

"Who is to say they will not demand our shirts next..."

A review of the Loan Collection of the Institute of
Archaeology

at the

University of Liverpool, 1904 – 1930

A thesis submitted in accordance with the requirements of
the University of Liverpool for the degree of Doctor in
Philosophy

By

Mac Eugene James II

January 2012



IMAGING SERVICES NORTH

Boston Spa, Wetherby
West Yorkshire, LS23 7BQ
www.bl.uk

THESIS CONTAINS

CD



IMAGING SERVICES NORTH

Boston Spa, Wetherby

West Yorkshire, LS23 7BQ

www.bl.uk

**BLANK PAGES HAVE
NO CONTENT**

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the origins and development of the Loan Collection at the Institute of Archaeology (I of A) from 1904 to 1930, at the University of Liverpool. It presents primary material collected from various archives in order to establish how the Loan Collection was assembled, how it developed, and how it changed over the time period under consideration here.

As part of this study, a short history of the I of A is presented in order to contextualize the Loan Collection. Points of connection with other university collections are identified and explored in order to help explain the methods used to acquire the artifacts in the Institute's collection. Equally, this work discusses how financial issues that affected the Institute of Archaeology had an impact upon the Loan Collection.

Further, this historiography outlines an attempt that was made to takeover the Institute of Archaeology and its Loan Collection in 1906. The thesis shows that this incident required the Institute to define its relationship with the University, besides the collection that it housed. It is also seen that this attempt at a takeover brought into question what the Institute referred to as a 'Museum' between 1904 and 1906.

Similarly, this thesis explores a later proposal in 1910 that endeavored to create an alliance between the I of A and the city of Liverpool's Public Museum. Both this latter attempt and the incident that occurred in 1906 are reviewed here as a means of aiding in defining and further contextualizing the Loan Collection.

The argument put forward in this thesis is that the Loan Collection held by the Institute of Archaeology was not a museum, and that the way in which the collection was created and assembled over the years under study never provided the space for it to become one.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	viii
CHAPTER ONE.....	1
Introduction.....	1
1.2 : Thesis Outline.....	3
1.3 : Research Methodology.....	5
1.4 : Missing Topics Worthy of Mention.....	8
1.4.1 : Teaching Activities at I of A.....	9
1.5 : Separate Appedices	19
CHAPTER TWO.....	20
A brief history of the Institute of Archaeology, 1904 - 1930	20
2.1: Introduction.....	20
2.1.1: Literature	21
2.2: The University	24
2.3: The founding of the Institute of Archaeology	29
2.4: The Institute of Archaeology, 1904-1930	34
2.4.1: 1904-1914: A decade of growth.....	34
2.4.2: The Institute of Archaeology during World War 1 (1915-1919).....	51
2.4.3: The years of decline (1920-1930).....	53
2.5: The University of Liverpool, its departments, schools and institutes	59
2.5.1: The Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine	63
2.7: Conclusion.....	67
CHAPTER THREE	71
Inter-relations between various Museum Collections, their Founders, and their Development.....	71
3.1: Introduction.....	71
3.1.1: Literature	76
3.2: The Manchester Museum	79
3.2.1: The Manchester Museum and Petrie.....	81
3.3: KT Frost, Queen's University, Belfast, and Petrie	85
3.3.1: Petrie's training of Weigall, Frost and Garstang in archaeological practice	88
3.4: Garstang's relations with Petrie	90
3.4.1: Repeated patterns of working relations?	92
3.5: UCL and the BM	96
3.6: Conclusion.....	100
CHAPTER FOUR	102
The Institute of Archaeology Loan Collection	102
4.1: Introduction.....	102
4.2: Literature.....	103

4.2.1: Contextualization and Charting the Loan Collection	104
4.2.2: Viewing the Loan Collection via the Annual Reports.....	108
4.3: The origins of the Institute of Archaeology's Loan Collection in 1903	109
4.4: The I of A Egypt Excavation Committee.....	110
4.4.1: The I of A and its interactions with the Excavation Committee	113
4.5: The Loan Collection: The early years (1904 – 1914).....	121
4.5.1: The War Years (1914 -1919)	128
4.5.2: The post-War decline (1920-1930)	128
4.6: Disposal: Feast and Famine.....	132
4.6.1: The attempt to sell the Loan Collection (1928-1930)	135
4.7: Conclusion.....	142
CHAPTER FIVE.....	145
External Relations - The Institute of Archaeology and the Liverpool Corporation's Library Museum & Arts Committee	145
5.1: Introduction.....	145
5.2: Literature.....	146
5.3: Definition and the expansion of relations between the U of L, I of A and LMAC.....	147
5.3.1: The original relations between the I of A and the LMAC.....	147
5.3.2: "Expanding Co-operation".....	148
5.3.3: Development of the 'Scheme'	154
5.4: The LMAC Report	159
5.5: The I of A's Response to the LMAC Report.....	168
5.6: The Second Attempt to Link the Collections	174
5.6.1: Rebuilding the relationship.....	174
5.6.2: The Proposed Alliance	177
5.7: Conclusion.....	182
CHAPTER SIX.....	185
Conclusion	185
6.1: A Brief Synopsis	185
6.2: Discussion of Collated Evidence	186
6.3: Conclusion.....	189
Bibliography	197
Primary Sources	197
Secondary Sources	201
Internet Sources	207
Photographs.....	210
APPENDICES.....	213

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Dedications:

To the Memory of my Grandparents Marcus & Isabel Arredondo; Ruth & Ray Cotton for their perseverance.

To the Memory of my Aunt and Second Mother, Elodia Mary Arredondo Hague.

To the Memory of my Uncle and Spiritual Grandfather Joel David Gomez.

To Bean, Syera and Robert; Felix and Linus, may you all achieve what your hearts endeavor to.

To Daniel and Tracey, without whose support and love this work would never have been possible.

To Dr Rick Peterson, Thank you for your teaching, friendship and support over the years and for your example of courage and strength.

To Ted Mills, my best friend, for shaking me up and setting the example.

To my dearest Hannah for picking me up, dusting me off and seeing me through to the end. Te amo, mi vida.

And to my heart Maya, may all that I have done pail in comparison to your achievements, as I endeavor that my accomplishments are merely, at best, possible foundations for your own. Just do it. Only don't know.

Thanks:

First and foremost, I would like to extend great thanks to my Supervisor Dr. Phil Freeman for his guidance, patience and understanding, over the duration of the production of this thesis. As well, thanks to Dr. S. R. Snape, Dr Matthew Ponting, Irit Narkiss Msc, Dr. Imogen Smith, and Dr. Patrick Hurley. I would also like to thank Drs. Iris and Adam Newton for their last minute editing skills and all around pleasant demeanor and Dr Anna Kennedy for giving up her

weekend. Thanks also to Dr Matthew Dillon, Dr Charlotte Raddler and Dr Nancy Llewellyn from the old school.

Many thanks to Patricia Winker who got me through the Archives of the Garstang Museum, I think I still owe you lunch.

Thanks to my friends for putting up with me: Jonty, Karen, Tony, Mrs. "Scooter" Hurley, Pete, Mark, Sally, Joey, Luke, Martin, John Gait, Helen, the entire staff of the Augustus John.

To new friends, the Evans family, Michel, Ashley, Magdalena & Daniel and to all the other friends we left behind in Ecuador, in the Kitchen, Thanks!

Thanks to My Family the James's: To Mom and Dad, Monique, Daniel & Tracy, and Querida; The Delaguerra's: Sheila & Danny, Syera and Bobby. I love you all and thank you for your patience over the years. Thanks to my extended family: the Gomez's, the Hague's, and to the Arredondo's at large. Thanks to the Barrett Family: Richard, Justine and Emily (also for you ace editing skills). And Scott Dowling, thanks for putting up with the continual absences. Thanks to old friends Kathy R., Marian and Jeff. Thanks to Annelise, Gethin and Sanda. Thanks to my adopted family, the Bassmann's Emmelie & Martin, Felix and Linus, who have been an amazing support through this entire time.

To those who helped me along the path to academia: Ted Mills, Pat Sillars, Dr Alysia Skilton, and finally Dr. William "Fabuna" Fulco S.J.

My greatest and biggest thanks to Hannah E. B. James, M.A., my wife. I could not have finished this work without your love, support, tolerance as an Editor, but most importantly you. I love you.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AGMA	Archives of the Garstang Museum of Archaeology
AM	Ashmolean Museum
AR	Annual Report of the Institute of Archaeology, University
BM	British Museum
EC	Excavation Committee affiliated with the I of A
EAA	Egyptian Antiquities Authority
EEF	Egyptian Exploration Fund
EES	Egyptian Exploration Society (formerly the EEF)
ERA	Egyptian Research Account
I of A	Institute of Archaeology
HM	Hunterian Museum, University of Glasgow
HSR	Hon. Secretary's Report of the AR
JMEOS	Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society
LC	Loan Collection of the Institute of Archaeology
LMAC	Library Museum and Arts Committee of the City of Liverpool
LMAC AR	Annual Report of the Library Museum and Arts Committee
LSTM	Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine
MM	Manchester Museum
MSC	Museum Sub-Committee of the LMAC
MSPNH	Manchester Society for the Promotion of Natural History
MNHS	Manchester Natural History Society
OC	Owens College
QUB	Queen's University Belfast
SJSC	Special Collection of the University of Liverpool Sydney Jones Library
SSC	Special Sub-Committee of the LMAC
UCL	University College London
UC Liv	University College Liverpool
U of G	University of Glasgow
U of L	University of Liverpool
UJA	Ulster Journal of Archaeology
VUM	Victoria University of Manchester

TIME LINE

1881

October 18: University College Liverpool granted its Charter.

1884

November 5: The University College became part of the Federal Victoria University System.

1902

March 4: Letter from Rev. J Watson to HO Forbes recommending J Garstang for a Readership at UC Liv.

Spring: The Faculty of Arts was empowered to self govern.

July 1: Letter from Watson to Principal AWW Dale regarding Garstang's Readership.

November 18: Garstang appointed Reader in Egyptian Archaeology.

1903

May 26: Letter from Garstang to Dale regarding assembly of collection for the use of students.

June 2: University accepts J Rankin and Garstang's offer of collection of Egyptian antiquities.

October 1: University of Liverpool granted its Charter..

1904

February 21: Letter from Garstang to Vice Chancellor AWW Dale regarding plans for an Institute of Archaeology.

June 20: Letter from J Brunner, R Brocklebank and Rankin to the University Council regarding the I of A collection.

June 21: Foundation of the Institute of Archaeology.

June 21: Three letters from Garstang to Dale regarding the founding of the Institute.

November 1: Rankin proposes a £3,000 donation for the foundation of a special lectureship in Archaeology.

November 3: Inauguration of the Institute of Archaeology.

December 15: A Mission Statement for the I of A is entered into the minutes of its first AGM.

1905

January 1905: Gift of £900 by the Holt family to the I of A for the appointment of a classical archaeologist.

February 27: Letter from the Town Clerk [of Liverpool] to the University Vice-Chancellor (VC), Dale, regarding the facilities provided by the Museum and a resolution passed by the Museum Sub-Committee and the Library Committee. Representatives appointed to meet with the University to discuss co-operation between the two bodies.

March 1: Letter from the VC to the Town Clerk; the letter of 27th February was to be put before the University Council.

March 13: U of L Council establishes a professorship in Classical Archaeology – RC Bosanquet appointed to the Chair.

- March 14:** 27th meeting of the University Council, when the Sub-Committee's letter is read.
- March 20:** John Rankin Lectureship in the Methods and Practice in Archaeology established
Garstan is appointed to the post.
- May 2:** Letter from the VC to the Town Clerk, the University Council chose representatives
(the Vice-President of the Council (JW Alsop), J Caton, Rankin & the VC) to meet
with the Museum Sub-Committee.
- May 13:** Letter from the VC to the Town Clerk, will inform [University Council]
representatives of the meeting scheduled at the Museum.
- May 19:** Meeting between the City/Corporation Museum Sub-Committee and
representatives of the University Council.
- June 16:** Letter from the VC to Leslie, thanking him for [unspecified]
his suggestions.
- September 22:** Motion passed by I of A for donation to the City Museum.
- September 25:** Letter from the VC to Sir W Forwood, regarding the University Library,
Botany and Natural History departments.
- October 6:** Letter from the VC to Garstang, regarding a meeting to discuss the collection.
- October 30:** VC sends a draft letter to the LMAC endorsing better relations between the
City Museum and the University.
- November 1:** Dale sends the final draft of his letter to the LMAC.
- November 14:** LMAC form a Special Sub-Committee (SSC) to review a series of
suggestions for a closer relationship between the LMAC and the University.
- November 24:** Letter from the VC to Garstang, regarding the latter's letter of November 17
in which he enquired about the 'Scheme.'
- December 1:** LMAC receives Dale's November 1 letter and resolves to form a Special Sub-
Committee to look into it.
- December 5:** The University resolves to create a committee for relations with the UL, I of
A & LMAC.
- December 8:** The I of A holds a Special Committee Meeting.
- December 9:** Letter from the VC to Forwood, regarding a meeting that would be held on
Dec 18. [Note variations of this invitation are sent to Permewan and Garstang.]
Letter from the VC to Alsop, regarding concerns over the I of A and the Sub-
Committee.
Letter from the VC to Brunner, regarding his account of the series of events
between the UL, IoA & LMAC.
- December 11:** Letter for the VC to Leslie, regarding the meeting of Dec 18.
- December 15:** 6th Meeting of the I of A's General Committee: VC calls representatives to
attend meeting on Dec 18 with the Sub-Committee. Danson and Grisewood are
chosen and the donation to the Public Museums is approved and sent, (see
September 22).
- December 15:** Letter from the VC to Grisewood, regarding the meeting of Dec 18.
- December 18:** Meeting between representatives from the UL, I of A, and MSC.
- December 22:** The Special Sub-Committee of the LMAC passes a resolution regarding its
relationship with UL and the I of A.

1906

- January 20:** Letter from the VC to Leslie, regarding potential problems with the I of A.
- February 2:** Special Sub-Committee of the Library, Museum, and Arts Committee releases
its report.
- February 3:** The *Liverpool Daily Post* features an article on the report.
- February 17:** Letter from VC to Leslie, regarding the arrangements for a meeting between
the Special Committees of the LMAC and UL.
- March 2:** Garstang writes to Danson, regarding his feelings on the LMAC report.
Letter from VC to Leslie, regarding issues with the I of A collection.
Letter from the VC to Leslie, regarding a request to Leslie for another 35 copies of
the LMAC report.

- March 13:** LMAC report submitted to the University Council.
- March 29:** Leslie steps down as the Chairman of the Special Sub-Committee. The post is then occupied by Forwood.
- April 24:** Letter from Davey to Leslie, regarding the LMAC report.
- April 25:** Letter from Leslie to Davey, in response to Davey's letter of April 24.
- May 1:** University Council meets, and passes a resolution regarding LMAC report that it will make no statement concerning the section regarding the I of A.
- May 11:** LMAC meets and receives the U of L's detailed response accepting the report and their position regarding the I of A.
- June 21:** 7th Meeting of the I of A General Committee. The I of A replies to that the report, responding to the Report of the SSC be approved, that a copy be sent to the University and to each member of the I of A Committee.
- September 26:** Letter from Forwood to the VC.
- September 29:** Letter from the VC to Forwood, regarding a meeting.
- October 16:** I of A release their official response to the LMAC report.
- October 17:** Letter from the VC to the Town Clerk, regarding an appointment to the Library Sub-Committee.
- November 13:** Rankin offers to turn Garstang's lectureship in Methods and Practice of Archaeology into a professorial appointment.
- November 13:** Brunner offers to endow a chair in Egyptology.

1907

- January 22:** Garstang appointed to the Chair in the Methods and Practice of Archaeology and P Newberry to the Chair of Egyptology.
Accommodation at 38 Bedford Street added to the I of A for Classical Archaeology.

1908

- May 5:** Sydney Jones continues Charles Jones' endowment to the Chair of Classical Archaeology.
- 16 June:** U of L appoints FP Barnard to Chair of Medieval Archaeology
Gann appointed to a lectureship in Central American Antiquities.

1911

- August 5:** Garstang letter to Danson regarding Institute's financial problems
Certificate in Classical Archaeology established.

1913

- July 11:** visit of King George V to the I of A.

1915

- Accommodation at 44 Bedford Street added to the I of A for the housing of Methods and Practice of Archaeology & Egyptology

1916

- October 31:** Sydney Jones gives £8,000 for the long term endowment of the Chair of Classical Archaeology

1919

- March 18:** Newberry resigns his professorship
December 16: Peet appointed to the Chair of Egyptology

1920

October 19: Bosanquet resigns

November 26: Certificate and Diploma in Archaeology established

Accommodation purchased at No. 11 Abercromby Square for the I of A

1921

February 15: Droop appointed to the Chair of Classical Archaeology

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

On 26 May 1903, John Garstang wrote to the Principal of University College Liverpool, A. W. W. Dale. In his letter Garstang stated that both he and a member of the University Council, John Rankin, were offering to donate their collections of Egyptian artifacts to the Department of Egyptology for use by its students. Following a charter, University College Liverpool (UC Liv) became an independent civic institution at the end of 1903 renamed the University of Liverpool (U of L). Subsequently, an Institute of Archaeology (I of A) was founded in 1904. It was following the establishment of this Institute that the artifacts offered by Garstang and Rankin in 1903, grew into a substantial and significant collection over the next decade. This collection came to be known as the Loan Collection (LC), and was largely the result of archaeological excavations carried out by Garstang in Egypt on behalf of others.

The purpose of this thesis is to present the first detailed study of the collection, as depicted above, that was housed in the I of A at the University of Liverpool. The thesis focuses on the period 1904 to 1930; with the former year being when the I of A was founded, and the latter the last year that there was any significant activity in the Institute with regards to the collection before it was absorbed into the University in 1947.

To date, there has been no published, detailed history of the LC. Previous historical studies, that have made reference to the I of A (Kelly 1981; Trigger 1989), in addition to the collection housed by the Institute (Shore 1985), are largely anecdotal. Consequently, they have not examined the LC in any great detail. Equally, various studies have considered particular excavations sites where Garstang carried out excavation work; at sites such as Esna and Beni Hasan (Downes 1974; Snape 1986). Yet, in the same way that the historiographies give little detailed evidence concerning the origins and development of the LC, as the studies of these sites were

primarily concerned with the excavations and subsequent yield of artefacts, they do not consider the collections within the I of A as a whole. It is therefore due to the lack of a detailed examination of the LC that was housed in the I of A was chosen as a focus for this research.

When this research began, the original intention was to trace the development of the collection from 1904 to 1947, and to develop a database that would document the development of the collection in a quantitative manner. As the research proceeded, however, it was found that there was insufficient data to construct the database. This was due to the fact that it was not possible to ascertain what had been in the collection, as no formal catalogue of artifacts could be found. It was therefore decided that a narrative history demonstrating how the collection was put together was necessary in order to establish why a formal catalogue and acquisition policy did not seem to exist for the collection.

As the research shifted direction, material emerged that indicated that the I of A housed a 'Loan Collection' (LC), which was neither owned by the Institute, nor referred to as a 'Museum' for more than the first two years. It however, subsequently came to light that the I of A did not put any real emphasis on teaching until 1912, nearly 10 years after its foundation. It seemed odd that the Institute would have a collection of artifacts, and yet they were not being used frequently in teaching. Therefore while the collection appeared on paper to be a 'teaching collection', in reality it is unclear how the LC was being used.. Consequently, it was recognized that more detailed research into the history of the I of A was necessary in order to provide further insights into the collection and its formation. Indeed, questions arose as to what exactly this collection had been, and why it had existed. Subsequently, while attempting to find answers to these questions, interesting aspects began to emerge. These related to the I of A and its relationship with other institutions, University and civic (particularly those with the University), as well as the process by which artefacts entered into the Institutes collection after excavation.

With the aforementioned findings in mind, this thesis provides a detailed explanation of how and why the LC was first started and how it

developed thereafter. It also analyses how the collection was assembled, and the ways that it changed over the years. In charting the changes in the LC, the thesis also presents a brief history of the I of A. This aspect of the work highlights key features of the Institute, with particular reference to its administrative, academic and economic characteristics.

Through the subsequent narrative, this thesis underscores the significant events that impacted upon the way in which the I of A came to define both itself and the collection that it housed. As such, the work presented here is considered to be a historiography. Rather than merely attempt to chart the influx of objects in the LC during the established dates, the intention therefore, is to set primary data, obtained through research in various archives, to a narrative, and an explanation of sequential events.

1.2 : Thesis Outline

In order to give a comprehensive account of the Loan Collection between 1904 and 1930, this thesis is structured as follows. Subsequent to this introductory chapter, Chapter Two provides a contextual history of the I of A. This is necessary in order to provide a background for the later discussion of the LC, which is considered in chapters Four and Five. As part of Chapter Two, a brief history of the University is given, beginning in 1902 and culminating at the point in which the I of A was founded in 1904. The account concerning the Institute is subsequently broken down into three main periods: from 1904 until 1914; between 1915 and 1919, the war-years; and from 1920 until 1930. The first phase of this history describes how the Institute underwent a decade of growth and expansion after it was established, particularly in terms of research and excavation. It will also be seen that it was during this decade that important endowments were made by donors to the U of L, which were meant to create and support a number of central chairs within the I of A. Indeed, the period 1904 - 1914 is considered to have been the most significant for the Institute's archaeological productivity. Yet, with the onset of war in 1914, the I of A underwent a period of relative inactivity spanning the following four years.

It will be shown that a decade of slow decline followed the end of the War, with financial difficulties beginning to undermine the Institute's work.

Chapter Two seeks to clarify the relationship that existed between the Institute and the U of L. In doing so, the departments of Zoology and Botany, in addition to the Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine (LSTM), will be used to compare and contrast the different form of relationships that the University had with various other subject areas. From a consideration of these relationships, one of the key features that will be demonstrated is that while the University paid the I of A for its lecturing, during the period reviewed in this work, the Institute was neither a department nor an institute of the U of L. Indeed, the I of A was a separate entity from the University.

Chapter Three studies three other University collections that were developed simultaneously to the collection at the I of A. These are the Manchester Museum (MM), the Queen's University Belfast (QUB) museum and the Petrie Collection in University College London (UCL). The interesting aspect to be established in this chapter is that there was one particular individual who linked these three collections with the I of A. This was Flinders Petrie. The way in which Petrie connects these collections is either directly or indirectly. In one way, he either contributed to the collections by way of providing or selling artifacts to them or else he trained the 'founders' of the collections. Another key feature of this chapter is that it give insights into what Garstnag's time with Petrie may have been like, and how his influence subsequently impacted on Garstang's archaeological work and how the LC developed.

Chapter Four examines the development of the LC housed at the I of A and how the collection changed over the years 1904-1930. The chapter investigates how the Excavation Committees (EC), the bodies that funded Garstang's excavations in Egypt and the Sudan, were structured and affiliated with the I of A. In turn, it considers a number of decisions made by the EC that impacted upon the LC and thus indirectly, the Institute. The chapter also looks at the disposal of artifacts, ie the removal of surplus artifacts from the LC. As there appears to have been no official policy with regard to disposal,

the chapter explores the methods that Garstang and the I of A put into practice in order to deal with the large quantities of artifacts that were generated by his excavations, and which ended up in Liverpool.

Chapter Five provides a detailed narrative of a dispute that took place between the Liverpool Corporation's Library Museum and Arts Committee (LMAC) and the I of A. The dispute lasted from 1906 - 1907 and helped to define the Institute as a body, in addition to clarifying its relationship with the University in print. The second part of the chapter focuses on an attempt at collaboration between the Public Museum and the I of A in 1910; a direct result of the dispute that took place four years earlier.

Through the narrative history of the LC housed at the Institute provided in this thesis, the primary argument that is put forward is that the collection of Egyptian artifacts, which began in 1903, never became a museum, due to the way in which it was assembled over the years. This in turn explains why the Institute had no accessions policy or a formal catalogue. As a consequence of the EC's excavations and Garstang's involvement in them, it is argued that what became known as the LC, housed by the Institute, was in fact something quite different to that which was portrayed by both the I of A and the U of L.

1.3 : Research Methodology

This thesis relies heavily upon original data located in various archives that are predominantly located in the city of Liverpool. The majority of the primary material used here is presented in its purest form; the data has not been paraphrased and is provided as accurately as possible within the confines of the text. It is presented in such a way so as to allow the reader to view the original source material in direct context to the narrative. Where gaps have emerged in the primary evidence, reference has been made to secondary sources where applicable, and if available. It has however not always been possible to fill every lacuna left by the original material, particularly as this is the first piece of research to be carried out specifically concerning the LC housed at the I of A. Thus, when original

data or secondary material has not existed to provide the fine detail or to explain certain events and situations, it will be seen that plausible suggestions or possibilities have been made in order to explore what the reality may have been. Equally, when questions have arisen that cannot be answered due to the absence of evidence, possible answers have been hypothesised.

The archives that house the majority of the original material used in this thesis are located in Special Collections at the Sydney Jones Library (SJSC), at the University of Liverpool. The material located in the SJSC that is specifically concerned with the I of A includes Annual Reports and Minute Books of the Institute, in addition to Minute Books of the I of A Special Committee. As their title suggests, the Annual Reports (AR) discuss the year by year workings of the Institute, such as its excavations, public lecturing, financial issues, and features of individual departments. They would have been released as a yearly report of the Institute. In 1920 the reports from 1904 to 1920 were bound together into a volume set. During the following eighteen years, subsequent volumes were added. The ARs were written for the Institute's Committee and other supporters of the I of A, in addition to the University of Liverpool.

The SJSC also holds daily letter books of correspondence that was sent to and from A.W.W. Dale during his time as Vice-Chancellor of the University (1903-1919). Equally, the Minutes of the University Committee are archived in the SJSC, along with the University Calendars and the Annals of the University of Liverpool. The U of L Annals recorded various motions passed by the University Council, as well as detailing endowments and appointments of staff, and documenting special events. While the University Calendar also outlined significant events that took place during the academic year, it also informed the public about what courses were running, and provided brief details of each department.

Despite their usefulness, a number of issues were encountered when using the volumes held in the SJSC. Firstly, the archived books and records are indexed superficially, in that the number of the volume is listed with a basic summary of its contents in both the library's printed and digital

catalogue systems, and, the indices of the volumes themselves are incomplete. Secondly, Dale's daily letter books present particular challenges. A large proportion of the letters are wet-copies, many of which are illegible. Moreover, the issues with readability go beyond penmanship, and are primarily associated with the quality of the copies themselves. Consequently, the information in some of the letters is irretrievable, however there are no alternative sources available. Where information is retrievable, by their very nature these letter books only represent the VC's side of the correspondence. This research therefore often entailed use of detection and deductive reasoning to establish what may have been included in the correspondence that was sent to the VC.

Another archive accessed in the course of this research was that in the City of Liverpool Central Library Record Office. In addition to housing the Minutes and Annual Reports of the Liverpool Library's Museum and Arts Committee (LMAC), this archive also includes the newspaper clippings relating to this particular committee. The situation that presented itself while carrying out research in the Record Office was very similar to that encountered at the SJSC with regard to indexing. In contrast, however, the staff at the Record Office lacked the knowledge of the staff in the SJSC, and as a result, added to the level of work required to obtain the necessary information from their archive. Moreover, while referencing, the Minutes of the LMAC it became clear that a number of events and committee meetings had either not been minuted or were otherwise omitted. It is not known whether this was through negligence or intentional omission.

A third archive used in this research was that in the Maritime Archive and Library Reserve Store (MALRS). The MALRS is part of National Museums Liverpool. Access to this archive was problematic as visitors are taken in on the last Friday of each month by special appointment. The main focus of the research at the MALRS has been in the Sir Francis Chantillon Danson Collection, which holds letters, business records, and postcards regarding I of A and EC matters in particular. As with the case of the VC letters, the Danson collection also consists of a number of wet-copy letter books, most of which are illegible. Additionally,

the lack of indexing by the MALRS left one requesting large files of material, without prior knowledge as to the utility of their contents. A great deal of time and care was then required to go through each document.

In summary, the greatest hindrances with regard to all three archives used in this thesis were a result of poor record keeping and indexing carried out by archivists over the last century. To help guide the reader through specific dates and events discussed in this thesis, a time line has been included. This also serves to map out the overlying chronology of the narrative. The timeline has been divided into its corresponding years and is based on the source material discussed in each chapter.

The Archives of the Garstang Museum of Archaeology (AGMA), however, are antithetical to all those mentioned above. While the archive is not as extensive as the others, particularly as much of its material is duplicated in the SJSC, it is well indexed and easy to use. Furthermore, the AGMA Registrar has extensive knowledge of the archive and its holdings. A key source of material housed in the Museum is the Accession Books of the I of A. These were intended to reflect the acquisitions of the I of A and included records of the purchases and donations of artifacts, both singularly and collectively. Procurements of books and pamphlets also dominated the Accession Books and featured as the most prominent acquisition from 1904 until 1930. The books also listed the plaster casts of artifacts used in teaching, principally in the Department of Classical Archaeology.

Another important resource used in this work was the letters of Harold E. Jones housed at the National Library of Wales. Jones was Garstang's assistant from 1903 -1907. His letters, usually written to his parents, give an invaluable personal insight into Garstang and the Excavation Committee that supported his excavations in Egypt.

1.4 : Missing Topics Worthy of Mention

It must be highlighted that this work is only concerned with the collection that developed as a result of excavations carried out by Garstang in

Egypt and the Sudan, and which were funded by the Excavation Committee (EC) and housed at the I of A. It does not therefore review, the classical cast and sculptural collection, South American, British Artifacts, the photographic collections, Hittite, nor any other collections that were also housed by the I of A. Neither does it consider the otherwise disparate array of artifacts and other objects which were donated, or bequeathed to the I of A over the decades. This is because none of these collections were a product of the EC's funded excavations. It must also be emphasised that this thesis does not aim to judge the character of any of the individuals involved with the I of A or any of the other bodies discussed herein; it merely reports their activities.

