation of societies interested mainly in ecclesiastical architecture to those concerned with wider antiquarian interests was the identification, in some quarters, of ecclesiology with Tractarianism. Although few members of the CCS seceded from the Church of England, they were under grave suspicion of popery. I have already referred to the article in the first number which disturbed influential figures in the university. The same number also announced that the Bishop of London had requested that his name should be erased from the list of patrons on the grounds of objections to one of the Society's tracts (*Ecclesiologist* 1, 1843, 24). This prompted Archdeacon Thorp, the president, to suggest to Neale that he revise various parts of the Society's publications which were open to a Romanist interpretation.

Despite criticisms of the Society's publications and work, it continued in much the same vein. By 1844 it was in trouble again, this time for erecting an altar in the Round Church at Cambridge, and other actions which were seen as theologically suspect. The *Athenaeum* reports:

"The Cambridge Camden Society has, it appears, carried its "restorations", at the Round Church, somewhat beyond the religious sympathies of the incumbent, who has given the Society "notice to quit," publicly assigned his reasons, and called on the friends of "the Protestant Reformation" to "support him in his opposition to the introduction of superstition." (*Athenaeum*, 2/3/1844, 200).

The most serious attack that the Society faced was a sermon preached on the 5th November 1844 by Rev Close, the perpetual

curate at Cheltenham, who then published his sermon under the title: *The "Restoration of Churches" is the Restoration of Popery*. In it he sets out to prove that "the *Ecclesiologist* of Cambridge is identical in doctrine with the *Oxford Tracts for the Times*." He wrote:

"It is not a question of brick and stone - of taste or science - the points at issue are purely doctrinal - it is whether Romanism or Protestantism shall prevail.... But enough of such sickening details; enough to establish beyond controversy that *such Restoration of churches not only tends to, but actually Is POPERY*." (The typography is his own. Quoted in Clark, 1928, 216).

The Church authorities could not stand idly by once such an attack had been launched, especially since the Oxford University authorities had finally condemned certain Tractarian works, although an attempt to condemn Tract XC failed. At a meeting of the CCS in February 1845 it was announced that the Bishops of Exeter and Lincoln, and the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge had withdrawn from the Society (*Ecclesiologist* 4, 1845, 71). The Committee of the CCS then proposed, to the surprise of the meeting, that the Society be dissolved. The drastic idea of complete dissolution was defeated in a postal vote by 271 to 109 votes. As a result, the Committee suggested a reorganisation which separated the Society from the university (*Account of the 6th Anniversary meeting*), and in due course it left Cambridge for London changing its name to the Ecclesiological (Late Cambridge Camden) Society. (The "Late Cambridge Camden" was later dropped).

On leaving Cambridge, the Society escaped most of the criticism, although its executive remained almost unchanged. A total of 121 members seceded from the Society during the 1845 crisis whilst 680 remained. Subsequently the Society was far less outspoken on doctrinal matters. Meanwhile a purely architectural society was formed in Cambridge which avoided any strong theological stance.

By the time the CCS became the Ecclesiological Society in 1845 its

main influence had been felt throughout the country. As a result of its labours, large numbers of clergy and laity alike became interested in church buildings and other ecclesiastical antiquities. From an interest in architecture, it was but a short step to a wider interest in antiquity in general, and from there could easily follow involvement with local societies and/or the British Archaeological Association. Although the theological controversies alienated many from the ecclesiological movement, people still retained an interest in antiquities. There was good cause therefore for both the supporters of ecclesiology and also those that had rejected it, to join forces with the new archaeological associations which aimed at investigating the past without dwelling on doctrinal issues.

Chapter 8

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE BRITISH
ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

The Idea of the British Archaeological Association

"The British Archaeological Association takes its rise from conversations which took place between Mr Wright and Mr Smith. Those gentlemen mentioned their intentions to Dr Bromet; and at a meeting held at Mr Wright's residence, December 5, 1843, it was determined to establish a central board" (*JBAA* 1, no. 1, 1845, preface).

In his *Retrospections* Roach Smith recalls that he first met Wright at the Society of Antiquaries, and had very soon after talked to him about founding a society similar to the "Société Française d'Archéologie" which had recently been founded in France by de Caumont. Roach Smith writes that Wright was

"a member of the Institut of France, and was in active alliance with some of the finest literary men in Paris. He could well understand and approve my object; but he, at first, thought we could do nothing until we had a Minister of Public Instruction.... I urged that we might wait years in vain; and pointed out the evils of delay. He consented to act with me at once; and so the British Archaeological Association ... came into being." (Smith, 1883, 76).

Roach Smith gave a more detailed account of the debate on whether to proceed with the project in a Biographical Notice of Wright published slightly earlier than *Retrospections* in *Collectanea Antiqua* 7 (1880, 246-249). There he indicates that he was approached by a small circle of antiquarian friends for advice on how best to set up a local society in Kent. Working on the rough draft for this provoked him into forging ahead with the larger, national scheme, which soon absorbed the Kent project. Giving up hope of governmental support, Wright and Roach Smith proceeded with their plans and called into their councils William Bromet (qv) because of his knowledge of French antiquarian societies and their practices.

It can be seen therefore that Roach Smith and Wright were the original initiators of the Association. They almost immediately invited the co-operation of Albert Way, Director of the SA "who eagerly entered into the project" (*JBAA* 1, no 1, 1845 preface, i), and several others to form a Central Committee. According to *Collectanea Antiqua* 7, (1880) many of these others were chosen on the proposal of Way. These included Amyot, Croker, Ellis, Madden, Pettigrew, Thomas Stapleton (qv), and Charles Winston (qv). Without doubt, gaining the support of Way was of major importance because of his importance in the Society of Antiquaries. Although both Wright and Roach Smith were active antiquarians, neither was so influential in the Society as Way. Way was also to be instrumental in starting the *Archaeological Journal*. The strongly pro-Way *Narrative of Facts...*, written during the split, suggests that the magnitude the BAA assumed in terms of membership was directly due to Way alone. It claims the original initiators of the Society "had no expectation of getting more than from one to two hundred persons to join them", but Way

"saw the advantage that might be derived from such an Association being formed, and thrown open to the public on as wide a basis as possible. His station and extensive connections, aided by his own high character, at once enlarged the prospects of the proposed Association. He is well known to be one of the best informed Antiquaries in the kingdom, and is as generally liked and respected as he is known. His name was a guarantee both of the utility, and of the respectability, of the undertaking, and by his exertions, a considerable number of persons of weight and influence were induced to join it." (*Narrative of Facts...* 1).

From other accounts though, it would seem that the great volume of interest in the BAA had taken all of its founders, including Way, by surprise. The vast number of correspondents acquired by the Association meant that, even without the redefining of rules provoked by the split, it would have soon been necessary to revise the Association's constitution to deal with the substantial numbers it had by the end of its first year. Indeed it seems that a sub-committee was set up in January 1845, to consider this



matter, although it only reported to the Way faction after the split had occurred.

The Aims of the Association

According to its full title, the BAA was set up "for the Encouragement and Prosecution of Researches into the Arts and Monuments of the Early and Middle Ages". Way's Introduction to the first volume of the *Archaeological Journal* explained further these objects and how they were to be achieved. The aims included obtaining information on ancient arts and monuments throughout the country, and helping to secure their preservation. Every department of Art or Antiquarian research was to be included. It was hoped that documentary material could be preserved and published, and that whenever structures were unavoidably condemned for destruction, plans and drawings could be made to record full descriptions. The BAA also planned to keep abreast with overseas antiquarian work.

"Foreign discoveries, the proceedings of the French "Comité des Arts et Monuments", and other Continental Societies, will be noticed, especially as illustrative of our national Antiquities: and with the view of instituting a comparison of analogous facts, an extended correspondence, both with Societies and individuals in all parts of Europe, is desired." (*Archaeol J* 1, 1844, 6).

Another aim recognised the vast amounts of archaeological material being uncovered

"during the progress of public works, such as cuttings in the formation of railways, sewers, or foundations of buildings ... The committee propose, as far as possible, to secure the careful observation and record of such discoveries, and preservation of the objects found." (Ibid).

The final aim of the Association was to obtain the sanction and support of the government in preserving national antiquities. This was of great concern to the antiquarian community and also recalls the BAAS's aim to gain government support for science (see Chapters 4 and 5).

The Central Committee

The means proposed for attaining the Association's desired objects included setting up a permanent Central Committee formed of people resident in London (see Appendix A). The Committee was to include the best qualified people in every department of antiquarian research. It was to meet fortnightly to answer questions about restorations and antiquarian research sent in by associates who lived outside London. Information from such communications was to be collected and imparted by the Committee, generally by means of the journal. These aims necessitated setting up a system of local correspondence, with the target of gaining corresponding associates in every town in the country, so that each district would have an antiquarian who could report on local antiquities and be on the look-out for threats to ancient monuments.

The Central Committee approached Lord Albert Conyngham to act as president of the Association. He responded with zeal and exerted his influence on behalf of the Association, especially in forming a Local Committee and making other arrangements for the Canterbury Congress. Conyngham proved an excellent choice as president for, not only did he have a genuine love of antiquities, but he also played an active role in the Association's meetings. The other officers of the Association were Pettigrew as treasurer, and Roach Smith and Way as honorary secretaries.

It was hoped that all the initial financial wants of the Association would be provided by voluntary contributions, and later costs would be covered by the sale of the journal. The introduction explains, "it is distinctly to be understood that there is no intention at any future time of exacting any annual subscription." (*Archaeol J* 1, 1844, 4). Since no subscriptions were sought, and potential members were not asked to make any commitment other than to offer their names as supporters of the Association, it is not surprising that by the end of its first

year the Association could boast a membership of over a thousand. The problem with this system was that it was unclear whether the members had any rights at all over the conduct of the Association's affairs. This was to prove significant following the divisions within the Central Committee in early 1845, and the desire of the membership at large to have a say in the matters causing controversy.

The difficulties that the lack of proper subscriptions could bring had been anticipated by the *Athenaeum* when it first reported the establishment of the BAA. It wrote,

"The objects contemplated by this Society are so good, that we heartily wish the projectors success; but when we read that the Society is to be supported by voluntary contributions, we are troubled with misgivings as to the result. However, let us hope for the best." (*Athenaeum*, 24/2/1844, 175).

After its initial support for the Association however, the *Athenaeum* became one of its most influential critics as the subsequent reporting of the Canterbury Congress shows (see Chapter 9).

Membership of the Association in 1844

Membership lists were circulated with each of the early numbers of the journal. Thus it is possible to see the rapid growth in membership over the first year (see Appendix C i). The membership lists separated those of higher station from the bulk of the membership, by publishing their names in order of social standing at the front of the list. Foreign members are also listed separately in some of the lists. The people at the head of the list (referred to below as "titled") include the Archbishop of Canterbury, Peers, Bishops, "the Honourables", Baronets, Knights, and Deans. This distinction of those of high social standing reflects the class-consciousness of early Victorian society. One factor in inducing people to join societies such as the BAA was

the presence of such names. The same phenomenon was found in scientific societies, hence the desire to attract the nobility to the British Association for the Advancement of Science (see Chapter 5). In the list with the first number of the Journal (March 1st) there were 53 titled names and 385 others. A list dated June 25th has 92 titled names and 741 others. By September, these figures had risen to 103 and 921 respectively.

An analysis of the September list (see Appendix C ii) shows that 23 temporal lords, twelve bishops, and twelve deans were members of the Association. The total number of clergy (which also includes sixteen archdeacons and sixteen rural deans) in the list is 368, 36% of the total membership. 167 of the members (16%) were Fellows of the Society of Antiquaries, and 68 were Fellows of the Royal Society. There were also a number of fellows of other learned societies, although, rather surprisingly, only five members were listed as Fellows of the Geological Society. There were twenty Fellows of the Institute of British Architects, and about as many again who were listed as architects in the membership list, but were not connected with the Institute. 23 of those on the list were Members of Parliament, and there were about thirty Oxford and Cambridge academics, including five Heads of Colleges. Just over 3% of the membership were listed as officers of national or provincial societies, on the whole to do with antiquarian matters. In addition, fourteen of the members were listed as connected with the British Museum (five of whom were on the BAA's Central Committee). The vast majority of the membership were titled as Esquires, however there were 25 simple Misters. In several cases their occupations were given. These included five engravers, four painters on glass, and a bookseller - clearly occupations particularly relevant to the antiquarian community.

The Association was a national society but, not surprisingly, most of its members were from England rather than from the rest of

Great Britain and Ireland. The membership lists for the BAA and AI in 1845 were divided by county, so it is possible to see how the members were spread geographically (there are no significant differences between the two societies). About a quarter of the membership came from London and Middlesex, and slightly more from the rest of the South-East and East Anglia. Only just over five per cent of the members lived in Wales, Scotland or Ireland (see Appendix C). These figures compare interestingly with the geographical location of the British Association for the Advancement of Science's membership (Morrell and Thackray, 1981, 548-549). In 1844, nearly 10% of the BAAS's life members were from Dublin alone, with other Irish members being found especially at Cork where the Association had met the previous year. Only 15% of the BAAS membership came from London, whereas 27% came from northern industrial towns, which were far less represented amongst the membership of the archaeological societies. Regional biases in the membership were to affect the locations of the BAA's and AI's congresses in their early years, (they were held primarily in the South of England), whereas the BAAS had very different policies behind the siting of its congresses (see Chapter 5).

One of the Association's stated aims was to encourage contact with overseas antiquarians. Therefore it had provision for foreign members. There were only three of these shown on the March 1844 list, but by June the list included 24 names, and this had risen to 27 by September. The vast majority of the foreign members were French, which reflects the far more advanced state of organised archaeological research in France at this period. There were however also representatives of Italy, Russia, Prussia, and Denmark in the list of foreign members. Of particular note here is the name of C J Thomsen, Keeper of Coins and Medals in the King of Denmark's Copenhagen museum and originator of the three age system (see Chapter 3).

The Proceedings of the Central Committee

The Central Committee met fortnightly in Pettigrew's house to discuss matters of antiquarian interest. Their proceedings were published with each number of the journal giving an account of objects exhibited, letters and communications laid before the committee, and any other business transacted. The early meetings were taken up with the formation and establishment of the Association, so the proceedings of the first number do not give a detailed report of each meeting. Instead a summary of the principal matters of antiquarian interest discussed at the early meetings was given. Subsequent numbers of the journal gave a report of each individual meeting. These were normally a page or two long, although sometimes the reports stretch to several pages in length.

To give an indication of the type and amount of business conducted at a fairly typical meeting, the following is taken from the report of the meeting on 25th June 1844:

Roach Smith stated that the Numismatic Society had presented a complete set of their proceedings to the Association.

Charles Manby (qv) exhibited two Roman bronze swords found near Hadrian's Wall, and a Norman sword found in the Thames.

Wright read a note from John Virtue accompanying an exhibition of fragments of Roman pottery and artifacts which had been found during the formation of a new railway.

Roach Smith exhibited a spur and fibula in bronze belonging to Joseph Warren. These had been found in Suffolk. The proceedings gives a description of them.

Roach Smith read a communication from Bateman about various barrows he had opened in the previous months. The letter, which is quoted in full in the proceedings, gives detailed descriptions of the artifacts and bones discovered in digging the barrows.

W B Bradford forwarded a notice of a recent discovery of the foundations of a building in a meadow near Winchester College. He suggested they were remains of a chapel founded in 1301.

Way exhibited some drawings by J B Jackson representing an artificial mound; a stone circle; and sketches of some churches in Dorsetshire.

A note from G B Richardson was read concerning discoveries made by workmen while removing panelling in a church in Newcastle.
(*Archaeol J* 1, 1844, 246-9).

Most meetings seem to have taken a similar form, with members of the Committee reading letters or exhibiting artifacts on behalf of correspondents. Roach Smith and Wright in particular were notable for making several contributions to most meetings. The Committee did more than just sit around discussing the communications they received. There are frequent references to action being taken following up information given by correspondents. In addition there are occasional appeals in the proceedings to members of the Association asking for financial contributions or for vigilance over archaeological sites of interest. For instance, on 24th July, Croker read a letter from Rev Thomas Dean respecting the state of Little Malvern Priory, and appealing for funds to help restore and preserve the church. The Committee resolved, "that in the present stage of the formation of the Association, it would not be advisable to begin to subscribe money towards the restoration of buildings." (*Archaeol J* 1, 1844, 251). However the Committee did call public attention to Dean's communication in the journal.

At the end of the first number of the journal, the vigilance of correspondents was requested to watch over a number of churches which were to be enlarged, having been voted money for the work by the Incorporated Church Building Society. The journal writes:

"Correspondents in the vicinity of these places are therefore requested to keep watch upon the work, and to furnish information of any paintings on the walls, or other matters of archaeological interest." (*Ibid.*, 71).

Another aim of the Association was to act as a lobbying voice with the government and official bodies. This role was apparent early in the Association's existence when, over a number of meetings, it was brought to the Committee's attention that a reservoir was to

be erected in Greenwich Park which would result in the destruction of several Saxon barrows. John Sydenham, who first notified the Committee of this on 12th June 1844 (*Archaeol J* 1, 1844, 166-7), feared that it was already too late to avert the destruction of the barrows. However, the public interest raised over the matter resulted in questions being raised in the House of Commons and the plans being changed after only twelve barrows had been destroyed. Furthermore, "the authorities had expressed their readiness to forward the objects of the Association in every way within their power." (Minutes of July 10th, *ibid.*, 249). At the following meeting Crofton Croker was able to report the full facts of the matter and that the problems had been resolved (*ibid.*, 251).

The *Archaeological Journal*

The organ of communication between the Central Committee and the bulk of the membership was the *Archaeological Journal*. Initially Way acted as editor for the first number, but due to his ill health, Wright helped out with it and brought out the three following numbers on his own. The journal was published by J H Parker, an Oxford publisher, and there was a Printing Committee consisting of six people who, it was intended, would divide the editorial work between themselves. The Printing Committee consisted of Ambrose Poynter (qv), for architecture; Wright, for general literature; Rev John Bathurst Deane (qv) , for medieval antiquities; Bromet, for translating documents from French publications; and Roach Smith and Way as the two secretaries. (*Verbatim Report of the Special General Meeting*, 6-7). These arrangements were not entirely satisfactory, and were, in part, to provoke the controversies at the end of 1844 (see Chapter 10). The first volume of the journal was well received by the public and members of the Association. In its first year about 2000 copies were sold.