1.4.1 : Teaching Activities at I of A

The focus of this section is to contextualize the teaching at the I of A with the provision for archaeological teaching at a number of different universities in the UK between 1904 and 1930. This section, however, is not intended to be an exhaustive survey of the 'whys' and the 'hows' of how archaeology came to be taught at the universities, but provides a brief overview of what was occurring with respect to teaching at various institutions that were contemporaneous with the I of A. The universities discussed in this section are Oxford, Cambridge and UCL. The texts used to discuss these universities do not provide an in-depth study of teaching, as teaching is not the primary focus of this thesis. They do, nonetheless, provide more detailed qualitative data about the teaching that went on at these institutions than that of the I of A.

A significant issue when examining the teaching practices of the I of A is that there is insufficient data to create a complete picture of lecturing for the period under consideration. Thus, it is extremely difficult to contextualize directly what was going on at the I of A with the other universities discussed here. Furthermore, as was stated earlier in this chapter, the I of A was an independent institution that was not an academic department or other constituent of the U of L. It was separate from the University. This relationship will be reviewed in greater detail in Chapters

Two, Four and Five. Therefore, underpinning the argument made in this section is that the I of A was an anomaly against the other universities discussed here. The archaeological teaching that was offered at the other institutions was done as part of departments within the respective university. Thus to compare the teaching at the I of A with that of other universities which offered instruction in the UK would not be a fair path of assessment in this context.

More specifically, the I of A lectured for the U of L in return for money, thus it performed a service for the University. To use contemporary terminology, one could arguably say that the U of L “outsourced” its archaeological lecturing to the Institute. This is a distinct difference to the universities considered in this section, as they did their own teaching. Freeman summarizes the focus of the I of A here: “[The I of A’s]...main thrust...was research funded mainly by Liverpool benefactors. It was therefore essentially a group of researchers, where staff undertook their own (private) work” (Freeman 2007:446). In line with this assessment, one could go further and say that the I of A was an independent research institute that to the uninformed had the appearance of a University department. As will be discussed in Chapter Five, the I of A occasionally appeared to make an effort to appear a part of the University, however, by its own admission, it was not. It will be shown in Chapter Two that the Honorary Secretary of the Institute, John Garstang, only first suggested that the I of A needed to focus more on students and teaching in the 1912 AR.

In the writing of this section, various sources about the individual universities’ archaeological teaching and museums were used. For teaching at Oxford and the Pitt Rivers Museum (PRM), Frances Larson’s *Henry Balfour’s Teaching at the Pitt Rivers Museum* (2006), in addition to the Timeline for the museum’s history, which was obtained from the PRM website, was utilized. Both these sources have provided the historical data on the PRM detailed here. For the purposes of this section, the main points mentioned during the tenure of Henry Balfour (1890-1939) (Larson 2006) reflect on his teaching, in particular the years that coincide with the time frame being reviewed in this thesis, 1904 -1930.

The material concerning the University of Cambridge and Miles Crawford Burkitt (1890 – 1971) was taken from P. J. Smith's, *A Splendid Idiosyncrasy* (2009). The texts used to discuss UCL and Margaret Murray includes *My First Hundred Years* (1963) Murray's autobiography and Margaret Drower's essay, *Margaret Alice Murray (1863 – 1963)* (2007). The biographical data on Belfour and Murray originates from the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Freeman's biography of Francis Haverfield, *The Best Training-Ground for Archaeologists* (2007), provides a perspective of the I of A and its teaching. This in turn contributes to the discussion concerning the I of A's lecturing as reported in its *Annual Reports*.

A number of other texts were explored that documented archaeological teaching in the UK. These included Ralston's *Gordon Childe and Scottish Archaeology: The Edinburgh years 1927 – 1946* (2009), and *The Place of Archaeology in British Education* (1944), by Aileen Fox. Ralston's essay on Childe is well written and informative. It covers the final years of the period under discussion here. It misses, however, the crucial pre-War I era that is of the core to this present work. Consequently, this text features little in this section. Fox's work advocated the promotion of archaeology in the British education system and she provided a strategy for fostering the study of archaeology in schools. Her key focus was on primary and secondary schools, and as such, did not relate well to the other institutions reviewed in this section. This text, therefore, again features little in the discussion here.

C. H. Read's, *Anthropology at the Universities* (1906), details the structure and requirements of the Anthropology degree from its introduction at the University of Oxford in 1906. John Myres', *The Provision of Historical Studies at Oxford* (1915), explains the way in which the academic system worked at Oxford at the time. It also included a "programme of studies...to compare with those of other Universities" (Myres 1915:7). While both texts would work well in context to other universities, however they are not directly relevant in the context of the I of A, as it was not a University department in the conventional sense. As a consequence, these sources have not been used for any of the purposes here.

Beard's (1999) "*Invention (and Re-invention) of 'Group D'...* ", although a well written piece on the Classical Tripos at Cambridge University, for the most part does not aid the objectives of this section. This is because it focuses on examinations. At the U of L, students who attended lectures and lecture courses provided by the I of A, if examined, would have been done so by the University. There are, however, no records pertaining to this. Beard echoes a variation of this problem in her experience researching her paper. "So far as I have been able to discover, no early examination script survives from Cambridge (or elsewhere); we actually do not know what any of the candidates wrote, how much or how well" (Beard 1999: 96). Another problem that is similar to Beard's, is that the records for lecturing at the I of A during the period discussed in this thesis are sparse at best, comprising as they do prospectuses of courses that its staff would be offering throughout the three academic terms in any academic year.

The remainder of this section provides a description of the teaching activities at the three chosen universities. This is followed by an examination of the I of A's *Annual Reports*, which are the only surviving records that provide information on the lecturing activities at the Institute of Archaeology.

The Pitt Rivers Museum was founded at the University of Oxford in 1884 (PRM 2012). Henry Balfour, was appointed its curator in 1891. Although Balfour was not required to give lectures he did so and in first series given on "the arts of mankind" he used pieces from the PRM collections to "illustrate his words" (Larson 2006). Larson sums up Balfour's Oxford teaching as:

...teaching formed a considerable part of Balfour's working life from the 1890s onwards, and he took a central role in the founding of systematic anthropology teaching at the University. He continued to serve on the Committee for Anthropology throughout his life, and regularly acted as an examiner for the Diploma (Larson 2006).

As the PRM became more involved with the teaching for University diplomas in other disciplines, the range of Balfour's teaching increased. By 1904 he was tutoring two students:

He spent time over the following two years tutoring Barbara Freire Marecco, who was at Lady Margaret Hall, and Cecil Mallaby Firth, at Exeter College, through a course in Prehistoric Archaeology at the Museum (Larson 2006).

In 1905, Balfour was on the new Committee for Anthropology that helped to coordinate teaching in the subject at the University. The same committee organized the teaching and exams for the diploma that was established in 1907 (Larson 2006). At the centre of Balfour's teaching was the PRM. According to Dallam Wallace, a former student and later a Professor of Anthropology at the University of Minnesota: "Our work with Henry Balfour was done entirely in the Pitt-Rivers Museum, of which he was Curator, before exhibition cases which frequently were supplemented with trays or handfuls of additional specimens" (Larson 2006). Wallace even went as far as to describe the examination process:

The examination included written work six hours a day for three days, and an oral given jointly by Balfour, Marett and Thomson. We were called into a room individually, and when dismissed were not allowed to communicate with waiting victims. Balfour's examination consisted largely of having us identify various specimens which we had not seen in the course of our work with him (Larson 2006).

The lecture notes of Beatrice Blackwood provide a further insight into Balfour's teaching. Blackwood was the University Demonstrator in Ethnology at the PRM (Knowles 2004). She also studied with Balfour from 1916 to 1918. Larson gives a description of what was detailed in Blackwood's notes:

Some of her lecture notes from the period survive, including notes she took during Balfour's classes (BB box 1 and 1A). The lecture courses cover 'The Aesthetic Arts' and 'The Industrial Arts' and 'Prehistoric Archaeology'. The lectures follow Balfour's written work, where applicable, very closely. Under the 'Aesthetic Arts', he discussed '1. art, decorative and realistic 2. music, mainly the instrumental side 3. personal ornament' (PRM manuscript collections: Beatrice Blackwood papers box 1). His lectures on the 'Industrial Arts' including fire-making technologies, 'the art, or industry, of war', fishing, the history of agriculture, navigation, and manufacturing industries, including pottery, textiles, basketry and metal work (Larson 2006).

The remembrances of Balfour's students are a testament to the impact he made upon them. They are similar to the sentiments shared by students who studied at Cambridge and UCL.

Miles Crawford Burkitt began teaching at Cambridge University in 1915. He was to begin giving lectures at Michaelmas on prehistoric and primitive art. He was also recognised as a lecturer by the Anthropology department that year. Due to the War, however, he never gave the lectures (Smith 2009). Smith discusses Burkitt's teaching again in 1923. At that time he was reportedly making 10 guineas a year from fee-paying students. Smith interviewed students who were "...impressed with Burkitt's warmth for the subject, his excellent memory and vast general knowledge, rather than his exact intellectual abilities. They were not concerned with the specific content of his lectures; they were attracted instead by his engaging presentation" (Smith 2009:27). Smith also comments how students appreciated his personal approach, as Burkitt allowed his students to use his private collection of prehistoric artefacts.

By 1926, Burkitt was teaching roughly 90 students from various degree courses. There was also "a category of non-matriculated students...[who]...paid two guineas a week for lectures" (Smith 2009: 28). Despite what appeared to be popularity amongst his students, "Burkitt would never have considered himself to be a professional" (Smith 2009: 28). The positive experiences had by archaeology students with Burkitt at Cambridge, and with Balfour at Oxford, are echoed by Margaret Murray's experiences at UCL.

In *My First Hundred Years* by the Egyptologist and Folklorist Margaret Murray (Mallowan 2004), the writer provides her early experiences as a student at UCL with the Edwards Professor of Egyptology there Flinders Petrie (see Appendix E6 for the biography on Petrie). Although her experiences predate the time frame of this thesis, they do provide insights into what would have been a student experience with Petrie.

When I first became a student of Egyptology in January, 1894 there was no training for the students in that subject except at Oxford, where it was for language only, and even there it was not a degree-subject in itself but one of a group of three oriental languages...(Murray, 1963: 93).

Murray goes on to write about the course structure that was in place at the time with Petrie:

At University College Petrie was away half the academic year; in the autumn term he gave lectures once a week...then he went off to Egypt leaving Dr. J. H. Walker in charge...in the spring he gave about six lectures on his winter's excavations (Murray 1963: 93).

Murray called Petrie's lectures "First-rate...but there was no system for teaching archaeology...Petrie was not cut out for the humdrum of business of regular teaching". She goes on to say: "...he could not understand the difficulties of beginners..." (Murray 1963: 93). She also mentions, however, that he was "different with serious students" (Murray 1963: 94).

Four years later in 1898, when the Egyptologist and Lecturer in Egyptian Hieroglyphics, F L Griffith left UCL, his post was divided between Margaret Murray and Petrie's assistant, James Herbert Walker. In her book, Murray also provides another perspective of her time at UCL; this time as a lecturer:

This was a post to which I was fitted, for my own early struggles with the language and the knowledge of the struggles for beginners had given me a good deal of experience in the difficulties that beset a new student and...complicated script as well as the language (Murray 1963: 95).

Drower commented on this time in her biographical essay entitled *Margaret Alice Murray*: "This arrangement worked very well. Her students declared her an excellent teacher, and she was appointed junior lecturer in 1898" (Drower 2007: 113). The following year Murray was given a salary.

In the context of the period that is reviewed in this thesis, Murray notes: "From 1904 till the winter of 1913...I was engaged in organising the training of students in Egyptology, which meant also the general principles of Archaeology, and in research and writing." She adds: "It was in these years that I was able to consolidate the training..." (Murray 1963: 103). Murray not only taught basic Egyptian language courses but also history, religion, arts and crafts of Ancient Egypt, as well as Coptic (Drower 2007). "She had learned by watching Griffith's mistakes as a teacher...she devised a simplified grammar of ancient Egyptian, suitable for beginners, and later added an elementary grammar of Coptic" (Drower 2007: 115). UCL students attended a number of different courses: basic mineralogy and geology, ethnology and anthropology, elementary surveying, elements of skeletal anatomy, photography for Archaeological recording and Aegean

pottery. After two years of study students were thought to be useful assistants in the field. If examinations were successful students would then have been awarded a college Diploma in Egyptology. Students were then able to go into the field with Petrie (Drower 2007). Field experiences in Egypt with Petrie are looked at more closely in Chapter 3 of this thesis. In 1921, Murray was made a lecturer, in 1922 a senior lecturer, and an assistant professor in 1924. Students, generally being 4 or 5 to a course, found Murray's teaching style pleasurable and informal. She was also known for being digressive in lectures and could go from Egyptology to the pagan origins of witchcraft to memories of her early life. She did not use lanternslides but preferred to use book or colour facsimiles for illustration purposes in class, and was also known for occasionally bringing chocolates to class (Drower 2007).

These three institutions all clearly had a strong emphasis on teaching. As institutions of higher education, this emphasis would be expected. In the case of the I of A, however, as an institution separate to the University, an emphasis on teaching is less clear-cut, a fact emphasised indirectly in its *ARs* and *Prospectuses*.

In each *Prospectus* of the Institute, a basic syllabus is laid out that shows the title of the lecture courses that were on offer for that academic session and then the names of the individual who would deliver them. During the early years of its existence, from 1904 until 1909, the entire academic year of the I of A's lectures and courses are outlined. Between 1909 and 1911, however, the Lent and Summer terms are omitted from the *Prospectuses*, and they state that "the Courses of Lectures for Lent and Summer Terms will be announced in a separate prospectus." These, however, no longer seem to exist. Further, from 1912 until 1916, the Lent Terms were reinserted into the syllabus but the Summer Term continued to be omitted but would "be announced" separately. As before, these publications are no longer extant. The evidence that can be obtained regarding lecturing from the *Prospectuses* and *Annual Reports*, nevertheless, has been gathered and displayed in Appendix A-1.

The date range for the data shown in Appendix A-1 is the same as that reviewed in this thesis; 1904 - 1930. To help make the data contained in this appendix more accessible to the reader, each academic year is dealt with as a single unit according to the relevant AR, and the information is given using the following categories: *Term, Who Taught, Other Important Details Related to This Teaching* and *Fees*. These categories are consistent throughout the document. There are, however, inconsistencies with regards to how the titles of courses and lectures were displayed and in the differentiation between University Courses and Public Lectures, and Morning Courses and Afternoon Courses. In the latter case, Morning Courses were usually University Courses the Afternoon Courses their public equivalents. These inconsistencies in how the data was displayed reflect the inconsistencies present in the primary data itself. In most cases, there is a box containing Further Notes at the bottom of each year that come from the previous year's *Annual Report*. It should be noted that in some cases, there is a repetition of information concerning lecturing between the *Prospectus* and relevant *AR*. This is because it was considered important to confirm what had and had not been taught that year, as in some cases, such information is not available from the *Prospectus*. For example, this is especially true for lecturing in the 'Department of Egyptology' from 1921 onwards, as the syllabus only stated that lectures would take place on 'various branches of Egyptian History, Archaeology and Literature'. The following year's *AR* would in turn provide detailed information on what had been taught. Equally, the lecturing that had occurred one year may have been different to that outlined in the relevant *Prospectus*. Therefore, on the majority, by referring back through the *ARs*, they can help confirm the lecturing activities in the Institute each year.

Although the prospectuses appear to have been in a continual state of change, what is made clear in the *AR* is that teaching continued throughout the period inclusive of the War. During the war years, however, the lecturing declined to a trickle and was kept going primarily by Bosanquet and Newberry. Further, the I of A also frequently saw

fluctuations in the numbers of courses on its syllabi. Freeman (2007) addresses this issue:

[A]...striking feature is the institute's appointments. Because it offered teaching to support the university rather than serve its own degree program, the resignation or other movement of staff did not automatically mean a replacement in the same area would be made, but that the institute would appoint in whichever field it desired. That it shared appointments in such diverse departments as the School of Local History, Paleography and Diplomatics, Welsh and of course History, Classics and Ancient History simply added to its vibrancy (Freeman 2007: 446-7).

Along with the inconsistency in courses, another problem lies in the fact that next to nothing is mentioned about student numbers in the *ARs*. No student lists survive and only numbers of people attending lectures are given in the academic year 1904-1905 and 1905-1906. The numbers provided were only for particular courses and it is unclear as to whether or not these numbers represent University students in attendance, or members of the public, as both would have been referred to as 'students'. There is never a total number for those attending lectures at the I of A as a whole. It is not until the 1920s when there is a continual mention of students. This is not in the context of attendance sizes but to the completion of courses by individuals and enrollments to the MA. As for the MA, it is unclear when it begins, as there is no mention of an official start date. The 1921-1922 *Prospectus*, nevertheless, is the first to mention both the supervision of students reading archaeological subjects for the Master of Arts degree in the School of Ancient History, and instruction to candidates reading for the Certificate and Diploma in Archaeology.

Due to the fact that there are no surviving teaching records outside the information preserved in the *ARs* and prospectuses, they are clearly the sole source for creating a picture of the lecturing that was being done at the I of A during the time that is reviewed in this thesis. It is not known if the I of A kept any records with regards to their students or courses, as no reference to them survives. The lack of information supports the fact that it is difficult to place the lecturing done by the I of A into a wider context of archaeological teaching that was occurring at other universities in the UK at the same time. There is insufficient evidence to debate Kelly's assertion that the I of A did not have a teaching focus, as there is too little evidence to

create a full picture of the lecturing done by the I of A. Nonetheless, when looking at the I of A's *Annual Reports* and the prospectuses, the information contained within them suggests that the Institute was driven more by 'research' than teaching. The *ARs* do contain updates on the staff's excavation activities and publications but lacks information about students. As will be seen in Chapters 2, 4 and particularly 5 of this thesis, the image of the Institute was at best unclear, and at times appears even contradictory. Another contradictory issue arises in Chapter 4, when attempting to contextualize the I of A's Loan Collection, and yields similar conclusions.

1.5 : Separate Appedicēs

This is a brief overview of the appendices, where they are located and a concise explanation. Separate indexed appendices are included in this thesis via DVD-ROM burned in a universal format so that they can be viewed on computers using various platforms, i.e. Windows, Linux, Mac, etc. The disk is attached to the inside of the back cover. The appendices are divided into 7 parts. The first five parts are congruous with the first five chapters of this thesis and consisting of the following Appendices : Teaching sheet, larger documents from chapters 2-5 and Collections sheet. The last two appendices are comprised of biographies and the financial records of the I of A 1904 - 1930.

CHAPTER TWO

A brief history of the Institute of Archaeology, 1904 - 1930

2.1: Introduction

As outlined in Chapter One, the focus of this thesis is the history of the artifact collection held in the Institute of Archaeology at the University of Liverpool. In order to examine the collection, it is necessary to outline the history of the Institute. This is important because it will provide a context for a later discussion of the collection in Chapter Four. Therefore, while Chapter Four discusses the collection, how it was formed and how it changed over the years between 1904 and 1930, this chapter focuses on various administrative, academic and financial issues pertaining to the Institute.

Following a discussion of the literature and source materials used in this chapter (Section 2.1.1), Section 2.2 outlines the history of the U of L prior to the founding and development of the I of A. This section considers John Garstang and his role in the University as it transformed from a university college (UC Liv), that was part of the Victoria University system, into an independent university in 1903. Since it is not the aim of this chapter, nor this thesis, to provide a comprehensive history of the University, the history provided in this chapter terminates at the point at which the I of A began to take form in 1904.

Thereafter, Sections 2.3 and 2.4 study the I of A's history. Section 2.3 explains the process through which the Institute was founded and established. Through the use of various letters, it shows how the initial idea for creating an Institute of Archaeology came into being, and how a committee was formed to implement its creation. This section continues to the point at which the Institute was officially inaugurated in June 1904. Section 2.4 documents the next phase in the history of the I of A, from its inauguration until 1930. This section is divided into three parts. Section

2.4.1 considers the years between 1904 and 1914, a decade of growth and expansion for the I of A, at both academic and fiscal levels. Section 2.4.2 describes the situation of the Institute during the War years, from 1915 until 1919. It is noted that, during this period, activity in the I of A was relatively quiet, since some of its key staff, such as Garstang, R.C. Bosanquet, and P.E. Newberry were involved in wartime duties. Indeed, during this period, the Institute saw the addition and departure of several members of staff. Section 2.4.3 discusses the period immediately following the War, until the end of the 1920s. It is in this section that particular attention is given to the financial status of the Institute, and it is shown that it was in this decade that the I of A experienced hardship and decline.

Section 2.5 looks at comparative relationships between the I of A and different entities linked to the U of L, namely the departments of Zoology and Botany, and the Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine (LSTM). The aim of this section is to provide a clearer understanding of how the I of A related to the University by comparing and contrasting aspects of the Institute with similarly affiliated departments and schools. An important aspect of this section is the consideration of the museum teaching collections in these respective entities. It is contextually noteworthy that the Department of Zoology was formerly called Natural History. While the various sources referred to in this section use both terms interchangeably, only the term Zoology will be used throughout the text to retain clarity.

2.1.1: Literature

The most recent and comprehensive text, which details the history of the University of Liverpool, describing the period from 1881 to 1981, is that by Kelly (1981). While Kelly provides a general (all be it often anecdotal) record, certainly for the early decades of the University's history, it can be argued that his work does not provide an in-depth analysis of any one particular department, school or institute within the U of L. Indeed, Kelly himself admits that the information relating to the genesis and early

years of the Institute of Archaeology is "...mainly biographical" (1981: 489). This is a period for which he appears to have relied heavily on the *Dictionary of National Biography* and the memoirs of certain leading figures in the University, such as R. Muir and C.H. Riley.

In order to provide a context for the development of the I of A in relation to the University's history, Section 2.2 therefore uses Kelly's (1981) work as a basis for the discussion, but also utilizes other primary and secondary sources to substantiate Kelly's work.

The primary materials used in Section 2.2 are the letters written by John Garstang and Reverend John Watson to the University's Vice-Chancellor, A.W.W. Dale. Watson (1850-1907) was a Liverpool minister, writer and novelist, who sat on the University Council. The letters from him and Garstang are used in this section to demonstrate how Garstang came to arrive at the U of L. Complimenting Watson's letters, there is also Nicoll's (1908) biography of Watson, which highlights the influence that Watson had within the University at the time. In this study, Nicoll includes a number of letters exchanged between Dale and Watson. In addition to these there is a commemorative note written by Dale detailing the work of Watson at the University. Additional primary material for this section comes from the *U of L Annals* and the *University Calendar*; sources which are used throughout this chapter, and are not only restricted to Section 2.2.

Of the sources used in Sections 2.3 and 2.4, those that specifically concern the history of the I of A, are materials now retained in the SJSC Archive. The original material used in these sections includes letters between Dale, Watson and Garstang, in addition to other members of a committee that was assembled during the formation discussions of the I of A. The correspondence used here provides an additional insight into the processes that occurred before, during, and after the time I of A's establishment. In addition to this original material, Sections 2.3 and 2.4 also refer to Kelly's (1981) and Freeman's (in prep.) unpublished history of the I of A. To date, Freeman's history is the most in-depth analysis written regarding the origins and early years of the Institute. Finally, from Section 2.4 onwards, the I of A's Annual Reports (AR) are used frequently as a

point of discussion concerning administrative, academic, and economic matters that were significant during the time period under review.

The discussion in Section 2.5 concerning the relationship between the University and its schools and departments relies heavily upon primary source material. At present, there appears to be no published literature that specifically documents the relationships that existed between the University of Liverpool and its affiliated institutes and schools during the early twentieth century. Therefore all of the materials that are presented in this section in order to explain the University's affiliations are of a primary nature. The respective primary materials principally include letters written by professors Garstang and W. A. Herdman.

In discussing the Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine (LSTM), a potentially useful source of material is a short history '*Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine: historical record 1898 - 1920*'. This is a monograph produced by the LSTM and published by the University in 1920. It has no particular author's name assigned to it, thus suggesting that it was a collaborative work. As the title states, it documents the first two decades of LSTM's history, and as such is a useful source in explaining the origins of the LSTM. Yet it is only marginally helpful in providing the necessary information, regarding the School's relationship to the U of L, that is required for this chapter. Likewise, Power's (1999) history of the LSTM from 1898 until 1990 fails to give a clear indication of the School's relationship with the University, but focuses more on the schools history and the development of tropical medicine in Britain in the twentieth century. However, one useful secondary source used in this section is an article by Allen (1983), taken from the *University of Liverpool Recorder*. With little secondary sources, the discussions concerning the I of A and LSTM in this chapter are largely of a primary nature and include letters from the Danson Archive.

The section concerning the relationship of the departments of Zoology and Botany and the University is brief due to the fact that there are currently few secondary accounts that document the history of either of these departments. What little has been written on the history of either of

these departments is to be found in Kelly. Further, materials discussing the teaching collections of the aforementioned departments comes from a series of articles written by Adrian Allen (1983) for the *Liverpool Recorder*. Allen's articles, although informative, focus more on the use of the collections rather than their actual composition.

2.2: The University

According to Kelly (1981), University College Liverpool was granted its charter on 18 October 1881. Three years later on 5 November 1884, the University College became part of the federal Victoria University System. In July 1903, the University College received another Royal Charter, and also received an Act of Parliament on 1 October that year (Kelly 1981: 128). Both of these approvals allowed the University College to separate from the Victoria University and achieve its independence, in turn giving the University power to confer its own degrees. The college therefore accordingly was renamed the University of Liverpool (U of L). The U of L was one of six original independent civic universities, otherwise referred to as the "Redbrick Universities", a phrase coined later by Bruce Truscott (1943). Truscott was the pseudonym of Edgar Allison Peers, an educationist and the Gilmour Chair of Spanish at the U of L (Atkinson, 2004). The "Redbricks", a consequence of the various institutions' red brick architecture, were the universities of Birmingham (1900), Manchester (1903), Leeds (1904), Sheffield (1905), and Bristol (1909). Truscott also included Reading University in his list. Founded in 1892, he listed it separately to the other six due to the fact that it did not receive its charter as an independent university until 1926. Truscott attributed the appearance of the group of new independent universities as a consequence of the:

"...widespread development of secondary education and rapid growth of great cities, particularly in the North of England, did university expansion enter upon a new chapter, this must be considered to have begun in the 'seventies and eighties', when almost everyone of the colleges which developed into the universities...had its modest rise" (Truscott 1943: 15).

The changes had as much to do with the need for the State to find more teachers, engineers, and administrators – for the empire as prior to this the main three universities in England (Oxford, Cambridge and Durham) were primarily concerned with educating the elite and training clerics. It was in the climate of expanding secondary education and population growth in the northern cities that UCLiv began to change and develop.

It has been noted that the Rathbone Professor of History at University College Liverpool (UCLiv), John M. Mackay (1856 – 1931), began to push for change within the structure of the college at Liverpool as early as 1895 with the drive for a faculty based system. Prior to this point, Kelly (1981: 124) states that:

“The idea that the teachers in a group of cognate subjects should meet together, to discuss and decide upon matters of common concern, just had not taken hold...Except in Medicine, there was no organization intermediate between Senate and the individual departments.”

Therefore, Mackay fostered the idea of creating faculties in the University College with the aim of generating an atmosphere of academic fellowship, ‘rather than a managerial university of the kind not uncommon in the United States’ (Kelly, 1981: 126). Mackay, initially, spearheaded his work in creating such an environment by convincing the College Senate to assign people to a committee in November 1895, with himself as its convener. It was through that committee that the suitability of establishing Faculty committees was contemplated and their respective functions and constitutions were defined. The committee favoured a Faculty of Arts and a Faculty of Science, yet influential science professors vetoed the latter. Subsequently, the Senate agreed to establish a Faculty of Arts, although during its early stages this was “...little more than a consultative committee” (Kelly 1981: 126).

Nevertheless, by 1902, the work of the Senate had steadily increased, and the idea of organizing the College into faculties became more appealing. Therefore:

“...in the spring of 1902 the Faculty [of Arts] was granted a new constitution, under which it was empowered, subject to the approval of the Senate, to ‘supervise and control the studies of the Faculty’...”

[Further], a Faculty of Science was constituted... in June 1902”
(Kelly 1981:125).

Before the College gained its autonomy as an independent civic university in the second half of 1903, a Faculty of Engineering was formed in the March of that year. During the writing of the newly independent University’s constitution, a provision was also made for a Faculty of Law (Kelly 1981: 125). The new administrative system gave faculties the power to make necessary appointments of chairs for their departments.

Thus, as has been suggested, Mackay’s idea of establishing a Faculty system was part of a wider ‘grand design’ for the making of a civic university (Kelly 1981: 126), and it was his efforts that helped to bring about an expansion within the UCLiv by pushing for an independent university. “In Liverpool it was, we can almost certainly say, Mackay who set in train the movement which led to the break-up of the Victoria University” (Kelly 1981: 127).

Despite all of his innovativeness, however, with the exception of Kelly’s (1981) brief notes, there is very little published material on Mackay or his work. Mackay does, nevertheless, feature prominently in the memoirs of his contemporaries at the U of L; namely those of the professors Ramsay Muir, of *Modern History* (1944) and the Architect Charles Reilly (1938).

It was in 1902 that, while the U of L witnessed the first processes of expansion, John Garstang was excavating at Beni Hasan in Egypt. During the course of that season, Garstang evidently met the Reverend John Watson. As noted above in Section 2.1.1, Watson was a minister and writer in Liverpool. He had a direct link to the UCLiv due to the fact that he held a seat on the College Committee, and he subsequently sat on the University Council of the U of L. Of Watson’s time at the University, Nicoll writes:

“From the foundation of University College, Liverpool, Dr. Watson gave the institution his whole-hearted and undeviating support. As his friend Professor Mac-Cunn has said, he had a wide outlook on national life and a profoundly civic spirit, and, moreover, recognized the value of University institutions as vitalising and humanising forces” (1908: 39).