As well as containing the proceedings of the Central Committee,

each number was primarily made up of papers on archaeological and antiquarian matters, but also included notices of recent archaeological publications. In addition the first volume included three transcripts of original documents. One (*Archaeol J* 1, 1844, 64-6) was from an early fourteenth century manuscript in the British Museum relating to early English receipts for painting and gilding materials used by monastic artists. Another (*ibid.*, 243-245) was several verses extracted from a fifteenth century Cambridge manuscript describing the interior of a chamber in a castle. These documents were introduced and annotated by Wright and Halliwell respectively.

Many of the papers found in the first volume (and especially in the first two numbers) of the *Archaeological Journal* are of a different nature to the majority of papers in future volumes of the *Archaeological Journal* and *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*. The first volume contains a number of papers which are written as general guides to particular types of antiquities. The Introduction explained that the intention was to give

"summary and familiar suggestions or instructions on every department of research, so as to direct the inquiries of correspondents, and explain to those, who may be uninitiated in such matters, the practical means whereby their researches may be carried forward" (*Archaeol J* 1, 1844, 5).

For instance, there are papers "On Numismatics"; "On Painted Glass"; "On Anglo-Saxon Architecture"; "On Military Architecture"; "On Roman London"; and "On Sepulchral Brasses". These papers are on the whole written for the edification of those gaining an interest in antiquarian matters, without having a detailed knowledge of particular subjects. The paper on numismatics is too general to be of interest to anyone already a student of numismatic science, but gives useful advice for the inexperienced on how to deal with discoveries of coins. There are instructions on how to clean coins depending on the metals they are composed of, and comments on classifying types and detecting forgeries.

As well as the papers of a general nature, there are also the more specific type of paper normally found in such a journal. For instance there are papers such as: "On the Kimmeridge 'Coal Money'"; "A Norman Tombstone at Coningsborough" (a paper which had been read at the Canterbury Congress); and "Rockingham Castle". In addition, a substantial number of papers published in the early numbers of the *Archaeological Journal* related to matters which one could equally expect to find in the pages of the *Ecclesiologist* (see Chapter 7). For instance, the first volume has papers such as: "On Bell Turrets"; "On the Remains of Shobden Old Church, Herefordshire"; "On the Medieval Ecclesiastical Architecture of Paris"; and "Remarks on some of the Churches of Anglesey". The second volume continues in the same vein with papers on "The Date of the Introduction of the Decorated Style of Architecture into England"; "Notices of Ancient Ornaments, Vestments and Appliances of Ancient Use"; "Ancient Oratories of Cornwall"; and articles on various specific churches. Of a total of 49 papers in the *Archaeological Journal's* first two volumes, more than twenty were concerned with church architecture or ecclesiastical antiquities. It would seem that many of those willing to write for the *Journal* considered their expertise to be in ecclesiological fields, and that it was assumed such articles would appeal to the membership. It is however interesting to note that the *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* and later volumes of the *Archaeological Journal* carried far fewer ecclesiologically based papers. This suggests that as the BAA and AI developed, the archaeological community was becoming less dependent on the initial interest stirred up by the Cambridge Movement.

The first volume of the *Archaeological Journal* contained a report on the meeting at Canterbury in September 1844. It is to this, the first British archaeological congress, that I will turn in the next chapter.

Chapter 9

THE CANTERBURY CONGRESS

The Idea of an Archaeological Congress

The great public interest which greeted the formation of the BAA led its originators to institute Britain's first archaeological conference. To prepare the ground for the meeting, Bromet produced a paper dated 8th May 1844 entitled "Suggestions for the "getting up" of a meeting of the British Archaeological Association during this summer at Canterbury." (This is bound with Roach Smith's unpublished proceedings of the Canterbury Congress). Bromet proposed circulating a series of archaeological questions to all the clergy and magistrates residing in the diocese of Canterbury, and using their replies to plan a programme of visits to sites of antiquarian interest. He suggested "that the meeting be fixed for as early a period in July as may be convenient to the clergy and magistracy." This however allowed insufficient time for the meeting to be organised, and it was instead scheduled for Monday 9th to Saturday 14th September 1844. It appears that the proposed circular of questions was never printed (*Collectanea Antiqua* 7, 1880, 247 note), and Bromet seems to have taken no further part in the plans. Bromet almost certainly had in mind, when he proposed circulating antiquarian questions to the Canterbury clergy, a series of such questions sent to all the parishes in France by the French Minister of Public Instruction. Bromet did eventually produce a similar list of "Queries intended to Assist Correspondents" which was published in the *Archaeological Journal* the following year (see Chapter 11).

A circular dated July 10th 1844 was sent out to all the members of the Association explaining that the objects of the meeting were:

"to promote a personal intercourse between antiquaries and historical inquirers who reside in different parts of the country and abroad, and to afford a week's amusement and instruction by the reading and discussing of papers on

antiquarian and historical matters before the different sections and examining together the Antiquities of the locality."

A ticket for the meeting was to be one guinea, and this would entitle the bearer to bring a lady as a guest. Those interested in communicating papers to the meetings, especially papers concerning the locality, were invited to contact the secretaries of the relevant section. The circular listed the officers for the meeting, and gave a brief outline of the proposed programme.

The congress was to be split into four sections: Primeval antiquities (which included all antiquities prior to the mid seventh century); Medieval antiquities; Architecture; and History. This is reminiscent of the sectional organisation of the British Association for the Advancement of Science summer meetings. Also similar to the BAAS meetings were plans for soirées and excursions (see Chapter 5).

Despite initial enthusiasm, this ambitious project did not receive the full support of the Central Committee nearer the time. Eventually only ten of its members participated in the congress. Most notably, Albert Way was opposed to the idea of the meeting, possibly on the grounds that such a large public affair was an inappropriate way of conducting antiquarian pursuits. Others too predicted disastrous results from an archaeological congress, and the meeting was nearly cancelled or postponed. Here is yet another similarity with the York meeting of the BAAS, which also had nearly floundered due to the apprehension of some of its organisers about the amount of preparation needed to make the meeting a success (see Chapter 5). At the close of the Canterbury meeting, in proposing a vote of thanks to the local committee, Thomas Wright indicated how it was only their enthusiasm which had enabled the congress to go ahead:

"the idea of a meeting like this which we now hold in Canterbury, was perfectly new in this country, and excited no small degree of apprehension. The fears of the committee in London had risen to such a height, that, I must confess, I

came to meet the ... local committee ... to inform them of the apprehensions of the committee, and the determination to put off the consideration of the subject to another year. But ... when I met those gentlemen, when I heard their opinions, and saw how zealously and judiciously they were preparing for our reception, I felt no hesitation in returning to the committee which had sent me, and saying, "We must meet at Canterbury this year!" " (Dunkin, 1845, 361).

Wright's assurances back to the Central Committee were insufficient, and "the majority forsook the field and fled, leaving others to bear the heat and burthen of the day". (Dunkin, introduction to *Report of the ... Special General Meeting*, 1845).

However as one of those who participated in the event records:

"The prognostications of a ludicrous failure indulged in by some old twaddlers were not verified: a most agreeable and interesting week was passed by some two or three hundred ladies and gentlemen, and the congress was unanimously declared a success." (Planché, 1872, II, 94).

Attendance at the Canterbury Meeting

Despite a number of hitches in the organisation of the affair, it does indeed seem to have been greatly enjoyed by those who attended, setting the precedent for summer archaeological conferences ever since. John Merewether later wrote to Pettigrew of "the vivid recollection" he had of the happy week the Association had spent together in Canterbury (Letter, Merewether to Pettigrew, 4/3/1845), and Roach Smith recalled the success of the week's proceedings in his *Retrospections* (Smith, 1883, 8). Unfortunately a significant number of prominent antiquarians failed to attend the congress, despite in many cases being members of the General or Sectional Committees. In addition to the ten out of twenty members of the Central Committee who were absent, a further 23 of those named as being on the congress' committees were not present, as opposed to 31 who were.

Those members of the Central Committee who failed to attend at all were: Charles Frederick Barnwell (qv), Edward Blore (qv), Bromet,

Ellis, Benjamin Ferrey (qv), Hawkins, Thomas William King (qv), Madden, Manby, and Way. Poynter only turned up for the architectural section on the evening it met and, according to Dunkin:

"by his behaviour, caused the only interruption of the general good feeling which reigned throughout the proceedings of the week. It was reported that both Messrs Britton and Godwin were affronted - and Mr Britton's valuable paper was not read." (Dunkin, 1845, Introduction).

It is interesting to note that all of those who failed to attend, later joined the Way faction. However, after the split of the Association, they were just as keen, as the other faction of the BAA was, to hold a similar congress in 1845 at Winchester. There was little support for them from those that had attended the Canterbury meeting. Dunkin wrote in the preface to his *Report of the Proceedings*:

"The meeting was a bold attempt, and the timid and insincere no doubt kept aloof from fear of a failure. Like the bat in the fable, they side with the successful party, and will no doubt make amends at Winchester for bad conduct at Canterbury. Indeed, it was repeatedly whispered, that those who first proposed the congress, and were its loudest advocates, shrank back in dismay, and fled the field when the hour of trial and danger approached." (Dunkin, 1845, v).

Way was originally to be one of the general secretaries of the Canterbury meeting, but his absence, due ostensibly to illness, meant that the other secretary, Roach Smith, was forced to rely heavily on the support of others, notably Wright, Croker, Pettigrew, and Planché. The congress was presided over by Lord Albert Conyngham who had worked hard liaising with the local committee to ensure the meeting's success.

In all nearly 200 tickets were sold. Dunkin's *Report on the Proceedings* lists the names of 141 people who took tickets in advance. He writes that "the majority of the gentlemen were accompanied by the ladies of their families". In addition three tickets were sold directly to ladies. 32 of those listed by

Dunkin were clergy (including the Bishop of Oxford), and sixteen were FSA. Not all the names are given with addresses, but of those that were, at least 21 were from Canterbury or its immediate vicinity, indicating the significant local support the meeting gained. These included the Sheriff, Mayor and several Aldermen of Canterbury, and also a number of clergy connected with the Cathedral. The first BAAS meeting at York had likewise attracted a significant number of local people. In both cases, many of these had only joined the Association in question because of the summer meeting, but were to remain members for future years.

The Meeting Itself

The initial meeting of the congress was poorly planned with no opening address being prepared or authorised by the Central Committee, although Roach Smith seemed to think it went off well (Smith, 1883, 8). The *Athenaeum* on the other hand was scathing, reporting:

"The first meeting of the General Committee took place at 2 o'clock, only one hour before the General Meeting. Very little had been done. Mr Albert Way, one of the two secretaries, was absent from ill health, and the members of the committee were at a loss for what to do or how to begin. The ill effects of a want of good previous arrangement were soon found, and as readily admitted." (*Athenaeum* 14/9/1844, 826).

Despite the lack of preparation, the opening address by the president explaining the objects of the Association started the main meeting off well, although this was followed by "a long wearisome rigmarole which bored the assembly to tears" (Marsden, 1984, 28) delivered by Sir William Betham on "The Origin of Idolatry". For most of the rest of the week the congress divided into the four sections, although these met at different times so those who desired could attend all the meetings. In addition to papers read before the different sections, there were centrally coordinated excursions and conversaciones. One of these trips

involved visiting Lord Albert Conyngham's estates to excavate some Saxon tumuli, or rather to witness labourers digging the barrows. This expedition was highly popular, despite being disrupted by heavy rain. Another excursion involved visiting Heppington to view the extensive Fausett collection of Saxon antiquities. This collection was to be the centre of great controversy in 1853-4 when the Trustees of the British Museum refused to buy it for the nation despite strong representations by the Society of Antiquaries and the rest of the archaeological community. Eventually the collection was bought by Joseph Mayer who presented it to the Liverpool City Museum. (Kendrick, 1954, 136). Roach Smith observes in his *Retrospections* (1883, 10-11) that "The importance of the visit to Heppington was not understood by the Press, or even by the Congress." For it was the first time that the collection had come to public attention, and Roach Smith realised that was to be important in its preservation.

The Primeval section, which embraced British, Roman and Saxon antiquities within its scope, included papers on Barrows by Rev John Bathurst Deane and Thomas Bateman; Roman remains at Dymchurch by Rev Isaacson; the Place of Caesar's landing in Britain by Rev Beale Poste; and on Egyptian embalming of the dead by T J Pettigrew. The Medieval section had papers on Old Sarum; Church wall paintings; and Ecclesiastical embroidery. The *Archaeological Album* recorded that,

"The tendency of the proceedings in the Medieval section was to secure a greater attention than has hitherto been paid to the preservation of the curious paintings now so frequently discovered under the whitewash of the walls of our older churches." (Wright, 1845, 4).

The highlight of the Architectural section was a lecture by Professor Willis, president of the section, on Canterbury Cathedral. Following the success of this lecture, Willis was to give popular talks about the local cathedral at many future congresses of the Archaeological Institute. Willis later

published the substance of his discourse as "The Architectural History of Canterbury Cathedral", which was very favourably reviewed in the *Archaeological Journal* (2, 1845, 274-283). Also in the Architectural section at Canterbury were papers on Gothic Capitals; Masons' Marks; a Norman Tomb at Coningsborough; and Dover Castle. The Historical section included a report on the Canterbury Archives by Wright; extracts from bursars' accounts of Merton College, Oxford, by J H Parker; and some Manuscripts from the library of Canterbury Cathedral investigated by Halliwell.

The *Archaeological Album* compares the nineteenth century archaeologists gathered at Canterbury with Chaucer's pilgrims. As well as visiting the cathedral, they also viewed other ancient monuments in the city, including the Chequer Inn, supposedly the lodging place of Chaucer's pilgrims, and the remains of several monastic houses and archepiscopal hospitals. A visit was also made to the Church of St Martin, which the *Album* described as the most interesting building in Canterbury after the cathedral.

One of the highlights for many of those who attended the congress was a lecture on embalming followed by the unrolling of a mummy by Pettigrew on the Friday evening. This highly popular demonstration involved revealing the face to show a "complacent smile" and concluded with raising the mummy to its feet and presenting it to the company (Dunkin, 1845, 352). Not unsurprisingly this was one aspect of the congress picked up by *Punch* which notes "The unrolling of mummies is a sort of monomania with Mr Pettigrew, and as the eccentricity is harmless, we do not see that it calls for the energies of a commissioner of lunacy." (*Punch* 7, 1844, 141).

The Reporting of the Canterbury Congress

Descriptions of the week's events were published in at least five provincial and eleven national publications, clippings from which

were kept by Roach Smith in his unpublished proceedings of the *Canterbury Congress*. The local publications which carried articles about the meeting were: *The Kentish Gazette*; *The Kentish Observer* (which published several very detailed reports); *The Kent Herald*; *The Canterbury Journal*; and *The West Kent Guardian*. Roach Smith kept newspaper articles from *The Morning Post* and *The Times*; and in addition there were also write-ups in the following periodicals: *The Illustrated London News* (5, 21/9/1844, 191-2); *The Athenaeum* (14/9/1844, 21/9/1844, 826-7, 852-4); *Chamber's Edinburgh Journal* (N.S. 2, 26/10/1844, 266-8); *The Literary Gazette*; *The Pictorial Times*; *The Builder* (1844, 479); *The Gentleman's Magazine* (N.S. 22, October 1844, 407-414); *Ainsworth's Magazine* (6, 1844, 363-370); and *Punch* (7, 1844, 141). The last three of these were even represented at the congress by their editors (Marsden, 1984, 28).

On the whole, the reporting of the congress was complementary, although the reporter to the *Athenaeum*, a member of the Historical Committee, poured scorn on much of the event (Smith, 1883, 11). The *Athenaeum's* objections appear to have been three-fold. Firstly, it objected to the lack of papers of purely local relevance and what it saw as insufficient interest in Canterbury itself. To a limited extent this was a legitimate objection because there were no formal visits to the Cathedral organised as part of the week's events (although an informal visit and lecture on the Cathedral by Professor Willis were very well attended and the Cathedral was open to those present at the congress). However the organisers had never set out to arrange an event of primarily local interest. Secondly, the *Athenaeum* suggested that a *British Archaeological Association* should confine itself to national antiquities only, and not consider dissertations on matters such as Egyptian hieroglyphs and mummies. Once more there may have been some justification in objecting to the public display of unwrapping a mummy and questioning the relevance of this to the proceedings of the rest of the week. However, such a spectacle

helped raise the profile of the whole meeting and probably remained in the minds of the majority of those who attended far longer than the rest of the congress. It is interesting to note that Pettigrew continued to amuse the BAA by unwrapping mummies on future occasions. Volume 4 of the *JBAA* has an article by him entitled "Observations on the Practice of Embalming among the Ancient Egyptians, illustrated by the Unrolling of a Mummy from Thebes." (*JBAA* 4, 1847, 337-348).

The objection which most irked the supporters of the congress was that the BAA was wasting its time on primeval speculations. The *Athenaeum* wrote:

"A careful survey of Roman remains in Britain will add little or nothing to our stock-book of architectural models, and the remains of Roman sculpture in Britain are in the very worst taste of expiring and degraded art." (*Athenaeum*, 21/9/1844, 853).

From this passage it can be seen that the *Athenaeum* was failing to understand the breadth of the Association's objects. As the supporters of the congress were quick to point out, there was far more to archaeology than just appreciation of Gothic architecture.

In its reporting of the week at Canterbury, the *Athenaeum* had ridiculed Roach Smith as the "father of broken pottery displays". A week later, in reply to a letter from Roach Smith objecting to the *Athenaeum's* stance, the Journal reiterated its complaints about the congress. The *Athenaeum* was later to prove one of the strongest opponents of the Wright faction during the split, and the following remarks addressed about Roach Smith can be seen as forerunning its subsequent attacks on the BAA:

"as he would have carried off a lion's share of the honours, had they been deserved, he must be content to take upon himself a lion's share of the laughter.... We heartily wish well to the Association, and therefore we wish it quickly rid of all quacks. If the members resolutely determine to carry out the professed objects of the Association, the Association may do great good. If, on the contrary, we are to have an annual display of humbug, the sooner it is knocked on the head the better." (*Ibid.*, 886).

The perception by some that the congress was a display of humbug perhaps precipitated the controversies which caused the split in the Association the following year. Although, with the exception of the *Athenaeum* reporter, the Canterbury meeting appears to have been greatly enjoyed, J H Parker many years later looked back to the congress for the origins of the divisions within the BAA. He wrote:

"It became evident at Canterbury that the Society consisted of two distinct classes of persons - the one, gentlemen of property and amateurs of Archaeology, who wished to have opportunities of communicating to others the information they had collected, that it might not die with them, as had frequently been the case with many of their friends. The other party consisted of professional archaeologists." (Parker, 1881, 33).

The term "professional" here should be treated with caution, for none of the antiquaries of the mid-nineteenth century were salaried archaeologists. Thomas Wright, who was dependent on writing and holding paid assistant secretaryships for his living, was as near to being a professional archaeologist as anyone in the period. But even if not clear-cut, the basis of a distinction between amateur and professional was nevertheless present, and this was exasperated by social distinctions between the two parties. I will consider this further when I explore the details of the split itself in the next chapter. A more immediate cause of discord among the Central Committee was the question of whether to publish the proceedings of the Canterbury Congress in a separate volume.

Publication of the Canterbury Proceedings

Looking back at the congress many years later, Roach Smith recalled:

"It was my wish that, as soon as possible after the Congress, the Proceedings should be printed. This the Central Committee declined to do; and most unwisely. Had the question been left to me and Wright, a volume, well illustrated, would have been sent to press at once. We were,

obviously, surrounded with colleagues who were not at all ardent, and who never had heart or earnestness in our cause. They were good men, and mostly eminent in science and literature; but they were not enthusiastic for archaeology" (*Collectanea Antiqua* 7, 1880, 249).

The Committee believed that the proceedings could be adequately outlined as part of the final number of Volume One of the *Archaeological Journal*. They felt that any papers which had been read at the congress and were worthy of publication should be passed to the Society of Antiquaries for publication in *Archaeologia*. The refusal of the Central Committee to sanction an official volume of the congress' proceedings was partially responsible for Wright publishing such a full account of the congress at the start of his *Archaeological Album*. It also resulted in Alfred Dunkin producing his own detailed *Report on the Proceedings of the British Archaeological Association*. This gives the fullest account of the congress and contains almost all the papers read at Canterbury.

In the preface to his *Report of the Proceedings*, Dunkin condemned those members of the Central Committee who had not supported the meeting. He explains that he had only decided to print his *Report of the Proceedings* because of the absence of an official record of the papers and excursions of the meeting. He wrote:

"How it was that the Central Committee did not print a report of the meeting cannot be comprehended, as at Canterbury it was asserted that a volume would be issued. The absence of so many of the Central Committee, may, perhaps, be attributed to the same origin - a little want of zeal, activity and business habits." (Dunkin, 1845, vi).

Roach Smith's personal views can be very clearly seen in a letter to one of those who had been at the congress and who wanted to know why an official volume had not been published. He writes:

"The Committee, for some unfathomable reason, would not listen to my proposal to publish our doings on that occasion; now however they see others doing it and too late regret their want of judgement and foresight. I fear the reason why many of the Committee showed so much apathy was that they did

not take active parts in the affair and therefore did not much care for those who did." (Letter, Roach Smith to W P Hunt, 28/12/1844, found with Hunt's copy of Dunkin, 1845, in the library of the SA).

Those that attended the congress were full of praise about the event, and were enthusiastic about the future prospects of the BAA. Wright concluded his article about the Canterbury Congress in the *Archaeological Album* with the following passage:

"It is impossible to calculate all the benefits to which the exertions of the Archaeological Association may eventually lead. It has been raised to the degree of power and usefulness which it has now attained by the mutual good feeling and the undisturbed unanimity of purpose which has guided the counsels of the individuals who have founded and hitherto conducted it; and it is most sincerely to be hoped that this unanimity may long continue, undisturbed by the jealousies and dissensions which have too often paralysed the efforts of similar institutions." (Wright, 1845, 42).

It is unclear whether Wright composed this trying to head off potential confrontations within the Central Committee following the Canterbury meeting, or whether he was just exceedingly naive in not noticing the jealousies and dissensions brewing amongst members of the Committee. Whatever the case, the passage stands out as a supreme irony in the light of the forthcoming controversy and split within the BAA.

Chapter 10

THE SPLIT

Controversy over the Archaeological Album

The "mutual good feeling" and "unanimity" amongst the Central Committee which Wright had applauded in the *Archaeological Album* was unfortunately not to last for long after the Canterbury meeting.

"The dispute which subsequently broke out within the upper echelons of the Association was perhaps inevitable, given the fact that a number of the personalities within the Central Committee seem to have been of a choleric and disagreeable disposition. The spark which ignited the decisive quarrel was however trite and ridiculous, and it arose as a direct result of the Congress." (Marsden, 1984, 31).

The problems began at a meeting of the Central Committee on December 11th, 1844. At this meeting, Bromet stated that, because Wright's *Archaeological Album* was to treat with the Canterbury Congress, it could be detrimental to the *Archaeological Journal*. He considered that the *Album* should not appear to be authorised by the Society, and therefore felt

"that it was necessary to notice on the Journal that no other publication was authorised but the Journal of the Society."
(*Verbatim Report...* 9).

At that stage no one else supported the proposition and it was dropped. At the next meeting however, on the 18th of December, Poynter and Bromet brought forth a proposition that a declaration should be printed on the cover of the *Archaeological Journal* to the effect that it was the only publication authorised by the Central Committee. Such a notice would have implied that the *Album* was not authorised by the Central Committee, and therefore appear to imply an official recommendation from the Committee not to buy it. After an hour's discussion the feeling of the meeting was against the proposition and it was withdrawn.

On December 28th, at a meeting of the Printing Committee, the

subject was brought up yet again, but this time with different results. Way (who had just returned from Paris) sided with Poynter and Bromet, and thus out-voted Roach Smith and Wright (the sixth member of the sub-committee, Deane, was absent). These three decided to issue a circular which declared the *Journal* to be "the only publication issued under the authority of the Central Committee." (*Verbatim Report...* 11). Furthermore, the circular was sent out in the name of the Central Committee itself, which had so recently decided against such a notice! Roach Smith and Wright were amazed that the Central Committee's decision on the subject could be thwarted, and protested strongly, but Way replied, "We are three to two, therefore we have a majority and shall do it"! (Quoted in Preface, *JBAA* 1, no 1, 1845, v). They therefore tendered their resignations from the Printing Committee. In Wright's words:

"The grounds on which Mr Smith and myself protested, and withdrew from the Committee, were, that we had no power of issuing such a circular, that we were compromising the principles of the Association, and that we were insulting the Central Committee, on which we were dependent, by doing what it had virtually decided should not be done." (*Statement*, 19/3/1845, vi-vii).

The matter was brought before the next meeting of the Central Committee on 8th January, 1845. At this meeting nineteen members of the Central Committee were present, whereas normally only from six to ten members attended. Previously, it had generally been the same individuals who had attended regularly, but henceforth several members attended who had hardly ever attended the committee before. At this, and the next few meetings, it became clear that Way was lobbying for support from many of the less active members of the Association, most of whom had been initially proposed as members of the committee by Way himself. It was this sudden interest in the affairs of the Association by hitherto inactive members which added to the indignation of Wright's supporters. The *Literary Gazette* later stated:

"The most active of the dissatisfied of Mr Way's partisans are, Messrs. Hawkins, Barnwell, Blore, Poynter, Manby, and

Ferrey, who, though elected soon after the formation of the society, have contributed nothing to its proceedings and have (as we gather from the minutes) only attended during the first busy year in the following proportions: Hawkins *twice*, Barnwell *four times*, Blore *once*, Poynter *four times*, Manby *once*, and Ferrey *five times*: whereas the minority members have attended, and done the committee-work, respectively, *twenty four, twenty three, nineteen, &c.*, times, and their names occur in almost every page of the proceedings as printed in the Journal". (Quoted in Dunkin, *Observations upon the Meeting*, 37-38).

The show of strength by Way's followers was not to prove important at the meeting of January 8th for, although Pettigrew contended that the Printing Committee had exceeded their powers, the matter was allowed to rest after Lord Conyngham (who had come to London especially to attend the meeting) had persuaded Roach Smith and Wright to withdraw their resignations in order to avoid further controversy. However the business was not at an end, as was to become apparent at the following meeting when the president was no longer present to maintain harmony.

This next meeting was on 22nd of January and there were twenty members present. Hawkins and Barnwell proposed and seconded the following resolution:

"That Mr Wright having, while acting editor of the "Archaeological Journal", become the editor also of a rival work, similar in character, and which has been prejudicial to the main objects of the Association in that publication, the Committee are of the opinion that Mr Wright should resign his place on the Editing Sub-Committee." (*Verbatim Report...*, 13).

This proposition struck Wright's supporters as manifestly unjust. The *Album* was

"in no respect similar to the "Archaeological Journal", from which it differs in size, colour, shape, appearance, etc. It does not contain one period of matter belonging to the Association, or that has been obtained through it, nor does Mr Wright attach to his name any connexion with the Association." (Preface to *JBAA* 1, no. 1, 1845, iii).

And furthermore,

"Mr Wright's publication of the Archaeological Album has, so far from having been an injury to the Association, or an

encroachment upon its rights, been one calculated to advance its interests, by showing to the public that pleasure and instruction may be combined in meetings of antiquarians in different parts of the country." (ibid., iv).

Despite these arguments, the proposition was carried by ten votes to six, although neither Pettigrew, who was in the chair, nor Wright voted, despite being opposed to the proposition. Conyngham, who had been ill and unable to attend the meeting, expressed his dissatisfaction at the proceedings, and had every intention of attending the next meeting to try to remedy the situation. This next meeting was held on 12th February, but once again Conyngham was too unwell to attend, however he wrote to Pettigrew expressing his opinion that the proceedings represented a great injustice to Wright.

At the meeting of the 12th of February, Pettigrew suggested that, in order to maintain peace, Hawkins and Barnwell should consent to remove the relevant entry from the previous meeting's minutes. This they refused to do, so Pettigrew moved to expunge the offensive minute. At this stage Wright, at Westmacott's request, voluntarily withdrew from the committee in order to allow matters to proceed. Thereupon the minute was removed but in an equally offensive manner, by a resolution stating:

"That Mr Wright, having signified his intention to resign his situation on the Editing Committee, the resolution of the last meeting relative to that subject be expunged." (Preface *JBAA* 1, no. 1, 1845, vi).

This led to Conyngham resigning, his letter of resignation being read to the committee at a special meeting on the 19th of February. In his letter he explained his reasons for resigning:

"I do this solely from my sense of extreme injustice done to Mr Wright, (to whose exertions we are so greatly indebted for the success of the Association,) and of the ingratitude shown to him for having granted to the 'Journal' the assistance of his literary talents. I feel that I cannot sufficiently show my strong dissent from the views taken by the Committee of Mr Wright and his 'Album'." (Quoted in the *Verbatim Report...* 15).

Pettigrew revealed that the president was willing to return to the Association if Wright were retained as editor of the *Journal* and the offensive minute expunged. However the committee took this as Conyngham trying to dictate to them, which they would not have, and so they immediately accepted his resignation. Conyngham's resignation would soon have been followed by the resignations of Pettigrew, Wright, Roach Smith, Croker and others, however Pettigrew, as treasurer, began to receive requisitions to summon a Special General Meeting from the membership at large who had heard of the president's resignation. Thereupon he and his colleagues desisted from resigning and instead called a meeting of the whole Association.

The Calling of the Special General Meeting

Pettigrew received requisitions signed by 162 members of the Association calling for him, as the senior officer in the absence of a president, to call a Special General Meeting to discuss the Society's affairs. At the meeting, in justifying his conduct in calling it in response to the requisitions, he explained that those names "embrace the chief of those who have subscribed to the funds, and also of those who have contributed papers" (*Verbatim Report...*, 2). Pettigrew sent out a circular and advertised in the major papers to the effect that a Special General Meeting would be held in the Theatre of the Western Literary and Scientific Institution, Leicester Square, at 8pm on 5th March. The circular stated:

"The want of concord among the Officers and committee, which has prevailed for the last two months, and which has unhappily led to the resignation of our most excellent and zealous President, Lord Albert Conyngham, and the probable retirement of other officers and members of the committee, renders it an imperative duty on all who feel an interest in the objects of the Association, or consider them as of National importance, to attend upon this occasion, when I trust such means will be adopted as may restore tranquility to the Association, unite all together in the promotion of its most useful purposes, and rescue it from destruction." (Circular to Members of the BAA, 26/2/1845).

At this stage the periodical press entered the fray. The *Athenaeum* of 1st March, 1845, noticed the division and began what was to be a long running attack on the Wright and Pettigrew faction. Almost every week for the next few months the *Athenaeum* was to deride the "An-archaeologists", as it branded their faction, and produce evidence of corruption or incompetence amongst its officers. The article of March 1st sets the tone for its future reports and also makes suggestions for the restructuring of the Association. It has therefore been quoted in full in Appendix D. The extracts below give more briefly a flavour of the *Athenaeum's* stance:

"We are heartily glad of this stir in the council; and may now hope for some good results. The Canterbury affair was really worse than we described it ... it was high time for the "better spirits" of the council to look ahead, and see that they did not lend their names a second time to the traders associated with them.... The *traders* must go ... We must have no repetition, at Winchester, of the Canterbury cockneyisms of last year.... The Treasurer must be a man of business habits ... The Secretaries must be disinterested men, of name and standing ... who can write good English, and speak it correctly when it is written. (*Athenaeum*, 1/3/1845, 221).

The *Gentleman's Magazine* also sided with the Way faction, although in less aggressive terms. In its number of March 1845 it briefly noted the difference which had arisen in the committee, putting it down to the *Archaeological Album*, which

"was foreseen as a work likely to injure the circulation of the Journal and with it the noble principles for which the Association has been carried on." (*Gentleman's Magazine*, N.S. 23, March 1845, 292).

Following Pettigrew's announcement of the Special General Meeting, the other half of the original Central Committee met on the 28th of February. They issued a counter notice denying Pettigrew's right to call the meeting. It read:

"Advertisements having appeared in the public papers calling, by order of the Treasurer, a Special General Meeting of the Members of the British Archaeological Association on the 5th of March, it was unanimously Resolved, and notice is hereby given, that no such Meeting has been appointed or authorised

by the Central Committee, and no authority to that effect has been delegated to the Treasurer, or any other officer of the Archaeological Association. Any proceedings of such a Special General Meeting will therefore be null and invalid. By order of the Central Committee." (Circular, 28/2/1845).

This circular was headed by the names of the twelve committee members at that meeting: Westmacott; Barnwell; Blore; George Bowyer (qv); Bromet; Deane; Ferrey; Hawkins; Manby; Poynter; Stapleton; and Way. It was also approved of by Birch who had been unable to attend the meeting. The circular went on to state:

"It is quite unprecedented that any member of a very small minority of a committee should appeal to the general body, against the repeated and clearly expressed opinion of a large majority." (Ibid).

It should be observed however that the "clearly expressed opinion by a large majority" was by no means the case, as can be seen from the voting figures in the accounts of the meetings above. The resolutions against Wright had never been carried by more than small majorities of those voting.

Despite the denouncement of the Special General Meeting by the opposing half of the committee, it nevertheless went ahead. At it, Pettigrew explained how the Association was without laws or precedents to govern the calling of such meetings, and he had therefore been guided by the constitutions of other learned societies, which provide a power on the part of the senior officer of the institution to summon extraordinary meetings. He contended that it had become ludicrous for the Central Committee to be the sole body invested with the power of calling General Meetings, for it was to appeal against a decision of the committee that so many of the membership had requested the General Meeting in the first place. The committee was a self-elected body with, originally, no direct responsibility to the correspondents. However, since the Association had begun to receive donations (Pettigrew had about 200 pounds in hand), Pettigrew believed that the officers and committee henceforth had a responsibility to their membership.

The Results of the Special General Meeting

The weather on the 5th of March was inclement to say the least, but nevertheless about 150 members turned up to consider the Association's affairs, and many more sent apologies for being unable to attend. After a lengthy explanation of the intricate details of the controversy and the meetings at which it developed (which is outlined above), the meeting went on to consider a number of pre-prepared resolutions. The meeting had listened favourably to Pettigrew's accounts, and warmly supported Wright, accepting all bar one of the propositions unanimously. This is not surprising since by virtue of attending, and hence recognising the validity of the meeting, the members present were thereby rejecting the authority of that half of the Central Committee which had declared the meeting to be null and void.

The resolutions adopted unanimously were to the effect: that an Annual General Meeting to elect the officers and committee of the Association should henceforth be held; that Conyngham be solicited to return to the Association as president; that the membership should henceforth be split into Associates, who would subscribe, and Correspondents, from whom no contribution would be required; that the journal should come under the Association's direct control; and that the treasurer be thanked for convening the Special General Meeting. There was also a resolution which proposed a new committee for the following year. This resolution was accepted with only five dissentients. The full wording of all the resolutions, and a list of the new committee, is given in Appendix E.

The new committee did not include any of those who had put their names to the paper denying the validity of the Special General Meeting, for by doing so they were taken to have resigned their positions. The nine other members of the original committee all appear on the new list, with Croker replacing Way as one of the

secretaries. The other names on the list included those of Sir William Betham, J R Planché, and the Dean of Hereford, all of whom had played prominent roles at Canterbury (but more on the Dean of Hereford below). Planché wrote of the dispute:

"They would have their Way, and on trifles divide,
So we took our own, having (W)right on our side."
(Quoted in Marsden, 1984, 33).

However in turning out the majority of the original committee the meeting seems to have gone too far, for this act was taken as too drastic a measure by a number of those who had hitherto supported the Wright faction, although the leaders of the faction claimed:

"The "majority" ejected themselves, by repudiating the general meeting and failing to attend and justify their conduct." (Preface, *JBAA* 1, no 3, 1845, viii).

It soon became clear that the Special General Meeting had not healed the breach, for the Way faction continued to describe itself as the legitimate Central Committee. It denounced Pettigrew and his colleagues, taking them to have resigned from the true committee, and began to fill their places as well as to remodel the Association's constitution. The Wright faction was weakened by the withdraw from its ranks of some of those whose names had appeared as members of its committee, viz: Amyot, Ellis, King and the Dean of Hereford. The reasons for these withdrawals are discussed in the preface to the first number of the *JBAA*:

"Mr Amyot and Sir H Ellis, being officers of the Society of Antiquaries, think it proper to preserve a neutrality, and have therefore declined being on the Committee; but it must be observed that Sir H Ellis disapproved the feelings manifested in the Committee, and that Mr Amyot on every occasion voted against the dissentients." (Preface, *JBAA* 1, no. 1, 1845, x).

It should be noted however that Ellis did later subscribe to the Way faction.