There is also other evidence that shows that Watson was a close friend of the University’s V-C, A. W. W. Dale. Dale contributed his personal

correspondence to Nicoll's biography of Watson, and provided the following assessment:

"Common work brought us closely together. He became a member—and an active member—of the Executive Council of University College. He gave time and thought to its service. He used his influence in its behalf. In the movement that created the new University of Liverpool he took a foremost part. His experience and his sympathies gave him a place of his own midway between his academic and his lay colleagues. He understood the minds of both. He could interpret and he could reconcile. And when differences arose, he never rested till the differences were settled. The University owes a lasting debt to his wisdom and his strength. But some of us owe him more than this" (Dale, writing in Nicoll 1908: 310).

Watson met Garstang while the former was on holiday in Egypt. He briefly explained meeting the archaeologist in a letter sent on 4 March 1902 to the Director of Liverpool Public Museums, Henry Ogg Forbes:

"It gives me much pleasure to state through you to any person likely to be interested in the advancement of research, scientific and historical, that I had an opportunity lately of meeting Mr. John Garstang in Egypt, and learning not only from himself but from other competent men about the excellent work that he has done in Egyptian Exploration.

He has also, I believe, the opportunity of securing a most promising field for exploration next season, a field practically certain to yield the most interesting results; and for the sum of £600 Mr. Garstang's services could be obtained for next season, and also the whole cost of labour defrayed, and the scientific results and antiquities secured after the Rights of the Egyptian Government are conserved, which are usually very moderate, for any institution which is willing to engage Mr. Garstang and pay this very reasonable sum.

My hope is that some of our Liverpool citizens who have means at their disposal will see their way to associate our city with the profoundly interesting work of Egyptian Exploration, and enrich Liverpool with some of its gains.

Trusting that Liverpool may not miss what is in my Judgement a most valuable opportunity" (Watson 4 March 1902 (a)).

Later that year, on 1 July 1902, Watson wrote to Dale. His letter illustrates that he was seeking to secure a position for Garstang. Watson included Garstang's CV with his letter, which read as follows:

"I enclose a note of Garstang's qualifications and work which you might glance over and return to me in a day or two.

It will shew prima facie evidence and perhaps even more than that, that he is a capable man.

My idea is that he should have a small honorarium, say £50 a year, or at least twenty five guineas in acknowledgment of his work although of course the honour of the readership would count very much with him at the beginning of his career.

Is it too late to do anything in the Senate this summer?

For Garstang may be picked up by an American University, by that monster Chicago whose maw is insatiable" (Watson 1 July 1902 (b)).

Both of Watson's letters to Forbes and Dale in 1902 suggest how Garstang came to work in Liverpool. Yet there are a number of unanswered questions relating to how Watson and Garstang came into contact with each other in Egypt. For example, who introduced Garstang to Watson and vice versa? What was the exchange that took place between them, which so impressed Watson, that he went out of his way to make such an effort for Garstang in Liverpool?

While such questions linger, it was recorded in the U of L Annal (1902: 40) that Garstang officially received an appointment at Liverpool in late 1902: "18 November 1902 (A) Mr. J. Garstang appointed reader in Egyptian Archaeology". That Garstang's appointment was made in November of the academic year 1902-03, it can be assumed that the University College Calendar for that period had already been published, thus explaining why Garstang's Readership does not appear therein. His post as a Reader, however, is listed in the following academic year's Calendar for 1903-04 (U of L Calendar 1904); the first Calendar published by the newly independent university.

Taking up the honorary position of Reader, Garstang's presence at University College Liverpool shaped what was referred to as the Department of Egyptian Archaeology. During that first year the department was housed in the newly constructed Victoria Building, situated on Brownlow Hill; the source of the term Redbrick (Kelly 1981: 82).

As a result of Garstang's responsibilities for lecturing as part of his Readership in the Dept. of Egyptian Archaeology, archaeology became one of the examined subjects listed in the U of L's Calendar for 1903-04. Listed under its Ordinances, the stipulation reads as follows:

“Subjects of the Examination...11. The studies of the Faculty from which subjects shall be chosen for Final examination are as follows:- ... (XV) Archaeology... [Note: 24 subjects in total]” (U of L Calendar 1904: 89).

In late 1903, Garstang, with the aid of Liverpool Businessman John Rankin, initiated both a library and Loan Collection of Egyptian Artefacts for the Dept. of Egyptian Archaeology. This is examined in much greater detail in Chapter Four. Garstang’s plans for the department did not end with the library and Loan collection however, and in February 1904 it became clear that he had much larger designs. In a letter to Dale on 21 February 1904, Garstang provided the first written evidence that he desired to establish an Institute of Archaeology at the U of L.

2.3: The founding of the Institute of Archaeology

The letter of February 1904 was sent by Garstang to Dale while the former was in Egypt at Beni Hasan. At the beginning of the letter Garstang enquired about a £10,000 grant that the U of L would be receiving from the City of Liverpool. He wrote of the need for a position in Classical Archaeology. Before sending his letter to Liverpool, however, Garstang revealed that he had spoken with R. M. Dawkins.

In 1902, Dawkins was admitted to the British School of Archaeology at Athens where he held a Craven Studentship. During his time in Athens, Dawkins pursued his interest in philology and the study of Greek dialects, besides touring the Greek Islands including Karpathos. Between 1904 and 1905, Dawkins worked under the charge of R. C. Bosanquet for whom he ran his excavations in Eastern Crete. Dawkins later took over Bosanquet’s position as the Director at the British School in 1906, and was subsequently responsible for four seasons at Sparta; work that had been initiated by Bosanquet before he departed (Halliday 2004).

As a consequence of Garstang’s contact with Dawkins in 1904, Bosanquet put forward a list of potential candidates for the post in Classical Archaeology in the proposed Institute of Archaeology. That list was

included in the same letter written by Garstang to Dale in February 1904, and read as follows:

“Having explained to you my hopes in regard to Archaeology in Liverpool may I also suggest the extreme desirability in making an election of this kind to adopt a term more suitable to modern methods ~~such~~ than Classical Archaeology; such as Greek or Latin Archaeology, the former in this case. Let us hope for representations of [.] Greek Archaeology, Latin Archaeology, Egyptian Archaeology, Babylonian Archaeology Eastern Archaeology, Western Archaeology, Comparative Archaeology...as a nucleus of an Archaeological Institute, all working from & in the University of Liverpool”
(Garstang 21 February 1904 c).

Garstang returned to Liverpool in March 1904. Sometime after a committee was formed with the purpose of implementing the proposal that Garstang had conveyed to Dale in the aforementioned letter. The contents of the original committee list is reproduced in its entirety in Appendix B-1(a), although the layout has been slightly altered.

Four months later, almost to the day in June 1904, a draft letter was prepared and sent to Dale from the Committee’s Vice-Presidents - J. Brunner, R. Brocklebank, Rankin and W. Johnston - regarding the creation of an Institute of Archaeology. Given their social status and professions, and thus their potential for significant financial stability, it is suggested that these four men were quite possibly members of Garstang’s “rich citizens” (Garstang 21 February 1904).

The draft letter, while sent to Dale, was addressed to the University Council for approval. It can be assumed that Dale, himself a member of the Committee, was presented with the draft in order to ensure that it had been properly prepared for presentation to the Council. The draft stated the following:

See Appendix B-1(b).

It can be conjectured that Garstang was involved in composing the draft version of the letter dated 20 June 1904, given his earlier endorsement for the formation of an Institute, as outlined in his letter to Dale in February 1904. Moreover, on the following day, 21 June 1904, Garstang sent three letters to Dale, all with reference to the formation of the Institute. The first letter stated:

“I have the pleasure in enclosing to you an application of a Committee formed for the promotion of Archaeological studies, for permission to use the word ‘University’ as part of the title applied to the School they propose: ‘University of Liverpool: Institute of Archaeology’ The remaining portion of the application for premises, and the accompanying application on behalf of this Department, as a matter of some urgency, may I trust have consideration at your convenience” (Garstang 21 June 1904 d1).

The request to use the ‘University of Liverpool’ in the I of A’s title suggests that there was a desire for the Institute to be affiliated with the new University, therefore allowing the fledgling Institute a greater degree of distinction by its association with this reputable institution. With the above draft letter in mind, the University also acted as a potential source of income for the I of A with greater potential for financial stability. At the same time, the University would have benefited from a readymade Institute, which according to its prospectus offered a range of public lectures on Egyptian and Greek Archaeology and Ancient History (I of A Prospectus 1904). The Institute would therefore be replacing the University’s Dept. of Egyptian Archaeology, with all the Egyptological instruction coming under the auspices of the I of A. The association that the two bodies shared seemed mutually beneficial. At the heart of the arrangement, the I of A provided ‘teaching’ for the U of L, while at the same time the University acted as a potential source of funding for the Institute. The Institute, however, remained a separate entity from the University, and thus secured its autonomy and independence.

In the second of Garstang’s three letters to Dale it was stated:

“On behalf of the Committee formed for the purpose of promoting Archaeological studies in connection with this University, I have the pleasure in enclosing the accompanying application to the Council for assistance in their project, particularly in regards to the payment of rent of two houses in Bedford Street as temporary accommodation.

On behalf of the Department of Egyptian Archaeology, perhaps I might be allowed to add, that there seems to be no sufficient accommodation within the Victoria Buildings for the immediate needs of this Department. The series of Egyptian antiquities provided by the Vice Presidents of this Committee with a view of being for direct use in teaching, is at present without accommodation, and the cases numbering about fifty, must remain in the cellars until some step such as that indicated by this application is made.

Gifts of antiquities for the purpose of comparative Archaeology have also been tendered by the High Commissioner of Cyprus, and Different Museums in South Australia, South Africa and elsewhere. The need therefore for accommodation is a real and pressing one, which I trust that the Council will find it possible to meet in the manner indicated” (Garstang 21 June 1904 d2).

This second letter reinforced what was proposed in the draft letter to Dale; that the space occupied by the Dept. of Egyptian Archaeology in the Victoria Building was insufficient and that new facilities were required. It can therefore be argued that the “application for premises” was made, and the issue was resolved with the acquisition of property on Bedford Street.

The third letter sent to Dale on June 21 was the official version of the aforementioned draft prepared by the Committee’s four Vice-Presidents. Both versions of the same letter are identical but for one exception; Johnston did not sign the final version.

As discussed in the introductory chapter, due to his position as Vice-Chancellor, Dale was a member of the University Council. He was also listed as a member of the committee that was formed for the proposed Institute (Garstang 21 June 1904 d3). Taking the latter fact into consideration, in addition to the correspondence that was sent to Dale from respective members of the committee during this period, it can be presumed that Dale was involved in the creation of the I of A from the outset. This supposition is supported by the fact that Garstang’s initial letter dated 21 February was addressed to Dale. This fact alone indicates that Dale had knowledge of Garstang’s ideas, and it can be assumed that Dale subsequently had input into the establishment of the I of A. Equally, as a result of the committee that was formed in June 1904, it can be surmised that six individuals (i.e. Garstang, Dale, Brunner, Brocklebank, Rankin and Johnston) were acting in unison to establish the foundations of the I of A.

There are two entries in the Annal of the U of L (1904: 46) that specifically identify the date of establishment of the I of A:

‘21 June 1904 (F) Liverpool Institute of Archaeology Established.

(G) Council agreed that the School for training in Social work and the Liverpool Institute of Archaeology be allowed to style themselves University Schools'.

The following month, on 4 July, while celebrating the University's first graduation day, a speech was given at a celebration dinner. It is unclear as to who was the speaker, but the oration was subsequently reported in the *Liverpool Post* (1904). The newspaper article referred to the speech, and mention was made to Garstang:

"...the interest...and so the association with Liverpool University will do Liverpool good in the eyes of the world. But interest is still further particular, because as a part of his enterprise. Mr. Garstang, with the liberal aid of some of the oldest and best friends of the university, and with good materials to begin upon, is promoting an institute of Archaeology. It will be in connection with the University, and a house has been secured for it. Mr Garstang, is co-operated with in this matter by the Liverpool members of the Beni Hasan Committee...This Institute of Archaeology is to be the home of a modest but valuable and effective museum, which will add distinction to the University. And there is some prospect of future excavations being held in the University name" (*Liverpool Post* 4 July 1904).

The writer of the article very clearly used an occasion of great importance to advertise the burgeoning I of A. The article equally demonstrated the rapid growth of the new University, which was looking to make its mark on the broader stage as a seat of learning.

With the founding of the I of A, and the consequent cessation of the former Dept. of Egyptian Archaeology, the U of L helped to usher in the creation of a new affiliation and interaction for the study of archaeology in the city of Liverpool. As a new relationship was formed between the two bodies, one might reasonably expect to find some sort of contract or written agreement that would detail or set out their relationship. It may be assumed that such an agreement would be found for the other departments, schools or institutes that associated with, or otherwise affiliated to, the University. To date, however, nothing of the sort has been found. The only source which makes reference to University Affiliates is the University Charter. In the U of L Calendar for 1903-04, the charter describes the requirements and criteria by which outside institutions could become linked to the University:

“...before recommending any such College or Institution, shall satisfy itself:- (a) That the College of Institution has attained a satisfactory standard of educational efficiency for the purposes for which affiliation is sought and is established on a permanent basis. (b) That the majority of regular students in such College are the age of sixteen years” (U of L Calendar 1904: 105).

Other than these lines, there appears to be no other written contracts or agreements between the University and its affiliated schools and institutes. What has become clear, and will be demonstrated in the following sections, is that the University’s relationships with different entities were ad-hoc. For example, in the case of both the I of A and the Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, the affiliates provided services to the U of L. Lecturing and associated facilities were paid for by the University. In return, these affiliated bodies benefited from the security of being associated with a larger institution whose financial base was greater than their own.

2.4: The Institute of Archaeology, 1904-1930

2.4.1: 1904-1914: A decade of growth

On page four of the I of A’s Preliminary Prospectus, which is likely to have been published between July and October 1904, an interesting reference to the I of A is to be found. This reference was derived almost verbatim from the second paragraph of the draft letter, prepared and sent to Dale on 20 June 1904 by the Vice-Presidents of the ‘I of A Committee’. That paragraph referred to ‘teaching’ and ‘research’, and how they were to be the central focus and work of the I of A. The majority of the words from this paragraph are repeated in the Prospectus, but with subtle differences between the two versions. The Prospectus edits the letter’s words by replacing ‘illustrating their own subjects’ with ‘illustrating the principles of Archaeology’, in addition to inserting ‘Architecture and the Applied Arts’ into the list of subjects for which the teaching collection would be used. Therefore, besides using the quote from the letter and making the small changes that it did for the purposes of the Prospectus, it can be argued that the I of A used the draft letter as a statement of purpose that served at the same time to act as an advertisement. By introducing

Architecture and Applied Arts as additional subjects into the statement, the I of A was also linking its subject to other departments in an attempt to reach out to a wider pool of prospective students.

The sentence that refers to the 'collection of antiquities' in the quote is also significant. This is because the following pages of the Prospectus, entitled 'Museum', describe the four rooms and their collections that the I of A housed on the ground floors of 40-42 Bedford Street. It would appear that the focus on the Museum in the Prospectus was another means to draw interested bodies into the new Institute. According to the Prospectus, the first of the I of A's public lectures of the academic year was scheduled for 4 October 1904. Courses for the Autumn, Spring and Summer terms were to be given as public lectures, with a considerable focus on Egyptology. The lectures were also, nonetheless, to range from Egyptian History and Medicine to Classical Greece and Ancient History. It is unknown to what extent these lectures were successful, as the AR for 1905-1906 made no reference to any of them.

By the end of 1904, the I of A was determining its importance and direction in significant ways. On 1 November, John Rankin made an offer to the University Council for a Lectureship in the Methods and Practice of Archaeology. As has been seen, Rankin had been a founding member of the I of A committee. His involvement with the Institute is discussed in more detail in Chapter Four. Nonetheless, the U of L Annals for 1904 (1904: 49) acknowledged Rankin's offer as follows:

1 November 1904 (A) Council informed by Mr. John Rankin that he proposed to devote the remaining portion of his donation to the University, £3,000, to the foundation of a Special Lectureship in Archaeology.

The Annal entry for the same month also referenced the official date of the opening of the I of A:

3 November 1904 (F) Inauguration of the Institute of Archaeology at new premises in Bedford Street, taking the form of an At Home and Reception by the Lady President, Lady Alice Stanley (U of L Annals 1904: 49).

Prior to its official inauguration, the Institute had steadily gathered momentum in the previous months. Aside from Garstang's presence, the I of A's AR for 1905 documented other people who had stepped in to assist as teaching staff:

“Five members now constitute the Staff; Dr. Pinches has accepted an invitation to help with Assyriology; the position in classical archaeology remains vacant, and has been temporarily filled by Mr. [j. ff.] Baker-Penoyre; [Mr. P. E.] Newberry work upon Egyptian History, in collaboration with Mr. Garstang representing Egyptian Archaeology, and the study of Numismatics from the scientific and historical standpoint is being furthered by Dr Philip Nelson” (I of A AR 1905: 15).

It can thus be argued that the I of A was founded on an ethos of growth from its inception. This was particularly evident in 1905. The U of L Annals for that year details monetary gifts that were given for the expansion of staffing in teaching and research (the latter from Johnston and Brunner), in addition to the dates of appointments made for various people in the respective posts and chairs.

At the end of January 1905, the Annals note donations for the purposes of appointing a Classical Archaeologist, as well as increased funding for continuing research:

31 January, 1905 (J) Gift of £900 by Mrs. Holt and Miss Holt to the University Institute of Archaeology, for a Classical Archaeologist, and a gift of £1,000 by Sir John Brunner in aid of research work' (U of L Annals 1905: 50).

The next staff appointment made that was referenced in the Annals of 1905 was directly related to Rankin's gift in November 1904. While simply noted in the Annals that on 28 March 1905 a lectureship in Archaeology was established (U of L Annals 1905: 51), this in fact came to be known as the John Rankin Lectureship of the Methods and Practice in Archaeology; a post to which Garstang was appointed from his Honorary Readership in Egyptology (Kelly 1981: 151). The following year, in 1906, Rankin increased the funding for the lectureship, and thus Garstang's position was transformed into a professorial chair in the Methods and Practice of Archaeology.

The next significant staff appointment was made in 1906. On 13 March, the “Council established a Professorship in Classical Archaeology, and appointed R.C. Bosanquet to the chair” (U of L Council Minutes 1906: 54). His post was the result of the gift made by Mrs. George Holt, and her daughter Emma, in January 1905, and led to Bosanquet’s resignation as Director of the British School in 1906.. Further financial support for Bosanquet’s chair in Classical Archaeology was provided by Alfred Booth and C. W. Jones in 1906, who both:

“...generously promised the sum of £50 per annum, to be added with the cordial agreement of the original donors to the £300 per annum for three years contributed to that Fund by Mrs. and Miss Holt” (I of A AR 1906: 8).

In the same year, a further addition was made to the members of staff at the I of A. Noted in the AR 1905-1906 is the staff appointment of E. Harold Jones, under Egyptian Art (I of A AR 1906). Jones had been Garstang’s excavation assistant in Egypt since 1903. Jones only appears, however, under the official staff list for the I of A in that particular AR. This is most likely because Jones left to carry out work for Garstang the following year. Jones’s relationship with the Institute via his connection with Garstang is examined further in Chapter Three.

Without doubt, 1906 was a pivotal year for the Institute. The I of A had grown to such an extent that the University Council claimed that “...the University was now equipped for the study of archaeology ‘on a scale without parallel in other British Universities” (U of L Council 1906).

In addition to new teaching staff, the I of A had also assembled a museum collection, which was first referenced in the Museums section of the University Calendar of 1905. The entry regarding the collection in the Calendar is a slightly edited version of the I of A’s 1904-1905 Preliminary Prospectus, with the important addition of listing a ‘printed catalogue’. The city of Liverpool’s Library, Museums and Arts Committee (LMAC) subsequently used this reference to the I of A’s collection against the Institute in 1906, when frictions began between itself and the Institute. These frictions were the result of a ‘Scheme’ that had been assembled by

members of the LMAC and the University Council with the intention of building closer relations between the LMAC, I of A and the University. It appears that the LMAC felt threatened by the artifact collection which the I of A and the U of L were describing as a 'museum'. This issues is examined in greater depth in chapters Four and Five. For the purposes here, however, it is important to highlight that, as a consequence of this friction, the I of A AR ceased to refer to the I of A's collection as a Museum. From the academic year 1906-1907 onwards, it was called a 'Loan Collection'. From this point forward in this thesis, the I of A collection will therefore be referred to as the LC.

The increase in staff appointments in the I of A continued in the next two academic years. The U of L Annals for the academic session 1906-1907 document financial donations from both Rankin and Brunner to the I of A:

- "13 November 1906 (I) Council accepted the offer of Mr. John Rankin to increase the endowment already provided by him for the Lectureship in Methods and Practice of Archaeology to the amount required for the endowment of a chair in that subject.
- (J) Council accepted the offer of the Right Hon. Sir John T. Brunner to endow a Chair of Egyptology" (U of L Annals 1906: 56).

With these offers accepted by the U of L, it was at the start of the following year that appointments were made to the newly established chairs:

- "22 January 1907 (G) Council established a John Rankin Professorship in Methods and Practice of Archaeology and appointed Mr. John Garstang to the Chair.
- (H) Council established a Brunner Professorship in Egyptology and appointed Mr. Percy E. Newberry to the Chair" (U of L Annals 1907: 57).

In 1907, Brunner made another financial contribution to the I of A, for the purposes of developing its premises:

"The most important feature of development within the Institute has been the extension of its premises, which has been made possible by the further generosity of Sir John Brunner. The new house, 38

Bedford Street has already been partly fitted, and will mainly devoted to the subject of Classical Archaeology" (I of A AR 1907: 17).

Equally, the AR for 1907 documented the addition of Professor J. L. Myres as a Special Lecturer in Classical Geography, while he was simultaneously the Gladstone Professor of Greek. At the same time J. Grafton Milne replaced P. Nelson as lecturer in Numismatics.

Due to the overall expansion in the I of A's work, the Institute Treasurer, A. L. Rea, noted that: 'It is anticipated that the expenses of the coming year will be considerably increased over the last' (I of A AR 1907: 11). The only clear reason given by the report for the increase was that it was due to the "extensions in the Institute's work" (I of A 1907: 11).

The subsequent year, 1907-1908, brought a continuation of the financial commitment made by the Jones family:

"5 May 1908 (D) Council accepted Mr. C. Sydney Jones's offer to continue the arrangement made by the late Mr. Charles W. Jones with the Institute of Archaeology with regard to the Chair of Classical Archaeology" (U of L Annals 1908: 62).

As noted above, Charles Jones initially supported the chair in Classical Archaeology in 1906. He then committed to support the chair for a further two years (I of A AR 1908), thus running until 1908. With the death of Jones in 1908, his son Sydney Jones agreed to continue the provision of financial support to the Chair.

On 7 May 1908, Sir Rubert Boyce - a General Committee member of the I of A and the Dean of the LSTM - wrote to F. C. Danson. Danson was one of the I of A Committee's Vice-Presidents and had been a member of the LSTM Committee. Boyce's letter concerned the I of A's need for an in-house journal:

"By the way I have urged upon Garstang and Myres the absolute necessity of their Institute bringing out regularly a journal of the Institute. Unless the public at large are kept informed of what is taking place, it is really useless to seek money in the Institute. After all, we are here to teach the public and we must interest them ..."
(Boyce 7 May 1908).

As shown in Section 2.3, Boyce was listed as a member on the original committee from June 1904. He had therefore been on the I of A's Committee from the very beginning. Boyce had been instrumental in the

development of the LSTM in the late 1890s, which is discussed below in Section 2.5. The noteworthy point, however, is that Boyce was a link between the LSTM and the I of A. For the AR for 1904-1905 notes that the LSTM was paying £32 in rent to the Institute. The following year, a further £7.10 was paid. While these two entries do not explain what the rent was for specifically, the payment, however, shows that a relationship existed between these two bodies dating back to the early years of the I of A's existence.

The fruition of Boyce's advice about the publication of a journal was announced in the I of A's AR for 1908:

“The Annals Of Archaeology[:] are designed for the publication of the results of Studies undertaken in connection with the Liverpool Institute of Archaeology. They will include also include preliminary *Reports* of the Expeditions and Excavations undertaken on behalf of the Institute or... its staff...They will also include reviews of the archaeological publications which bear upon departments of Archaeology and Anthropology...which members of the Institute are engaged” (I of A AR 1908: 26).

The description of the journal in the AR continues to list the publications' contents, as well as quoting the cost at 10/- per quarter, or at 2s. 6d. for an individual copy (I of A AR 1908).

From this point, the Institute began to deepen its ties to the LSTM. For example, 1908 saw the appointment of Dr T. W. Gann. Gann was a Government Medical Officer in British Honduras who had been a student in the LSTM. Before his appointment in British Honduras in 1894, Gann had conducted archaeological excavations on barrows in England. With the connection that the LSTM and the I of A had established via Boyce, it can be assumed that Gann was introduced to the I of A during his time in Liverpool in 1908. After his time at the LSTM, Gann returned to British Honduras to resume his post as Medical Officer (Hammond 2004).

It was proposed that Gann be appointed to a lectureship in Central American Antiquities in the I of A in early 1908. Bosanquet wrote a letter to Danson, dated 19-20 January 1908, regarding Gann's possible appointment:

“Myres has told me of the proposed appointment for Gann and we have discussed the possibility of housing his collection. It is a most desirable strengthening of our Institute.

I feel that Newberry as well as myself will do all we can to further it. I go to Glasgow to morrow (sic), for the lectures which I [?] contribute a syllabus and do not return until February 1st. It seems a pity to wait so long before taking action. If you could have a meeting sooner, please do not think of postponing it until I am back; I am heartily with you" (Bosanquet 19-20 January 1908).

Gann's appointment was confirmed in the Institute's AR, where he is referred to as a "distinguished student of Central American Antiquities" (I of A AR 1908: 18). The AR also states the following concerning Gann's new position within the I of A:

"Dr. Gann was appointed to the lectureship of Central American Antiquities at the Institute of Archaeology, and was also appointed director of excavation in Honduras. Dr. Gann, on his part, undertook to deposit his valuable collection of antiquities from British Honduras at the institute of Archaeology" (I of A AR 1908: 18).

As a consequence of Gann's post, an excavation committee, one that was affiliated to the I of A, was created. Unsurprisingly, Boyce was a founding member of this particular committee. This excavation committee and others that were affiliated with the I of A are discussed in greater detail in Chapter Four.

Another addition to the I of A's cohort of staff is referenced in the AR for 1907-1908; that of Francis P. Barnard. The U of L Annals for that year documented the following:

'16 June 1908

(A) Council established a Professorship of Medieval Archaeology and appointed Mr. F. P. Barnard to the Chair' (U of L Annals 1908: 63).

As had been indicated in the AR for 1906-1907, there was a concern mounting over the Institute's finances due to the rapid expansion in its work. This concern increased over the subsequent months, and the Treasurer's Report from the AR for 1907-1908 relayed similar reservations:

"As foreseen in the Treasurer's Report for last year, the expenses of the present year have been very much higher previously...It has been hoped that the Committee of the Institute will devise a means of placing the finances of the Institute upon a sounder basis, so that not only may the deficit be made good, but the usefulness of the Institute be extended and not hampered by lack of funds" (I of A AR 1908: 30).

Taking the preceding paragraphs in this section into consideration, it has been demonstrated that the I of A underwent rapid and solid growth from the first year of its existence (1904) until the academic year 1908-1909. This growth was based principally on endowments and gifts made to the I of A by generous donors, which in turn went to fund the chairs occupied by Garstang, Newberry and Bosanquet. The other lecturers, some of them honorary or shared appointments, donated their time and services. This financial security began to change, however, and while some accessions were made note of in the AR for 1908-1909, no new staff were added to the Institute during that year. This can be attributed to the financial problems that the Institute was undergoing. In 1909, Garstang wrote about the financial struggle that was ensuing and its impact on the I of A at the end of the Hon. Secretary's Report (HSR):

“Notwithstanding signs of unabated energy, the Institute has been greatly hampered during the past year by falling off of the General Fund. Doubtless this is partly due to the general depression of trade; but it must be recognized that the basis of the Institutes finances, being without any endowment or guarantee is unsound; and the liability to fluctuation in the subscription lists not only restrains expansion on every hand, but strangles any consistent policy of efficacy and development. The materials and opportunity are all provided, but under the present conditions they cannot be utilized to their full advantage. To this serious and regrettable state of things the Committee's attention is urgently invited” (I of A AR 1909: 12).

The monetary concerns that Rea had expressed previously, and which had clearly been outlined in the ARs, became more visible in 1909. At the end of the HSR, Garstang was evidently crying out for financial help on the part of the Committee. Rea reinforced Garstang's plea:

“...It is with regret that he [the Treasurer] is compelled to show an increased deficit, and it is to be hoped that the Committee of the Institute will devise some means of securing the finances upon some substantial basis if the work is to be carried on...” (I of A AR 1909: 27).

Rea subsequently noted the cause of their financial difficulties:

“An examination of the accounts will show that the Institute has been unfortunate in losing the subscriptions of several supporters who have contributed handsome sums in previous years of its existence, and although several new subscribers have been obtained the total income this year shows a decrease... as compared with last year...” (I of A AR 1909: 27).

Under the sources of income for the year, Rea lists the following:

“The Grant of £80 per annum from the University, as well as their payment of rent and taxes... Other sources of revenue have been the payment of for the use of the Lecture Room by the Board of Biblical Studies, and hire of slides, etc” (I of A AR 1909: 27).

In addition to Rea’s list, revenue was made up by the publication and sale of the *Annals of Archaeology*, and subscriptions to the I of A, for which one received a copy of the AR. The subscribers were predominately committee members, and had been used as a source of income for the I of A from its foundation. Additional money made its way into the Institute’s coffers in 1909 with a bequest from a departed committee member towards Classical Archaeology: “(E) Bequest of £500 by the late Miss M.A. Booth allocated towards the endowment of the Chair of Classical Archaeology” (U of L Annals 19 January 1909).

Despite the Institute’s rapid expansion in its first years, it appears that it did not have a plan to ensure long-term financial, regardless of Rea’s advice. Nothing of the sort is evident in the ARs or in any other documents pertaining to the I of A throughout its history.