King had signed the requisition calling for the Special General Meeting, but had been unable to attend it. He appears to have fully supported the Wright faction until he learnt the result of

the meeting, and then seems to perform a complete *volte-face*.

"In a letter to Mr Croker, dated March 7th, he says, 'I regret deeply that I cannot concur in the measures resorted to by a minority of the Committee in the extraordinary step of calling what has been named a "Special General Meeting of the Association".'" (Ibid., xi).

King thereupon withdrew from the new committee, and ensured that his name remained on the list of the Way faction's committee.

The Dean of Hereford and Attempts at Mediation

John Merewether, the Dean of Hereford, also withdrew from the Wright faction's committee and joined the committee of Way's followers. The complexities of his behaviour and the detail of his correspondence is deserving of consideration at some length. He had taken the chair of the Primeval Section at the Canterbury Congress and become a firm supporter of the Association. On receiving Pettigrew's circular of February 26th 1845 (see above), calling for a Special General Meeting, he wrote back saying:

"I have been extremely concerned to learn that circumstances have led to a discordant feeling in the Counsels of the British Archaeological Association". (Merewether to Pettigrew, 4/3/1845)

He regretted that he was unable to attend,

"for the purpose of lending my humble but anxious endeavours to co-operate with others in restoring tranquility, and reorganising our valuable staff.... It has been often a wish of mine that I could have been on the Committee during my frequent sojourns in London, had the *Rules* permitted it". (Ibid).

Pettigrew read this letter aloud to the Special General Meeting, and later, in accordance with what those present took to be Merewether's wishes, he was elected to the Council of the reformed committee. However, Merewether then discovered from his friend Way that the meeting had not been sanctioned by the original Central Committee and had indeed been boycotted by supporters of the Way faction. He wrote back to Pettigrew explaining that he had not realised the call for the meeting had

"emanated from the favourers of one side of the question only. My anxious wish was to see amity and concord re-established, and being unable to attend in person I wrote to you expressing my earnest desire to see such a result, from what I deemed to be a Meeting for the express purpose of union; perhaps somewhat presumptuously suggesting to each side a sacrifice of such feelings as might have been excited by unintentional or even misjudged proceedings for the sake of restoring the Association to its sound and healthful vigour! The same post which brought your acknowledgement of my letter of the 4th March, and a gratifying one it was to my mind *as then informed*, also put me in possession of one from Mr Albert Way, by which I learnt for the first time that the meeting was not constituted as I supposed and had not the object in view of which I had hoped". (Merewether to Pettigrew, 9/4/1845).

As a result, Merewether found "it quite impossible to take office in the committee formed under the circumstances" (*ibid.*), and joined the Central Committee of the Way faction. In a later letter he complains at the way the facts of his withdrawal were presented in the Preface of the *JBAA*, no 1. He wrote that his

"letter of the 4th of March in its general tenor, and specially in mentioning my wish to have been at *the Committee*, if fairly read, must prove that I had in contemplation *the Committee* with which I had been in communication with at Canterbury, and before the division which up to this time I had lamented, and that I had not the smallest conception that it was proposed to create another schismatic and opposition Committee, with which nothing would have induced me to cooperate". (Merewether to Pettigrew, 5/5/1845, Merewether's italics).

Merewether may have published his correspondence in order to justify his conduct but, if anything, it seems to exonerate the actions of the Special General Meeting, and indicate the unreasonableness of Merewether's own position. "If fairly read" here seems to imply: "in the light of later communications on the subject". It is also worth noting that the vast majority of the original committee who had been active at Canterbury had joined the Wright faction committee. The only officer of the original committee with whom Merewether could not possibly have been in communication with at Canterbury, by virtue of his non-attendance,

was Way, who was also the only officer to denounce the Special General Meeting!

Merewether's letters repeatedly expressed a desire for reconciliation, yet he seems to have done little to try to bring such a reconciliation about. His partisan support of the Way faction, whose committee he joined, undermined any claim to impartiality he may have had. Nevertheless it seems that the Wright faction were desirous of healing the breach, but their overtures were rejected by the Way faction. It appears that subsequent to the split, Pettigrew met Way and Hawkins and

"distinctly told them that any measures for healing the disunion would be met by Lord Albert and all with whom I was acting in the most cordial manner; that any sacrifice that could be made to obtain peace would be made, and that we were ready to entertain any proposition to that effect. They expressed themselves then unprepared to offer any, and it was left to them to consult upon and consider it; but no overture of any kind has been made, on the contrary, every means has been taken to annoy us, personally to abuse us, either by anonymous papers or in the journals." (Pettigrew to Merewether, 10/4/1845).

A further offer to seek reconciliation was made by Conyngham through Merewether. He wrote:

"I can state upon the part of the gentlemen with whom I am acting, that so far from entertaining any feeling of hostility towards the rival Committee, we are willing to lay the whole affairs before any gentlemen competent, from not having been previously canvassed, to give a fair unprejudiced opinion, and to be guided by their decision." (Conyngham to Merewether, 22/4/1845).

Conyngham suggested the vice-presidents of the Society of Antiquaries as mediators, and this suggestion was eagerly accepted by Merewether who determined to show Lord Albert's letter to the Way faction. However, before any mediation could be effected, Merewether attended a meeting of the Society of Antiquaries which put an end to his desire to bring about any re-union. In Pettigrew's words in a public letter to Merewether, (which is obviously biased but nevertheless appears to state the true facts

of this point):

"at this meeting your indignation is aroused by the annunciation of a present of the Journal of the Association by the Central Committee of that body, which presentation you conceive "next to an insult to the venerable society to which it was offered;" and from this presentation you deduce the utter hopelessness of effecting a reconciliation, and here your extraordinary efforts to heal the dissensions appear to have terminated!" (Pettigrew to Merewether, 31/5/1845).

Controversy over Subscriptions

One of the advantages the Wright faction had following the split, was that the funds of the original Association were in the hands of Pettigrew, and the minute books and records for the first year were in Roach Smith's possession. As the two factions went their separate ways, some of the supporters of the Way faction applied to Pettigrew for money which had been paid to him before the division. P Hardwick and E Hailstone both requested that their donations, each of five pounds and made before the split occurred, be handed over to the Way faction. In Hardwick's words:

"I sent you a small donation towards [the BAA's] funds, you having undertaken to receive subscriptions and donations. You have thought proper to retire from this Association, and you have endeavoured to form another society under the same name; but as the Association I joined still exists, and is governed by a majority of the same gentlemen who were its first directors, I wish it to be distinctly understood that it is to this the original Association that I intended the donation to be applied" (Hardwick to Pettigrew, 19/3/1845, quoted in *Athenaeum*, 17/5/1845, 488).

Pettigrew and his committee replied that he had not resigned and had not formed a new Association, and they therefore refused to return the money, although they did promise that he would receive their journal for the next five years. Hailstone was also unable to recover his donation.

The *Athenaeum* took up the similar case of the Rev R Lane Freer, a friend of Merewether, who also unsuccessfully tried to have his subscription transferred to the Way faction (*Athenaeum*, *ibid.* and

31/5/1845). Freer, and also the Hon Marmaduke Onslow and the Rev Dr Morris, paid their subscriptions *after* the split had taken place (on the 19th, 12th and 14th of March respectively), in response to a circular announcing the results of the Special General Meeting, and therefore had even less of a claim that their money should be returned.

In his public letter to Merewether, who had alluded to the case of Freer, Pettigrew defended his actions in retaining subscriptions, writing:

"I cannot, however, here but notice the infamous attempt of your neighbour, the Rev Lane Freer, so ably seconding the editor of the *Athenaeum*, to fix upon me *individually* as the person refusing to refund money subscribed, and not as the Treasurer and responsible officer of an institution accountable to the members for the proper employment of the funds. Are the morals of these gentlemen so loose, that they imagine I am capable of putting my hand to the money of the Association, and disposing of it in any way I please, without the sanction of the governing body?" (Pettigrew to Merewether, 31/5/1845, 9).

Pettigrew then played his trump card against Merewether:

"Your name certainly does not appear in the list of those who have required a return of their money, for you never gave a donation, and the amount due for your ticket of admission to the Canterbury Congress still remains unpaid"! (ibid. 9-10)

Whether this was really the case we can not know, for Merewether denied the allegation saying he was "POSITIVELY CERTAIN" that he had paid Roach Smith for his Canterbury ticket. (Letter to *Athenaeum*, 21/6/1845, 618).

Accusations abounded between the two sides about the misappropriation of funds. The *Literary Gazette* of 21st June charged that the list of subscribers to the Way faction was inaccurate, with a number of the names actually having subscribed to the Wright faction. This accusation was however later repudiated by the *Athenaeum* (26/7/1845, 745), which in its turn persistently called on Pettigrew to produce the accounts. As with the earlier stages of the dispute, the vitriolic language used by

both sides is characteristic of the rows so common between Victorian men of knowledge. When their honour was questioned, the protagonists in the dispute did not hesitate to use "strong expressions of indignation [to] repel such mean, dastardly, and villainous accusations and assertions"! (Pettigrew to Merewether, 31/5/1845, 11).

Although Pettigrew and Merewether were caught up in their battle of words, the absurdity of the situation was not lost on all of the early Victorians. The Noviomagian Society, a dining club offshoot of the Society of Antiquaries and of which Croker was president, found scope for some light-hearted amusement in the regrettable split and the inability of the two sides to resolve their differences.

"It was proposed that as a cure for squabbling, or fussy, or overbearing dispositions, the parties should be compelled to join the British Archaeological Association, where nothing is eaten but honey, and nothing drunk but the milk of human kindness. A premium was offered for a new pun, on the names of the rival disputants, and a fresh Way to set all Wright was anxiously worked for, but not found." (Minutes of Noviomagian Society, 19/3/1845, quoted in Levine, 1986, 69).

Analysis of the Causes of the Split

Throughout this chapter I have quoted extensively from letters and other sources in order to give a narrative account of the development of the split in the BAA. I make no apology for the quantity of quotations, since the participants' own words tell the story as their contemporaries would have read it. Inevitably some of the accounts are heavily biased, but in order to understand how the public and members of the Association viewed the split, what is said to have happened is at least as important as what actually did happen.

What is immediately apparent from the accounts above is that there was no simple or single cause behind the controversy. It should

be realised that not only were there a number of factors at work, but, more importantly, the significance of the different issues altered during the months of discord. One of the earliest problems, before the dispute became open, was the jealousies which had arisen between those who had attended and worked hard at the Canterbury Congress, and those who had not participated. The great success of the event rankled with those who had taken no part, but were subsequently hoping to be responsible for the organisation of the Winchester Congress. Those that had put in the work for Britain's first archaeological congress had every intention of gaining the credit for such. This factor behind the breakdown of the Central Committee's unanimity developed into disagreements over the publication of the Canterbury proceedings (see Chapter 9). Ironically, it was the refusal by the majority of the Central Committee to sanction an official volume which led Wright to report the congress in the *Album*, thus leading to the next stage of the dispute.

Before the Special General Meeting, the Way faction maintained that the disagreement over the *Archaeological Album* was the only problem:

"As gross misrepresentations have been industriously circulated on the subject, the Committee think it necessary to explain that the only ostensible point in dispute is, the expression of an opinion by a large majority of the Committee, that the editorship of the *Archaeological Journal*, and the *Archaeological Album*, by the same party, were incompatible" (Circular of 28/2/1845).

The *Archaeological Album* dispute, however, was only a spark to other, more serious, causes behind the split. It is interesting to note that henceforth the Way faction made very little reference to this origin of the rift in the Central Committee. This was partially because the editorship of the *Archaeological Album* was not, in itself, such a matter for concern, but also because the original argument had been superseded by the question of Pettigrew's right to call the Special General Meeting, and the validity of that meeting's decisions. In looking back at the

split during the September Winchester Congress, the Marquis of Northampton seems to concede the argument over the *Album* in pressing his attack on the legitimacy of the Special General Meeting:

"No notice was given that the minority intended to turn out the majority of the Committee ... What power had they to do so? None.... Without now going into the question of the *Album*, admitting (for the sake of argument) that there had been mistakes in the matter, nothing justifies such a proceeding." (*Archaeol J* 2, 1845, 314).

The Wright faction also ceased to pursue the point of the editorship of the *Album* and the *Journal* being compatible, in part because they felt they had won the moral victory, even if not a numerical victory, when it had come to votes in January and February 1845, but mainly because Wright himself was willing to resign his place on the Printing Committee in order to try to maintain peace. Before they left the issue of the *Album*, they suggested that the real originator of the dissent had been Parker, the editor of the *Archaeological Journal*, who was jealous that the *Album* emanated from another publisher (*JBAA* 1, no 1, 1845, iv).

For Wright's supporters, the issue now under question shifted to Way's canvassing of the inactive majority of the committee in order to outvote the other officers and active members of the committee. The founders of the Association saw that its government was in danger of being taken out of their hands. They were concerned that, now the society had become a proven success, those that initially had been only lukewarm about its prospects, were seeking to take a share in the credit from running a successful enterprise.

There is little question that Pettigrew was acting outside his *de juro* authority in calling the Special General Meeting, for the constitution of the Association was clear to the effect that the Central Committee was the only decision-making body. However, he states his defence well:

"I should like to know what the 162 members [who signed requisitions for the Special General Meeting] would think of an officer who would resist their appeal in deference to 13 members, whose conduct had so imperilled the Association as to deprive it of its original president, and to have occasioned the two founders and other members of the Committee to express their intention to follow the example of their chief?" (Pettigrew to Merewether, 31/5/1845, 8-9).

It was whether or not Pettigrew's actions here were justified that determined for most members of the Association to which faction they gave their support.

A significant factor in the dispute was the existence of personality clashes between members of the Central Committee. This seems to have been partly behind the original difficulties with the *Archaeological Album* - a personal indifference towards Wright by some of his colleagues influencing them in their dogged hounding of him from the printing committee. His friend Roach Smith, although congenial enough, also had little in common with some of his fellows on the Central Committee, save their mutual interest in antiquity. Whilst Wright and Roach Smith may have been respected by all of their colleagues, their relationship with some of them probably went little further. Following the meeting of March 5th, the dominant personality became Pettigrew, and there is no doubt that he was at times a difficult man to get on with. Once more, the emphasis of the underlying unease exacerbating the dispute, can be seen to subtly move round, this time to rest on Pettigrew's cantankerous nature.

These personal dislikes and mistrusts were stirred up by the *Athenaeum*, whose articles tended to lead the controversies as much as to report them. The *Athenaeum* had, from even before the split, dwelt on the social incompatibility between members of the Central Committee. Many of those involved in the BAA saw archaeology as a levelling ground where people of different politics and class could meet as equals united by their mutual interest in antiquity, similar to the way in which the BAAS was able to cut across social

strata on the neutral ground of science (see Chapter 5). On the other hand, the *Athenaeum* would have none of this, and repeatedly called for the "better spirits" to take the government of the Association out of the hands of the "traders". The *Athenaeum* was of the firm belief that the running of learned societies should be vested in the hands of "men of rank or property" whose private means relieved them of the sordid task of earning a living. Roach Smith may have been a successful businessman, but he was nevertheless firmly in the middle class, as was Wright, being forced to earn a living by his publications. It was to these men and their middle, as opposed to upper class friends, that the *Athenaeum* took exception. A detailed discussion on Victorian social classes is outside the scope of this thesis, but this matter is gone into in great detail with respect to the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society by Sally Brookes (1985, 207-212).

It is possible that the actions taken by the socially distinctive factions have a basis in a far wider movement of nineteenth century political thought. Such speculation is really outside the range of this work and would require further study to substantiate, but may put the courses of action of the two factions during the split in a slightly different light. It may only be coincidence, but is nevertheless interesting how, in the Age of Reform, it was the Wright faction, with its roots in the middle classes, that appealed to the democracy of the Association at large to help settle the dispute. Whereas the Way faction, drawing a greater support from the establishment and upper class, trusted to the legitimate authority of the ruling elite of the self-accountable committee.

Chapter 11**THE BRITISH ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION AND
ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE SUBSEQUENT TO THE SPLIT****The Strengths of the Two Factions**

Once it was clear that neither side would easily give up their claim to be the legitimate Association, the dispute was followed by a struggle to recruit supporters by each faction. The initial strength of the Wright faction lay in its possessing the two co-founders of the society and three of the original four officers, one of whom was the highly respected Conyngham. However only two other members of the original committee attended the Special General Meeting and retained their names on the committee which that meeting appointed. The Way faction, on the other hand, boasted fourteen members of the original committee, one of whom had switched his allegiance to it from the newly appointed committee, and others of whom, despite supporting Wright in the initial dispute, considered the Way faction to still be the true continuation of the Association. A further strength was the high personal regard with which Way was held by many in the archaeological community.

The main disadvantage which members of the Way faction were initially under was that the majority of them had played only a minor role in the affairs of the Association to date. The active antiquarians who had attended the Canterbury Congress were on the whole more inclined to lend their support to those members of the original committee who had contributed most to it, namely the Wright faction. The *Gentleman's Magazine*, although firmly supporting the Way faction from the start, admitted to having

"some misgivings how far the not vainly-boasted activity, and the admitted zeal and intelligence of the stirring minority might not prevail in the struggle for popular support. However their recent efforts have been met by not inferior activity, nor inferior perseverance, on the part of the deserted majority, and there can now be no doubt that the

original Committee, will stand its ground triumphantly." (*Gentleman's Magazine*, N.S. 23, June 1845, 631).

The Wright faction had a headstart in terms of recruiting subscribers, for they already had the money from donations made before the split, which were henceforth considered as subscriptions. However the Way faction rapidly recruited members, and published a list showing they had acquired 151 subscribers by April 12th (in *Athenaeum*, 12/4/1845, 376). A list of subscribers to the Wright faction was published with the first number of the *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*. This contained 193 names, however 29 of them were from donations received in 1844, and several others were from before the split or had been paid accidentally to the Wright faction. At least 23 in the list of those whose money had been received in 1845 were also shown as having subscribed to the Way faction, which probably indicates that their real sympathies lay there. For instance Hardwick, Hailstone, and Freer are included and we know that they requested their money be passed to the Way faction (see Chapter 10). It was not always the case, however, that those who are listed as subscribers to the Way faction repudiated the Wright faction. Sir William Betham, for instance, is listed as having subscribed to the Archaeological Institute in a list of subscribers published with the *Archaeological Journal* after the September Winchester Congress, even though he was on the Wright faction's committee and chaired most of the sessions at their Winchester Congress in August.