While financial issues were beginning to pervade the I of A towards the end of the decade, the Report of Departments in the AR for 1908-1909 records that Newberry and his student, Meta Williams, had been cataloguing the Egyptian Collection at the Liverpool Public Museum (I of A AR 1909). This work continued until 1910. The year 1909 saw both Newberry and Myres join the Museum Sub-Committee (MSC) of the City’s Library, Museums and Arts Committee’s (LMAC). Both the cataloguing project and the appointments of Newberry and Myres to the MSC were signs of an improvement in the relationship between the I of A and Public Museum, following the frictions that occurred in 1906, as discussed in greater depth in Chapter Five.

The HSR in the 1909-1910 AR announced the departure of Myres to “... a Chair of Ancient History at Oxford” (I of A AR 1910: 9). Further, the Hon. Secretary reported that a fund had been created in order to address the Institute’s growing financial concerns:

“The formation ... of a special Endowment Fund (as mentioned by the Hon. Treasurer in his Report) to ensure the continuity of the Institute’s work and to free the Staff from an ever-present disquietude as to their resources has met with a signal initial success” (I of A AR 1910: 9).

But still the Treasurer’s Report warned of “a state of affairs to which the attention of the Committee is directed” (I of A AR 1910: 26). The Treasurer commented upon the Endowment Fund that the Secretary had referred to in previous pages:

“In response to the Committee’s appeal, several friends made generous contributions to an Endowment Fund, opened with a view of relieving the Staff and the Committee from the ever present necessity, due to fluctuations in the subscriptions list. Amongst these there should be noted the contribution of Mrs. and Miss Holt, amounting jointly to £500, that of Mr. Ralph Brocklebank, amounting to £1,000 to be regarded as the equivalent of his previous annual subscription of £50, and the offer of add a further sum of £100” (I of A AR 1910: 27).

The Treasurer’s Report also made a suggestion for a ‘Special Fund’ for the chair of Classical Archaeology. This proposal resulted from the fact that the endowment for the chair was scheduled to terminate on 30 June 1911. With regard to the situation the Treasurer noted that it “is for the Committee to say what steps should be taken in the regrettable dilemma which had arisen” (I of A AR 1910: 27).

It was during 1910 that the I of A and the LMAC began to negotiate an amalgamation, which would involve the Institute moving from its premises on Bedford Street close to the University to the Public Museum in the city centre. This proposal of amalgamation followed the proposed ‘Scheme’ in 1906 by the LMAC. As stated previously, this ‘Scheme’ had caused tension between the two bodies. Yet with financial concerns mounting, the proposal of 1910 could not have come at a better time for the Institute. Due to the insurmountable obstacle of insufficient capital, however, the amalgamation failed to materialise Both the attempt at an alliance in 1906 and the proposal for amalgamation in 1910 will be discussed at length in Chapter Five.

During the following academic year, 1910-1911, Boyce died. His death was reported in the AR’s HSR:

“By the death of Sir Rubert Boyce the Institute has lost one of its earliest supporters. He gave it his ungrudging help during the difficult period of its foundation, and was afterwards a moving spirit in establishing the Honduras Exploration fund” (I of A AR 1911: 9).

In the same year Myres' post as lecturer in Classical Geography was: “...filled by the appointment of Prof. C. F. Lehman-Haupt, of the University of Berlin” (I of A AR 1911: 10). Monetary aid was also given to the Chair of Classical Archaeology endowment:

“The guarantee to the University in respect of the Chair of Classical Archaeology has been extended by the generosity of Mrs. and Miss Holt, Sir John Brunner, and Mr. Alfred Booth” (I of A AR 1911: 10).

Still concerned by the financial state of the Institute, Garstang sent a letter to Danson on 5 August 1911:

“Parlous statement of the I of A finances, after discussions with the accountants...Deficit is £435 and overdrawn...more in fact than our private guarantees warrant. The state of things is so serious that it is difficult to see how the Institute is to be maintained, much less developed, unless it is remedied ...” (Garstang 5 August 1911).

The HSR also gave an update of the I of A's economic situation in 1911:

“The Treasurer's Report describes the successful effort which has been made, with the liberal help of friends of the Institute, to pay off the deficit on the working up to June 30, 1910. The accounts for the past year still show a deficiency, in spite of the rigid economy that has been practised. The cost of heating, lighting, and attendance has increased in the past years, owing to the amount of University teaching- including evening classes- carried on under the roof of the Institute, not only by its Staff but by the Departments of Palaeography and Celtic, which have been temporarily accommodated on the upper floor of Nos. 38 and 42 Bedford Street” (I of A AR 1911: 12).

The Hon. Treasurer's Report confirmed the situation:

“The Special Deficiency Fund opened a year ago has practically extinguished this incubus of debt, which had been incurred by the rapid expansion of the institute's energies during the previous season” (I of A AR 1911: 29).

With the help of 'friends', the I of A was able to continue functioning, yet as the Treasurer's Report states: “...the Finance Committee has judged it desirable to cut down all expenses so far as possible” (1911: 30). This included economies in library spending: “Expenditure on the Library, on which regrettably small sums have been spent in recent years, must be

further curtailed” (1911: 30). Despite the positive overtures made in both of these reports about the state of the Institute’s finances, the monetary position remained precarious in the long term. Further, the financial assistance that had been given had not solved the I of A’s overall economic problems, and had merely served to bandage a fiscal wound.

The following academic year saw the departure of Garstang’s assistant Horst Schleipack to the Anthropological Museum at Berlin (I of A AR 1912). More positively, the HSR in the 1911-1912 AR discussed improvements that had been made to the I of A’s financial situation during the preceding year:

“The Finance Committee have met four times. In response to their urgent representations, the University have increased the amount of their annual grant to £400, a sum which covers the necessary expenditure involved in the Institutes premises, the caretaking, and the office. They have accepted a gift of Sir John Brunner...and ...have a better financial report for the coming year. They have found themselves able to rescind the resolution forced upon them...last year...to discontinue the purchase of all books and periodicals” (I of A AR 1912: 11).

The last line with regard to purchases made for the library is curious, in that it does not reflect what was stated in the previous year’s AR. The Treasurer’s Report for 1910-1911, as seen above, used the phrase “further curtailed”, which implied that an increased reduction in library spending had occurred. Equally, there are no other indications in the I of A’s archive that the expenditure allocated for books would cease. The implication, therefore, is that the Institute’s financial situation may have been worse than the Committee was willing to admit on record. Nevertheless, as improvements were felt in the Institute’s economy, the purchasing of books resumed and the Finance Committee was “informed of a recent generous gift of £50 towards the library made by C. Sydney Jones” (I of A AR 1912: 11).

Academic developments in the I of A during 1911-1912 can be seen through the Reports of Departments:

“A new regulation of the Faculty of Arts has added Classical Archaeology to the list of subjects which maybe offered for final examination. It is also possible for candidates to present themselves to the University for a Certificate in Classical Archaeology taken as a separate subject” (I of A AR 1912:11).

This recognition from the Faculty was the first of its kind to recognise the I of A's academic work. Further, as the Institute underwent something of a financial upturn and renewed growth, the following year brought distinction to the I of A when King George V made a Royal visit to the U of L and Queen Mary toured the Institute. The HSR recorded the following in the AR for 1912-1913:

"His Majesty the King, ...in his address from the University, presented by the Vice Chancellor at Liverpool on July 11, 1913, made gracious and encouraging reference [to the Institute]" (I of A AR 1913: 9).

Confirmation of the King's visit was reflected in a later entry to the U of L Annals on 2 October 1913, which directly quoted the Kings statement:

"...thanks to the liberality of your public spirited citizens, it has been able to provide for the teaching of archaeology and to pave the way for the wonderful results which have rewarded the researches of its members at Meröe and other places" (U of L Annals 1913: 81-82).

The change in the fortunes of the I of A was substantiated in the HSR for 1912-1913, where there was a notably stronger emphasis on the reorganization of the Institute and it's teaching:

"The firmer establishment and experience of the Institute as a working organization suggest that the time has come when certain departures might fittingly be made, including the framing of a more definite constitution. It will in any case be desirable in the near future to reorganize the internal working arrangements, having due in regard to the expansion of the Institute and the increasing activities of its several departments" (I of A AR 1913: 11).

The HSR called for "Scholarships and Fellowships to encourage undergraduate and post-graduate studies" and mentioned the success of Classical Archaeology in which two students had earned certificates (I of A AR 1913: 11). The HSR also stipulated that there had been interest in a Diploma in Archaeology expressed by an honors student from another University:

"Provision for such students is one of the first claims upon the Institute, being one essential reason for its foundation. The numbers of such applications would be increased, and the usefulness of the Institute greatly enlarged" (I of A AR 1913:11).

With regard to scholarships and fellowships, the HSR stated that:

“...many deserving young scholars who might otherwise be prevented by purely financial reasons from pursuing their studies with us...would be...enabled to take... advantage of the opportunities...which this Institute is now in a position to afford them” (I of A AR 1913:12).

Up to this point, the I of A’s primary focus appears to have been the expansion of its premises and diversification of its departments via the appointment of chairs and lecturers. Excavation had also been an important focus of the Institute’s activities and this is addressed in context to the LC in Chapter Four. Kelly (1981) however observed that at this time the Institute did not have a particular emphasis on teaching. Yet, as seen above, the I of A’s focus altered towards teaching during the year 1912-1913. It is difficult to identify one specific catalyst for the shift in the Institute’s focus here. It could have been that, with a new found sense of financial stability resulting from the increased generosity of benefactors and the University, it was possible to re-direct foci towards student endowments. Moreover, Classical Archaeology was granted recognition by the Faculty as a result of its academic endeavors. Indeed, students could be examined and earn a certificate in the subject, therefore providing the I of A with motivation to further its teaching capabilities. Regardless of the cause, however, the sentiments that were expressed seemed to call for more of what might today be called ‘student outreach’. The I of A therefore, clearly sought to establish itself as a recognized centre for education at this time.

The push towards improving its academic accreditations for students continued in the following year. In the context of developing a range of qualifications that the Institute could offer students, it was noted how the “project of a Diploma in Archaeology recommended at the last meeting is still having the favorable consideration of the Faculty of Arts” (I of A AR 1914: 8). The HSR in the AR of 1913-1914 also reflected on the success of its efforts to achieve endowments for students:

“The policy of endowed Scholarships and Fellowships had been adopted and defined by the Finance Committee. One such Scholarship has been established within the University by the name of the ‘Institute of Archaeology Scholarship,’ and the University have framed regulations embracing the terms of the gift as passed on to them by our Finance Committee” (I of A AR 1914: 8).

The creation of another fellowship, this time in the archaeology of music, was also under review, but was impeded by the start of the First World War:

“The Institution of a Fellowship (in the archaeology of music) is also within view, and complete provision for such a post has, we hope, only been deferred by the disaster which has overtaken civilization during recent months” (I of A AR 1914: 9).

Despite the War, the Finance Committee voted to give Kathleen Schlesinger a grant for research in the archaeology of music. The balance sheet for that year shows that the grant awarded for this research totaled £80. The majority of the money came from Sir Robert Mond, with the remainder funded by his mother Mrs. Ludwig Mond, Garstang, and the Anthropologist and author C.G. Seligman.

The chair in Classical Archaeology received additional financial aid in 1914. On 12 May, the U of L Annals reported the following: “(M) Gift of £150 by Mrs. Holt and £50 by the Rt. Hon. Sir John Brunner each per annum for three years for the Chair of Classical Archaeology Account” (U of L Annals 1914: 83). Several days later, on 27 May, it was noted that: “(B) Council acknowledged Mr. C. Sydney Jones’ promise to endow the Chair of Classical Archaeology in the year 1917, when the temporary endowment expires” (U of L Annals 1914: 84).

The year 1914 also saw the Institute maintaining cordial relations with the Public Museum: “Public demonstrations and instruction classes have been held in the museums by members of [I of A] staff” (I of A AR 1914: 8). While relations with the Public Museum continued to improve, the I of A found itself in growing need of plaster casts for teaching purposes. The AR commented that this need, however, would have to wait until after the war due to tightening in expenditure. As the HSR in 1914-1915 demonstrates, although the I of A continued to see some financial improvements during the next academic year, changes to its spending were necessary:

“The European war has broken out since the last report of the Hon. Secretary, and the past eleven months have been, naturally, a time of great anxiety. The policy that has been pursued has been one of scrupulous economy” (I of A AR 1915: 8).

The fastidiousness of the I of A's economy had been impacted by the University, which was compelled to reduce its previous contribution of £400 towards rent, rates, taxes and caretaking of the Institute to £350 (I of A AR 1915: 21). The AR for 1914-1915 shows some of the areas in which I of A spending was curtailed. For example, very few new volumes were purchased for the library (1915: 9), and Classical Archaeology made no purchases of casts and antiquities (1915: 11). This particular economy was reinforced in the Treasurer's Report, in which it was stated that:

“The special fund for casts illustrating classical art, which was opened in 1913, and amounts to £70 15s. 0d., is still in the Hon Treasurer's hands, no purchases being possible during the war; and the endeavour of the Finance Committee to realize the total of £150 has not yet been carried out” (1915: 21-22).

The publication of the *Annals of Archaeology* was also affected by the War. The I of A lost over £100 to the University Press on the printing and distributing of the journal during the period. The Treasurer's Report consequently noted that: “The Finance Committee agree with the Committee of the University Press that it is advisable to suspend further publication until the end of the European war” (I of A AR 1915: 22). The situation with the University Press equally impacted upon the publication of the I of A's AR, which it ceased to publish after 1915 and did not reinstate until 1920.

Nevertheless, despite the strains that the War brought to the I of A's expenses in 1915, the Institute continued to grow in size that year by means of gifts from donors:

“The gift of a new house, No. 44 Bedford Street, by Mr. C. Sydney Jones, has enabled us to relieve some of the congestion in our working apartments, and in this house rooms have been set aside for the Professors of Egyptology and the Methods and Practice of Archaeology. This enabled us to re-arrange No. 42, which now contains the Institute Office and the General Library. Rooms have also have also been set aside for... antiquities” (I of A AR 1915: 9).

Robert Mond paid the expenses incurred with the move to No. 44. An addition to the staff group was also made in 1915. On 1 June 1915, the U of L *Annals* recorded that: “(K) Readership in Mediaeval Archaeology

founded and Professor F. P. Barnard appointed to the post” (U of L Annals 1915: 86).

Garstang took a leave of absence during the years of the War, and went to work for the French Government and the Red Cross in France. Other staff members also worked away carrying out war duties, such as Bosanquet, who aided the Serbian Relief Fund. While Garstang was absent from his post as Hon. Secretary to the I of A, Bosanquet, Newberry and W. R. Halliday, the Rathbone Professor of Ancient History, assumed Garstang’s duties when they were available. When all three professors were absent, the care of the Institute was placed in the hands of its Assistant Secretary (I of A AR 1920a).

2.4.2: The Institute of Archaeology during World War 1 (1915-1919)

(Please note, the dates given in the title of this section are meant to reflect dates of the ARs not the actual dates of the War.)

There is little to report regarding the work of the I of A during the War. The only significant entry made in the U of L Annals between 1916 and the end of 1918 was with regard to the chair in Classical Archaeology. Entered on 31 October 1916, it shows that Jones fulfilled the promise that he had made in May 1914 to endow the Chair: “(I) Gift of £8,000 by Mr. C. Sydney Jones for the endowment of the Chair of Classical Archaeology in memory of his father, the late Mr. Charles W. Jones” (U of L Annals 1916: 88).

The ARs for the years between 1915 and 1919 were published as a summary in one single document in 1920. This AR primarily focuses on the activities of I of A staff during the War. Indeed, rather than considering archaeological research and excavations, as would have otherwise been discussed in the ARs during peacetime periods, the Reports of Departments in the summary outline the activities and movement of Newberry, Bosanquet, and Garstang. Noteworthy points that were made include Newberry resigning from his post as Brunner Professor of Egyptology at

the end of the War, in order to finish a History of Egyptian Civilization, and Bosanquet and Garstang having decorations conferred upon them for their work by the French Government and the Red Cross of Serbia.

The University accepted Newberry's official resignation on 18 March 1919, as reported in the U of L Annals: "(B) Council accepted Professor Newberry's resignation of the Brunner Chair of Egyptology" (U of L Annals 1919: 95). His replacement is listed as appointed on 16 December 1919: "(M) Mr. T.E. Peet appointed to the Brunner Chair of Egyptology" (U of L Annals 1919: 99). Incidentally, Peet also lectured in Egyptology at Manchester Victoria University, a post he had held there since 1913 and which continued until 1928 (Gunn 2004).

The AR summary for the War years documents a change that occurred with regard to Schlesinger and the grant for her research into the archaeology of music. The AR indicates that the grant had in fact transformed into a fellowship in Archaeology of Music (1920a: 4). The finances to support this fellowship came from the same four benefactors who had initially given funding for the grant in 1914; Mond, Mrs. Mond, Garstang and Seligman. The Fellowship was for £100, with Mond contributing the majority of this amount, giving £65 (1920: 20a). What remains unclear, however, is the exact date when this Fellowship became official, and whether or not Schlesinger received the full amount annually over the whole period of the War. The records that could answer this enquiry are now lost. What is recorded, nevertheless, is that Schlesinger prepared data, engaged in research and presented reports concerning ancient musical systems and instruments between 1915 and 1919 (I of A AR 1920a).

During the War the I of A's finances appear to have remained intact, and the Treasurer's Report in the 1920 AR summary thanked supporters of the Institute, in addition to the University Council, for helping ease the economic strain that the I of A underwent in previous years. The University had continued to contribute £350 to the I of A's maintenance throughout that time. The Treasurer credited the economic stability of the I of A during the War to the following:

“The gratifying state of the accounts is attributed in a large measure to the economies rigidly exercised throughout the war by the Assistant Secretary, Miss Williams, and the general policy of a minimum expenditure” (I of A AR 1920a: 19).

While the I of A’s financial situation was relatively stable during the War, there was one particular change that occurred with regards to the I of A’s premises. As documented by the HSR in the AR summary of 1920:

“The University Department of Education being temporarily transferred to the Institute, the whole of No. 44 Bedford Street was assigned to it with the use of other rooms in various parts of the building for lectures. The newly-formed Liverpool and District Regional Survey Association was also compelled to seek temporary accommodation under our roof, and the University Press still occupies a room in No. 38” (I of A AR 1920a: 13).

The preceding quote indicates that the space that the I of A occupied on Bedford Street was reduced towards the end of the war, meaning that by 1920 the I of A only resided in No. 40-42 Bedford Street.

2.4.3: The years of decline (1920-1930)

After the War, the I of A was left in a far different position to that which it had been before. The earlier growth of the Institute, which had been fuelled by the continual presence of the cadre of benefactors (Brunner Rankin, Danson, etc), was not just affected by the War, but also by time and age. As will be discussed in Chapter Four, the committees that funded the excavations carried out by the I of A ceased to function with the advent of the War, and were not reformed subsequently. Equally, the subscriptions that the I of A had relied upon in previous years as a source of revenue began to dwindle and steadily drop in number post-War. Finally, the U of L’s grant to the I of A for maintenance appears to have decreased by the end of 1921 by approximately £180 (I of A AR 1921: 22). The reason for this reduction in the U of L’s grant is not clear. Whatever the explanation, the decline with the reduction in other sources of income meant that the range and scale of activities undertaken by the Institute during the 1920s slowed substantially, and failed to pick up again before the decade was out.

The AR for the year 1920 shows another change that was made to the I of A’s premises:

“During the Autumn of 1919 the Committee had strengthened by the addition of many new members, and at a Special Meeting held on 16th March, 1920, it was decided to buy No. 11 Abercromby Square, and to remove the Institute thither at the earliest possible date...It occupied nearly eight weeks and was completed by the end of September, though, naturally, the final rearrangement of the library and the collections is a matter which can only be accomplished gradually and which will need months if not years to complete satisfactorily” (I of A AR 1920b: 15).

The reasons for purchasing No. 11 are clearly outlined in the HSR for the same year. It was easier to supervise and control by the Assistant Secretary and Caretaker due to its compactness, in comparison to the “...somewhat straggling quarters in Bedford Street” (I of A AR 1920b: 15). Similarly, the accommodation in No. 11 was more adequate for housing the various collections that the I of A held, along with the library, which had formerly been “scattered over various rooms and floors in separate houses” (1920b: 16). It could be supposed, however, that the purchase of No. 11 played a significant role in the dramatic and negative shift that occurred within the I of A’s finances in the early 1920s.

In 1920, the U of L’s grant to the I of A was listed in the AR as £400 - the same total as was paid before the commencement of the War. It had been restored to the original amount in 1920 due to the fact that the sum of £350 was no longer considered adequate “under normal conditions now developing” (I of A AR 1920a: 18). Yet, the HSR for 1920 stated that “...it should be clearly understood that financially we are unable to see very far beyond the present moment” (I of A AR 1920b: 17). Thus, in the same year, a decision was made to sell some of the duplicate artifacts from the Egyptian collection held by the I of A. This sale is discussed at length in Chapter Four. Nevertheless, given that the amount earned from the sales secured revenue for the I of A, it is apparent that this action was carried out with a clear reason; the I of A needed to find funds from an alternative source. The urgency is emphasized by the drop in the sum granted by the University for the Institute’s maintenance. As stated above, the U of L’s grant which had reduced in 1921, had by 1922, dropped to a mere £100 (I of A AR 122: 22). This, without doubt, would have been a huge knock to the Institute’s economy. Interestingly, however, the Treasurer’s Report in

1922 makes no reference to this reduction in the U of L's grant, suggesting that the Institute was wary of advertising this issue openly.

Besides a change in its accommodation, in 1920 the I of A also witnessed a number of modifications to, and resignations by its staff. While retaining his Chair at the I of A, Garstang had started a new post as Director of the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem, meaning he was only scheduled to teach at the I of A for the Lent Term of 1920. Garstang's work with the School had started in 1919 after working for the Red Cross (Gurney 2004). As a direct result of his new position, Garstang had "...begun work on a complete catalogue of the antiquities of Syria and Palestine" (I of A AR 1920b: 13). Four of his students assisted him in this catalogue during the Autumn and Lent Terms, before Garstang and two students left for Jerusalem, where Garstang remained until November of that year 1919 (I of A AR 1920b: 13).

On 19 October 1920, the U of L Council recorded the departure of Bosanquet: "(M) Council accepted Professor Bosanquet's resignation of the Charles W. Jones Chair of Classical Archaeology" (U of L Annals 1920: 104). Halliday and Mr Ormerod covered the public lectures formerly given by Bosanquet until a replacement for him was appointed (AR 1921). More importantly, one month later, on 26 November, the I of A accomplished a goal that it had set out to achieve back in 1913: "(H) Court sanctioned Ordinances establishing Certificate and Diploma in Archaeology" (U of L Annals 1920: 105).

At the beginning of 1921, the Institute made two new staff appointments. Firstly, on 12 January, the U of L Annals documented that: "(A) Readership in Welsh Mediaeval Antiquities established and Mr. Edward Owen appointed to the post" (U of L Annals 1921: 106). This was followed by an entry concerning Bosanquet's replacement on 15 February: "(I) Mr. J.P. Droop appointed to the Charles W. Jones Chair of Classical Archaeology" (U of L Annals 1921: 106). According to the HSR in 1921, Droop "...took up his duties at the beginning of the Summer term" (I of A AR 1921: 10).

Following the University's authorization in 1920 for the I of A to accredit students with a Certificate and Diploma, the Institute stated that:

“Instruction is given by the staff to candidates reading for the Certificate and Diploma in Archaeology...The staff also supervises the reading in archaeological subjects of candidates for the Master of Arts Degree in the School of Ancient History” (I of A AR 1921: 6). As a consequence of this increased emphasis on teaching, however, higher demands were placed upon the library, which was “... not quite up to the standard requisite...to meet the research needs of staff or wider teaching we are now giving” (I of A AR 1921: 18). As stated above, the I of A was again suffering financial problems, which impacted on the expenditure for new books. In this context, in 1921 the HSR stated that: “...we are forced to restrict our purchases to the absolute minimum” (I of A AR 1921: 18).

The Treasurer’s Report for 1921 is particularly interesting, as it does not make reference to any particular financial crisis but does mention that: “...the Accounts are in many ways abnormal ones, covering as they do the transitional period between the old and new organisation of the Institute” (I of A AR 1921: 21). This ‘new organisation’ is entirely unexplained. The only indication of any changes being made is to the financial calendar, that had been altered in order to match that of the U of L’s; in that it now covered 13 months rather than 12. It is presumed, therefore, that this ‘new organisation’ is related to how the Institute’s finances were handled after the War.

The Institute’s financial condition continued to be a concern in the following years. The sale of duplicate artifacts that had begun in 1920 continued until 1926, in the hope that this would bring in the necessary additional income. Just as the HSR in 1921 had commented upon the lack of economic resources to improve the library, the HSR for 1922 continued in the same vein:

“...it would be idle to pretend that our library is quite adequate to either the needs or the reputation of the Institute, and when easier times return it will be the first object to call for increased expenditure” (I of A AR 1922: 18).

And yet the Hon. Treasurer’s Report for the same year commented that: “On the whole the result of the year may be considered satisfactory” (I of A AR 1922: 21), despite the fact that the grant from the U of L had dropped

by £300 compared to two years prior. The Treasurer attributed this economic satisfaction to a considerable increase in subscriptions and donations, yet the total sum of these only equated to £100.10s. 6d.

Looking at the Hon. Treasurer's Report for 1923, it indicates that the previous year's Treasurer's Report had indeed been overly optimistic in its estimates:

"It was hoped that this year it would be possible to present accounts showing what might be regarded as the normal income and expenditure of the Institute on the new basis. Unfortunately one or two items on both income and expenditure side must still be regarded as abnormal" (I of A AR 1923: 18).

Despite the Hon. Treasurer's negative perspective, the I of A saw its teaching capabilities pay off when some students succeeded in examinations or obtained Masters' degrees in 1923. Further, it appears that the Institute's economics began to improve, all be it slightly. The total revenue from subscriptions and donations increased by £21, where £45 was recovered from two years worth of Income Tax, and the City of Liverpool made a special non-recurrent grant to the total of £10 (I of A AR 1923). Later in the year, further financial help came following the death of Mrs. Ludwig Mond. The U of L Annals document that on 16 October "(B) Bequest of £500, under the Will of the late Mrs. Ludwig Mond, to the Music Fund of the department of Archaeology" (U of L Annals 1923: 120). This bequest helped to secure the fund for the Fellowship in Archaeology of Music for the next few years.

In 1924, there was a concern growing with regard to the Endowment Fund that the I of A had come to rely upon. The year prior had left a debit balance on this fund, which was subsequently wiped out by a donation from Sydney Jones of £80. A transfer was made from the General Working Account to the Endowment Fund, which the I of A hoped to continue to make in subsequent years. The Hon. Treasurer highlighted that there "is a real need at the moment to increase the Endowment Fund of the Institute, so as to make it less dependent on the generosity of one or two large subscribers" (I of A AR 1924: 20). This statement is significant because it indicates that the Institute was beginning

to realize that the days in which it could be financially dependent upon the generosity of supporters were coming to an end.

The Hon. Treasurer's Report for the following year further suggests that the I of A finances, and therefore its work, were coming under real threat:

“Additional subscriptions are a real necessity if the present activities of the Institute are to be carried on without curtailment. This is the more important when it is remembered that the Endowment Fund must largely be increased” (I of A AR 1925: 20).

The threat that the financial crisis would have upon the work of the I of A became particularly pertinent in 1926. In that year the HSR stated: “We cannot repeat too often that we cannot afford to economize on our Library. To do so regularly would be to spoil the work of years” (I of A AR 1926: 17). Equally, the Hon. Treasurer's Report noted that the Institute had closed its Classical Art Fund, the I of A's Scholarship Fund, the Spanish Fund and the Suspense Account as a consequence of the expenditures incurred during the past 12 months. The subscriptions and donations to the I of A in 1926 had dropped to £106.18s, and the U of L continued to grant only £100, as it had done since 1922.

By 1927, the Hon. Treasurer reported that: “On August 1st, 1927, the overdraft to the bank was £71.0s.11d., so that the next year starts with a burden of debt far greater than the Institute has yet bear” (I of A AR 1927: 20). It was this state of affairs that led the I of A to attempt to sell its Egyptian collection between 1928 and 1930. This proposal is discussed at length in Chapter Four. The Hon. Treasurer pressed upon the Committee the need to increase funds, ‘...if the activities of the Institute are not to be diminished’ (I of A AR 1928: 16).

This financial crisis continued to be a significant matter for the I of A, and the later ARs do not show any signs of improvement. By 1930, subscriptions and donations totaled £101.17s., and the contribution made by the U of L had dropped to £90. The ARs, therefore, show that the I of A had failed to raise sufficient capital in order to become financially independent from its shrinking pool of benefactors. Due to the inability to

raise adequate funds, the Institute never regained the momentum that it had had in its early years.

2.5: The University of Liverpool, its departments, schools and institutes

Having summarized aspects of the I of A's history in the preceding section, it is worth considering to what extent the function and structure of the Institute was comparable to other departments and schools in the University that had what were referred to as a 'teaching collections' in the early decades of the twentieth century. By comparing and contrasting the I of A with the likes of Botany and Zoology (formerly called Natural History), in addition to the LSTM, the way in which the I of A's relationship with the U of L was constructed might become clearer. The aim of this section therefore is to develop a context for the I of A's relationship with the U of L.

The departments of Botany and Zoology have been chosen for this contrast and comparison because both became involved with the dispute concerning the LMAC in 1906 as a consequence of having their own teaching collections. Thus, not only do these departments offer an insight into how some of the different entities with teaching collections were structure, but they also reveal how these entities became connected to the I of A through a variety of circumstances. Similarly, the use of the LSTM as source point of comparison is no coincidence. As was noted in the previous section, the LSTM and the I of A were directly linked through the Dean of the LSTM, Rubert Boyce. The LSTM however, is itself also worthy of note, as like the I of A it too functioned as a separate body within the U of L. That said, unlike the I of A, the LSTM was ultimately able to establish and maintain financial independence from the University, thus raising a number of questions with regards to the I of A's financial structure and its ability to become self-sufficient.

Before the faculty system was established at UC Liv in 1902, departments had no mediating body between them and the University

Council. The departments had no autonomy and were required to answer to the Council in all matters. Following the installation of the new system, departments became accountable to the faculties in which they were placed, which in turn were answerable to the University Council. In the case of the Faculty of Arts, the: “professors of...subjects, together with the Principal, the Professor of Mathematics, and what we should now call non-professorial Heads of Departments, made up the Faculty” (Kelly, 1981 125). When the Faculty of Science was constituted in June 1902, the constituent departments were Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Natural History, Botany, and Physiology, with Engineering also joining them for a short time.

The first point of contrast between University departments and the I of A, therefore, is that departments were entirely under the auspices of the University. On the contrary, and as has been discussed earlier, the I of A was structured independently of the U of L, and was not accountable to it, although the Institute did rely on the University for financial assistance. Further, the main purpose of the departments’ existence was teaching. Departments taught lecture courses with the aim of enabling students to graduate with either a certificate or degree. In contrast, it has been seen that the I of A’s main reason for existence was to develop research and archaeological excavation. While it did give ‘public’ lectures, it could be argued that this was the Institute’s method of providing a service to the University. The Institute was not granted permission from the University Council to give educational accreditation to its students until 1912, nearly a decade after the Institute was founded. This permission however, only concerned Classical Archaeology, and it was not until the 1920s that the I of A was authorized to endorse certificates, diplomas and degrees in other archaeological subjects. This fact corroborates Kelly’s assertion that “the main emphasis of the Institute was excavation and publication rather than teaching” (1981: 224).

In order to aid in teaching, many University departments housed teaching collections, which were usually referred to as Museums. Allen (1983: 93) states that by 1902, UC Liv “...could boast the existence of 10

museums, six of them in the Faculty of Medicine". Kelly (1981: 122) writes that:

"In the medical and science departments, museums of machinery, models and specimens, were regarded as essential teaching instruments, and Heads of Departments frequently devoted a great deal of time to their care and development."

One such departmental museum was Zoology. According to its first history the Department of Zoology "...was one of the three or four scientific departments with which University College opened in January, 1882" (Department of Zoology, 1905: 3). Within its museum, Zoology initially housed the collections from Geology and Prehistoric Archaeology in addition to its own department (Kelly, 1981: 122).

The Derby Professor of Natural History from 1881 to 1919, Professor W. A. Herdman (later Sir William), is said to have commented that:

"A museum in a University department need not aim at having complete series of organisms. Its main purpose is to serve as a teaching collection which will represent adequately the various types of structure which the student has to study" (Allen, 1983: 131).

It is noted that Herdman made this proclamation in 1905, at the opening of the new Zoology department building on Brownlow Street. Zoology had previously been housed "in the inconvenient and badly lighted Asylum building, though it did have a small new museum building in Ashton Street" (Kelly, 1981: 106).

Herdman was a strong believer that a museum in an educational context, such as in a University department, should "reflect the research and any special features in the teaching of the department" (Allen, 1983: 131). Further, Herdman was concerned with the way in which museums were used in teaching to such an extent that he stressed in a paper, which he gave in 1887, that:

"Their specimens should be arranged and labeled in a natural, in other words scientific, manner according to their genetic affinities and in the light of Darwinian thought, and not as a mere collection of curiosities" (Allen, 1983: 131).

Allen (1983: 131) explains that, while Herdman struggled to completely realize his ambition of how an 'ideal Natural History museum' should be

conceptualized in a University, “he was able to achieve a number of his objectives of relating museum collections to the active teaching and research of his department”. Prior to Zoology’s move to its new building in 1905, the University Calendar for that year was published. It is in this Calendar that the use and purpose of Zoology’s museum collection was clearly laid out, and its contents were outlined: (See appendix B1 (c))

The Calendar explained what the new building would provide for the museum and how teaching would benefit from this provision:

“In the new buildings...there will...be sufficient museum space to enable the collections enumerated above to be adequately displayed, both for general educational purposes and also for the needs of special classes of students...[T]here will be a special...Museum of Local Marine Biology; and a considerable amount of space...will be available for research” (U of L Calendar 1905: 149-150).

In the context of Zoology, the Calendar also made comment that:

“As there is no fund for the purchase of specimens, the Museum is dependant for its increase upon donations of friends, and many interesting specimens and preparations have been given by former students and others interested in the Natural History Department” (U of L Calendar 1905: 149).

This latter point is interesting, as it is similar to the Egyptian collection in the I of A, which was “provided by the munificence of various friends of the University...from excavations made during the past years in Egypt” (U of L Calendar 1905: 145). The Calendar helps to indicate that both the I of A and the Zoology department relied on outsiders to contribute to, and expand, their collections. Yet the 1905 Calendar does not describe the use and purpose of the I of A’s collection in the same way that it does Zoology’s. It merely lists the objects contained within the Institute’s collection, the place from which they originated or were excavated, and the ways in which they were housed by the Institute; in which rooms and cabinets. The shape of the description regarding the I of A’s collection in the Calendar changed over time. This is worthy of note, as the way in which the wording changed was a significant aspect of the tensions that ensued between the I of A and the Public Museum in 1906. This tension is discussed further in chapters Four and Five.

Besides Zoology, the Botany department was also an entity in the Faculty of Science that housed a museum collection for the purposes of teaching. When Botany first began to be taught at Liverpool, it is listed as belonging to the Medical School in the School's Annual Report for 1884-85. It was later transferred to Zoology, where R. T. Harvey Gibson took responsibility for its teaching. Harvey Gibson's lectureship was subsequently augmented to a professorship in 1894 (Kelly, 1981). Kelly (1981: 106) states that Botany acquired new accommodation on Brownlow Street in 1901 via a gift from W. P. Hartley. While Kelly does not make it clear whether or not it was this move that resulted in Botany establishing its own department, it is known that when the Faculty of Science was created in 1902, Botany was listed as a separate department to Natural History. It was, however, in this new Botanical Laboratory on Brownlow Street that Botany's museum was situated (Allen 1983).

When discussing the teaching collections within the University, Allen notes that Botany's museum was of a similar design to Zoology's. It was situated on the ground floor of the building, where it:

“...occupied a room forty-five feet long by thirty-four feet wide, communicating with a ten-foot broad gallery. The museum accommodated both a teaching collection (plants, fruits, seeds, etc.) and an exhibition of specimens illustrative of Economic Botany, including samples of commercial products derived from vegetables” (Allen 1983: 133).

An important part of Botany's collection was its herbarium (Allen, 1983). The U of L Calendar for 1905 confirmed that Botany's museum and herbarium were fitted with cases, museum glass and “other necessary equipment”, besides there being a workshop and laboratory adjacent to the collection (U of L Calendar 1905: 151).

2.5.1: The Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine

According to the *Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine - Historical Record 1898-1920* the LSTM was “...officially opened, April 22, 1899” (LSTM 1920: 1). Before its official opening, the George Holt Professor of Pathology, Rubert Boyce, was appointed Dean of the School on 20 January

1899. Following its inauguration, the UC Liv Calendar for 1900-1901 listed the LSTM's objectives, and the criteria for applications to the School, as follows:

"The objects of the School are (1) Study and Research in tropical diseases: (2) Organization of expeditions to the tropics: (3) The Training of men and Nurses intending to proceed to the tropics...Students must be qualified men, or must have completed at least four years of study. In other cases special application must be made" (UC Liv 1901: 74).

It appears that the LSTM was involved with UC Liv from its outset. Under the section dedicated to the LSTM, the UC Liv 1900-1901 Calendar provides an insight into the relationship that existed between both the School and the U of L:

"The School is Governed by a Committee Representative of the University of Liverpool, The Royal Southern Hospital, and the Merchants and Shipowners of Liverpool" (UC Liv 1901: 74).

While the LSTM appears to have been governed by the U of L, by way of its committee, the School in fact existed as a separate entity to the University. This therefore leaves one pondering over the exact association between the two. In order to help clarify this, the *Historical Record* includes a letter sent from the LSTM to Dale:

"On November 7th [of 1904], it was resolved that the attention of the Council of the University be drawn to the condition of the finances of the Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine; and that the consideration of the services rendered to the University by the School and of the increasing sum required for the conduct of the School on its present scale, the University be asked to relieve the School of the expenses incurred in the maintenance of University laboratories, set apart for the use of the School, which expenses at present to a sum of £620 per annum" (LSTM 1920: 5).

On 12 November 1904, Dale responded to the LSTM's letter with the following:

"1.The Resolution and the financial statement that you forward shall be laid before the Council at an early meeting. The agenda paper for next Tuesday has already gone out, and I cannot bring up the business then...3. Will you kindly let me know how the total cost of Maintenance - £620- is made up?" (Dale 12 November 1904: 181).

These two letters aid in identifying how the relationship between the LSTM and the U of L functioned. The LSTM provided a service to the U of L, which was teaching. Further, it provided facilities for instructing the

University's students. The School's principal function, however, was research and the cure of tropical diseases. This is similar to the I of A's situation, in which its main focus was excavation and archaeological research. Therefore it is possible that the interaction that existed between the LSTM and the U of L was similar to that of the I of A and the University. On the one hand the service that was performed by the I of A for the U of L was lecturing, whereas on the other, the service performed by the LSTM was teaching. Initially, the LSTM's relationship to the U of L was partly financially based, while at the same time their affiliation to each other offered each body a reciprocal 'distinction'. This is again similar to the I of A and U of L, as both parties benefited from their affiliation. This, as emphasized in Section 2.3 above, was demonstrated in the article published in the *Liverpool Post* on 4 July 1904.

The exchange between Dale and the LSTM shows that the latter's monetary request to the University was based on services provide by the School for the University. In contrast, however, it has been demonstrated previously that from its outset, the I of A relied upon the U of L's financial aid to assist in maintaining its existence. In turn, the I of A could be seen as performing its service of lecturing in recompense for the financial assistance provided by the University.

While observing how the LSTM and I of A compare with regards to their respective relationships to the U of L, it is of equal interest to examine the association that existed between the LSTM and Institute. Various ways in which these two bodies were connected have been discussed previously in this chapter. Indeed, it was shown that Boyce was a significant factor in the connections between the I of A and the LSTM. This was at both a financial and academic level. Since Boyce was on the I of A's founding Committee, it can be assumed that he was somehow involved with the rental agreements that took place between the two bodies, and that he was also involved in connecting the I of A to Gann, resulting in the formation of the British Honduras Excavation Committee, of which Boyce was a member.

Boyce clearly played an influential role in the U of L. Before UC Liv became an independent institution, he was on the Senate of University College, and “favoured its development and expansion into an independent and autonomous university” (Sherrington 2004). In his position as both an officer for the UC Liv and the Corporation, he played an influential role in promoting the success of the U of L in its early years. He endowed four chairs in the new University, and later proved to benefit the LSTM through his skills in organizing and fund-raising (Sherrington 2004); ‘He often joked that the word ‘cash’ would be found written across his heart’ (Sherrington 2004).

What is significant, for the purposes of this section, is the extent to which Boyce may have influenced the I of A, especially with regards to its relationship to the U of L. It can be argued that Boyce played a partial role in the I of A’s development after several years of its existence, due to the fact that it was Boyce who first insisted that the Institute bring out a journal concerning its work, in order to stimulate financial support from the public. With this mind, therefore, did Boyce also play a role in developing the I of A’s independent stance from the U of L? Owing to a lack of evidence, this question remains unanswered, yet it seems a plausible idea based upon his overall interactions with the I of A.

In the same way that Zoology and Botany had museums that were used as teaching collections, the LSTM followed in the same way. As Allen (1983: 97) states:

“From its foundation in 1899, the Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine has been conscious of the need to provide material for visual and practical instruction in tropical medicine. Specimens were received from all over the world, a most important source being thirty-two expeditions sent abroad by the School between 1899 and 1914. The museum has been shown to the School’s overseas visitors from an early date, but, in the light of its primary purpose as a teaching collection, it was not opened to the public until 1926, when, during Civic Week, the public were invited to view an exhibition illustrating tropical diseases, their causes and prevention.”

The main difference between the collections housed by Zoology, Botany and the LSTM was that the latter’s was not on display to the public, whereas Zoology and Botany’s were. Equally, the I of A’s professed

teaching collection was also on display to the public. This therefore allows for a comparison between the School, Departments, and the Institute with regards to their respective collections.

There are no written indications that the LSTM did not directly own its collection whereas the I of A's was predominantly a collection in which artifacts had been loaned. The reasoning for this latter fact regarding the I of A's collection is substantiated in Chapter Four. Nevertheless, the point of comparison here is that the LSTM's collection existed for the specific purpose of teaching and research. This contrasts with the other three collections, which while being used for teaching, remained accessible to the public. Therefore, not only did the LSTM function independently from the U of L, but it also maintained control over its teaching collection. Similarly, while although Botany and Zoology were departments of the University, control over their collections appeared ambiguous, as will be shown in Chapter Five. To the contrary, with regard to the I of A's collection, a loan collection, by its title, cannot have been under the control of those who housed it, as it did not own the pieces. The I of A's relation to its collection will be examined in greater detail in Chapters Four and Five.

With the collections of Zoology and Botany in mind, it was the entries in the 1905 Calendar regarding their museums that assists in the departments' connection to the incident involving the I of A and the LMAC in 1906. It was this particular Calendar that was to become a subject of debate in the ensuing episode, and it is for this reason that Botany and Zoology figure in this contrast with the I of A, its collection and relationship to the U of L.

2.7: Conclusion

The period of 26 years that this chapter covers has demonstrated various highs and lows in the history of the I of A. A dominant and recurring factor in that history is that of its financial difficulties, as there emerged an almost constant call for financial help from the Institute throughout the period under consideration. With what seems to have been

a continual culture of expansion from the very beginning, the Institute was consequently spread monetarily thin; and was almost perpetually poverty-stricken.

Despite its initial successes in its academic appointments and physical size, it appears to have failed to establish a strong financial foundation that would provide any long-term planning. Even when the Institute did manage to achieve a degree of financial stability through its main source of income – via the generosity of its benefactors and the U of L - there was still no question over the need to consolidate its finances for the future. The I of A had the opportunity to strengthen its economic base during the first decade of its existence, prior to the War. Although it took itself down a new path of establishing student endowments, rather than reinforce an attitude of cautious expenditure in the long-term, the Institute attempted to continue its regular expansion. While this ultimately gave the I of A added credit as an educational centre, a question that arises is: why did the I of A not seek to create for itself a continual source of financial stability, or alternatively, complete monetary independence from any other affiliate or institution?

There appears not to have been any real concern raised over the fact that the I of A was financially dependent upon the generosity of a small group of donors until 1924; 20 years into its existence. The mentality that prevailed, therefore, it is argued was one in which the proverbial boat was being continually patched. It is clear that the Institute suffered greatly after the War. This was due to deaths of a generation of benefactors, and a potentially declining interest in the Institute and its work. The latter was ultimately demonstrated by the decline in annual subscriptions, which seemed to be an on-going problem after the War.

Another issue that may have impacted the Institute's finances after the War is that although Garstang was still a member of staff at the Institute, he spent a portion of the academic year in Palestine. Undoubtedly, Garstang was one of the initial driving forces behind the establishment of the Institute. His reputation as a successful archaeologist and prolific excavator brought distinction to both the I of A and the U of L. Similarly,

the reputation that followed Garstang is likely to have been one of the causes for the interest and support given to the Institute during its first years by members of the richer citizenry of Liverpool and those involved in the University as a whole. After the War, however, Garstang could have possibly lost some of his own interest in the I of A, spending increased time in Palestine. He seemed to be trying to refocus his academic attentions while still managing to keep his foot in the door by holding on to his Chair. Therefore, to what extent did Garstang's lack of presence at the I of A impact upon its financial situation following WW1? What could be argued is that without Garstang's constant attention, overall enthusiasm for the Institute may have waned thus leading to its further financial struggles.

In this version of the history of the I of A, the matter of education became a reoccurring issue, yet it was not until the academic session 1912-1913 that there was a real push for a focus on education within the Institute. Five years before, Boyce had cited education as a motivating factor for the *Annals of Archaeology*. Further, it was in 1906 that the U of L Council made the claim that "the university was ...equipped for the study of archaeology on a scale without parallel in other British Universities" (U of L Council 1906). Was this scale of study, however, intended for students or academic researchers? The U of L's claim regarding archaeological education was made just two years after the Institute was founded. Furthermore, education had been one of the I of A's primary aims listed in its Preliminary Prospectus of 1904. Why then did it take another several years for the education of students to become a significant concern to the Institute? A potential factor could have been that in 1911, Classical Archaeology, in essence run by Bosanquet, achieved the distinction of being the first department in the I of A to be authorized to offer a formal qualification in the subject. A Certificate in Archaeology was not offered until 1920. Is it possible that the committee thought that it was time to change the focus of the I of A, and possibly to reinvent itself as an apparatus of higher learning? If so, why?

Finally, the contrast made between the I of A and the departments of Botany and Zoology shows that the Institute's relationship with the U of

L was unique. Although it was not a part of the University, as was the case of Botany and Zoology, the I of A remained financially dependent upon the University throughout the period discussed in this thesis. The Institute was similar to the LSTM, however, in that both were separate entities from the U of L. Further, the primary focus of these relationships was that both performed a service for the University. The I of A gave lectures, while the main function of the LSTM, as a 'School', was to teach. With regard to finances, the LSTM seemed to be paid for the services it provided for the U of L, whereas the Institute appears to have given lectures in response to the economic support it received from the University.

CHAPTER THREE

Inter-relations between various Museum Collections, their Founders, and their Development

3.1: Introduction

A report entitled *University Museums in the United Kingdom: A National Resource for the 21st Century*, which was authored and published by the University Museums UK Group (2004), stated that: 'Many university museums have their roots in 19th century teaching collections, some of which are now superfluous to undergraduate courses while others are well – and even increasingly- used' (2004: 5). This statement points one towards four museum collections which are discussed in this chapter. The focus of this chapter is an examination of the origins and development of three university collections – University College London (UCL), Manchester Museum (MM) and Queen's University Belfast (QUB) - which were all assembled during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and are thus contemporaneous with the founding of the I of A's collection. Further, this chapter investigates the connections between the founders of these four museum collections, besides the extent to which the practices of the respective founders in cataloguing artefacts from excavations are comparable.

One of the most distinctive features that emerges with regard to the origins of the four collections is that the individuals who were responsible for them had relationships with one another. This fact ultimately affected where artifacts were housed after their excavation or acquisition. Furthermore, as will be shown, all of the museums named shared an important common dynamic; that of Flinders Petrie.

From 1892 Petrie was the Edwards Professor of Egyptian Archaeology and Philology at UCL until his retirement in 1933. Part of his appointment meant that he curated the Edwards Collection, which had been bequeathed to the University after the death of Amelia Edwards in

1892. Petrie also had responsibility for overseeing the library and its collection (Drower 1995). Petrie's early excavations in Egypt greatly contributed to the Edwards collection, while his subsequent excavations helped to foster its growth. In making significant contributions to the field of archaeology, Petrie indirectly spread his archaeological practices throughout the other institutions discussed in this chapter. It will become evident that Petrie was either the person who 'trained' those who had started the collections at the university museums discussed herein, or else acted as the primary source of the artifacts that came to be their basis. In particular instances, both of these phenomena are so.

While the collections at the I of A and QUB were aided by Petrie's direct assistance through the 'training' of their curators, the MM, in contrast, only benefited through the receipt of Egyptological and archaeological artifacts found during Petrie's excavations. These excavations were in great part due to funding provided by Jesse Haworth and Martyn Kennard. Haworth, Kennard and Petrie developed the Egyptological and Archaeological collection at the MM concomitantly with the collection at UCL. Despite the origins of these two collections slightly predating those of the I of A and the QUB, between 1909 and 1914, all four developed simultaneously. This chapter therefore shows that Petrie was indirectly a partial catalyst in the creation of what came to be called the LC at the I of A, and the teaching collections at UCL, the MM and the QUB.

Following a review of the sources used in writing this chapter, Section 3.2 pays attention to the Manchester Museum. The MM initially focused on Natural Science, rather than on archaeology and Egyptology, and its collection was principally assembled for viewing. It was through the involvement of benefactors of the University Victoria Manchester with the museum, however, that the collection began to resemble those of the other three institutions discussed in this chapter. Dr. Jesse Haworth and Martyn Kennard made donations of archaeological and Egyptological artifacts that ultimately expanded the range and focus of the MM collections, giving an impetus for the collection to be used in teaching. Jesse Haworth was a yarn textile merchant in Manchester and amateur Egyptologist. He funded

Petrie's excavations in Egypt with Martyn Kennard, who was a writer and a prominent engineer in Manchester, who was also a strong benefactor of archaeology (Dawson & Uphill 1972).

The Haworth Wing at the MM was opened in 1912 to house the Egyptological and archaeological collections. Consequently, the archaeological aspect of the museum was provided with an appropriate niche. A noteworthy aspect of Section 3.2 is that the museum collection at Manchester was not originally assembled with the principal aim of teaching. This therefore stands in contrast to the self-professed claims by the I of A and its collection, which, as seen in the preceding chapter, was held, at least on paper, for the purpose of teaching.

In contrast to the collections at the MM, the QUB collection was assembled at its inception in 1909 with the specific purpose of teaching. Section 3.3 examines the life and career of the museum curator at QUB, K. T. Frost. This section demonstrates that Frost had a connection to Petrie as a consequence of being one of his former assistants, and which aided Frost's ability to establish a teaching collection at QUB. While Frost was the curator at QUB he created a catalogue for the artifacts that had been accessioned. Frost's emphasis on cataloguing can possibly be related to his time with Petrie. This is shown by considering the training of another of Petrie's assistants, Arthur Weigall. Through the study of Weigall's time with Petrie, possible insights are obtained into how Frost, and even Garstang, were trained. As established in the introductory chapter, Garstang was one of Petrie's students and assistants from 1899 until 1901, establishing their connection.

As the preceding sections consider the origins of the collections and connections between the various personalities who worked at UCL, the MM and QUB, Section 3.4 discusses Garstang and the differences in his cataloguing practices that can be drawn with regards to his work, in contrast to the individuals and institutions examined in the aforementioned sections. Section 3.4 also raises questions about Garstang's relationship with Petrie. These are a result of examining some letters written by Harold E. Jones, who was an assistant to Garstang. These letters provide a perspective on

how Garstang worked in the field, besides indicating the relationship that he had with Petrie as one of his assistants and later as a professional. This section ultimately provides an insight into Garstang's character, which helps to demonstrate Garstang's methods in assembling the LC, which is discussed in detail in Chapter Four.

Section 3.5 begins with a statement made by the I of A regarding competition, or lack of, between UCL and the British Museum (BM). This statement is used in order to help demonstrate and understand elements of Petrie and his work and character further. In order to establish the validity of the I of A's claim regarding the relationship between UCL and the BM, a number of incidents that occurred between Petrie and various individuals at the BM are reviewed in this section. As will be demonstrated, the I of A appears to have been correct in its opinion that there was no competition between the two institutions. Further, this section also provides greater context to how Petrie became linked to the MM.

Firstly, however, it is worth considering why other particular University museum collections that already existed in the nineteenth century, such as the Ashmolean Museum (AM) at the University of Oxford and the Hunterian Museum (HM) at the University of Glasgow, have not been used in this discussion. This is due to the fact that the origin and creation of the collections examined here lie predominantly in the 19th century, whereas the AM and HM were founded much earlier than most other museum collections, and, not for the same reasons.

The origins of the collection at the AM date back to the early 17th century. The collection was originally assembled by Elias Ashmole, an antiquarian and astrologer, who began cataloguing his collection of curiosities in the early 1650s. He left his collection to the University of Oxford prior to his death in 1692, with the stipulation that a building be constructed to house the collection (Hunter 2004). By the 1670s Ashmole's collection had grown beyond simple curiosities, and included Roman artifacts, and, amongst other things, an extensive numismatic collection, manuscripts, and a number of geologic and zoological specimens (MacGregor 2001). The doors to the AM officially opened on 21 May 1683

(MacGregor 2000: 6), making it the oldest extant museum in Britain. Although re-housed in 1908 after the consolidation of Oxford's various university collections (Hunter, 2004), it is clear that the AM collections were on the majority assembled well before that of the I of A, MM, UCL and QUB, and under different circumstances.

The origins of the HM collection lie with William Hunter, a socially well-connected anatomist, physician and man-midwife who was born in Scotland in 1718 (Brock 2004). Hunter's professional status brought wealth and contacts that allowed him to indulge in his interests of antiquarianism and collecting. He held a coin collection said to have been only second in size to that of the King of France (Brock 2004). By 1768, Hunter had a large room in a newly built home in London, which was dedicated as a museum. Here, a variety of collections were housed:

"His collection of anatomy preparations was vast...Hunter purchased minerals and curiosities brought back from Cook's voyages. In 1781 incunabula and 656 manuscripts. He received many gifts for the museum, and his library and museum were open to all who wished to use them. Duplicates were given to universities, institutions, and friends" (Brock 2004).

The collection remained in London and was used for teaching purposes in lectures of anatomy for 30 years after Hunter died in 1783. Hunter's English will stated that it was to then be given to his *alma mater*, the University of Glasgow (U of G; Brock 2004). In order for the U of G to house the collection, Hunter left a provision of £8,000 in his Scottish will for the university. It stated that the money be made available to the Principal and professors of the University, and that it be invested. Further, his Scottish will stipulated that:

"...the "rents, interest and profits" were to be allocated, one half to the English Trustees to maintain and augment the collection while still in London...the other half to go towards "purchasing a spot or piece of ground, in or near the College of Glasgow, and in or towards erecting and building a fit and commodious house or buildings for the reception of my book, and all the above mentioned articles contained in my museum", and also towards the cost of transporting the collection from London and arranging it within the new building" (Keppie 2007: 33).

Consequently, the HM was founded in 1807.

When juxtapositioned against the I of A's collection, the Ashmolean and Hunterian museum collections fall into a similar category as one another. Both the latter collections are not as contemporary as that of the former's, and the roots of these University collections were grounded prior to the beginning of the nineteenth century. The Ashmolean, in particular, is considered to be the oldest museum in Great Britain, and one of the oldest in the world (MacGregor 2000). Equally, the Hunterian is the oldest in Scotland (Keppie 2007), and being bequeathed to the University of Glasgow in 1783, similarly fails to fit into the criteria as a 'contemporary' collection.

3.1.1: Literature

The documentary sources that were accessed, while researching for the writing of this chapter, are largely of a secondary nature. In Section 3.2, which focuses on the Manchester Museum (MM), the work of Alberti (2009) is relied upon heavily. Alberti's recent study of the MM provides a comprehensive history, through which the origins and growth of the museum are concisely explained. In addition to Alberti, a journal published by the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society (1913, onwards) provides reminiscences by Haworth concerning Petrie. The same journal also published a report of a lecture given by Haworth concerning the expansion of the MM.

The sources utilized in Section 3.3 for a study on Frost and the QUB are predominately from the *Ulster Journal of Archaeology* (the UJA hereafter), along with a short study by Dunlop (2007). These two sources represent the only published literature available, to date, concerning Frost and the QUB. Frost is also referred to by Petrie in his autobiography (1932: 192). Petrie's reference, however, does not compare to the depth of information found in the UJA articles. The overall lack of published resources available, therefore, has created difficulties in forming an extensive narrative for this section.

The earliest reappraisal of Frost's work at QUB was a poorly edited re-print of Frost's original 1910 catalogue for the QUB collection (Russell, 1969). Russell divided Frost's catalogue into five sections. He briefly commented on the material listed in Frost's collection and the use of it. Nothing more was published about the QUB collection until Dunlop (2000) produced a more complete and satisfactory discussion about Frost; explaining his career and his contribution to the Department of Archaeology at QUB. Dunlop's discussion is in the form of a biographical article written in a colloquial style. The first half of the article focuses on Frost's life, while the latter part discusses his brief military service and subsequent death in the Great War. The article not only provides an insight into Frost's life, but also gives the reader a glimpse into the man's philosophy and passion for his work.

Dunlop and Hartwell (2004) published an article concerning Frost and the QUB, which specifically considered Frost as a curator and explored how he went about assembling the museum collection. By using letters written by Frost, the two authors provide a deeper insight into the character of Frost. This particular source is also significant because it represents the entirety of what is believed to be the original printing of Frost's catalogue from 1910. Furthermore, this reprint of the catalogue includes Frost's original notes, found in the Archaeology department of QUB. These notes are significant because they enable the reader to understand who it was that excavated the pieces referred to in the catalogue. This consequently allows for extensive cross-referencing with other pieces from the same excavation. Thus, the artifacts can be traced back to their original sources. Equally, Dunlop and Hartwell's reprint provides a much clearer and more concise layout of Frost's catalogue than that given by Russell (1969), therefore making it much easier to read and, consequently, from which to work. Overall, Dunlop and Hartwell provide a deeper understanding of the QUB teaching collection and its first curator, thus making it an indispensable source in the writing of Section 3.3. Dunlop (2007) later examined Frost's career in a different light; more as an academic than as a curator. Dunlop also explored Frost's theories on Atlantis. While not immediately as relevant

as the other articles used in this section, this piece does offer a view of the curator from an alternative perspective.

Section 3.3.1 presents a summary of the training that Petrie may have provided to Frost and Garstang. This is based on the biography of Arthur Weigall (Hankey 2001). Weigall was an Egyptologist and author, who was trained by Petrie. He later worked for the Egyptian Department of Antiquities as an Inspector from 1905 until 1914. Weigall's life and training are discussed in this section via the use of his personal letters, as used in Hankey's (2001) biography of Weigall, who was her grandfather. The letters Hankey uses were written to colleagues, friends and family. They are significant because they give anecdotal accounts about Weigall's experience as an assistant to Petrie, in addition to the methods Petrie used to train his students while working under him. Weigall's letters also indicate how Petrie was viewed by some of his former assistants, including the British Archaeologists James Quibell and Arthur Mace. Further, Weigall came to know Garstang as a fellow assistant during his time with Petrie, mentioning him in a small anecdote.