By June, the Way faction had definitely gained the upper hand, both in the number and influence of its subscribers. According to the *Gentleman's Magazine* (N.S. 23, June 1845, 632), the Way faction by then had more than three hundred and fifty subscribing members. This had risen to 644 before the end of the year according to the list published after the Way faction had adopted the title of the Archaeological Institute. Whereas the Wright

faction, retaining the BAA name, never attained as many as five hundred subscribers at any stage in the following few years (see Appendix C iv).

By virtue of having substantially more subscribers than the Wright faction, the Way faction could also boast a greater total membership, even though the Wright faction may have had more non-contributing correspondents. Over the next years the category of correspondents was phased out. In some cases this meant the members in question just ceased contact with the society, whereas in others they became subscribing associates. For instance, the Rev John Wetherall, rector of Rushton and a member of the Architectural Society of the Archdeaconry of Northampton, who had been a correspondent of the original Association, was a member of the AI in 1845, but did not at that stage subscribe, although from 1848 his name appears on the list of annual subscribers.

As significant as the rapidly increasing list of members for the Way faction, were the influential names enrolled in their ranks. Their president for their Winchester Congress and the succeeding year was the Marquis of Northampton, President of the Royal Society, and he headed a committee of eminent men, many of whom held important positions in the Church or at the Universities. By November 1845 there were four vice-presidents and 25 honorary members of the Way faction committee as well as 24 ordinary members. One of the vice-presidents was Samuel Wilberforce, the Dean of Westminster, and also on the Central Committee as honorary members were the Deans of Peterborough, Chichester, York, Wells, Exeter, Winchester, St Asalph, Ely, and Hereford. Other prominent churchmen included the Venerable Charles Parr Burney and the Venerable William Hale, Archdeacons of Colchester and London respectively. Whewell, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, was also an honorary member, together with the Masters of Clare Hall, Cambridge; Downing College, Cambridge; and University College, Oxford; the Rector of Exeter College, Oxford; the Principle of

Brasenose College, Oxford; the Registrar of Oxford; Buckland, Reader in Geology at Oxford; and Willis, Jacksonian Professor at Cambridge.

It is at this stage, ironically after the Institute had dropped its deliberately reminiscent title of the *British Archaeological Association*, that the organisation came to mirror still more closely the British Association for the Advancement of Science. Buckland, Whewell, and Peacock (Dean of Ely), had all been presidents of the BAAS, and their influence doubtless helped shape the form the Archaeological Institute took. It is surely no coincidence that the Central Committee was to choose York as the venue for their next summer meeting, and that the president was the Earl of Fitzwilliam who, as Lord Milton, had presided over the very first congress of the BAAS, held at York (see Chapter 5). As with the BAAS congresses in 1832 and 1844, the AI in 1846 was to receive the aid of the Yorkshire Philosophical Society. With all these parallels it comes as no surprise that Rev Vernon Harcourt, the mastermind behind the BAAS's York meeting, was a member of the local committee for the 1846 archaeological congress at York.

The Wright faction, on seeing the names on its rival's committee, took pains to emphasise its more influential members. Its Central Committee of July 1845 is headed by a list of nine noble patrons. However only one of these felt the desire to subscribe. The next list we have (September 1847), shows that the BAA had managed to recruit 25 peers. By comparison, in June 1848 the Archaeological Institute laid claim to 36 peers, although this was a slightly lower percentage of its total membership than the proportion for the BAA (see Appendix C v).

The Support of the Clergy

One of the most notable points apparent from analysis of the membership lists, is the remarkable preference for the Way faction

among the clergy (see Appendix C v). The clergy had made up 36% of the original Association in September 1844, and represented a majority of the members not resident in London. A year later, the Way faction boasted 549 clergymen amongst its members, and the Wright faction laid claim to 384, although some of these were later to request that their names be removed from the list of correspondents. The country clergy had eagerly lent their names to the Association when there was no membership fee, but not so many of them were willing to become subscribing associates after the split. Of those that did, by far the vast majority subscribed to the Way faction - 197 are listed as subscribers following the Winchester congress, as opposed to just 27 subscribers to the Wright faction in July 1845.

An important factor in influencing the choice of the Way faction by the bulk of the clergy was the clear support for its Central Committee shown by the higher clergy. As mentioned above, by November 1845 there were ten deans on the Archaeological Institute's Central Committee. The only dean shown on the Wright faction subscribers list of July 1845 was the Dean of Durham, yet even he was in the process of withdrawing from the Association (*Athenaeum*, 17/5/1845, 489).

Just as the clergy offered their support to the Way faction, so too the employees of the British Museum closed ranks behind their colleagues on the Central Committee. Hawkins, Keeper of Antiquities, had been backed up by Birch, the Assistant Keeper of Antiquities and Barnwell, Birch's predecessor, during the split. They were now joined on the Archaeological Institute's committee by Newton and Vaux, both of whom were also connected with the Department of Antiquities. Madden, Keeper of Manuscripts, who appears to have left the original committee before the split, rejoined his colleagues on the AI's committee. These six were joined by a further dozen British Museum men who are listed as subscribers to the Institute after the Winchester Congress.

The Winchester Congresses

Both factions intended meeting at Winchester in the summer of 1845, the Wayites in September, and their rivals in August. The Way faction however, had the advantage that many of the authorities at Winchester had subscribed to their Association. These included the Warden, the Headmaster, and other members of Winchester College, the Mayor, the Recorder, the Town Clerk, the Under Sheriff, the Dean, the Chancellor of the diocese, and at least five canons of Winchester.

The Mayor, Town Clerk, and two of the town Councillors judiciously served on the local committees for both Winchester Congresses. However once more the Way faction had the clear advantage. Of the twelve members of the local committee for the August congress, no fewer than eight had already subscribed to the rival Way faction, whereas only two had contributed to the Wright faction funds. These two were the zealous Councillors who served on both local committees and subscribed to both bodies. They were the only contributors to the Wright faction from the eleven-strong September local committee, of which all save one were subscribers to the Way faction. This comparison may not be strictly fair on the Wright faction, since the list of subscribers I have been forced to use for them dates from July 1845, whereas I have used a list of subscribers for the AI which probably dates to September 1845. Therefore it is possible that some of the members of the August congress local committee didn't contribute to the Way faction until the time of the September congress. Nevertheless, it is still apparent that the antiquarians of Winchester felt a greater commitment to the second of the two British Archaeological Associations to descend on their city.

The Wright faction congress opened on 4th August with a short speech by Conyngham followed by a longer address "On the Objects and Pursuits of Antiquarian Researches" by Pettigrew. He could

not but help allude to the recent dissensions in the Association, and in doing so he recognised the superior influence of his opponents:

"A Party of seceders, important if regarded in respect to the weight of their names, to the respectability of their positions in life, and formidable by their individual interest and perseverance, have endeavoured to wrest from us our title and our right ... this party ... have ... endeavoured to thwart the fulfilment of those objects to which they had themselves previously given their sanction." (*Transactions of the BAA ... at Winchester, August 1845*, 9).

As at Canterbury there were nominally four sections, but this time there were no sectional committees and the whole congress met at each section. One suspects that this was due to the Wright faction's limited numbers at Winchester because of the increasing dominance of the other faction. Following the Canterbury meeting, a correspondent to the *Gentleman's Magazine* had offered some critical remarks meant "rather as hints for the next occasion than as censures upon a first experiment." The gist of these had been that henceforth the sections, like at meetings of the BAAS, should be "real", rather than consisting of assemblings of the Association as a whole, hence giving insufficient time to read all the papers that had been offered. (*Gentleman's Magazine*, N.S. 22, November 1844, 495 and N.S. 23, January 1845, 46). This point was taken up by the Way faction, and some of the meetings of its sections coincided. Nevertheless there were still at least eighteen papers for which there was insufficient time. (*Proceedings of the AI at Winchester, September 1845*, xxv).

The Way faction congress began on the 9th of September. Unlike at the August meeting when there had been no separate sectional committees, there were long lists of officers and members for the September committees. Many of these were eminent men, friends of the increasingly influential members of the Central Committee.

"Such a list of Vice Presidents and Members of Sectional Committees certainly never before graced any association, of a character so absolutely free from all political, religious, party or sectarian feelings." (*Athenaeum*, 6/9/1845, 881).

There is one further point about the sections at Winchester which is illustrative of the nature of the split itself. This is that the Way faction had no distinct Primeval section, instead their Medieval section included Early Antiquities. In all other respects they seemed keen to emphasise the similarities with the successful first congress, and so the absence of this section is the more striking. There are probably two reasons for the absence of a primeval section from the Way faction congress. Firstly, one of the aspects of the Canterbury Congress derided by the *Athenaeum* was the interest in primeval matters; and secondly, there were just insufficient antiquarians in the Way faction with an active interest in primeval antiquities to make the section worthwhile. Consideration of the Canterbury Primeval sectional committee reveals that of those of its members who attended the Canterbury meeting, seven were to subscribe to the BAA whereas only four subscribed to the AI.

The dominance of the clergy in the Archaeological Institute meant that a greater emphasis was placed on ecclesiological matters in their proceedings. There were of course papers about and visits to churches during the August congress, but these were a more dominant part of the meeting in September. Both societies visited Winchester Cathedral, but Professor Willis' lecture on the subject to the Way faction was more authoritative than Edward Cresy's paper for the Wright faction. These papers were published in the respective *Proceedings* or *Transactions*, and both were the longest papers in their volume (Willis' was 80 pages and Cresy's was 45 pages long).

The Way faction congress ended on the 15th of September with a General Meeting of the subscribing members. At this, accounts were submitted and a list of donations was read. The meeting then turned to the matter of the rival societies. The Marquis of Northampton discussed the dispute and proposed that, to avoid further confusion, their society should henceforth be called "The

Archaeological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland". This was accepted unanimously, and the meeting then proceeded to adopt a set of rules and regulations for the government of the Institute. These were in many ways similar to the rules adopted by the Wright faction at the Special General Meeting. The Institute, like the BAA, was to consist of Life Members contributing at least ten pounds, Annual Members subscribing a pound a year, and Corresponding Members, who would make no contribution and not be entitled to vote or have any other privileges. The new rules differed from those of the BAA in three respects. No mention was made of the journal; the annual meeting was to be held at the summer congress rather than in London earlier in the year; and, most significantly, greater power was vested in the Central Committee. The experience of the split had caused the BAA to reduce the power of its Central Committee, whereas it encouraged the AI to reinforce its Central Committee's authority. In a few years Parker was to give up the *Archaeological Journal* as too expensive and it, like the *JBAA*, would come under the direct control of its society. In a couple of years the decision was also made that the annual meeting should be held in London in May. However, the distinction between the two archaeological societies did not so easily disappear.

Reporting of the Winchester Congresses

Both societies learnt from the mistake of the previous year and decided to publish official volumes of their proceedings at Winchester. The BAA's 483-page *Transactions* included 53 papers which were delivered at their congress. They were divided up into the sections and followed by an abstract of the proceedings of the congress. Some of the other papers read were not printed in entire, but abstracts were given of most of them in the report of the proceedings. The Archaeological Institute's *Proceedings* were a less comprehensive record of their congress. The volume was restricted to fifteen papers, primarily relating to the

antiquities of Winchester itself and its environs, and including a report of the proceedings at the meeting. It was promised that some of the other communications would be published in the *Archaeological Journal* in the future. The volume is ninety pages shorter than the BAA's, and irritatingly does not possess continuous page numbering, with certain papers having their own numbering scheme.

The two congresses were covered by the press, but to very different extents. The *Gentleman's Magazine* devoted seven and a half pages to the Archaeological Institute's proceedings (*Gentleman's Magazine*, N.S. 24, October 1845, 401-408), but less than two pages to "Mr Pettigrew's" British Archaeological Association (*ibid.*, September 1845, 289-290). The *Athenaeum* spent just under a column pouring scorn on the "an-archaeologists" (9/8/1845), but gave the extremely substantial amount of 37 columns, over three weeks, for reviews of the Institute's congress and the papers read. (*Athenaeum*, 13/9/1845, 902-906; 20/9/1845, 923-925; 27/9/1845, 942-948). This was more than four times the space devoted to the Canterbury meeting a year earlier. By way of further comparison, the 1845 congress of the BAAS was reported over five weeks, with a total of 84 columns of type. Of this, 25 columns related to the BAAS as a whole and the president's address, 19 columns to reports on Section A, 13 columns each to Sections C and D, and the other 14 columns between sections B, E, F and G. The coverage of the AI compares very favourably with these figures. Had archaeology been covered by its own section within the BAAS, then it is unlikely to have ever gained the extensive coverage it gained from being a separate association (see also Chapter 5).

The Two Journals after the Split.

Apart from the annual congresses, the journals were the most tangible aspect of the two societies. It was therefore important

that each faction should produce as high a quality journal as possible. The division of the original Association had introduced greater competition into the "market-place" of the antiquarian community. However, the extent to which the archaeological "consumers" judged between the products on offer is difficult to gauge. Ultimately their reasons for choosing one society rather than the other were more likely to be based on the newspapers or periodicals that they read and on the opinions of their antiquarian friends, than on a careful analysis of the rival journals. The *Gentleman's Magazine* compared the first number of each journal after the split, and found that the *JBAA* was

"of workmanship certainly inferior in paper, printing, and engravings, to the Journal produced by Mr Parker."
(*Gentleman's Magazine*, N.S. 23, June 1845, 632).

The *Athenaeum* found the fifth number of the *Archaeological Journal*, "the best number ... published yet" and gave a glowing review of it. (*Athenaeum*, 12/4/1845, 351). In the blunt way so characteristic of the *Athenaeum's* dealings with the "an-archaeologists", it suggested that one reason for the improvement was the absence of Wright. The *Archaeological Journal* contains articles by Rev J L Petit, Professor Willis, Birch, Way and Bromet. Way's article is an interesting paper about the Legend of St Werstan, as exhibited by the stained glass windows of Great Malvern Priory (*Archaeol J* 2, 1845, 48-65). Bromet's "Queries intended to Assist Correspondents" (*ibid.*, 66-70), is clearly what he had in mind, but never produced, prior to the Canterbury Congress (see Chapter 9).

The immediate spur for Bromet to produce the Queries was a request from a correspondent for advice from the committee on how to form more complete accounts of monastic settlements. The correspondent had gone on to suggest that

"the publication by the Committee of a set of instructions similar to those issued by the French "Comité Historique", would be a valuable auxiliary to archaeological research."
(*Archaeol J* 2, 1845, 76).

Some of Bromet's questions were taken from a list prepared by Monsieur Giuzot, when Minister of Public Instruction, for the clergy of each of the 33,000 communes or parishes in France. Bromet's questions are in the form of:

"Are there in the parish or township any *rocks*, or *stones* which are the objects of either tradition or popular *superstition* and what *names* do they severally bear?" (*Archaeol J* 2, 1845, 66).

The paper includes questions about ecclesiastical edifices which are clearly similar to the ecclesiological notes of Neale for the "taking" of churches (see Chapter 6). Where the AI differed from the Cambridge Camden Society and the French "Comité Historique" was that there was no systematic attempt to survey en masse and collect in the data. To do so would have necessitated the support of large numbers of correspondents, but the AI and BAA never managed to mobilise these to anywhere near the extent that the Cambridge Camden Society had done.

The journals of both archaeological societies covered the proceedings of the Central Committee up until the split in almost identical words, and then continued by reporting the proceedings of their own faction. The fifth number of the *Archaeological Journal* contains an article by Thomas Baker on a Roman Villa discovered at Bisley. This otherwise unremarkable article is made notable by the existence of a very similar article by Baker, with the same title, published the following year by the BAA. (*JBAA*, 2, 1846, 324-327). However apart from this there seems to be no direct overlap between the two periodicals.

Further Attempts at Reconciliation

With the adoption of their new name by the Archaeological Institute, the period of the split can be considered at an end. However it seemed to many a waste of resources for the two societies to remain separate. In 1850 the BAA adopted a resolution to seek amalgamation, but this was rejected by the AI.

Pettigrew expressed his

"deep regret, that ... there should still exist divisions which have created two great central bodies, having the same objects in view - the same intentions and purposes to fulfil - yet not infrequently acting adversely to each other ... the division has fomented a party-spirit, - has set not only body against body, but, in some few instances, individual against individual, and must therefore be deeply deplored." (Pettigrew, 1850, 172).

In 1876 amalgamation was once again rejected by the RAI (the Institute had gained the epithet "Royal" in 1866). Further attempts at union were made towards the end of the nineteenth century (in 1892 and 1896) as the activity of the two societies began to decline and they came under increasing financial pressure. However, union never came about, and the two societies, although on friendlier terms than in the years immediately after the split, are still separate today.

Chapter 12

CONCLUSION

British Associations : for Science and for Archaeology

There is more to the British Archaeological Association's name than a mere resemblance to that of the British Association for the Advancement of Science. Macleod's comments on the BAAS's title apply equally to the BAA's:

"Notably, it is "British", not English, Scottish, Welsh, or Irish; nor, more especially is it "Royal". It speaks to the nation and the people, not to Crown and Court." (Macleod and Collins, 1981, 11).

Although only 5% of the BAA membership came from Scotland, Wales and Ireland, a far smaller proportion than that of the BAAS, its scope was always meant to be national, providing a mechanism for provincial antiquarians to consult the "experts" on the Central Committee in London. However, despite lip-service to the provinces, the BAA showed a marked reluctance to travel far from the Home Counties, its Durham Congress in 1865 being the furthest north it ventured for many years. The AI was slightly more ambitious, visiting Newcastle in 1852 and Edinburgh in 1856. However the AI later adopted "Royal" as an addition to its title, arguably revealing a more exclusive nature in its ambitions. The dropping of "Association" by the Way faction is also suggestive. The BAAS was

"not a "Society", but an "Association" ... As words conjure images, the Association traded the closed image of the learned society for a progressive, participatory rhetoric - assembling, free from patronage, a visible union of voluntary practitioners" (ibid).

Both the BAA and the AI remained more open than most learned societies, although of the two, the AI, with its battery of higher clergy, was the more intimidating to members with no great worldly position in society.

The most important component in the title was the word

"Archaeological", rather than "Antiquarian". Noticeably, this was the one word carefully retained in their titles by both bodies after the split. A distinction was just (and only just) becoming apparent in the 1840s between archaeology, with a more rigorous methodology, and antiquarianism with broadly amateurish overtones. Members of the BAA and AI were not yet eager to rid themselves of the term antiquary, but they were beginning to aspire to the title of archaeologist. Perhaps this was due to their seeking reflected glory from the discoveries of Middle Eastern archaeology, or maybe a desire to distance themselves from the mockery of the *Pickwick Papers*. Whatever the reason, in the years after the foundation of the BAA the terms antiquary, antiquarian and antiquarianism, were gradually superseded by archaeologist, archaeological and archaeology.