Hankey's biography of her ancestor helps to provide yet another perspective of Petrie that is not always as favorable, and at times, quite different to Drower's (1995) biography of Petrie. This tarnishing effect of Petrie can be said to be a simple consequence and by-product of Hankey's description of her grandfather. Hankey's representation of Weigall's experience as one of Petrie's assistants through his letters, nevertheless, aids in understanding the ways in which Petrie may have trained both Frost and Garstang. In turn, therefore, Weigall's letters offer further knowledge concerning the practices that Frost and Garstang acquired, which they subsequently implemented while curating their respective university collections.

In Section 3.4, various letters are used that are taken from the archive of Harold E. Jones. Jones' letters used in this section provide a day-to-day perspective of Jones's time spent with Garstang in Egypt. They therefore allow for a very personal, albeit one-sided, view of Garstang as a field archaeologist. In the Jones' letters there is just one reference made to

Petrie and his wife, Hilda. Yet this one remark concerning the Petries serves to reinforce the perspective that is given by Hankey in her study of Weigall.

Lastly, in Section 3.5, Petrie's autobiography, *Seventy Years in Archaeology* (1932), is referred to. Petrie's memoirs are ambiguous, however, as there appear to be some very large gaps in the narrative concerning his professional relationships with some of his contemporaries. Petrie himself recognized this fact. In the foreword he stated: "This is only the record of the work, and of what led me up to it, and has nothing otherwise to do with the inner life" (1932: 1). Through a critical reading of Petrie's memoir, it becomes apparent that if he had issues with someone, they were scarcely commented upon, if mentioned at all. The word 'issues' is used in this context to refer to instances of frictions that occurred while Petrie worked with and for various museum and Egyptological bodies. Such an example is observed in Section 3.6 with regards to his interaction with R. S. Poole, Sir Charles Newton and E. A. Wallis Budge at the BM. Given the issues that are discussed later in this chapter with regard to these three individuals, it would appear that Petrie's "inner life" did in fact manage to make its way on to the pages of his book.

In order to fill in some of the gaps left by Petrie, Drower's (1995) biography entitled *Flinders Petrie: A life in Archaeology* is of vital importance. This fact is demonstrated in Section 3.5. While it can be argued that Drower was a sympathetic biographer of Petrie, thus writing with a certain element of bias, she does provide a particular perspective of Petrie in regard to his personality and character that his own autobiography does not allow for. In turn, this helps to create a broader picture of how he worked both in the field and with his contemporaries.

3.2: The Manchester Museum

What became the MM started as the private collection of John Leigh Philips (1761-1814). Philips was a Manchester textiles manufacturer, who assembled a private collection ranging from fine art to antiquities and

Natural History specimens (Alberti 2009). After Philips died in 1814, Thomas Henry Robinson, another Manchester merchant, purchased the collection for just under £5500. In 1821 Robinson was declared bankrupt, and with a lack of space in his home to keep it, had to sell the collection. The 'Manchester Society for the Promotion of Natural History' (MSPNH), of which Robison was a member, agreed to buy the collection, with each member contributing £10 toward the total price. Before the collection could be sold, however, Robinson died, and the collection was subsequently purchased from his family for £400 by the MSPNH. By 1824 the MSPNH had become the Manchester Natural History Society (MNHS), and was housing the collection in its own museum (Alberti, 2009). By the mid-1850s the museum was suffering financial difficulties because of low subscriptions, and poor attendance, along with the competition from the Salford Museum two miles away. It was in this climate that Owens College (OC) agreed to take on the collection:

“Salvation came from close to home in the form of Owens College, the first of the ‘civic colleges’ in provincial England... Founded 1851, Owens had struggled through its first decade, but in the 1860s was beginning to thrive” (Alberti 2009: 22).

Although ownership of the collection was transferred to OC, the college was unable to move the museum’s contents due to a lack of space. Following the transfer of ownership, Alberti notes that in “...January 1868 the Natural History Society formally dissolved” (Alberti 2009: 22). By this time the collection had grown considerably. Due to a desire, on the part of the college, that the collection become “purely scientific”, the “articles that had no relationship” to the more scientific aspects of the collection, such as “anthropogenic” pieces, were sold (Alberti 2009: 22). Interestingly, however, the sales excluded the Carthaginian and Egyptian artifacts that were part of the collection at the time (Alberti 2009). In 1873, what was termed a smaller and more focused collection was physically moved to OC:

“The collections themselves finally arrived at the college in 1873, a surprising site as they trundled in carts...many of the larger quadrupeds visible to the citizenry. They were stored in the college attics...with exception of the giraffe and the elephant which remained on the ground floor” (Alberti 2009: 22).

Thereafter, in 1880, the college was granted its Royal Charter and became the Victoria University of Manchester (VUM). After the elephant and the giraffe had been used for purposes of teaching, the remaining collection was removed from storage and put on display (Alberti 2009). Thus, the MM was opened to the public in 1890.

“The Manchester Museum was founded as an institution devoted to natural history, but did not remain so for long. Even by the time it fully opened in 1890, some man-made things were on display beside natural specimens” (Alberti 2009: 64).

The expansion in the focus of the museum was largely due to the work of Sir William Boyd Dawkins (1837–1929). Dawkins was a geologist and palaeontologist, and was Curator at the MM from 1869 to 1890 (Tweedale 2004). Alberti describes Dawkin’s attitude to his curatorship as follows:

“For Dawkins, Archaeology and Anthropology were cognate enterprises that were bordered by history and paleontology...The material culture upon which these were based could therefore be arranged in an uninterrupted sequence of development that encompassed both nature and culture...’Man and his works,’ Dawkins therefore argued, ‘must find a place in all Natural History Museums” (Alberti 2009: 65).

3.2.1: The Manchester Museum and Petrie

Besides opening in 1890, the MM also received Egyptological material that year, which had been excavated by Petrie in joint ventures with Haworth and Kennard in Egypt. This material made up the majority of the Egyptological collection. According to Alberti (2009) the ‘Flinders-Petrie Collection of Egyptian Antiquities’, on loan to the museum, was kept in a separate room from Dawkin’s chronologically sequenced material. The MM, however, viewed the science students of OC as its primary audience. Despite there being an inclination towards disposing of the Egyptological collection for a want of space, it was retained because of its popularity with the public, in addition to the fact that private donations continued to arrive at the museum (Alberti 2009).

As the MM was student-oriented, something interesting occurred in contrast to the other museums discussed in this chapter. While this will be

discussed in greater detail in the following sections, in short the MM collection became one that taught. In contrast to other university museum collections, such as the QUB's, which was specifically assembled for the purpose of teaching from the onset, the MM collection developed into a reference collection used in teaching. It was at VUM, however, that the artifacts, after a sequence of journeys, formally became a teaching collection.

Over a decade after the MM opened to the public, Haworth attempted to donate his Egyptological collection to it in 1905:

“He would be absolutely willing to give to the museum at Owens College all his antiquities subject to an undertaking being given that they shall be suitably and permanently exhibited, say in a room with good light, and of not less dimensions than the upper room on the second floor...He would also require a ticket describing the object, his name should appear as contributor” (Alberti 2009: 110).

Due to the fact that the focus of the collection was towards natural science students, the offer was declined. During the following years, nevertheless, Haworth provided his support through donations towards the funding of talks given by Petrie and his wife on Egyptology, all of which drew in large audiences.

Another link between Petrie and the MM is to be found with Margaret Murray (1863-1963). As referenced in the introductory chapter to this thesis, without any formal school or university education, Murray began to study with Petrie in 1894. By 1899 she had been “appointed to a junior lectureship in Egyptology, making her the first woman in Britain to earn a living from archaeology” (Champion 1998: 179). Because of the poor stipend at UCL, Murray was forced to take on extra work, which included cataloguing for the MM (Champion 1998). In 1908, Margaret Murray unwrapped the mummy of Khnum-Nhakt - one of the ‘Two Brothers’ found by Petrie in Egypt - in front of an audience of 500 at the MM (Alberti 2009).

It was also in 1908 that Classical and Oriental Archaeology began to be taught at the UVM. As a consequence of the growth in the collection,

the MM required greater space. In order to satisfy this need, Alberti reports that:

“Encouraged [by the situation], Haworth took the one course of action he knew the Museum could not resist: he pledged £5000 for a new building. A public appeal raised a further £3000. The committee capitulated...” (2009: 69).

In the end, two buildings were added to the Museum; the first was built in 1912, and the second opened on 12 October 1913. The MM’s new galleries were in keeping with Dawkin’s original arrangement by sequence, “in which Ancient Egypt sat at the overlap of (written) history and prehistoric archaeology” (Alberti 2009: 70). With regards to the shift that occurred within the MM collection, one containing predominantly natural science pieces to one including archaeological and Egyptological artifacts, Alberti states that:

“The Manchester Museum humanities collections [collections dealing with human wares] precipitated around the seed of Haworth’s loan of Petrie’s material in the period between the opening of the Museum in 1890 and the Great War” (2009: 81).

It was Haworth who indirectly created the MM’s connection with the I of A, QUB and UCL collections. This was due to his funding of Petrie’s work in Egypt, along with Kennard’s financial support too. As discussed earlier, Haworth had been financially instrumental in creating a place for the Archaeological and Egyptological collections at the MM; “The Museum [MM] had Jesse Haworth to thank for its founding Egyptological collection” (Alberti 2009: 102). On 1 January 1887 Haworth received a letter from Edwards with regard to Petrie. Petrie had officially resigned from the EEF on 16 October 1886, as a consequence of conflicts that had occurred with Stuart Poole (Drower 1995). Section 3.5 discusses this conflict in more detail. Petrie therefore needed to find new sources of funds for his work. It was the aim of Edwards to acquire monetary support for Petrie in her letter to Haworth. Haworth (1913: 16) commented that Edwards stated, “It would be giving work to a great and admirable scholar, a man of chivalric honour, and advancing science”, while adding that “(h)e is the most accomplished excavator the world has ever seen” (1913: 16). Edwards’s persuasive power must have been considerable because Haworth

decided to fund the excavator. Petrie briefly explained the working arrangement made with Haworth, and also Kennard, in his autobiography:

“...I did not wish to pledge my time to be entirely in the service of anyone. The plan which worked very smoothly was that I drew on my two friends for all costs of workman and transport, while I paid my own expenses. In return, we equally divided all that came to England. Thus it was in my interest to find as much as I could” (Petrie 1932: 79).

According to a memorial about Haworth by the Curator of Egyptology at the MM, Winifred M. Crompton, the arrangement between Haworth and Petrie “...lasted nine years, during which Mr. Haworth had the disposal of a third that was found. The great bulk of his share he handed on to the Manchester Museum...” (Crompton 1920: 51). Petrie elaborated on the process by which artifacts were divided between him, Kennard and Haworth:

“The whole proceeds I divided into three lots as equally as possible, made a list of each, sealed the lists, and sent them to one friend, who sent on two lists to the other, who returned one list to me. Then we agreed on exchanges, if desired...” (Petrie 1932: 79-80).

Haworth (1913) recounted that he and Petrie had met in Manchester, at meetings of the British Association in 1887. It is in this account that he referred to Petrie as to “... whom we are chiefly indebted to” for the Egyptological collection at the MM (1913: 15). That collection was housed in the attic of the MM until the Jesse Haworth Building was constructed in 1912 (Carpenter, 1933). The collection at the time was important; its significance was emphasized by Tattersall (1915, cited in Alberti 2009: 70-71). Tattersall (1915) referred to Petrie and quoted him as stating:

“The collection is particularly valuable to students of Archaeology because, as it has been obtained almost entirely through scientific excavations, the place in which almost every article is found is known, and also the excavators’ data for the period to which it should be assigned” (cited in Alberti 2009: 70-71).

By associating the MM collection with archaeology students, Petrie was not only underscoring its value in a general sense but also as a teaching collection. With the pieces in context to their original provenance, the students would have been able to contrast them with pieces from an

unknown origin. Students dealing with pieces that would have lacked the data mentioned by Petrie would then need to carry out extensive investigation into the origins of the pieces, in order to acquire the same or even partial information as to their history and culture.

While it can be argued that Petrie was key in establishing a connection between UCL and the MM, Garstang also helped to associate the I of A with other universities' collections, particularly with the MM. It can, nevertheless, be said that the link Garstang had to the MM was derived from the prior connection Petrie had to Manchester. This is particularly noticeable in the fact that Garstang was working with Haworth and Kennard before the founding of the I of A, and "...for two years he contributed a portion of his finds to the Manchester Museum" (Haworth 1913: 17). It is assumed that it was Petrie's earlier association with Haworth and Kennard that led to Garstang's work with the latter two, yet as there is no direct evidence to support this, it is left to simple conjecture at this point. Haworth and Kennard, nevertheless, were members of the EC prior to the I of A. Furthermore, Kennard continued his association with Garstang after the I of A was established, when he funded Garstang's Hittite excavations in 1907 (I of A AR 1908). From 1908 to 1910, Kennard not only continued to fund Garstang's Hittite digs, but also funded those in Meroe; the latter excavation was similarly funded in 1911. Another point of contact between the I of A and the MM that can possibly be attributed to Petrie and his connection with the MM is through W. B. Dawkins, who was a Vice-President of the I of A from 1904 to 1928. The associations that existed between the I of A and the MM, therefore, further aid in addressing how, and through whom, university collections and individuals were connected on a wider scale.

3.3: KT Frost, Queen's University, Belfast, and Petrie

Frost was born in 1877 at Launceston, Cornwall. He was a student at Oxford University from 1896 to 1900, and graduated with a BA in Classics and Philosophy, followed by a B. Litt in 1907. From 1900-01 he

excavated in Greece supported by a Studentship from the British School at Athens. Subsequently, between 1902 and 1903, Frost was a lecturer and tutor at Isleworth Training College, Middlesex. From 1904 until 1905 he worked in the Sinai with Petrie and became a Fellow of the Royal Geographic Society in 1905 (sponsored by his Oxford mentors, J.L. Myres, and D.G. Hogarth). Frost was employed by the Egyptian Government between 1905 and 1908, before returning to Oxford in 1908, where he worked in the Bodleian Library, taking part in the systematic revision of the library's catalogue (Dunlop and Hartwell 2004).

In 1909, Frost began lecturing at QUB. According to Dunlop and Hartwell:

“A responsibility bestowed upon KT Frost on his coming to Queen's was setting up an archaeological museum and teaching collection within the university...Some artefacts had been inherited from the classics department of the University College and it seems that others came from Frost's own collections...” (2004: 130).

Frost also took it upon himself to establish a photographic archive. In a letter of 10 January 1910 he stated, “I have had the run of all of Petrie's photographs for the last 25 years and have found his photographer and slidemaker so that we get sets made up” (Dunlop and Hartwell 2004: 130).

He went on to write:

“...the London University has bought most of Petrie's collections and is rearranging them: in this arrangement there is much they don't need themselves and which I do...The best of it is that the bulk of the stuff was found by Petrie himself or Quibell...and was brought straight to London where it has remained...it has never passed through the hands of a dealer...I have also been slogging at the British Museum... also I have to meet the Palestine Exploration Fund and lift what I can off them” (Dunlop and Hartwell 2004: 130-132).

Frost's letter demonstrates his resourcefulness in addition to his conscientiousness. It can be said that he was pleased that he had been able to acquire artifacts that had not been purchased from antiquities dealers, but that had come directly from the field via Petrie and his former assistant, James Quibell. Because of a lack of information on Frost, it is unknown exactly what Frost's opinion was with regard to the dealing of antiquities.

Given what was said in that letter, however, it can be surmised that Frost's opinion over antiquities dealing was akin to that of Petrie; neither one approved of the practice. Petrie's position on the latter was demonstrated in Section 3.4.1, and in Tattersall's (1915) assessment, in which Petrie comments upon the importance of the origins of pieces in the MM's Egyptological teaching collection.

Frost's time with Petrie and at the Bodleian would have provided him with the necessary knowledge to create a catalogue for what was to be the QUB teaching collection. In the republished version of Frost's catalogue by Russell (1969), in the revised and improved version by Dunlop and Hartwell (2004), which was based on the original, the following point is made:

"A typewritten copy of the Frost Catalogue, dated 14 March 1924, incorporates gaps in the lists for which there has hitherto been no obvious explanation...a copy of the catalogue in Frost's handwriting exists in the archives of the Department...The Mystery of the blank spaces ...is quickly solved: they represent words in Greek characters. These could not be reproduced by the typewriter and presumably had to be transcribed in ink on the Master copy, but not on the copy that survived...There is no evidence that the catalogue has been published previously, but it appears to have been compiled with the intention of it being displayed or otherwise made available to the museum" (Dunlop and Hartwell 2004: 130).

Tragically, Frost's career was cut short by his death on 14 August 1914, quite early on in the First World War, and leaves one to speculate on what may have been achieved by the Curator had he survived.

Frost's letter of January 1910 indicates that he and Petrie maintained an amicable relationship after their season of working together. Disappointingly, the only real comment that Petrie's memoirs make to any personal details regarding Frost is a list of whom Petrie took to the Sinai, and a subsequent comment concerning the death of Frost: "...K. Frost, who was killed in the war, running a machine gun singled handed and given a military funeral by the Germans" (Petrie 1932: 192). In not only mentioning Frost's death, but also how he died, Petrie indicate that he had a certain respect for Frost, at least enough to remember him in his memoir. With Petrie's tendency for omission, these lines, in addition to the aid that he provided Frost in starting the QUB collection, give rise to the indication

that there must have been some significance to their relationship. To date nothing has been found that specifically documents the dimensions of the association between Frost and Petrie. What little is hinted at, however, in Frost's letter of January 1910, gives the impression that he too had a level of respect for Petrie.

3.3.1: Petrie's training of Weigall, Frost and Garstang in archaeological practice

Hilda Petrie (Petrie's wife) helps to shed light on how Petrie first came to acquire his assistants:

"...in the early (eighteen) nineties, Flinders Petrie wrote a letter to *The Times* to invite donations to provide for expenses of a student who would for expenses of a student whom he would undertake to train. Foundations were being laid in the new science of excavation and the interpretation of results. As yet no school had risen where field volunteers could be reared, and where various methods with which he was experimenting could be practiced...A small fund, the Egyptian Research Account, was raised and renewed from year to year, which sufficed to put a student in the field and to provide excavation alongside major work. In this way...Messrs. Quibell, Green and Garstang received there training" (H. Petrie 1952: 1).

The letter mentioned by Lady Petrie was written to *The Times* and was published on 16 October 1894. As the individuals who came to work for Petrie discussed here were not his students per-se, the term assistant creates a clearer picture for purposes here. For this reason, assistant will replace Petrie's use of the term 'student' from here onwards.

Aside from the elements of Petrie's letter detailed by his wife in the above passage, Petrie is also seen to have made his feelings known regarding the Egyptian Research Account [ERA] in the letter:

"There is no lack of men willing to do such work; several have applied to me since Egyptology has been publicly established at this college [UCL]...The organization of such a scheme should grow up spontaneously to fit the requirements and opportunities that arise and no cut-and-dried rules could be suitable to begin with...I shall be on the spot carrying on my own work, and be able to help guide the new enterprise" (Petrie 16 October 1894).

The Times reported the EEF's 10th Ordinary Meeting on 14 November 1896. In that article the correspondent referred to Petrie's speech, in which Petrie mentioned the ERA: "...he had established a student fund at the University College which had proved most valuable" (*The Times* 14 November 1896).

While in the field, Petrie was known for his meticulous and disciplined work practices. These traits can be seen in his autobiography, when he stated:

"The usual time-table in the longer days was a start at 5:30; after seeing all the workers in position and booking them, I went to breakfast at 8 or 9, watching the pits with a telescope from my hut door. The rest-time was from 11:30 to 2:30, and then we went on till 6:30. After dinner, there was all the recording, marking, and stowing away of pottery and other things, and writing journal and letter till 10 or 11 o'clock" (Petrie 1932: 47).

As mentioned in Section 3.1, both Frost and his contemporary Garstang worked as assistants to Petrie. Given the description from Petrie's autobiography, it is reasonable to assume that both Garstang and Frost, while with Petrie, would have worked in a similar environment. Despite Petrie's 'recording, marking, and stowing away' of artifacts, the differences in the drive to create catalogues for their collections by Frost and Garstang were quite distinct.

Firstly, there is no evidence to suggest that Garstang ever created a formal catalogue for the LC that was housed at the I of A; there is not one to be found in the archives held by SACE at the University of Liverpool. Further, as will be seen in Chapter Five, when the I of A was reported to have created a catalogue, Garstang denied that there ever was one. In contrast, however, as Section 3.3 demonstrates, Frost had assembled a catalogue for the collection at QUB. It can be suggested that Frost's precision in his cataloging was due to the Petrie's influence on Frost.

Before either Garstang or Frost worked for Petrie, both had prior experience in excavation. This was not the case, however, for Arthur Weigall. In her biography of Weigall, Hankey (2001) provides an insight into what both Garstang and Frost may have experienced as Petrie's assistants before going out into the field. Hankey notes that, in his early work experience with Petrie in 1901, Weigall:

“...began work straight away, coming into college daily, cataloguing all the hieroglyphic inscriptions in Petrie’s collection, and then weighing all his ancient weights...this was a work of minute mathematical calculation...he literally slaved for Petrie...Every evening they [Petrie, his wife Hilda and Weigall] were the last to leave, locking up together...” (2001: 28).

Weigall’s experience, it could be argued, was unique for his lack of field experience or prior training. Yet it was not uncommon at that time to take people with no experience into the field. This is demonstrated further in Section 3.4 in the context of Garstang and one of his assistants. Hankey (2001) also mentions that Garstang was still working for Petrie when Weigall started. This would have been after Garstang’s last season in 1900-01. This fact allows one to hypothesize that Petrie’s assistants were trained with him before leaving London for Egypt and that they used training experience in the field. At the end of the excavation, the assistants were likely to have been expected to go back to England, a supposition reinforced by Hankey, who recounts how Weigall returned to England to finish his work with Petrie and to help set up the exhibition to display that season’s finds.

3.4: Garstang’s relations with Petrie

While it could be said that Weigall and Frost appeared to retain amicable relations with Petrie following their time as his assistants, it is argued that Garstang did not maintain much of a relationship with Petrie after the 1901 season. Other than an entry in the Accession Books of the I of A in October 1907, which stated, ‘Sandal soles. Presented by Mrs. Flinders Petrie. 3 soles of sandals, probably of Roman date’ (Accession No. 2027), there is no evidence of contact or correspondence between Garstang and Petrie for the years from 1901 until 1923. In his autobiography, after 1900 Petrie does not mention Garstang again until he writes about attempting to excavate at Byblos in September 1923. It was at this time that Garstang was the Director of the Department of Antiquities in British Mandate Palestine. It could have been that Petrie tried to write to Garstang about digging at Byblos in 1923, yet if he did, nothing came of it.

Given the small community that existed in the field of archaeology in Britain at the time, especially in Egyptology, it appears surprising that Garstang and Petrie did not maintain greater contact after 1901. This is especially interesting when taking into account Garstang's efforts to establish an influential group on the I of A's Committee. Consequently, a reasonable question is: did a problem exist between Garstang and Petrie? Another question is: why was Petrie not on the I of A Committee? There is no evidence that suggests he was invited or that Petrie had turned down an invitation.

In order to attempt to answer these questions, it is worth noting a number of Weigall's experiences with both Petrie and his wife. In Hankey's (2001) book, she notes some comments that Weigall made concerning Mr and Mrs Petrie:

"The professor's idiosyncrasies, and worse, his wife had taken there toll. He describes Hilda in his memoirs as being simply 'impossible', a parody of her husband with none of his charm. A season with them could reduce strong men to an incoherent rage" (Hankey 2001: 32).

Hankey further discusses Weigall's frustration, highlighting an excerpt from one of his letters that referred to Quibell and another former assistant to Petrie, Arthur Mace. The excerpt demonstrates the reactions of both Quibell and Mace to the married couple:

"Quibell, a most quiet and silent man, becomes really frightening with regard to them. If one talks very much about them, he turns quite white... Then there is Mace, also a silent man, who bursts into the most passionate language if one speaks of them, and with wild eyes and clenched fists swears vengeance. They all tell me that I should only have needed one more year with Petrie to hate him as much as I hate his wife, and certainly his behavior at the end of the season... went a good way towards that" (Hankey 2001: 32).

With the above quote in mind, it is possible that Garstang may have also fallen victim to Professor and Mrs Petrie, thus distancing himself from the couple. A further clue to the possibility of difficulties between Petrie and Garstang is found in the Jones Archive at the National Library of Wales. The frustrations that Weigall felt over the Petries are reminiscent of similar annoyances experienced by an assistant of Garstang's, Harold E. Jones.

3.4.1: Repeated patterns of working relations?

Harold E. Jones (occasionally E. Harold Jones) was born to William and Marianne Jones on 7 March 1877 in Barnsley, Yorkshire. After his father was appointed as Head-teacher at the Carmarthen School of Art, Jones attended Queen Elizabeth Grammar School in the same town. He subsequently became a pupil-teacher at the Carmarthen School of Art in 1895, until 1902, when he won a three-year scholarship to attend the Royal College of Art in London (Delaney 1986).

Jones became a skilled artist and, as Pinch-Brock states, "...his college sketchbook shows his skill in drawing archaeological artifacts" (2001: 31). While in London, however, he developed symptoms of tuberculosis. He was consequently unable to complete his scholarship course, as "...rest and a warm, dry climate were prescribed" (Pinch-Brock 2007: 31). Jones's father suggested that a cure may be found in Egypt, and that his skills as an artist could be useful in archaeological work. Through mutual friends, notably P. E. Newberry, Garstang was contacted. He subsequently "...invited the young artist to join his excavation [in Beni Hasan], even offering to pay his traveling expenses" in the spring of 1903 (Pinch-Brock 2007: 32). During the time that Jones worked for Garstang, he frequently wrote letters to his parents. Given the small community of archaeologists working in Egypt at the time, it is to no surprise that Jones commented on the disposition of Petrie and his wife. In a letter of 26 March 1904, Jones wrote:

"...[He - Petrie] has bad luck and goes back with practically nothing but Roman lamps...He is in poor health and seems in bad odour generally with people here - his wife is generally said to be the curse..." (Jones 26 March 1904).

In a fragmented letter of 5 September 1905, Jones clearly shows a number of issues that he had with regard to his relationship with Garstang. Further, the letter also displays an indication of Garstang's opinion of Petrie. In spite of the gaps in the letter, due to the illegibility of Jones's script, the point is clear. Jones states that Garstang had written a long account to *The Times*,

reporting the season's work in Egypt and published on.... Jones comments in his letter that:

“...no mention of me of course...tho' I alone did 3 sites mentioned and most of the other...while he [Garstang] only worked Negada...Such is life - the thing he complained of in Petrie - Not acknowledging assistance...But other people who know me and what I have done for him - will not think anything more of me or less of him” (Jones 5 September 1905).

While this represents Jones's perspective on the matter, it provides a possible insight into yet another reason for a distance between Petrie and Garstang. Jones's letter highlights an interesting indication of how Garstang felt as an assistant to Petrie; in that his work was not acknowledged. Therefore, with this point emphasized by Jones, it is possible to understand why there was a lack of interaction between the two parties after Garstang's last season working for Petrie.

What is ironic, however, is that Garstang's treatment of Jones worsened in the following two years. While initially Jones enjoyed a good relationship with Garstang, through which he was introduced to various other members of high society and to other archaeologists, it appears from his letters that over the course of the years Jones's regard for Garstang diminished. In a letter of 23 January 1904, Jones mentions that he and Garstang were still getting on splendidly, yet comments that Garstang is “rather absent minded at times”. On 24 January 1905, Jones sent a letter to his parents in which he stated that:

“...So far I've practically done all the work at the sites...so you can imagine it has been a busy time and I feel as tho' I've been here years tho' its only a little over a fortnight” (Jones 24 January 1905).

What Jones' letters show is that as he became more experienced as an excavator, so Garstang increasingly left him to carry out his work in Egypt. This is particularly clear in two letters written by Jones in 1906. On 26 February, Jones commented on Garstang's activities that season:

“Garstang has had a splendid year so far - playing golf and traveling about sight-seeing - he has only this week gone away with some men (20) to dig Nubia taking golf clubs with him!” (Jones 26 February 1906).

In the second letter, of 2 March, Jones emphasized this further by saying that Garstang would not want him to leave, "...as it would mean he would have to do some excavating and less golf!" (Jones 2 March 1906). The following year, in 1907, a letter written by Jones reported that Theodore Davis offered him £160 to leave Garstang's employ. Davis was an American attorney and a noted sponsor of excavations in Egypt (Drower 1995). He had first visited Egypt in 1899, where he was introduced to Newberry, who in turn encouraged Davis's interest in Egyptology. Consequently, due to his wealth, Davis "...was able to finance excavations carried out by Newberry and others, and from 1903 to 1912 had a permit to explore the Valley of the Kings under the supervision of the Antiquities Service" (Dawson & Uphill 1972: 78).

On 16 February 1907, Jones sent a letter that further explained Davis' invitation to leave Garstang:

"...Mr Davis has very kindly offered me a present of £160 for next year towards my expenses for me to give up Garstang and his excavating as the sand and pay he says are not good enough for me. He thinks I am wasted on archaeology after seeing my paintings and drawings...Garstang is offering me £130 this year after promising £150 and has extended the time from four to six months work in Egypt. Mr Davis is going to give me his commissions as usual to paint out here next year and the same figure that I am getting..." (Jones 16 February 1907).

Jones followed this with a letter six days later, stating a firm decision:

"I think I would be foolish if I did not take this opportunity as I would have a far more congenial time...Garstang will not care for me giving up the excavation outthere with him as for the very poor salary he has had an assistant who has run whole expeditions while he draws a double the amount...Garstang's new toy is a horse. So between that and golf I don't expect the work will be troubled much!" (Jones 22 February 1907).

Even after Jones left Garstang's employ, it appears that he continued to suffer uneasiness with regards to Garstang. In a letter of 4 January 1908, Jones relayed his frustration with yet another instance in which Garstang had not acknowledged his work properly. Garstang had written a book on Beni Hasan, but had failed to give any appreciation of the work Jones had carried out:

“...He just mentions me and that’s all no more. No one would gather from his mention that I did anything to help him as he acknowledges nothing” (Jones 4 January 1908).

In his letters the extent to which Jones felt his work for Garstang went unacknowledged, besides underpaid, is clear. Therefore, taking both this and Garstang’s own experience while working under Petrie, it is possible to suggest that Garstang and Petrie were in fact very similar characters when in the field.

While Jones’ letters provide the only primary data concerning Garstang’s personal experience of working for Petrie, and how this may have subsequently conditioned Garstang’s own practice in the field, it is possible to see other areas in which Petrie influenced Garstang’s later work. First, Garstang copied Petrie’s practice in exhibiting finds following a season’s expedition. Garstang’s exhibitions are discussed in chapters Four and Five. Petrie began the practice of exhibiting finds in 1884, following his return to London from excavations at Tanis in Egypt:

“The objects which I was allowed to retain I showed in London, at the first of a long series of annual exhibitions which has done much to educate the public.

I had written to Poole saying that a room should be obtained for exhibition; but all that was done was to agree on a shed at the back of a dealer’s garden. This was utterly impossible, so I went to the Royal Archaeological Institute...and got the loan of their room. This led to my continuing to exhibit in that building until I was housed at University College” (Petrie 1932: 52).

Second, it can be argued that Garstang subsequently developed the model Petrie used to divide artefacts between himself, Haworth, Kennard, further in the way that he structured the EC in funding his excavations. Garstang’s version of Petrie’s model is reviewed in the following chapter.

The interplay of relations between universities, their respective museums, and those individuals that aided in their foundations and subsequent development have been the focus of the discussion up to this point in this chapter. It has been considered how far Petrie can be used to link various aspects of QUB, the MM, UCL and the I of A, besides how his archaeological practices may have influenced the way in which the

collections at these institutions developed by way of their ‘founders’. This is particularly relevant in the case of Frost and Garstang. The next section helps to demonstrate other aspects of Petrie and his character, besides other interactions he had with contemporaries working within the discipline of archaeology.

3.5: UCL and the BM

In a document written by the Institute of Archaeology in 1906, an anonymous person stated that: “...just a few hundred yards from the British Museum, UCL had its own teaching collection and the two were not competitive...” (I of A 1906: 3). The document was a response to a claim made by the Public Museum in Liverpool that the I of A was competing with it and its collection. It seemed to have been written by the I of A as a way of comparing the Institute and the Public Museum with two other institutions in the UK that had similar characteristics respectively. By investigating the relationship between the collections at UCL and the British Museum, this section will further support the argument that there were many connections between the founders of various museum collections in the UK. It also gives further insight into how Petrie worked and the type of relationships he had with his contemporaries, particularly when he was not only in the field, but also when working in the museum.

The I of A was content in its claim that there was no competition between UCL and the BM. While the I of A offered no rationale as to why it made this statement, it can be assumed that it was based upon knowledge that the museum collection at UCL simply existed as a teaching collection, and thus there was no threat to the BM, which principally existed as a collection for viewing by the general public. What is key here, however, is that it was Petrie who formed any connection that existed between the BM and UCL. When Garstang was an assistant for Petrie in the late 1890s, the archaeological community of academics across the museums of universities was small. It can be assumed, therefore, that Garstang would have been aware of the relationship that Petrie had with the BM as a consequence of

his two season's working for him, which subsequently helped inform the I of A's statement regarding competition.

Yet the association that Petrie had with the BM was less than positive, as it appears that he would try to avoid various individuals who held significant posts at the museum. This reticence was due to disputes between him and its staff, which consequently left Petrie with personal grievances over those concerned. His disputes were with individuals such as Poole, Newton and Budge, of the BM. Stuart Poole was a numismatist and Egyptologist, and the Keeper of Numismatics at the BM between 1870 and 1893 (Caygill 2004). He was also a co-founder of the Egyptian Exploration Fund (EEF) with Amelia Edwards in 1882 (EEF). Edwards was an author and Egyptologist. She was also a major supporter of Petrie during his early career (Manley 2004). See Petrie's biography in Appendix F-1 for more information on Edwards.

The EEF was a "society for the promotion of excavation" in Egypt (Drower 1995: 63). Sir Charles Thomas Newton was a Classical Archaeologist and the Keeper of Greek and Roman Antiquities at the BM from 1869 until 1885 (Cook 2008), and was also involved in the founding of the EEF. Sir Ernest Alfred Wallis Budge was an Orientalist and Keeper of Oriental Antiquities for the BM from 1894 until 1924 (Smith 2004). He also collected antiquities for the BM in Egypt between 1886 and 1913.

According to his autobiography, Petrie's association with the BM was based on his past relationship with the EEF that dated back to 1883. Petrie's work with the EEF started late that year and continued until 1886 (Petrie 1932). It was in 1886, however, that disputes occurred between Petrie and those at the BM, which ultimately led to him resigning from the EEF. These disputes were linked to Poole and Newton and their management of the EEF, which Petrie commented upon in his autobiography. As an example of Petrie's feelings over the management of the Fund:

"The constant mismanagement of affairs in London made the conditions of work too impossible. Poole and Newton cut out the founder, Miss Edwards, deciding on work without her or the

committee; yet without the advantages of autocracy in promptitude and foresight. When reform was decided on by a meeting of the committee, it was quashed by Newton ordering that the resolutions passed should be suppressed. After this there was no hope of securing tolerable management, and I felt it necessary to resign. At the fund annual meeting the reason was concealed, by Poole stating falsely that my health suffered, that it was necessary for me to retire, and that he had arranged lighter work for me" (Petrie 1932: 47).

Petrie went on to write that following this, he did in fact make it to Egypt in 1887, taking photographs for the Eugenicist, Francis Galton.

Petrie's dealings were with the EEF and not directly with the BM. The BM, however, employed both Poole and Newton, the controlling influences in the EEF at that time. Petrie also notes that Amelia Edwards was the founder of the EEF, when in fact she was a co-founder along with Poole. This fact is supported by both Caygill (2004) and Manley (2004). One can only speculate as to why Poole cut Edwards out of the decision making process. One explanation may lie in the fact that Edwards lived in Bristol (Drower 1995), while the EEF was run out of the BM in London. It would have therefore been much easier to remove Edwards from the decision making process than to include her. Another plausible suggestion is that Edwards was a victim of academic and intellectual snobbery, as well as male chauvinism. Nonetheless, what is clear is that Petrie took these dealings with Poole and Newton personally, to the extent that he commented upon them in his memoir. It can therefore be argued that it was their actions that had an affect on Petrie's future dealings with the BM. Despite the fact that Newton died in 1894, and Poole subsequently in 1895, Petrie's professional relationship with the BM seems to have remained tenuous throughout his subsequent career.

The strained nature of Petrie's relationship with the BM continued with Budge (Drower 1995). In November 1886 Edwards received a letter from Sir Peter Le Page Renouf. Renouf was an Egyptologist and a religious writer, besides being the Keeper of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities at the BM between 1886 and 1891 (Altholz 2004). In his letter Renouf complained that:

“...the antiquities donated to the Museum by the fund [EEF] were valueless: Nothing that Budge had chosen for the Museum had been delivered: he could not recommend the Trustees to accept “a vast quantity of pottery and small objects that from our point of are worthless” (Drower 1995: 105).

According to Drower, Edwards replied demanding that unless Renouf retracted his assertion and apologized, nothing would go to the BM. After a month, Renouf replied with a grudging apology. This therefore restored good relations with the Committee. It happened that the entire incident had been a misunderstanding on the part of Budge, and things had in fact been well in hand. Drower explains how:

“...Petrie could not exonerate Budge, whom he rightly suspected of having been responsible for Renouf’s first draft letter (the draft of which, is preserved in the archives of the Oriental Department, is in Budge’s writing), and he could not forgive the word “worthless”... “The false statements of that letter, and the gross ignorance it shewed of genuine and scientific archaeology, bar me from having anything to do with this quarter again.” His estrangement from the British Museum, and strained relations or open hostility toward himself and Wallis Budge, were to last the rest of their lives” (1995: 105).

In his memoirs, Petrie mentions another incident that occurred with the BM in 1894 when he was working at UCL. This incident concerned two statues of the Egyptian god, Min, found at Coptos. Petrie had planned on sending the pieces to the BM. The discussion had gone so far that he had met with the Assistant Keeper of British and Medieval Antiquities and Ethnography, Sir Charles Read, to discuss where the statues would be placed. They agreed upon positioning and lighting. They were only waiting for the Keeper of British and Medieval Antiquities and Ethnography, Sir Augustus Franks, to return from holiday in order to finalize their plans. Petrie wrote about the final outcome of his discussion:

“On return he [Franks] wrote to me that he was “advised that the figures are unhistoric rather than Prehistoric,” and therefore declined them. The comment was absolute nonsense...and it is not difficult to guess the source” (Petrie 1932: 153).

Petrie omits the name, but Drower comments that “...Petrie clearly suspected Budge as the author of this piece of nonsense” (1995: 211). Petrie subsequently commented that, “Much followed in consequence; the

Museum's refusal made us immediately offer the figures to the Ashmolean, where they were at once accepted" (1932: 153). He goes on to mention that further prehistoric artifacts from Naqada and sculptures from Hierakonpolis were also to be sent to the AM. Thereafter, Petrie wrote, "Thus the folly of spiteful advice put Oxford for all time ahead of London in early Egyptian history. Such chances never recurred, nor are likely to arise again" (1932: 153).

That last line seems tinged with regret. Despite personal differences with some of the staff of the BM, it can be supposed that he would have preferred the artifacts to go to London. It could be assumed that he was not concerned about any potential rivalries with Budge or anyone else at the Museum. His main drive seemed to be getting the pieces housed, where they could be cared for and well displayed.

3.6: Conclusion

This chapter has examined the origins of three other university collections which were assembled in the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and that overlapped with the founding of the I of A. The chapter has also demonstrated how a number of different connections existed between the four collections. This was not only between the pieces and their origins, but also between their respective founders of the collections. Yet the main link in both these cases can be argued to have been that of Flinders Petrie.

The relation that Petrie had to the other three university collections under examination here is clear. Firstly, both Garstang and Frost worked for Petrie, which, unsurprisingly, seemed to influence their own subsequent practices in archaeology. Frost and Garstang, however, appear to have taken on different aspects of Petrie's practices. With reference to the sourcing of artifacts, the Queen's Collection also benefited by receiving archaeological pieces from Petrie via UCL, while Frost was also given access to Petrie's sizeable photographic archive there

In the case of UCL, Petrie's connection to the university was direct and the collection benefitted directly from his expeditions. Likewise, it was through Petrie's work with Haworth that the MM built up its Egyptological collections, as discussed in Section 3.2. Further connections also existed with the MM via the lectures given by Petrie, in addition to work carried out in Manchester by Murray. An additional connection between Petrie and the MM was through Garstang's work with Haworth, and donations of finds made by Garstang to the MM. This latter point consequently helps to link the I of A with the MM, besides the fact that Haworth and Kennard were members of the EC prior to the establishment of the I of A. In the context to QUB, Section 3.3 demonstrated how the connection between Frost and Petrie ultimately influenced the origins of the collection at QUB.

The other facet to Petrie's connection with university institutions discussed here has been the 'training' he provided for those individuals who subsequently founded collections. In the case of Frost and Garstang, although they both had prior excavation experience, they received additional training in the field with Petrie. Additionally, both exhibited different characteristics in their own archaeological work that can be connected to their time spent working with Petrie. Frost appears to reflect Petrie's conscience with regard to artifacts, in addition to his cataloguing techniques. He also seemed to hold views similar to Petrie with regard to antiquities dealers. With respect to Garstang, not only did he follow Petrie's practice of holding exhibitions after his excavations to display his finds, but he also seemed to take Petrie's *modus operandi* with regard to how he organized his excavations financially; the way in which funding of excavations was acquired and the way the seasons were structured. These two latter elements will be studied in further detail in the next chapter.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Institute of Archaeology Loan Collection

4.1: Introduction

In the last chapter it was established that there are no comparable collections at other universities to that of the Liverpool I of A's Loan Collection. It was seen however, that there were connections and similarities between the I of A and the institutions that were reviewed. The purpose of this chapter is to demonstrate how the Loan Collection at the I of A was created, and what happened to it during the years between 1904 and 1930.

After a brief analysis of the sources used in Section 4.2, Section 4.3 outlines how the Collection was initiated by a letter that Garstang sent to Dale on 26 May 1903. This letter not only discussed the need for space to house artifacts, but more importantly also confirmed that both Garstang and Rankin had offered to lend their collections to the University for use by its students. This section also considers the issues of ownership and control of artifacts which became part of the collection over the years. This ultimately links to a discussion of the Egyptian Excavation Committee (EC), which was affiliated to the I of A, and is the focus of Section 4.4. In Section 4.4, the structure and function of the EC is outlined, and the manner in which it interacted with the I of A and its collection is considered. For the purpose of simplification EC will be used as an acronym for the Committee, rather than EEC, due to the fact that over the years the excavation committees changed their names.

Section 4.5, and its sub-sections, focus on the Loan Collection from 1904 to 1930, using primarily the Institute's AR for its framework. This section examines the 'Glory Years' of the collection from 1904 to 1914, in which the Institute went through its greatest period of growth; only halted by the First World War. Subsequently, this section notes that during the

War, from 1914 until 1919, the growth of the collection ceased. Lastly, Section 4.5 considers the Collection's further decline in the post-War years, from 1920 to 1930. Section 4.6 discusses the disposal of the collection, and in this context, the term 'disposal' is used to refer to the processes by which the I of A reduced the size of its holdings. The first part of this section briefly studies the disposal of artifacts in the context of the Institute's early years. The second half of the section focuses on the years from 1920 until 1930, during which time, due to financial hardships, disposal of artifacts became a means by which the Institute maintained financial viability. This financial reinforcement was accomplished through the sale of duplicates, and later through an attempted sale of the Egyptological collection. Section 4.2.1, is a brief contextualization of the LC. It looks at the antiquarianism from the 18th century to the archaeology of the 19th Century and places the LC in context to them. This section also serves to explain the collection appendix (See appendix C-1).

4.2: Literature

The relevant primary materials used for this chapter are the I of A's Annual Reports, held by the SJSC, the Museum's Accession Books, and a number of letters regarding the attempted sale of the collection which are located in the AGAM. These letters were between the I of A, the representative of the American Colonies Store, and the Toledo Museum of Art.

The Annual Reports are the spine of this chapter and serve as the primary guide for the narrative. Using the ARs in the context of this chapter, it is possible to follow the expansion of the artefact collection in a limited way, rather than using the reports to consider events that took place within the I of A in context to its overall history. In order to achieve the aim of this chapter, Section 4.5 also uses corresponding contextual elements such as letters, newspaper articles and the I of A's Accession books, and creates a clearer picture of the activities involving the collection through the years.

Snape's (1986) doctoral thesis which describes the unpublished mortuary assemblages from Garstang's excavations at Abydos, is referred to in Section 4.6. Snape's work is useful here for the insights that it provides into the methods that Garstang used to dispose of surplus artifacts after his respective excavations.

The Literature utilized in section 4.2.1, is used to help contextualize the LC. M. Diaz-Andreu, *A World History of Nineteenth-Century Archaeology*, (2007). G. Perry, *The Trophies of Time: English Antiquarians of the Seventeenth Century* (2007). P. Levine, *The amateur and the Professional*, (2002). R. Sweet, *Antiquaries*, (2004). P. Freeman, *The Best Training Ground for Archaeologists*, (2007). D. Woolf, *Images of the Antiquary in Seventeenth-Century England*, (2007).

4.2.1: Contextualization and Charting the Loan Collection

The purpose of this section is to provide a brief background on antiquarianism and the shift that took place towards archaeology in the nineteenth century. Woolf (2007: 11) describes antiquarianism as involving "well trained, disciplined scholars possessing a keen devotion to the understanding, restoration and preservation of the past". One may argue that this is similar to a historian or archaeologist, yet the characteristics of antiquarians are relatively distinct and specific in regard to what evidence and information they collected about the past, in addition to their practice of collecting material. Parry (2007: 2) points to the fact that antiquarianism goes back as far as ancient Rome and Greece; it later became a popular practice in England from the sixteenth century onwards:

The antiquarian movement in England developed out of the convergence of Renaissance historical scholarship with Reformation concerns about national identity and religious ancestry... The Reformation and growing sense of national destiny that accompanied the improving fortunes of England in the sixteenth century caused scholars to try to form a clearer understanding of the origins of the nation, and to trace the verifiable course of English history through Saxon times... (Parry 2007: 2).

Due to the magnitude of time involved in this topic, however, this section will begin in the eighteenth century and follow through to the mid-

Victorian era. As will be seen, antiquarianism shifted towards the practice of archaeology during the 1800s, because it “was increasingly believed that antiquarianism could not offer anything to historical researches” (Freeman 2007: 57). By discussing antiquarianism and the transition to archaeology here, this section will help to provide a context for the remainder of this chapter, which focuses on the archaeological activities of the Egyptian Excavation Committee and the Loan Collection at the I of A from 1904 to 1930.

In the early history of English antiquarianism, Woolf (2007: 12) indicates that there was a philological side and textual side to its practice:

On the one hand, [there is] the humanistic philological tradition of the close study of text-bound language... [and] On the other hand, there is the peripatetic antiquary for whom languages as such are but one among many tools, and for whom objects, rather than texts, are both the problem and the primary data (Woolf 2007: 12).

In the seventeenth century, however, antiquaries began to divide; those concerned with philology became “more concerned with classical scholarship, literature, etymology, linguistics and – more recently – anthropology” (Woolf 2007: 13), and as such, “the object-orientated archaeological cadet branch of the family,...for the most part of the past three centuries, assumed stewardship of the whole estate” (Woolf 2007: 13). Woolf also recognizes that the “popular notion of what an antiquary was and what he did changed remarkably little between the seventeenth and the later eighteenth centuries...” (Woolf 2007:13).

By the eighteenth century, “... a distinction was drawn between historians, who focused on rhetoric and grand narratives and antiquarians” (Díaz-Andreas 2007: 2). Although both historians and antiquarians used classical texts, “as one of their main sources...”, the antiquarians, however, “...believed that antiquities could best provide new information not contained in texts...” (Díaz-Andreas 2007: 2). Another development during this was the advent of antiquarian societies and clubs (Díaz-Andreas 2007: 52). One example is The Society of Antiquaries in London, which was founded in 1707 by the Royal Society. The Society created a forum in order for members to report their findings (Díaz-Andreas 2007: 54). Further, the

Society made the physician and antiquary, William Hunter (1718-1783), who was mentioned in Chapter 3, a member in 1768 (Brock 2004).

Hunter's collection, which subsequently became the basis for Hunterian Museum in 1807, was briefly comprised of the following: "...[a] collection of anatomy preparations, [a] collection of coins... minerals and curiosities... [a] collection of shells and corals... [an] insect collection... [a] picture collection... [and a] library..." (Brock 2004). Hunter is a prime example of an antiquary of his time, and his character helps to give an insight into those of other collectors during the same century; Hunter was a well-educated man, with a diverse collection that reflected someone with multifaceted interests. Sweet (2004: xiv) states that:

To examine the figures who made up the antiquarian community of the eighteenth century is to consider how a large proportion of those who comprised the social and intellectual elite of this period understood the past, its interpretation and its meaning for contemporary life.

Another antiquary of the eighteenth century was William Borlase (1696–1772). Borlase began collecting minerals and fossils, in addition to his other interests of planting and gardening. He was encouraged to study the natural history of his country by examining the structure and properties of the fossils. He also developed an interest in the remote antiquity of monuments, which had previously been overlooked by others, besides studying the Druids. In 1754 Borlase published *Observations on the antiquities historical and monumental, of the county of Cornwall* (1754; 2nd edn, 1769). This was the first text to provide a chronological account of the antiquities of the Cornish county, and was the first book to describe, illustrate, and classify a noteworthy number of them (Haycock 2004).

Sweet (2004: xiv) quotes Borlase in his explanation of the antiquary business:

The proper business of an Antiquary...is to collect what is dispersed, more fully to unfold what is already discovered, to examine controverted points, to settle what is doubtful, and by the authority of Monuments and Histories, to throw light upon the manners, Arts, Language, Policy and Religion of past Ages.

By the nineteenth century, however, antiquarianism had begun to go into decline. Freeman (2007: 57) comments that "Antiquarianism had become

unfashionable and even a topic of ridicule, a situation that had not been helped by publicised hoaxes..." Freeman links this decline to there being a limited description of monuments and artefacts, besides "fanciful" interpretations (2007: 58). Consequently, Freeman states that, "it has been suggested that many problems were based on the absence of a more sophisticated understanding of the past" (2007: 58). As such, archaeology subsequently "emerged as an independent discipline" (Levine 2007: 35). By the 1870s and 80s, subdivisions had appeared, and archaeologists and antiquarians became separated (Díaz-Andreu 2007). As Levine (2007: 39) reinforces, the word "archaeologist" came to signify the trained and respected professional, 'antiquarian' acquired the sub-meaning amateur, and with it a definite depreciation in value". Dissociating itself from antiquarianism, the field of archaeology "built up a network of men, skilled if formally lacking in training, familiar with one another and establishing for the first time communal standards of practice and discipline"(Levine 2007: 35).

Along this latter vein, Petrie again becomes of key importance here. As seen in the previous chapter, Petrie was one of the most prominent archaeologists of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. He consequently falls into the above network of men described by Levine (2007); particularly those who formed certain standards of practice and discipline (see Petrie's biography in Appendix E-1). Chapter Three also demonstrated elements of how Petrie worked with, and trained, his assistants, who in turn contributed their skills to the network of archaeologists continually developing. As such, the increased significance of archaeology as a discipline in the late 1800s, and those involved in it, such as John Garstang, directly connects the Institute of Archaeology and the Loan Collection it housed to the archaeology movement occurring at the time.

4.2.2: Viewing the Loan Collection via the Annual Reports

In the Introductory chapter to this thesis, an attempt was made to contextualize the teaching offered by the I of A. What is demonstrated in that chapter, however, was that as the I of A was not fully part a university, it is difficult to compare what it offered with archaeological teaching at other university institutions with it. Further, there is a key point that the I of A did not have a heavy emphasis on teaching. This said, however, it will be seen that the collection being looked at presently in this chapter and the next, via the Annual Reports, is referred to as a “Teaching Collection”. But why would an Institute, which does not have a real focus on teaching, require a “Teaching Collection”?

This chapter will look at the development of the Loan Collection housed at the I of A. To aid in the process, included in Appendix C-1 of this thesis, is a year-by-year chart, recording the flow of objects and pieces into the Institute as described in the Annual Reports. The ARs are the sole source of data for this chart. The data, however, is often incomplete, and frequently anecdotal. The latter point here is taken to an extreme at times, where in some cases the loans of antiquities made are not listed in their entirety. This situation is escalated further by the fact that artefacts are frequently collated into one entry, and are not described as individual pieces. This being said, however, the ARs are not meant to be a catalogue of the contents of the Loan Collection; they are reports for the yearly subscribers and the General Committee of the I of A. Consequently, the ARs are an insufficient source of data when attempting to chart the Loan Collection, although they are the only source available.

The charts found in Appendix C-1 provide the following details of pieces listed in the Annual Reports: *Piece Description*, *Source*, and *Provenance*. Where possible, pieces are categorized into Classical Archaeology or Egyptology, or are listed under ‘Other’ in some cases. Minor changes to the subheadings can occur due to changes in excavation sites.

4.3: The origins of the Institute of Archaeology's Loan Collection in 1903

Part of the foundation to the I o A's artifact collection can be observed in a letter dated 26 May, 1903. While Garstang was a Reader at UC Liv, he wrote to the University's Principal, A.W.W. Dale, with regard to acquiring space for the assembly of a collection of antiquities from Egypt, which were being 'given' by himself and John Rankin for use by students. The letter appears to be in response to earlier correspondence received by Garstang from Dale. As none of Dale's letters appear to be archived for the period before UC Liv became the U of L, the content of his original letter is unknown. The letter Garstang sent in May 1903 reads as follows: See appendix C-2(a).

The documents that catalogue the specific contents of the collections held by Garstang and Rankin at that time appear not to exist, thus the scope of the collection given to the UC Liv in 1903 is not known. It is assumed that Dale agreed to Garstang's request for space in 1903. This is evidenced by the fact that, as discussed in Chapter 2, by June 1904 Garstang was informing Dale that there was no longer adequate space in the Victoria Building following his excavation in Beni Hasan that had begun in December 1903.

Although Dale's response to Garstang's letter no longer exists, after UC Liv transformed into the U of L in the latter half of 1903, the University's *Annal* illustrates the College's reaction to Garstang's May 1903 letter:

'2 June 1903 (D) Council accepted Mr. John Rankin's offer to present the College his collection of Egyptian Antiquities.

(E) Council accepted Mr. Garstang's offer to place at the disposal of the College his Library and type collection of antiquities.' (U of L 1903: 41).

There is a particular aspect in Garstang's letter that is noteworthy. Indeed, the conditions that Garstang and Rankin placed upon their 'given' collections, suggests that both wished to retain control over the objects, regardless of the fact that they were referred to as 'gifts'. Despite using the

word 'gifts', while appearing to be 'giving' their collections to the department, it can be argued that Garstang and Rankin were in fact offering a loan, as opposed to an outright donation that would have given the U of L ownership and consequent control over the respective collections.

In keeping with the matter of loaning artifacts and their ownership, it is important to establish how later artifacts became part of the I of A's collection during the first years of the Institute's existence. The collection was increasingly made up of artifacts that were loaned, by benefactors, to the Institute. These artifacts came from the various excavations carried out by Garstang on behalf of the EC of the I of A, and were received by the Institute's benefactors in reward for their support with the excavations. An important question therefore, is how did these benefactors, who were often not archaeologists, but who lent artifacts to the Institute, come into possession of these items? Although at the time it was possible to purchase antiquities privately or from dealers, in the case of those linked to the Institute, it was more common for them to be subscribers to its Egyptian Excavation Committee (EC). John Rankin is a particular example in this instance. It is therefore necessary to consider the structure and function of the EC and how it interacted and influenced the LC at the I of A.

4.4: The I of A Egypt Excavation Committee

The EC was a committee made up of wealthy individuals, mainly, but not exclusively, from Liverpool who seem to have been driven by owning (and disposing of) Egyptian artifacts. The EC is a prime example of how, and by whom, Garstang's excavations were funded. There is little that can be said with certainty about the origins of the EC. It is said to have been started by F. G. Hilton Price in 1899 (I of A AR 1909). Price (1842-1909) was an antiquarian and London banker, whose life was predominantly devoted to archaeology. Despite being interested in the prehistoric, and owning fine collections of artifacts from various places and periods, Price was also actively involved in the study and collection of Egyptian

antiquities. In 1885, he joined the EEF, and was later elected its president in 1905 (Roberts 2004).

Price was also a key figure in the life of the I of A. He is listed as a Vice- President in its Committee List from 1904 until his death in 1909. It can be assumed that Price was connected to Garstang through Flinders Petrie, as a consequence of Garstang's time working for the latter from 1899. It is likely that Garstang was introduced to Price by Petrie, since the two were linked through Petrie's ERA, as its finances were managed by Price (Petrie 1894).

In order to fulfill their financial commitment to the EC, members advanced money to the Committee and in return, received shares in the archaeological expeditions to which they subscribed. Those funds in turn helped to fund Garstang's excavations. In its most refined form, each share was equivalent to £100, or one Lot and 10 lots to a excavation, though the amounts and numbers could vary. As Freeman (in prep.) states:

'This would make for a minimum budget for a season of at least £1000 of which Garstang would draw a salary (usually £300) and provision of c. £130 for the season's assistants. In reality the budgets usually exceeded that sum'.

Freeman's description is reinforced by a draft of the contract and conditions laid out for the Abydos Excavation Fund in 1907, dated 10 November 1906. The draft has been edited for the purposes here: See appendix C-2(b).

The final amount for that season's excavation, recorded in the AR were £1,142.18s.4d. There were 10 shares amounting to £110, with an additional cost of a house for Garstang at Abydos, which was covered by the EC for £42.18s.4d.

While in Egypt, Garstang excavated and collected artifacts. Before he returned to Liverpool however, he was required by Egyptian law to communicate with the Egyptian Antiquities Authority (EAA) with regard to the distribution of the excavated material. The EAA therefore had the first share of Garstang's finds. An example of how the EAA acquired the first share is demonstrated in a letter sent by Jones to his parents from Esna. Written on 17 April 1906, Jones mentioned that it was he and Weigall, who

in Garstang's absence, went on behalf of the EAA, to divide the finds from that season (Jones 1906). In another letter, dated roughly 9 July of the same year, Jones commented that the finds would be going from Egypt to the Liverpool Public Museum to be put on exhibit (Jones 1906).

It was once Garstang had returned to Liverpool that the remaining artifacts were distributed among the EC members. This was organized by "...a two-tier ballot in which the excavator (Garstang) was not supposed to show preference or favouritism to particular syndicate members" (Freeman, in prep.). Once the portions had been divided and the lots allocated, the artifacts were distributed amongst the patrons of the committee. It was at this point that members of the EC were in a position to loan their antiquities to the I of A's collection if they had not elected to retain them or dispose of them. The ballot system however was not an easy process, particularly because:

"In at least two instances, the members were asked to contribute additional funds because of unexpected discoveries...[and] [t]hen there [were] the occasional instances where Garstang had to rearrange the distribution of lots because certain members of the committee were unhappy with their allocation" (Freeman, in prep.).

In 1909, Price died. Following his death, the Hon. Secretary included an acknowledgement of the contribution that Price had made to the I of A in his Annual HSR:

"The Institute has lost during the past year one of its first Vice Presidents, the late F. G. Hilton Price for many years the Director of the Society of Antiquaries in London. Mr. Price was the founder, ten years ago, of the Egyptian Excavations Committee, which was affiliated to the Institute in 1905; and had been treasurer of its funds from its outset; during this time nearly £10,000 has been devoted through this body to Egyptian excavation" (I of A AR 1909: 9).