The Science - Antiquity Parallel

Much of this thesis has involved drawing analogies between the scientific and antiquarian communities, primarily in terms of how knowledge was organised through public bodies. This sheds light on such issues as specialisation, professionalism, intellectual networks, and the provincial-metropolitan dichotomy. I believe this approach is valuable for the study of both communities, although researchers in the history of archaeology probably have more to learn because history of science studies have concentrated so much on these kinds of questions already.

In the nineteenth century, developments in the scientific community seem to precede equivalent moves in the antiquarian community, just as the RS's foundation had preceded that of the SA. For instance, scientists began to achieve professional status far earlier than did historians or archaeologists; scientific literary and philosophical societies generally grew up a couple of decades before provincial antiquarian societies; of the metropolitan learned societies, the scientific ones achieved

independence from the RS before the antiquarian ones diverged from the SA; and, most central to this thesis, the BAAS was founded fourteen years before the BAA.

Whilst the immediate causes behind the foundation and success of the BAAS and the BAA are clearly different, the similarities between the two associations and other bodies of the same period suggest that the underlying root causes were the same. This view is strengthened by the overlap between cultivators of science and cultivators of antiquity. Although those "at the fountainheads of knowledge" in the one community seldom had the leisure to play active roles in the affairs of the other, they were often passively involved. For instance, eleven of the BAA's 1844 Central Committee were, or became, Fellows of the Royal Society as well as being Fellows of the Antiquaries. Likewise, several of Morrell and Thackray's "gentlemen of science" lent their names to committees of antiquarian societies (see Chapter 11). Many of the very few professionals in the scientific and antiquarian communities at this period were employed by the British Museum. Because the Departments of Natural History and Antiquities were on the same site, these men were often in close contact with each other, forming a visible link between the two communities.

The key to understanding the BAA's development is an understanding of the people involved and an appreciation of Victorian society and culture. Those involved were mainly male, well-educated, Anglicans from the middle classes, although they ranged from the comfortably well-off to those dependent on patronage. For most of them, antiquarianism was an interest to be pursued in their leisure time. They perceived it as a valuable pursuit which fitted in with Victorian views on occupying leisure time usefully, and was, above all, respectable. This assessment of the antiquarian community compares closely with that of the scientific community. The clergy were prominent in both groupings, although they played a far more significant role in the management of the

BAAS than the BAA. In both communities there were provincial interests where local pride was a source of motivation. Involvement in local societies offered gentrification, although on the whole antiquarians tended to be socially secure already, whereas those joining literary and philosophical societies were consciously seeking to confirm their middle class status.

Whilst the majority of those involved in the BAA were from the affluent middle or upper classes, the contribution of the more humble antiquarians was acknowledged. Pettigrew rather patronizingly observed:

"It is no less the duty than it is the interest of those whose lot in life has been cast in a happy mould to assist those who have been less fortunate; for it must be admitted that some of the best contributions we have received have been, I may say, from the operative rather than the speculative antiquary." (Pettigrew, 1850, 177).

The leaders of the BAAS were also conscious of the valuable role the uneducated mechanic or technician had in the advance of science. The Baconian inductive ideal depended on the willing labour of the lower orders of society in order to help furnish the facts from which the philosophers could generalise. It was the function of the clerisy, the national church of intellect, to lead and direct such labours for the advancement of knowledge. Those that ran scientific and antiquarian bodies often saw their role as that of the clerisy.

Bacon's inductive method, as a guide for the BAA, was praised by Pettigrew (*ibid.*, 175), and was also greatly beloved by Harcourt (Morrell and Thackray, 1981, 267-9) and others among the BAAS. As a philosophy put into practice, admittedly in often modified forms, it also links together the ideals of the Geological Society and the Cambridge Camden Society, which encouraged provincial inductive research with their *Geological Inquiries* and *A Few Hints on the Practical Study of Ecclesiastical Antiquities*. However, Whewell questioned the value of mechanically collecting data in

such ways. Morrell and Thackray argue that

"Whewell aimed to displace Baconian inductivism as the [British] Association's ideology of proper science. Henceforth there would be no place for the purely empirical provincial worker in science ... The result of Whewell's views was the restriction of the scope of provincials within the BAAS. Debarred from Baconian *participation*, they became either the minions of or the deferential *audience* for the Association's theorists, who ... were predominantly Cambridge savants." (Ibid., 271).

Whewell and these Cambridge savants became honorary members of the AI's council, and may have influenced it in eclipsing the participatory role of the provincial antiquarians. The BAA, on the other hand, under the influence of the Baconian-minded Pettigrew, was more willing to countenance contributions from a wider community. This was closer to the original ideals of the BAA as first constituted, but may have been one of the frictions which provoked the split.

The first half of the nineteenth century saw a proliferation of societies, associations and clubs. The sections of society outlined above were to dominate the scientific and antiquarian bodies of their age. It was the interest in antiquity throughout a nationwide community, rather than just among a small London network of antiquaries, which enabled the BAA to develop as it did.

Causes and Effects

Historical studies are notorious for blurring the distinction between cause and effect, often because agents in events can also be used as indicators relating to the same events. Throughout this thesis I have stressed the existence of a significant rise in public interest, both in antiquity and in science. This is an indication of the success of bodies such as the BAA and at the same time was a cause of this very success. At first sight, it may seem a dangerously circular argument to claim that public

interest helped the growth of institutions whose advance can be judged by their popularity, which in turn reveals the scale of public interest. However, I believe that there is validity in such an argument which should perhaps be better seen as an upward spiral of cause and effect, with a number of additional inputs boosting the movement.

I have identified several underlying causes behind the BAA's popularity. These vary widely from the Romantic Movement, which awakened public interest in the past, to the legacies of the Industrial Revolution. As well as its effect on society as a whole, the Industrial Revolution was fundamental to the growth of geology, which in turn affected the study of antiquity. Religious and political factors played a part too. The zeal of the ecclesiologists owed much to their belief in the doctrinal nature of their studies, and the liberal Anglican support for natural theology encouraged investigation into antiquity as well as nature in order to show the Divine Hand at work. The movement for Reform in politics encouraged a climate of reform within institutions. When reform was frustrated, or the established institution moved too slowly, new bodies sprang into being.

An Archaeological Parliament

The BAAS has been called the "Parliament of Science" - a title which recognises its claims over the whole scientific community. The BAA and AI never quite achieved such a status, perhaps because of the dissensions which had divided them so early in their development, but the constitutional metaphor does suggest a few analogies. The annual congresses, although only a week in length, acted as forums for the discussion of antiquarian topics. They raised the public profile of archaeology by acting as a visible, peripatetic meeting where antiquarian savants could meet with those interested in local topography and provincial researches. The "humble labourers" gradually found their position as

participators eroded as they became more an audience to be lectured to by the learned, but they still attended the congresses. The change of emphasis, which becomes noticeable sooner in the AI, is largely tied up with the process of professionalization, although, even at the Canterbury Congress, the floor had been monopolised by a few key speakers. Interestingly, those for whom antiquity was a livelihood, if not a profession, such as Halliwell and Wright, were more often associated with the BAA.

To return to the parliamentary analogy, Conyngham's role as President was more that of a constitutional monarch than of a prime minister. He could try to persuade the Committee, but ultimately he was the Committee's figurehead rather than their being his followers. The Committee was akin to a governmental cabinet, being responsible for the day-to-day running of the Association. The Association's membership can be seen either as the members of a parliamentary house or as the electors, with the non-members being those to whom the franchise had not been extended. One of the matters in contention during the split was the relationship of the Central Committee to the membership at large, and what say each should have in the Association's government. The solution adopted by the AI was an oligarchic structure with power over the Association's conduct being vested in the Central Committee. The BAA, having already appealed to a General Meeting to overturn the wishes of a majority of the Central Committee, opted for a more democratically-based structure, although predictably the real influence still remained in the hands of a few active individuals.

The consensus government which worked so well for the BAAS fell down with the BAA in 1845 for two main reasons. Firstly, the personality clashes between members of the Central Committee caused a gulf which could not be bridged, despite the best efforts of Conyngham. Secondly, like any organisation, different members

saw different ends arising from their association. This was exacerbated as the aims of the Association subtly shifted during its early development. I have discussed controversies which occurred in other organisations covered in the thesis, and shown that a row of its kind was by no means unique in the Victorian intellectual community, although the BAA's may have resulted in a more noticeable result than elsewhere.

There is little sense in passing judgements on the two factions nearly one hundred and fifty years after the split, and that has not been an aim in this thesis. However, I have endeavoured to establish the real factors behind the controversy and add to our modern understanding of the split by investigating the contemporary evidence. As with most quarrels, there are points to be said in favour of both sides, just as criticisms can be levelled at each faction. Fortunately for British archaeology, the split resulted in the establishment and survival of two national bodies, both of which could work to preserve ancient remains, record antiquarian discoveries, and advance the study of the past. Arguably, a single, undivided body may have carried out these aims more effectively, yet today the British Archaeological Association and the Royal Archaeological Institute have been joined by other national organisations also working to further the interests of archaeology.

Appendix A**MEMBERS OF THE 1844 CENTRAL COMMITTEE****i Biographical Sketches**

The following are short biographical sketches of the members of the BAA Central Committee. The names given below are taken from lists of the Central Committee dated 1st March, 25th June, and September 1844, and bound with some issues of the *Journal*. By the time of the split in early 1845 it appears that the committee also included Birch, Bowyer and Barham who are not shown on any of the 1844 *Archaeological Journal* lists. For completeness, biographical sketches of them are also given below.

It is difficult to determine exactly who was on the committee at any particular time, as there are several conflicting lists published in periodicals and with different numbers of the *Archaeological Journal*, not all of which are dated. For instance, the *Gentleman's Magazine* published a list in March 1844 (N.S. 21, 295), which does not include Croker, Ferrey or Manby. However according to the list in the *Archaeol J* dated 1st March 1844, only Croker of these was not then a member. It appears that Eastlake and Winston had withdrawn from the committee by September 1844, probably due to other commitments, although they are still listed as members of the Association in the full membership list published in September. The introduction to Dunkin's *Report of the ... Special General Meeting* includes a list claiming to represent those who were members of the committee on 5th March 1845. This includes Barham and Birch, and does not include Bowyer, Eastlake, Madden, Roach Smith or Winston. The omission of Roach Smith is certainly a mistake, as may be that of Bowyer and Madden. I have tried to give under the individual entries information about how long each individual was on the committee. A comparison of the different committee lists and the allegiance of the committee members after the list is given in Appendix A ii.

The main source of the following biographical information is the *Dictionary of National Biography* in which all save Barnwell, Bromet, Deane and King are listed. *Modern English Biography* by Frederick Boase has also been utilized. The letters and occupations I give immediately after the names are those given in the September 1844 list.

Lord Albert Denison Conyngham, K.C.H., F.S.A., President of the Numismatic Society, *President*

(1805-1860). Third son of the First Marquis Conyngham, he served as a soldier and diplomat before becoming whig MP for Canterbury from 1835 to 1841 and from 1847 until 1850 when he was raised to the peerage as First Baron Londesborough. A very wealthy patron of archaeology, he had, by the 1850s, an annual income of about 100,000 pounds. As an enthusiastic antiquary he was elected F.S.A. in 1840, and F.R.S. in 1850. He contributed six communications to *Archaeologia*. He was President of the Numismatic Society 1843-1845 and 1851-1855. In 1855 he became vice-president of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society, and was vice-president of the British Association meeting at Hull in 1853. Akerman, Crofton Croker, Fairholt, Roach Smith and Wright were all close friends who worked with him or helped catalogue his collections. Conyngham remained President of the Association until he resigned in 1849 after being opposed by Pettigrew and others in a proposal to open a voluntary subscription for a testimonial to Roach Smith. He later joined the Archaeological Institute, although he remained a member of the BAA as well.

Thomas Amyot, Esq., F.R.S., Treasurer of the Society of Antiquities.

(1775-1850). Having held several valuable appointments in the Colonial Office, he had acquired a position of independence by the

1840s and was able to devote his time to archaeology. He was Treasurer of the SA from 1823-1847 and contributed 15 papers to its Transactions. Amyot assisted in founding the Camden Society, of which he was Director from 1839-1850. He was also involved with the Councils of the Percy and Shakespeare Societies in their early years.

Rev Richard Harris Barham

(1788-1845). Author of the humorous and highly popular *Ingoldsby Legends* (first published collectively in 1840), Barham helped add wit to the proceedings of the Canterbury Congress. He is not listed as a member of the Central Committee in any of the 1844 lists, but Dunkin claims that he was on the committee at the time of the split. Planché suggests that coming down to London during inclement weather to add his support to the Wright faction accelerated his death on 17th June 1845 (Planché, 1872, II, 95). Roach Smith called him an accomplished scholar and first-rate antiquary as well as praising his writing (Smith, 1883, 15).

Charles Frederick Barnwell, Esq., M.A., F.R.S., F.S.A., late of the Department of Antiquities, British Museum.

(c.1781-1849). Barnwell was one of the original members of the Numismatic Society. After the split in the BAA, he joined the AI, although he retired from the Central Committee in July 1846.

Samuel Birch, Esq., F.S.A., Department of Antiquities, British Museum.

(1813-1885). Birch was employed by the Public Records Office until 1834. He was one of the original members of the Numismatic Society. From 1836 he was Assistant in the Department of Antiquities, becoming Assistant Keeper there in 1844, specialising in Egyptology. In 1839 he became a corresponding member of the

Archaeological Institute of Rome. He published *Gallery of Antiquities* in 1842 and also wrote on hieroglyphics and the ancient Egyptians. In 1860, after the reorganisation of the BM's Department of Antiquities, he became Keeper of Oriental Antiquities, which at that time also included what British and Medieval Antiquities there were in the Museum. Birch was not listed as a member of the Central Committee in any of the 1844 lists, but he was a member of the committee by the end of February 1845. Following the split, he joined the AI's Central Committee, and contributed articles to the *Archaeological Journal*.

Edward Blore, Esq., D.C.L., F.R.S., F.S.A.

(1787-1879). Blore was an architect and artist who worked with Sir Walter Scott and was in constant correspondence with Rickman, the writer on Gothic architecture. He held the appointment of special architect to William IV and to Victoria in the earlier part of her reign. His hard work as a draftsman can be seen by the 48 volumes he left behind him, containing nearly 5000 drawings. Following the split he joined the AI's Central Committee.

George Bowyer, Esq., D.C.L., F.R.S.A., Barrister-at-Law

(1811-1883). Bowyer was admitted a student of the Middle Temple in 1836, being called to the bar in 1839. He was the author of a series of valuable textbooks on constitutional jurisprudence. In 1844 he was made a D.C.L. at Oxford. In the 1850s he became a prominent Catholic and entered parliament. He succeeded his father as seventh baronet in 1860. According to the *Verbatim Report of the Special General Meeting* (p 16), Bowyer did not become a member of the Central Committee until after the dissensions which were to lead to the split had taken place, although he was a member by March 1845, and joined his name to the Way faction in rejecting the validity of the Special General

Meeting. After the split he became a member of the AI's Central Committee, although he left this in July 1846.

William Bromet, M.D., F.S.A., Corresponding Member of the "Société Française pour la Conservation des Monuments Historiques."

Dr Bromet had travelled in France, and was acquainted with French antiquarian associations and their practices, and so was brought into the discussions of Wright and Roach Smith about forming the BAA at an early stage. He was one of the members of the Printing Committee in 1844, and was one of the main protagonists against Wright in the discord preceding the split, after which he joined the AI's Central Committee.

Thomas Crofton Croker, Esq., F.S.A., M.R.I.A., &c.

(1798-1854). From an early age this Irish antiquary collected songs and legends and was also an accomplished artist. He made his name as an author with the popular *Fairy Legends and Traditions of the South of Ireland*. From 1818 to 1850 he worked at the Admiralty. He was an active member of the SA, being elected in 1827. The following year he established, with some other members of the SA, the convivial Noviomagian Club of which he was permanent president, and through which Roach Smith first met him. He also helped found the Camden and Percy Societies. He was a Fellow of the Royal Antiquarian Society of Copenhagen (1833) and of the Swedish Antiquarian Society (1845). From 1837 to 1854 he was registrar of the Royal Literary Fund. He was a close friend of Conyngham and became one of the secretaries of the BAA following the split, which post he held until 1849.

Rev John Bathurst Deane, M.A., F.S.A.

(1797-1887). Deane was educated at Pembroke College, Cambridge (BA 1820, MA 1823). From 1836 until 1855 he was second classical

master and head mathematical master at Merchant Taylors (where he himself had been schooled). Following the split, he joined the Central Committee of the Institute.

Charles Locke Eastlake, R.A., F.R.S., F.S.A., Secretary to the Commission on Fine Arts

(1793-1865). This painter, who became president of the Royal Academy in 1850, was a great authority on art. He was secretary of the Fine Arts Commission in the late 1830s and became chief advisor to the government and Prince Albert in all matters of art. He was elected a member of the Royal Academy in 1828 and became its librarian in 1842. From 1843 to 1847 he was Keeper of the National Gallery, and became Director of it in 1855. His name appears on the March and June 1844 Central Committee lists, but he appears to have resigned by September 1844.

Sir Henry Ellis, K.H., F.R.S., Principal Librarian of the British Museum and Secretary of the Society of Antiquities.

(1777-1869). Ellis began working for the British Museum in 1800 and became Principal Librarian in 1827, which post he held until he retired on a pension in 1856. Following the parliamentary committee of 1835 which looked into the low state of efficiency of the Museum, it became clear to the Trustees that a change of management was needed, and many of his duties were devolved to the Secretary of the Museum. He was elected F.S.A. in 1807 and was secretary to the SA from 1814 until 1853, during which time he only missed two meetings and made numerous contributions to the *Archaeologia*. From 1853 to 1857 he was Director of the SA. He was one of the founders of the Numismatic Society, being on the original Council. He was appointed to the BAA's Central Committee elected at the Special General Meeting in March 1845, but shortly withdrew in order to remain neutral from both the Wright and Way factions.

Benjamin Ferrey, Esq., Fellow of the Institute of British Architects.

(1810-1880). Ferrey was one of the best architectural draftsmen of his day. He had been a pupil of the elder Pugin but was also influenced by the classical school. In 1839 he became a Fellow of the Institute of British Architects of which he was twice vice-president. He became an F.S.A. in 1863. After the split he was a member of the AI's Central Committee until July 1846.

Edward Hawkins, Esq., F.R.S., F.S.A., Keeper of Antiquities, British Museum.

(1780-1867). Hawkins became Keeper of Antiquities in the British Museum in 1826, and held the office until his resignation in 1860. His particular interests lay with coins and medals. He helped found the Numismatic Society and was the society's second president (1839-1841). He was elected F.R.S. in 1821 and later became a vice-president of the Royal Society. In 1826 he was elected F.S.A., becoming a vice-president of the Antiquaries in 1856. He contributed to the proceedings of both societies, and also published *Silver Coins of England* (1841) and *Numismatica Britannica* (1852). Hawkins was one of the leaders of the Way faction, and became a member of the AI Central Committee, encouraging a number of others from the BM to do likewise.

Thomas William King, Esq., F.S.A., Rouge Dragon Pursuivant.

(1801-1872). King was Rouge Dragon Pursuivant from 1833 until 1848 when he became York Herald, which post he held until his death. He became an F.S.A. in 1836 and contributed to *Archaeologia* and the *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries*. King was originally a supporter of Wright during the controversy, and was appointed to the Central Committee elected at the Special General Meeting. However, he withdrew from this on the grounds of

not agreeing to the necessity of a General Meeting, and later joined the AI's Central Committee, of which he remained a member until May 1846. He later rejoined the committee until August 1851.

Sir Frederic Madden, K.H., F.R.S., F.S.A., Keeper of the MSS. British Museum.

(1801-1873). An antiquary and palaeographer, Madden began working for the British Museum in 1826, becoming head of the Manuscript Department in 1837. He was elected to the Antiquaries in 1828 and also became a member of the Royal Irish Academy. He was one of the first hundred members selected for the Athenaeum Club in 1830, and was elected F.R.S. in the same year. In 1839 he joined the Numismatic Society. He was a gentleman of the Privy Chamber to both William IV and Victoria. His publications include a number of editions of ancient works, some of which were of significant philological importance. He appears to have left the Central Committee by the time of the split, however, he was elected to the AI's committee at the Winchester Congress.

Charles Manby, Esq., Secretary of the Institution of Civil Engineers.

(1776-1850). After working for some time in Paris, Manby established himself in London as a Civil Engineer in 1835. He relinquished his private practice in 1839 on being appointed secretary of the Institution of Civil Engineers. He was elected an F.R.S. in 1853. After the split he joined the AI's Committee.

Thomas Joseph Pettigrew, Esq., F.R.S., F.S.A., Treasurer.

(1791-1865). Pettigrew was a successful and wealthy London surgeon who was prominent in a number of societies. In 1808 he had been elected a member of the Medical Society of London,

becoming one of its secretaries in 1811. He was also secretary of the Royal Humane Society (1813-1820). He helped to establish the City Philosophical Society and the Philosophical Society of London in 1808 and 1810 respectively. Later, he sat on the first Councils of the Historical Society of Science and the Percy Society. In 1812 he became a Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons, and in due course became surgeon to the Duke and Duchess of Kent and as such vaccinated their daughter, Princess Victoria. Later he became the Duke of Sussex's surgeon, and also undertook to catalogue the Duke's library at Kensington Palace. This catalogue was published as *Bibliotheca Sussexiana*, and was well received. He had been elected F.R.S. in 1827 and three years later took a leading part in managing the election of the Duke of Sussex as president. He had a keen interest in mummies, and published seven books on embalming and Egyptology. He also published 54 antiquarian books and papers, and 21 on medical subjects. He served the BAA as a vice-president and its treasurer until 1865.

Ambrose Poynter, Esq., Secretary of the Royal Institute of British Architects, Member of Council of the Government School of Design.

(1796-1886). Poynter was a successful architect who helped found the Royal Institute of British Architects in 1834 and served on its Council. He was an original member of the Arundel Society and the Graphic Society. A student of heraldry, he made drawings to illustrate Sandford's *Genealogical History of England*. He was a member of the AI committee after the split until August 1847, and contributed several papers to the proceedings of the AI.

Charles Roach Smith, Esq., F.S.A., Hon member of the Society of Antiquaries of Spain, late Hon Secretary of the Numismatic Society, *Honorary Secretary*.

(1807-1890). A farmer's son, Roach Smith was apprenticed to a chemist and in 1834 set up in business himself as a chemist in

London. An early interest in Roman coins developed into a wider interest in collecting all sorts of Roman and British remains. In London he diligently watched and excavated for antiquities during development of the city and dredging of the Thames. This enabled him to build up an extensive collection which was visited by antiquaries from far and wide. In 1856 the collection was sold to the British Museum for 2000 pounds (two-thirds of the original price it was offered for), and now forms the core of the Romano-British collection. Roach Smith was elected F.S.A. in 1836 and contributed much to *Archaeologia*. From 1841 to 1844 he was one of the honorary secretaries of the Numismatic Society, of which he became an honorary member in 1852. After his retirement to Strood in 1855 he actively assisted the work of the Kent Archaeological Association. For many years he compiled "Antiquarian Notes" for the *Gentleman's Magazine*. He also wrote for the *Athenaeum* and contributed to the *Archaeologia Aeliana* of the Newcastle Antiquaries. His privately published journal, *Collectanea Antiqua*, began in 1843 and ran to seven volumes, the last of which was published in 1880. He was one of the leaders of the Wright faction and served as secretary of the BAA until 1851.

Thomas Stapleton, Esq., F.S.A.

(1805-1849). Stapleton was elected F.S.A. in 1839. He contributed several learned papers to the *Archaeologia*, and in 1846 became a vice-president of the Antiquaries. He was also one of the founders of the Camden Society, undertaking one of its earliest works, *The Plumpton Correspondence*, in 1839. Later he became an F.R.S.

Albert Way, Esq., M.A., Director of the Society of Antiquaries, Corresponding member of the "Comité des Arts et Monuments", *Honorary Secretary*.

(1805-1874). After being educated at Trinity College Cambridge (BA 1829, MA 1834), Way travelled extensively in Europe and the

Near East where he learned something of archaeology in the field. He was elected F.S.A. in 1839 and was Director of the SA from 1842-1846. He was a skilful draftsman and contributed much to the publications of the SA and other societies. Joan Evans has described him as "an admirable example of the leisured archaeologist, the learned amateur, of the old school." (Evans, 1949, 2). He was the key figure in the AI after the split, serving as its secretary.

Sir Richard Westmacott, R.A., F.S.A., Professor of Sculpture, Royal Academy.

(1775-1856). Like his father and his son, Westmacott was a sculptor. He was elected a member of the Royal Academy in 1811, and in 1827 became its professor of sculpture, in which role he often advised the Trustees of the British Museum with regard to displaying their sculptures. He lectured annually at the Academy, showing considerable archaeological knowledge. He was Chairman of the Central Committee at the time of the split, siding with the Way faction. He served on the AI Central Committee until August 1851.

Charles Winston, Esq., Inner Temple

(1814-1864). Despite having a large legal practice, Winston devoted much time to the study of fine arts, especially architecture and glass painting. He became the leading British authority on painted glass, and wrote an article on the subject in the first volume of the *Archaeological Journal* (1844, 14-23). In 1847 he published *An Inquiry into the Differences of Style observable in Ancient Glass Paintings especially in England, with Hints on Glass Painting*. He had begun this in 1838 by arranging the subject along the lines of Rickman's *Gothic Architecture*. He also published *An Introduction to the Study of Painted Glass* in 1849. Winston appears as a member of the BAA Central Committee in

the lists of March and June 1844, but appears to have left the committee by September 1844, although he remained a member of the Association until the split whereupon he joined the Institute.

Thomas Wright, Esq., M.A., F.S.A., Corresponding member of the Institute of France, (Académie des Inscriptions), and of the "Comité des Arts et Monuments."

(1810-1877). The son of a poor printer, Wright was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, with Whewell as his tutor (BA 1834, MA 1837). At Cambridge he came to know J M Kemble who induced him to study Anglo-Saxon. He also became a friend of James Orchard Halliwell (later Halliwell-Phillips) with whom he collaborated on many antiquarian projects, including a monthly periodical, *The Archaeologist and Journal of Antiquarian Science* (September 1841 - June 1842), and with whom he formed the short-lived Historical Society of Science. Wright was an active member in several of the printing clubs formed just prior to the BAA. He was secretary of the Camden Society, and treasurer and secretary of the Percy Society. Always of limited means, these offices and his publications helped him support himself. Much of his antiquarian work in middle life was undertaken at the expense of wealthy patrons, such as his friend Lord Conyngham. Unfortunately, much of his prolific output was hastily executed and errors abound, but his enthusiasm and industry were inexhaustible until his mind failed in 1872. The British Museum catalogue contains 129 entries of Wright's works, and he contributed many papers to archaeological periodicals. In 1837 he was elected F.S.A., and in 1842 he was elected a corresponding member of the French Institute. Without a private income, his need to make a living from his antiquarian researches meant he was never encouraged in his work by the socially established Society of Antiquaries. For much of his time on the BAA Central Committee he served as its secretary for foreign correspondence, and he also became a vice-president of the Association in the 1860s.

ii Comparison of Committee Membership Lists, Attendance at Canterbury, and Allegiance after the Split

	1/3/44	25/6/44	Sept'44	28/2/45	5/3/45	Allegiance	
Conyngham	-	*	*	+	*	C	Wright
Amyot	*	*	*	+	*	C	-
Barham	-	-	-	?	*	C	Wright
Barnwell	*	*	*	*	*		Way
Birch	-	-	-	*	*		Way
Blore	*	*	*	*	*		Way
Bowyer	-	-	-	*	-		Way
Bromet	*	*	*	*	*		Way
Croker	-	*	*	+	*	C	Wright
Deane	*	*	*	*	*	C	Way
Eastlake	*	*	-	-	-		-
Ellis	*	*	*	+	*		-
Ferrey	*	*	*	*	*		Way
Hawkins	*	*	*	*	*		Way
King	*	*	*	+	*		Way
Madden	*	*	*	?	-		-
Manby	*	*	*	*	*		Way
Pettigrew	*	*	*	+	*	C	Wright
Poynter	*	*	*	*	*	(C)	Way
Roach Smith	*	*	*	+	-	C	Wright
Stapleton	*	*	*	*	*	C	Way
Way	*	*	*	*	*		Way
Westmacott	*	*	*	*	*	C	Way
Winston	*	*	-	-	-		-
Wright	*	*	*	+	*	C	Wright

The first three columns are from official lists published with *Archaeological Journal* 1. The fourth column consists of those who signed the denouncement (dated 28/2/1845) of the Special General Meeting. These are signified with "*"; those marked as "+" were

definitely members at the time, whereas the status of those marked "?" is unclear. Those shown as "-" were definitely not members. The fifth column is from Dunkin's *Report of the ... Special General Meeting* and contains at least one inaccuracy (Roach Smith is not listed as a member).

The letter "C" indicates attendance at the Canterbury Congress, Poynter only attended very briefly. The final column details which, if either, committee the individual had joined by 25th March 1845, soon after the split (using the *Athenaeum*, 376).

iii Connections with other Societies, 1842-1845

The individuals marked with "*" were on the Council of the relevant society or printing club at some stage between 1842 and 1845. Those indicated "+" were fellows or members of the RS, SA or NS in this period. The information comes from *Proceedings of the SA*, the *Archaeologist and Journal of Antiquarian Science*, the *Athenaeum*, and the *Gentleman's Magazine*.

	RS	SA	NS	Camden	Percy	Shakespeare
Conyngham		*	*	*		*
Amyot	+	*		*	*	*
Barham						
Barnwell	+	*	*	*		
Birch		+	*			
Blore	+	*				
Bowyer						
Bromet		*				
Croker		+	+	*	*	
Deane		+				
Eastlake	+	*				
Ellis	+	*	+	*		*
Ferrey						
Hawkins	+	*	*			
King		*	+			
Madden	+	+	+	*	*	
Manby						
Pettigrew	+	*	+	*	*	*
Poynter						
Roach Smith		*	*			
Stapleton		*				
Way		*		*		
Westmacott		*				
Winston						
Wright		+		*	*	*

Appendix B

PRINTING CLUBS

The following information on Printing Clubs is taken from *The Learned Societies and Printing Clubs of the United Kingdom: being an Account of their respective Origin, History, Objects and Constitution*, by Rev A Hume LL.D., F.S.A. (1847). It is supplemented by details from Levine, 1986, Appendix II.

Date of Foundation	Name	Objects
1812	Roxburghe Club	Publication of unpublished MSS, and reprinting of rare and valuable works. 40 members max.
1823	Bannatyne Club	Printing works illustrative of the History, Antiquities, and Literature of Scotland. 100 members. Based in Edinburgh.
1828	Maitland Club	Printing works illustrative of the History, Antiquities, and Literature of Scotland. 100 members max. Based in Glasgow.
1828	The Oriental Translation Fund	Publication of translations from Eastern MSS.
1833	Iona Club	Investigating and illustrating the History, Antiquities, and early Literature of the Highlands and Islands of Scotland. Included conducting excavations on Iona.
1834	Surtees Society	Publication of inedited MSS illustrative of the moral, intellectual, religious and social condition of the NE of England and the Border Country. Unlimited members.
1834	Abbotsford Club	Printing of Miscellaneous pieces, illustrative of History, Literature, and Antiquities. 50 members max.
1836	English Historical Society	Publishing medieval chronicles.

- 1838 Camden Society Publication of Documents, Letters, ancient Poems, etc, to render accessible materials from the Civil, Ecclesiastical, or Literary History of the UK. 1200 members max.
- 1839 Spalding Club Printing of Historical, Ecclesiastical, Genealogical, Topographical, and Literary remains of NE Scotland. 500 members max. Based in Aberdeen.
- 1840 Irish Archaeological Society Printing of Genealogical, Ecclesiastical, Bardic, Topographical, and Historical Remains of Ireland. 500 members max
- 1840 Parker Society Reprinting the best Works of the Fathers and early Writers of the Reformed English Church and publishing MSS by the same.
- 1840 Percy Society Bringing to light obscure specimens of Ballad Poetry. 500 members max.
- 1840 Shakespeare Society Printing books illustrative of Shakespeare and his time. 1000 members max.
- 1840 Berkshire Ashmolean Society Regional publications.
- 1840 Historical Society of Science
- 1840 Motett Society Reprinting early Church Music
- 1840 Musical Antiquarian Society Printing scarce and valuable musical works from MSS.
- 1841 Society for the Publication of Oriental Texts
Printing standard works in Syriac, Arabic, Persian, Turkish, Sanskrit, Chinese, and other languages of the east.
- 1841 Granger Society Publication of ancient portraits and family pictures.
- 1841 Lincolnshire Topographical Society Regional publications.
- 1842 Aelfric Society Publication of Anglo-Saxon and other literary monuments, civil and ecclesiastical, tending to illustrate early state of England. 500 members max.
- 1843 Chetham Society Publishing Archaeological, Biographical

- and Historical books relating to Counties Palatine of Lancaster and Chester. 350 members max. Based in Manchester.
- 1843 Wycliffe Society Publication of early Puritan and Non-Conformist writers.
- 1843 Sydenham Society Reprinting of early medical literature, including translations from Latin, Greek, Arabic, etc. Unlimited membership.
- 1843 Spottiswoode Society Publication of rare and curious MSS, Pamphlets, and other works illustrative of the Civil and ecclesiastical state of Scotland.
- 1844 Ray Society Promotion of Natural History by printing original works in Zoology and Botany, and translations and reprints of foreign and rare works. Membership unlimited.
- 1844 Wernerian Club Republication of Standard Works of Scientific Authors of old date, and publication of approved modern works. 25 Ordinary members and 50 Associates, who must be qualified in Natural History or Philosophy.
- 1845 Caxton Society Publishing Memoirs and Chronicles of the Middle Ages.
- 1845 Hanserd Knollys Society Works of early English and other Baptist writers.
- 1846 Cavendish Society Promotion of Chemical Science by translating and publishing Valuable Works and papers on Chemistry. Membership unlimited.
- 1846 Hakluyt Society Printing rare and valuable Voyages, Travels, and Geographical Records, from an early period of exploratory enterprise.
- 1846 Anglia Christiana Society Lives, letters, and documents of early ecclesiastical history.
- 1846 Ecclesiastical History Society
- 1849 Arundel Society Promoting knowledge of art by copying and publishing important works of ancient masters.

Appendix C

MEMBERSHIP STATISTICS

Both the BAA and the AI occasionally published lists of their members in pamphlets, separate from their journals. Occasionally these were kept with the volume when it was bound together at the end of the year, however this was by no means always the case, and depended on the the binder of the volume. Therefore the presence or absence of a membership list in any particular individual volume is often a matter of chance, and different runs of the same journal may contain membership lists from different years. I have been unable to discover membership lists for every year, despite consulting six different sets of the *Archaeological Journal* (including the AI's own run). Whether this is because they were not produced in every year, or because they have been lost, is not clear. However, from the data I have collected, a number of comparisons may be drawn between the BAA and the AI, and changes over time in their membership can be seen (see Chapters 8 and 11).

Following the split and the introduction of subscriptions by both factions, the importance of the non-contributing correspondents decreased, and lists of them do not seem to have been published after 1845.

i The Growth of the British Archaeological Association in 1844

	Total	Clergy	FSA	"Titled"	Foreign
1st March 1844	438	136	92	53	3
25th June 1844	833	308	137	92	24
September 1844	1024	368	167	103	27

The divisions are not exclusive, i.e. a titled member who was also a clergyman and an FSA would count towards the totals in several columns.

The division "Titled" consists of the names published separately at the front of the membership lists. It includes Peers, Bishops, "the Honourables", Baronets, Knights and Deans (see Chapter 8). The June list, unlike the March and September lists, published the names of MPs and vice-presidents of the SA with the titled names. However, for consistency in comparing the lists, I have instead counted them towards the main membership.

ii Breakdown of the British Archaeological Association by Letters and Occupation, September 1844

Nobles	23	F.S.A.	167	
Baronets	18	F.R.S.	68	
Knights	19	F.I.B.A./A.I.B.A.	20	
Members of Parliament	23	F.G.S.	5	
Clergy	Total	368	University Academics	30
	Bishops	12		
	Deans	12	British Museum employees	14
	Archdeacons	16		
	Rural Deans	16	Mr (as opposed to Esq)	25
Officers in learned or provincial antiquarian societies				33

iii Breakdown of the British Archaeological Association and the Archaeological Institute by Geographical Location, 1845

There are no figures for the regional distribution of the BAA's 1844 membership, however, the 1845 membership lists of both successor societies are divided by county. The regional divisions below are taken from Levine (1986, 50). Oxfordshire and Northamptonshire have been incorporated as part of the Midlands, Lincolnshire as part of the North-East, and East Anglia has been included in the South-East.

	AI	BAA
South-East	26.5%	30.5%
London	26	25
Midlands	17	16
South-West	14	11.5
North-West	4.5	5
Yorkshire	3.5	4
North-East	3	3
Wales, Scotland and Ireland	5.5	5

iv Division of the British Archaeological Association into the Wright and Way Factions

	Total	Clergy	FSA	Nobles	Foreign
<u>Original BAA</u>					
September 1844	1024	368 (36%)	167 (16%)	23	27
<u>Wright faction BAA</u>					
July 1845 ¹	1159	384 (33%)	103 (9%)	19	38
<u>Way faction AI</u>					
Sept (?) ² 1845	1485	549 (37%)	137 (9%)	36	40

It should be noted that the lists for the two factions are not exclusive, for instance 29 of the foreign names listed were honorary members of both the BAA and AI in 1845. The figures include both correspondents and subscribing associates.

¹ The BAA's July 1845 list was qualified as being "of all who have not openly seceded from the original Association"

² This list is undated, but it is bound with *Archaeological Journal* 2, and clearly dates to some time after the September Winchester Congress because it is headed with the new name of the Archaeological Institute. It is probable that it represents the state of the Institute immediately after the congress.

v **Subscribers to the British Archaeological Association and the Archaeological Institute, 1845-1849**

	Subscribers			Clergy	F.S.A.	Nobles
	Annual	Life	Total			
<u>Wright Faction BAA</u>						
30th April 1845	177	15	192	29 (15%)	37 (19%)	4 (2%)
July 1845	240	13	253	27 (11%)	46 (18%)	4 (2%)
September 1847	468	17	485	32 (7%)	72 (15%)	25 (5%)
1848/49	456	14	470	40 (9%)	69 (15%)	22 (5%)
1849/50	436	20	456	37 (8%)	76 (17%)	20 (4%)
<u>Way faction AI</u>						
25th March 1845 ³	143	8	151	35 (23%)	? ?	3 (2%)
Sept (?) ⁴ 1845	621	23	644	197 (31%)	62 (10%)	19 (3%)
June 1848	886	37	923	254 (28%)	86 (9%)	36 (4%)
June 1849	933	55	988	274 (28%)	83 (8%)	38 (4%)

Sixteen names from the BAA's April 1845 list are missing from its July 1845 list. Four of these were life members, and six were clergy, although at least one of these, Barham, had died rather than withdrawn by July. Of the others, all bar one are listed as subscribers to the AI in 1845. There were also several others shown on the July list who had expressed a desire to withdraw or had subscribed to the AI.

³ This list is taken from the *Athenaeum* (12/4/1845, 376). It does not indicate whether subscribers were F.S.A.

⁴ See footnote 2.

Appendix D

ARTICLE FROM THE *ATHENAEUM* CONCERNING THE SPLIT

The following is taken from the *Athenaeum* (1/3/1845, 221), and concerns the split in the BAA's Central Committee (see Chapter 10).

"Things are not altogether right - and we had foretold as much - in the British Archaeological Association. There is a split in the self-elected Council. Mr Albert Way has brought a kind of *Pride's Purge* among them; and, supported as he is understood to have been by Mr Hawkins, of the British Museum, Mr Blore, the architect, Dr Bromet, and others in whom the public have confidence, - the Canterbury Mountebanks, as they are called, have been outvoted. Mr Wright has resigned the editorship of the Journal, and Mr Pettigrew and Mr Smith are on the tremble or the move. We are heartily glad of this stir on the council; and may now hope for some good results. The Canterbury affair was really worse than we described it; and as we were in September likely to have a repetition of the same thing at Winchester, it was high time for the "better spirits" of the council to look ahead, and see that they did not lend their names a second time to the traders associated with them. The two factions are at this moment all energy and expectation. The minority have summoned a special meeting on the 5th; and the cropped down council is preparing a counter-statement, and biding its time. Our own mind is pretty well made up. The *traders* must go: so we said from the first, and we emphatically repeat it. We must have no repetition, at Winchester, of the Canterbury cockneyisms of last year. The Association must have what it has all along wanted - a constitution and laws. The body should consist of members who pay a certain annual subscription only - not, as now, of a long list of names, whose only effect upon the Association is that of adding to its printing expenses. The society must be framed anew. Let it enter names and receive subscriptions *at once* for the current year - frame the fundamental laws of its association - elect a council composed of men of tried and confirmed reputation, and stipulate a yearly audit and certain yearly retirements. The Treasurer must be a man of business habits, and one who will have the permanent interests of the society at heart. The Secretaries must be disinterested men, of name and standing, willing and able to work - not zealous for the exaltation of themselves or their own special pursuits - men who can write good English, and speak it correctly when it is written. A British Archaeological Association thus established, will have the fundamental principles of permanent existence built into its structure; the study of

British antiquities will become generally useful - will awake a fresh feeling for the subject, discover facts of consequence and moment, and preserve from injury and neglect the interesting antiquities of our island - memorials such as Camden loved - "Remains concerning Britain". It is probable that we shall have next week to report progress.

Appendix E

**RESOLUTIONS PASSED AT THE SPECIAL
GENERAL MEETING, 5/3/1845**

1. Proposed by Rev R H Barham, seconded by T C Croker, Esq.

"That an Annual General Meeting be in future held in London, in the month of March, at which a statement of the Association shall be submitted by the Central Committee, and an account rendered of the receipts and expenditure; and at this Meeting the officers and committee for the year be appointed."

2. Proposed by Charles Roach Smith, Esq, seconded by Sir James Annesley.

"That the most grateful thanks of this Meeting be given to Lord Albert Conyngham, K.C.H., F.S.A. for the zeal and ability he has displayed in the discharge of the duties of President of the Central Committee; and that he be earnestly solicited to return to the Association, and again preside over the Central Committee."

3. Proposed W Jerdan, Esq, seconded by Thomas Lott, Esq.

"That the Central Committee shall consist of a President, a Treasurer, two Secretaries, and seventeen other members; and that the following gentlemen constitute the same for the ensuing year, with power to fill up any vacancy that may arise during that period.

President - Lord Albert Conyngham, K.C.H., F.S.A.
Treasurer - Thomas Joseph Pettigrew, Esq., F.R.S., F.S.A.
Secretaries - Thomas Crofton Croker, Esq., F.S.A., M.R.I.A.
- Charles Roach Smith, Esq., F.S.A.

Committee

Thomas Amyot, Esq., F.S.A., Treasurer S.A.
Sir James Annesley, F.R.S., F.S.A.
The Rev. R Harris Barham, M.A.
John Barrow, Esq., F.R.S., F.S.A.
Captain Beaufort, R.N., F.R.S.
Sir William Betham, F.R.S., F.S.A., Ulster King at Arms
George Richard Corner, Esq, F.S.A.
Sir Henry Ellis, K.H., F.S.A., Secretary S.A.
Joseph Gwilt, Esq., F.S.A.
The Very Rev. the Dean of Hereford, F.R.S., F.S.A.
Thomas William King, Esq., F.S.A., Rouge Dragon
R Monckton Milnes, Esq., M.P.
J Robinson Planché, Esq., F.S.A.
J Emmerson Tennent, Esq., M.P.
John Green Waller, Esq.
Sir Gardner Wilkinson, M.A., F.R.S.
Thomas Wright, Esq., M.A.

4. Proposed by Alexander Horace Burkitt, Esq., seconded by John Brent, jun, Esq.

"That the members of the Association be divided into two classes, Associates and Correspondents. That the Associates consist of Subscribers of one guinea or upwards per annum, or of a life subscription of 10/ 10s; by which they will be entitled to receive a copy of the Society's Journal, to attend all General Meetings, and to vote at the election of Officers and Committee. That of the Correspondents no contribution be required; that they may be entitled to attend all General Meetings, but not to vote in the election of Officers and Committee."

5. Proposed by S C Hall, Esq., seconded by Dr Lee.

"That the Journal of the Society be printed and published in London, at the expense of the Association, and that the profits arising from the same be devoted to the purposes of the Institution."

6. Proposed by Arthur Ashpital, Esq., seconded by Dr Copland.

"That the best thanks of this Meeting be given to the Treasurer, for the great services he has rendered the Association from its formation, and particularly for his attention to the wishes of a large body of its Members, by convening the present General Meeting, which the Members confidently hope will tend to the proper establishment and perpetuity of the Institution."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Periodicals

- Ainsworth's Magazine* 6, 1844
- Archaeological Journal* 1 - 6, 1844-1850
- Archaeologist and Journal of Antiquarian Science*
1, 1841; 2, 1842
- Associated Architectural Societies - Reports and Papers.*
1, 1850-1
- Athenaeum* 1844; 1845
- The Builder* 1844
- Chamber's Edinburgh Journal* N.S. 2, 1844
- Collectanea Antiqua* 1, 1848; 7, 1880
- The Ecclesiologist* 1 - 6, 1843-1846 (1 : 2nd ed)
- Gentleman's Magazine* N.S. 21 - 24, 1844-1845
- Illustrated London News* 5 - 7, 1844-1845
- Journal of the British Archaeological Association*
1 - 5, 1845-1850
- The Literary Gazette* 1844
- Numismatic Chronicle* 1, 1839; 2, 1840; 7, 1845
- Numismatic Journal* 1, 1837; 2, 1838
- Proceedings of The Geological Society of London*
1, 1834 (relating to 1826-1833)
- Proceedings of The Numismatic Society of London*
1836-1839
- Proceedings of The Society of Antiquaries of London.*
1, 1849 (relating to 1843-1849)
- Punch* 3, 1842; 7, 1844
- Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society of London*
1, 1845 (with *Proceedings* from 1843)
- Reports and Communications of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society*
1, 1859 (relating to 1851-1859)

Circulars and Pamphlets

"British Archaeological Association - Programme and List of Committees for the First Annual Meeting, Canterbury, September 1844". 10/7/1844

"To the Members of the British Archaeological Association". Pettigrew T J, 26/2/1845

"British Archaeological Association" Way A, 28/2/1845

"A Verbatim Report of the Special General Meeting of the British Archaeological Association, Held at the Theatre of the Western Literary Institute, 5th March 1845". (Taken in shorthand by T E Jones)

"Statement". Wright T, 19/3/1845

"A Report of the Substance of the Several Speeches at the Special General Meeting of the British Archaeological Association, held at the Western Literary Institution, Leicester Square, on Wednesday evening, 5th March, Thomas Joseph Pettigrew Esq, FRS, FSA, in the Chair. Appended to which are some Observations Upon the Proceedings". Dunkin A J, 1845

"A Narrative of Facts in reply to the ex-parte statements and representations of Mr Pettigrew and Mr Wright". Oxford, 1845

"The British Archaeological Association". Merewether J, 12/5/1845

"Letter to the Very Reverend John Merewether, D.D., Dean of Hereford, in reply to the publication of his correspondence relating to the affairs of the British Archaeological Association". Pettigrew T J, 31/5/1845

"Account of the Sixth Anniversary Meeting of the Cambridge Camden Society, May 8th, 1845. (Published as part of bound copy of Ecclesiologist 4)

Books and Articles

- Archaeological Institute (1846) *Proceedings at the Annual Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, at Winchester, September, MDCCCXLV*. London
- Archaeological Institute (1847) *Memoirs Illustrative of the History and Antiquities of the City and County of York*. (Proceedings of York Congress, July 1846). London
- AKERMAN J Y (1847) *An Archaeological Index to Remains of Antiquity of the Celtic, Romano-British, and Anglo-Saxon Periods*. London
- ALLEN J R (1884) "The Past, Present, and Future of Archaeology." *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, 5th series, 1, 232-248
- British Archaeological Association (1846) *Transactions of the British Archaeological Association, at its Second Annual Congress, held at Winchester August 1845*. London
- British Archaeological Association (1848) *Transactions of the British Archaeological Association, at its Third Annual Congress, held at Gloucester August 1846*. London
- BABBAGE C (1830) *Reflections on the Decline of Science in England, and on Some of its Causes*. London
- BOASE F (1892-1901) *Modern English Biography*. London
- BREWSTER D (1835) "The British Scientific Association" *Edinburgh Review* 40, 363-394
- BRIGGS M S (1952) *Goths and Vandals - A Study of the Destruction, Neglect and Preservation of Historical Buildings in England*. London
- BROOKS S A (1985) "L. A. M. A. S. : A Victorian Establishment." *Transactions of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society* 36, 203-222
- CANNON S F (1978) *Science in Culture: The Early Victorian Period*. New York
- CARSON R A G (1986) *A History of the Numismatic Society 1836-1986*. London

-
- CLARK K (1928) *The Gothic Revival: An Essay in the History of Taste.* London
- COLERIDGE S T (1839) *On the Constitution of Church and State, According to the Idea of Each.* 3rd edition, London
- DANIEL G (1975) *150 Years of Archaeology.* 2nd edition, London
- DANIEL G (1981) *A Short History of Archaeology.* London
- DICKENS C (1836-7) *The Pickwick Papers.* The World's Classics edition (1988), Oxford
- Dictionary of National Biography*
- DREYER J L E & TURNER H H (1923) *History of the Royal Astronomical Society, 1820-1920.* London
- DUNKIN A J (1845) *Report on the Proceedings of the British Archaeological Association at the First General Meeting held at Canterbury in the Month of September 1844.*
- EASTLAKE C L (1872) *A History of the Gothic Revival.* London
- EVANS J (1949) "The Royal Archaeological Institute: A Retrospect." *Archaeol J* 106, 1-11
- EVANS J (1956) *A History of the Society of Antiquaries.* Oxford
- GÜNTHER A E (1980) *The Founders of Science at the British Museum 1753-1900.* Halesworth
- HUME A (1847) *The Learned Societies and Printing Clubs of the United Kingdom.* London
- KENDRICK T (1954) "The British Museum and British Antiquities." *Antiquity* 28, 132-142
- KLINDT-JENSON O (1975) *A History of Scandinavian Archaeology.* London
- KNIGHT D (1975) *Sources for the History of Science 1660-1914.* London
- KNIGHTS B (1978) *The Idea of the Clerisy in the Nineteenth Century.* Cambridge

-
- LEVINE P (1986) *The Amateur and the Professional*.
Cambridge
- LEVY F J (1963/4) "The Founding of the Camden Society"
Victorian Studies 7, 295-305
- MACLEOD R & COLLINS P (eds) (1981) *The Parliament of Science -
The British Association for the Advancement of Science
1831-1981*. Northwood
- MARSDEN B M (1984) *Pioneers of Prehistory*. Ormskirk
- MILLER E (1973) *That Noble Cabinet - A History of
the British Museum*. London
- MORRELL J & THACKRAY A (1981) *Gentlemen of Science -
Early Years of the British Association for the Advancement of
Science*. Oxford
- NEWTON C (1851) "On the Study of Archaeology."
Archaeol J 8, 1-26
- Numismatic Society (1838) *The Institutes of the Numismatic
Society of London*. London
- ORANGE A D (1972) "The Origins of the British
Association for the Advancement of Science." *The British
Journal for the History of Science* 6, No 22, 152-176
- PAGAN H (1986) "Record of Members and Fellows."
Carson, *History of the Numismatic Society 1836-1986*. London
- PARKER J H (1881) "Archaeological Societies" *The
Antiquary* 4, 32-33
- PETTIGREW T J (1850) "On the Study of Archaeology, and
the Objects of the British Archaeological Association." *JBAA*
6, 163-177
- PIGGOTT S (1976) "The Origins of the English County
Archaeological Societies." *Ruins in a Landscape*, 171-195,
Edinburgh
- PLANCHE J R (1872) *Recollections and Reflections*. 2
Vols, London
- PORTER R S (1978) "Gentlemen and Geology: The
Emergence of a Scientific Career, 1660-1920." *Historical
Journal* 21, 809-836

-
- RUDWICK M J S (1963) "The Foundation of the Geological Society of London: Its Scheme for Co-operative Research and its Struggle for Independence." *British Journal for the History of Science* 1, 326-355
- RUSKIN J (1849) *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*. Century edition (1988), London
- SAINT A (1988) Introduction to *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*. Century edition, London
- SHAPIN S & THACKRAY A (1974) "Prosography as a Research Tool in History of Science: The British Scientific Community 1700-1900." *History of Science* 12, 1-28
- SMART T W (1847) "Account of some Ancient British Antiquities Discovered in Kent's Cavern, near Torquay, Devon." *JBAA* 2, 171-174
- SMITH C R *Proceedings of the Canterbury Congress* (unpublished, see Chapter 2)
- SMITH C R (1883, 1886, 1891) *Retrospections, Social and Archaeological*. 3 Vols, London
- STEWART R (1989) *Party and Politics 1830-1852*. London
- THOMPSON A H (1939) *The Surtees Society 1834-1934*. Durham
- THOMPSON A H (1945) "Address in Commemoration of the Centenary of the Royal Archaeological Institute." *Archaeol J* 100, 1-15
- THOMPSON J (1869) "The Objects and Advantages of Architectural and Archaeological Societies." *Associated Architectural Societies Reports* 10, 153-159
- THOMPSON M W (1990) *The Cambridge Antiquarian Society 1840-1990*. Cambridge
- TRIGGER B G (1989) *A History of Archaeological Thought*. Cambridge
- WHITE J F (1962) *The Cambridge Movement - The Ecclesiologists and the Gothic Revival*. Cambridge

- WOODWARD H B (1907) *The History of the Geological Society of London.* London
- WRIGHT T (1845) *Archaeological Album, or Museum of National Antiquities.* London
- WRIGHT T (1847) "On the History and Prospects of Antiquarianism in England." *Edinburgh Review*, **86**, 307-329
- WRIGHT T (1892) *The Celt, the Roman and the Saxon: A History of the Early Inhabitants of Britain, down to the Conversion of the Anglo-Saxons to Christianity.* 5th edition, London
- Unattributed (1910) "Some Notes on the Origin of the British Archaeological Association" *JBAA*, N.S. **16**, 49-52