Interestingly, following Price's death, it appears that members of the EC began to purchase more than one share in Garstang's excavations. For example, in the Balance Sheet of Accounts in the AR for 1912-13, Sir Robert Mond purchased five shares in that season's excavation at Meroë, thus paying £500. By the final year of excavations, prior to the War, the Statement of Account for the Sudan Excavation Committee shows that 16 members had purchased shares; two of which were for £300 each, and the

total Account Balance amounted to £2,049. While there is no evidence that specifically explains the increase in share purchases after 1909, could it have been that while Price was alive, limits were put on EC members and the number of shares that they could purchase in any given excavation? If this had been the case, it could be argued that Price's death, and thus the loss of him as EC Committee Treasurer, may have caused any limits that had been put on members previously to be subsequently lifted as a consequence of Price's passing. This could potentially explain why the number of EC members and their subscribed shares increased.

When the EC became affiliated with the I of A in 1905, it becomes understandable how the I of A's loan collection grew over the first years of its existence, given the way in which it functioned. The next part of this section considers the interaction between the I of A and the EC in more detail.

4.4.1: The I of A and its interactions with the Excavation Committee

In order to shed light on exactly how the I of A came to acquire the pieces in the LC, it is first worth considering a letter dated 11 November 1903, sent by Garstang to Dale regarding the funding of the upcoming excavations at Beni Hasan in Egypt:

"I have the Honour and the pleasure to inform you that

Mr. John Rankin of Liverpool

Mr. Ralph Brocklebank of Tarporley
and Sir John Brunner Bart. Wavertree.

Have united in the joint equipment of an archaeological expedition to Egypt for this winter season in the direct interests of the University, and the product of the excavations to be made will in due course be presented to the Archaeological Museum of this Department.

I should deem it a favour if you would announce these generous gifts to the Council and to the public" (Garstang 11 November 1903).

By January of the following year, the excavations at Beni Hasan were underway. Garstang's assistant, H. E. Jones, wrote to his parents about their

work on 6 January, 1904. He explained to them how the excavation had already cleared “135 tombs” and had found “c.£11,000” in artifacts (Jones 6 January 1904). A few days later, on 10 January, Price wrote to Garstang about the lack of payments made by members to that season’s account at Beni Hasan:

“...I am pleased to learn from your letter and post card that you are doing well- 5 boats from one tomb is excellent. I enclose you a check for £100- but we only have £50 in hand as only Kennard and Brocklebank paid in full. Neither Arthur Evans nor John Ranken (sic) have paid anything at all. Macgregor owes £50- and I owe £50- then there is someone else making Seven whose name I can’t remember...the member have better be told to send their cheques to Herr Thild for the acc. of the Beni Hassan (sic) Fund” (Price 10 January 1906).

With respect to the need for another EC member, as expressed by Price, Garstang wrote to Dale from Beni Hasan on 13 February:

“I have much Pleasure in informing you that the vacant place in the Beni Hasan Excavations Committee & list of patrons has been filled in the direct interest of the University.

Mr Johnston thus joins with the three gentlemen to whom the council already expressed its thanks. Will you deem it suitable to render a similar courtesy to Mr. Johnston also; and to communicate this item to the local press. You will be glad to know that the excavations are producing satisfactory results” (Garstang 13 February 1904).

Following the addition of Johnston to the EC, the number of members was increased to 8. There are obviously two members missing from the 10 discussed in Section 4.4; so either the excavation carried on without the others, or the information on the missing members has been lost.

Dale sent a response to Garstang regarding the expansion of the EC on 22 February:

“Your letter has anticipated one from me by a few hours...I am glad to hear that the vacant place in the syndicate has been filled; the fact shall be communicated to the Council at the next meeting, and I have no doubt they will do in this case what they did in others.

I hope that you are having a pleasant as well as a profitable time” (Dale 22 February 1904).

The letters dated 11 November 1903, 10 January and 13 February 1904 contain two key pieces of information. First, they list the individuals who “equipped” the expedition to Egypt. Secondly, they demonstrate that this

money did not go directly from the hands of the contributors into Garstang's, but it was channeled through Price into the EC account.

While excavating at Beni Hasan, Jones wrote to his parents on 26 March 1904, giving them news of the work. He wrote about bringing home objects: "perhaps a mummified cat or two. Tho' they have to be smuggled away". He went on to add: "Garstang was very pleased with the discoveries and said I had added £300 at least to the year's finds" (Jones 26 March 1904). It is unclear, however, if Jones's £300 was in addition to the £11,000 mentioned in his letter or was separate from the total sum.

In another letter to his parents, written on 7 April 1904, Jones wrote that he expected to return on 6 May. He also noted that the expedition would be bringing back "160 cases" (Jones 7 April 1904). Jones' letters create a picture of excavation that was potentially very lucrative. During the following season's excavation at Esna, Jones sent a letter on 25 February 1905 updating his parents on the expedition's progress and the finds that they had made. He wrote of one object in particular: "...best of all - a fine roll of papyrus probably according to Garstang worth from £200-£300" (Jones 25 February 1905). As will be shown later in this chapter, an unknown portion ended up becoming part of LC, while others went to various institutions, British UK and international.

A case in point of this is a discrepancy in the number of crates packed and brought back from the Esna excavations of 1905. Jones wrote to his parents on 3 May about packing up the expedition: "Today I packed up 83 boxes..." (Jones 3 May 1905). The implication here is that they were all full of artifacts, and he subsequently mentioned the thousands of pots that he had to put in the expedition's storehouse. He continued to write that he was sending one of the cases to the Training College (Jones 3 May 1905). Yet, in her account of that same season at Esna, Dorothy Downes (1974) writes that the excavation yielded 65 crates. This therefore leaves a discrepancy of 17 crates. There is no record of where they went.

In the same year Esna was excavated, the EC it became affiliated with the I of A. The relevant clauses are shown here:

No. 1: Committee for Excavation in Egypt “known previously as the Beni Hasan Committee of the Institute” (with, added in ink by FCD, “Edfu Excavation Committee shall be a special committee of the Institute”), now to be called the Committee for Excavation in Egypt.

No. 2: 7 members of the Committee listed – R Brocklebank, Brunner, Johnston, MacGregor, Hilton Price, Danson & John Rankin

No. 4: “Excavations and expeditions in Egypt conducted under the auspices of this Committee shall be regarded as the work of this Institute and entitled to the name and title of this Institute accordingly, without rendering the General Committee liable or responsible in any way for the costs of such expedition” (EC 1 September 1905).

This change is explained by a general letter that was sent from Jones on 5 September 1905 to the recipients of objects:

“...the pottery we sent you this year was not from the Beni Hasan Excavations Committee but the Edfu Excavations Committee - both however being the excavation of the Liverpool Institute of Archaeology. As the site of excavations are frequently changed it has been decided in future that the Excavations Committee of the University Institute of Archaeology, Liverpool at Beni Hasan, Edfu, etc...” (Jones 5 September 1905).

The affiliation between the EC and the I of A was made official at the Institute’s Annual General Meeting on 22 September 1905 (I of A AR 1905). After the affiliation occurred, the EC funded an excavation in Esna, as was mentioned in Jones’s letter of 17 April 1906 and noted in Section 4.4.

After the return of the finds from that Esna season, they were distributed in Liverpool. Garstang sent a letter to Danson on 30 July 1906 regarding the distribution of the Esna finds:

“I have the pleasure to inform you that at the meeting of the Excavations Committee on Friday afternoon last, your lot fell out at No.10 in the order of choice No.4. I enclose a list of the antiquities which constitute the chief portion of this lot, which are being forwarded to your address as arranged” (Garstang 30 July 1906).

As result of Danson’s absence from the meeting, Garstang chose a lot on his behalf. As Jones prepared the lots for that season’s finds, as opposed to Garstang, the act would appear to be ethically sound. It must be kept in mind, however, that Garstang was the one who excavated the artifacts. This

is important to note, as the consequences of Garstang's actions at this meeting of the EC will be seen later in this section.

In a letter from Garstang to Danson, on 7 September 1906, there is a particular line that is worthy of note. The letter is in regard to problems over the sale of duplicate artifacts. While it is reviewed in its entirety in Section 4.6, the following line demonstrates how Garstang assured Danson that problems would not affect:

“...our private sales will still continue and I shall be glad to sign certificates for such; these will be in that case evidence of a business transaction” (Garstang 7 September 1906).

This short excerpt helps shed light on the appraisal that were given by Garstang, shown earlier in this section. This sentence in Garstang's letter demonstrates that the EC was involved with the private sale of antiquities. What is not clear, however, is to what extent they were involved.

The following letter helps to give a deeper insight into the scale of the EC's practices of selling finds. In the following year's expedition at Abydos, Garstang wrote to Danson on 30 March 1907 and updated him on the progress:

“We are continuing a systematic excavation of the XII Dyn. Necropolis. The results are very satisfactory & encouraging. In addition to inscriptions on stone we have found a number of small objects characteristic of this date some of special character.

Amongst the former are 3[?] granite statuettes [a] number of stone vases of various forms, beads of glass[?], amethyst, carnelian, scarabs, etc. among the latter a full size scimitar (the form held by the gods in the purple representations), a wooden figure of a women carrying a baby, & a bronze or copper figure of a private person in excellent condition. We purpose to go on steadily until the middle of April; the whole site will amply repay the excavations” (Garstang 30 March 1907).

The implications of the last line demonstrates are that, as the 'whole site' would 'amply repay the excavations', the EC would benefit, including financially. It also gives further insight into Garstang's financial evaluation of artifacts; reinforcing themes in Jones's letters, as discussed earlier in this section. The estimate made in Garstang's second letter to Danson puts the value of the finds at Abydos at £1,142.18s.4d. This is the same amount mentioned earlier in this chapter for the 1906-07 season. With Garstang's

prediction that the excavation at Abydos would in fact pay for itself in mind, a question that needs to be asked is: did all the excavations run by the EC pay for themselves? If this were to be the case, it puts a new perspective on Garstang's assessment of £11,000 for the 1903-04 season. If Garstang was correct in his estimation, after taking out £1000 for excavation costs, each of the 8 shareholding members of the EC that year could potentially have seen as much as a £1250 profit. This fact led Freeman to suggest that the committee was excavating for profit:

'What appear to be Excavation Committees in the IoA reports were in the words of Garstang's assistant, HE Jones, syndicates for the importation and redistribution of artifacts, for profit' (Freeman in prep).

Freeman's assertion via Jones's statement is appropriate, given the evidence presented here. It is clear that there was an intention to sell in what could arguably be considered large quantities. The letters sent by Garstang on 7 September 1906 and 30 March 1907 confirm Jones' sentiment, and also provide an indication of the scale involved. The true extent of the EC's sale of antiquities however, may never be known.

The combined profits made from Abydos by the Committee members can be approximated to have been enough to fund almost an entire decade of excavations. In turn, if excavations were continually lucrative, it could mean that pieces that had the potential to be most profitable were being sold in order to keep money flowing into the hands of EC. In this context, therefore, the conclusion that can be derived from this in relation to the LC at the I of A, would be that the pieces that became part of the LC, were either finds that could not be sold or, alternatively, pieces that EC members had decided not to sell but which they wished to be housed for public display. The bulk of artifacts in the LC are most likely to have been as a result of the former rather than the latter. Yet, as there was no catalogue for the LC, there is no formal record of what was displayed.

In the academic year 1907-1908, two other excavation committees joined the EC. The Hittite and the British Honduras Excavation committees were affiliated to the I of A in order to provide additional

financial aid for excavations in Anatolia and Central America. Neither of these committees, however, was as consistently active or lucrative as the EC. A second season of excavation at Abydos was carried out in the academic year 1908-1909, continuing the excavations that had begun the year prior. In February 1909, Garstang sent a report on the season's excavation to the EC. The letter updated the Committee on the discovery of another tomb (No. 249) at the site, which required another £100 for it to be excavated fully. Due to the fact that [he had] only 8 members of the EC had expressed an interest in providing funds, he suggested there be a re-division of shares. Garstang also requested that Hilton Price secure rooms at the Society of Antiquaries in London in order to display that season's finds (Garstang 1909).

In a personal letter to Danson on 12 February 1909, Garstang informed him that the excavation at Abydos was finding £100 worth of artifacts a day. He also explained the need for an 11th subscription to the EC. Although Garstang had received two offers for the share from people outside of the Committee, he was attempting to keep the situation as internal as possible (Garstang 12 February 1909).

In a letter of 30 March 1909 to Danson, the I of A's assistant secretary, Miss F. Davey, established who had agreed to pay the necessary additional funding to the EC for the excavation of the recently unearthed tomb:

"I wish also to call your attention to a letter from Mr Russell Rea to Professor Garstang, of which the following is an abstract:- "I am willing to pay my share of any extra cost in this year's exploration that may be incurred in following up the recent interesting discoveries. Should all the shareholders not be prepared to do the same, I am willing to enter into any arrangement to share the expenses with those members who are willing to do so, it being of course understood that the distribution at the end of the season will in some way be made in proportion to the contribution"" (Davey 30 March 1909).

Davey's letter also informed Danson of Price's death. A financial problem arose for the EC with the Treasurer's death, which was explained in a report by Garstang on 12 June 1909. Owing to the lack of funds, there had been an overspend of £100 on the season. Garstang stated that Price had

agreed to pay the deficit (Garstang 12 June 1909). According to the AR balance sheet for that year, the contribution paid by each member of the EC appears to have been £110 (I of A AR 1909), which consequently paid off the deficit left by Price. After Price's demise, Garstang asked Price's brother to step in as an interim treasurer. The following season William Grisewood, who was also the Treasurer for the I of A, replaced Price's brother.

A circular sent out by Garstang on 17 July 1909 showed that the division of finds from Abydos took place at the rooms of the Society of Antiquaries of London. The circular also included a clause that most likely came from the contract and conditions of the EC for that year:

"For the purposes of final division. The objects shall be arranged by the excavator into approximately equal and representative groups corresponding with the number of share holders, which groups may be revised or altered by the Committee. Lots shall be drawn to decide the order of selection. The excavator shall not personally represent any absent member of the Committee in the choosing of groups" (Garstang 17 July 1909).

Given the wording, it would appear that there may have been issues with Garstang having chosen the lot for Danson in July 1906. Although conjecture, it is possible to suggest that the EC had taken the necessary steps to ensure that nothing of the sort happened again.

Following Price's death, the EC was referred to in the AR as the Excavations in the Sudan Committee, which was reflective of where it was carrying out its expeditions. The AR's after 1909 also cited the resolution that was made in September 1905 regarding the EC and its affiliation to the I of A, in order to confirm that it was indeed the same committee, only with a different name.

The next shift that occurred with regards to the naming of committees came in the academic session 1912 -1913, when all three committees were listed in the AR under the heading 'Affiliated Committees'. The committees continued to be listed as such in the AR until the session 1914-1915, which coincided with the start of the Great War. It was in that year that the 'Affiliated Committees' were listed for the last time, and never reappeared.

During and after the War, there were only two periodic entries of money going towards archaeological excavation recorded on Balance Sheets for the I of A. The first was listed in the summary AR for the period 1915 to 1919, which collated everything regarding the I of A in that time. The amount of money listed as advanced for excavation totaled £2.17sh, which was sent to support Gann's continued work in British Honduras. The British Honduras EC, recorded in the AR of 1914-1915, had established this amount, and the same sum continued to be sent until 1922.

In 1924, the AR shows a Spanish Fund which gave £40 to J. P. Droop for an excavation that he was running in Spain. The money was donated by the politician and chemist, Sir Max Muspratt (Williams 2004). During the years 1925 and 1926, the amount listed in this fund dropped to £6. The listing of this fund from 1924 until 1926 was the last time that the I of A was recorded as being involved with the funding of an excavation between the years of 1904-1930.

4.5: The Loan Collection: The early years (1904 – 1914)

In Chapter Two an excerpt taken from a newspaper report concerning a speech that was given at a graduation celebratory dinner on 4 July 1904, was commented upon. In the course of the oration, the speaker praised Garstang and announced the formation of the I of A. As the reporter relayed it:

“This Institute of Archaeology is to be the home of a modest but valuable an effective museum, which will add distinction to the University. And there is some prospect of future excavations being in the University name” (*The Liverpool Post*: 1904).

In Section 4.3, a letter written by Garstang, that concerned the 'gift' of a collection of artifacts to be loaned to the Department of Egyptology by Garstang and Rankin was discussed. Given Garstang's conditions attached to the 'gift' of a loan in that letter, it has been argued that he and Rankin wanted to retain control of their artifacts. This collection can be said to have contributed to the beginning of the Loan Collection at the I of A, supported by the fact that in the Preliminary Prospectus for the 1904 -1905

academic year, a statement was made by the Reader in Egyptian Archaeology, Garstang, as follows: "The Present Egyptian collection, provided by the citizens of Liverpool within the past two years, enables a suitable start to be made" (I of A 1904: 19), to what was referred to as a museum. This statement, while confirming the external source of the materials, does not make it clear if the collection was explicitly provided as a loan. As will be made clear in this section, what is referred to as a museum by the I of A and in the newspaper report of July 1904, as well as the Prospectus for that year, was defined as something different only two years later.

In the AR for 1904, the HSR stated the following with regard to the 'museum':

"The Hon. Secretary is glad to report various gifts to the museum...The Government of Cypress have presented...Cypriot pottery ...Three Australian Museums have...forwarded ethnological specimens...and various other small gifts...The most important accession in this way has been a granite head from a portrait statue of one of the Pharaohs...presented by Mr. John Rankin. In this connexion we must specially mention the Rev. W. Macgregor, Mr. Hilton Price... Professor Boyce ... as well as our staunch supporters, Mr. R Brocklebank, Sir John Brunner, Mr. J. Rankin and Mr. W. Johnston" (I of A AR 1904: 18).

Seven of the men mentioned were members of the EC, while Boyce was a member of the I of A Committee. So the question is: was it those men who added to the collection that year from their shares? Equally, is it for that reason that they are in particular mentioned?

As commented upon in Chapter One and earlier in this chapter, there is no formal catalogue for the Loan Collection, nor is there any information in the Accession Books that would allow for disentangling precisely what was placed in it. At present, therefore, the necessary sources for determining what was in the museum are not available. This dilemma plays throughout this chapter. The only resources, which provide any particular reference to the pieces in the collection, are the Annual Reports. Unless a special note were made in those reports that highlighted the acquisition of specific objects, such as a Pharaonic bust 'given' by Rankin in the 1904-1905 academic year to be put on display, one is left to speculate

about the contributions made by Brocklebank, Brunner, Johnston, and Rankin, both in 1904 and thereafter.

The academic year 1905-1906 saw a number of additions to the collection. In the Hon. Secretary's Report for that year, under the heading of 'Accessions to the Museum', the following was stated:

"The constant friends of the Institute, Sir John Brunner, Mr. John Rankin, Mr. F.C. Danson, Mr. Wm. Johnston and Mr Brocklebank, have again placed at the disposal of the Institute almost the whole of the antiquities accruing to them from the explorations made for them in Egypt and Nubia during last winter...Two complete burials have been re-arranged in the museum exactly as found, with their funerary deposits placed around them. These, with other antiquities exhibited in the same room, form an important addition to the loan collection, and are of special use for the staff and students of the University in illustrating the development of primitive civilization" (I of A AR 1906: 18-19).

The names of the persons who contributed antiquities remain the same as before, but for the addition of F. C. Danson. Similarly, only significant objects of special interest that were added to the collection were noted. The last sentence of the above excerpt, however, is of particular importance. It is the earliest reference currently known which refers to collection housed at the I of A as a 'loan collection'.

Although the sentence appears to be benign, it was in fact a reaction to the tensions that had been mounting between the Institute and the Liverpool Public Museum, with regard to the former's collection, which erupted in early February 1906. While these tensions are the focus of Chapter Five, it is worth commenting on them here, particularly as they resulted in Garstang being forced to redefine the collection at the I of A as a Loan Collection rather than that of a museum (I of A 1906). That redefinition became a shaping moment in the history of the I of A, not only because it affected how the Institute defined itself, but also because it impacted upon the I of A's relationships with the Public Museum. The episode in question lasted five years, and forced the I of A to marginalize on paper, collections it held in order to avoid the appearance of it competing with the Public Museum. Thereafter, with one or two exceptions, the word museum is not used in context to the I of A in the ARs. One exception is that the Balance Sheets in the AR continued to refer

to a Museum Account. The same account is also referred to in the full text of the report.

The first time that the use of the word 'museum' was dropped in the ARs was in the academic year 1906-1907, where, for example, the "Loan Collections of Egyptian and Classical Antiquities are open at the same hours as the Libraries" (I of A, 1907: 6). Despite problems with the Public Museum, the LC at the I of A continued to grow:

"In the Museum Account there has been an expenditure of £32.5s. 6d. which was chiefly been incurred by the fitting of new shelving and cases to accommodate the gifts and loans of made during the preceding year by members of the Excavations Committee" (AR of the I of A 1907:11).

During 1907 and 1908, the Institute saw further growth through the addition of artifacts from Garstang's excavations:

"...the Professor has conducted an excavation for four months in the Necropolis of Abydos in Upper Egypt...Important educational series of objects from these tombs have been secured for the purposes of the Institute by the generosity of certain benefactors" (I of A AR 1908: 16).

It was however, not only the LC that was undergoing expansion in these years. As discussed in Chapter 2, the collections in Classical Archaeology and its slide collection also increased. Equally, a further increase in growth during the year 1907-1908 saw the addition of Gann to the I of A's staff and the creation of what was called the Dept. of Central American Antiquities. Indeed, before Gann returned to British Honduras, he placed some of his artifacts at the Institute. As a consequence of all this expansion, the I of A took over 38 Bedford Street in 1908.

With regards to Gann, the AR commented that:

"To enable Dr. Gann to continue his researches on pre-historic sites in British Honduras a Central American Excavation Fund has been formed through the kindness of a number of friends, and a sum of £40 was placed at the disposal during the summer of 1908...A further grant from the Central American Fund will be sent to Dr. Gann for work during the winter season..." (I of A AR 1908: 18).

The I of A, however, appeared to encounter financial problems during the 1908-09 session. In the AR for that year, certain changes are observed when compared to earlier reports. For example, a common feature of indirectly thanking the 'benefactors' is not repeated as it had been

before, and there are only two real references to the acquisition of artifacts. One is in Gann's report of his excavations, printed as part of the Reports of the Departments: "Dr. Gann writes that he has concluded his excavations for the present season...the objects found have already been consigned to Liverpool" (AR of the I of A 1909:19). The other is in context of the acquisition of casts and watercolor copies by Bosanquet for Classical Archaeology.

As seen in the AR of previous years, it was common for 'benefactors' to give what would appear to be substantial amounts of artifacts to the LC, which in turn occasioned a word of thanks in the reports. The year 1908-1909 was different in this regard. While the exact reason for this is unknown, it is suggested that this could have been linked to the difficulties that occurred with the Public Museums.

Nevertheless, in the following year, the LC saw a return to normality and various additions were made. In the Hon. Secretary's Report for 1909-1910, the first was listed as originating from Gann, from whom "a further series of specimens have been received from him for the special committee..." (I of A AR 1910: 10). Similarly, the Report goes on to mention pieces that had come in from Garstang's work that year at both Meroe and in Asia Minor:

"...there may be specially mentioned the acquisition of a unique set of Meroitic antiquities, through the generosity of a patron who remains anonymous, supplemented by gifts from members of the Sudan Excavations Committee, including Mr. R. Brocklebank, Mr. James Smith, and Mr. Robert Mond. Mr. C. Sydney Jones has also generously offered to provide the nucleus of a series of representative Hittite sculptures from Asia Minor, and as such a collection has not been formed at all in this country, it should prove of great usefulness" (I of A AR 1910: 11).

Garstang's report for his Dept. of Methods and Practice provides further information on the contents of those gifts given by the anonymous donor, as well as by Brocklebank, Smith, Mond and Jones:

"As a result of these excavations...a unique series...including examples of Ceramic art, Faience, and Glazed work, as well as inscriptions and sculptures has been deposited in the Institute..." (I of A AR 1910:16)

Additional gifts arrived that year, including some from Spain:

“An object of remarkable nature and interest is an Archimedean Wooden Screw Pump of Roman age, from Spain, presented by the United Alkali Co., through the good offices of Mr. H. Auden, D.Sc. This is exhibited in the entrance hall of the classical department” (I of A AR 1910:11).

Besides this, a second gift of Spanish provenance, reported in the I of A Accession Book was a:

“...gift by Horace Sandars to the Institute of a collections of ancient picks, etc., of peculiar interest from Roman Mines in Spain. These are exhibited in the Cast Gallery of Classical Sculpture” (I of A AR 1910:12).

Although the I of A continued to undergo financial troubles during the 1909-1910 session, the additions that were made to the LC appear to have been of significant quantity. See appendix C-1.

After the troubled relations between the I of A and the Public Museum from 1905 until 1910, things changed significantly and the relationship gradually improved, with plans made to strengthen the association between the two entities. Part of this involved the permanent loan of artifacts to the Public Museum. These were from Garstang’s work at Meroë, as well as from the I of A’s Aegean collection:

“The past year has witnessed increasingly close relations between the Institute of Archaeology and the Liverpool City Museums. Arrangements have been made for the exhibition in the City Galleries of two important collections, formed in connection with the Institute. One of these is the series of casts of Hittite sculpture from Asia Minor, procured through the generosity of Mr. C. Sydney Jones, the other the Aegean collection of originals and reproductions illustrating the Bronze Age in Crete and Greece, the nucleus of which had been exhibited for some years in Bedford Street. The Staff of the Institute welcome hospitality extended to them by the authorities of the Public Museums, and take this opportunity of expressing their thanks to the Chairman and member of the Libraries, Museums and Arts Committee, and of the Museums Sub-Committee, as well as to the Curator and Staff of the Museums” (I of A AR 1911:9).

The LC at the I of A also continued to expand. In the 1910-1911 report, it was reported that:

“Some very fine objects from Meroë have been presented by members of the Sudan Excavations Committee, in particular a bronze sistrum by Mr. Robert Mond, a Greek cameo by Major Rhodes...” (I of A AR 1911:11).

Garstang gave further details about the objects that were loaned to the collection by these two benefactors in his departmental report for that year:

“...Several important specimens found in these excavations, including examples of metal-work, faïence, and pottery, have been placed in the Institute through the generosity of Mr. Robert Mond and Major Rhodes. From gold forming part of the hoard found in the palace, presented by these donors, facsimiles are to be made for the Institute collections of two gold jewels in the excavations” (I of A AR 1911:16).

The year 1911-1912 continued the acquisition of objects by the I of A for the Loan Collection:

“Mr. Robert Mond and other generous friends have presented to the Institute objects from Meroë which, combined with those secured in previous years, form a representative collection of the Ethiopian Arts from 700 B.C. to 100 A.D. These specimens, by the courtesy of the authorities, are being exhibited temporarily in the Liverpool Public Museums. Mrs James Smith has devoted much time to the classification and arrangement of antiquities, both in the Department and at the Museums.

The Professor has since arranged and labelled the new Hittite collections placed in the Public Museums by the generosity of Mr. C. S. Jones” (I of A AR 1912:16).

In the AR for 1912-1913, neither the report of the Meroë excavation, the Hon. Secretary's Report, nor the Report for Methods and Practice, all written by Garstang, mention anyone from the EC placing artifacts into the LC from that season's excavations. It is known that Garstang brought items back, because the exhibition of that season's finds was held at the Society of Antiquaries in London (I of A AR 1913). There are a number of possible reasons why no artifacts were listed as being placed in the LC. The most obvious is that no EC members deposited any items in the collection that year. Alternatively, perhaps objects that were placed into the collection were not deemed to be of any great importance and thus were not commented upon in the Annual Report.

The AR that was published for the year 1913-1914 showed no real growth in the LC, and Garstang's excavations at Meroë were concluded in the spring of 1914 (I of A AR 1914). As discussed in Chapter Two, in the two years that lead up to the start of the Great War, the Hon. Secretary's reports became increasingly concerned with the I of A as an educational institution. Further, as mentioned in Section 4.4, the year 1914 also witnessed the end of the excavation committees and the intensified attention with the Loan Collection.

4.5.1. The War Years (1914 -1919)

Sydney Jones arranged for an extension to the Institute's accommodation into 44 Bedford Street in 1914. It was noted that "Rooms have also been set aside in these two houses for the Meroitic, Hittite, Abydos, and Honduras antiquities" (AR of the I of A 1914: 9). It can however be argued that there was no real expansion of the LC during the years of the First World War, particularly as the War put a halt to excavations. Consequently, there was little need for the excavation committees. Indeed, during the War, a general "policy of minimum expenditure" (AR of the I of A 1919:19) was enforced. This included halting expenditures on the development of the cast collections, which further halted the Institute's expansion.

Acquiring the additional space for the collection at No. 44 in 1914 meant that the I of A was accommodated in four rented houses on Bedford Street. However, by the end of the War, things appeared to have changed; No. 44 had been taken over by the U of L's Dept. of Education and No. 38 was occupied by the University of Liverpool Press. This left the I of A back in its original accommodation, at Nos. 40 and 44. With its attempt at expansion in 1914 quashed, the circumstances seem to indicate that the direction of the I of A was changing; a shift which was to affect both its LC and the I of A as an institute into the next decade.

4.5.2: The post-War decline (1920-1930)

The ARs for the period 1920-1926 seem to have little to report with regards to an increase in the number of artifacts in the LC, and it appears that any expansion of the LC had all but ground to a halt. Indeed, gone were the days in which benefactors deposited their shares of a season's finds in the LC, and the Institute was struggling to reinvigorate itself after the War. Money became a constant source of concern for the Institute and it was forced to begin selling off its duplicates, as discussed in Section 4.6. Any additions to the collection were generally small. Nevertheless, between

1920 and 1926 the I of A was still able to acquire artifacts. These were generally obtained in the form of donations and gifts from friends of, and outsiders, the Institute.

In March 1920, the I of A moved to 11 Abercromby Square (I of A 1920), where it was noted that "The Second Floor [was] mainly devoted to the Egyptian collections..." (I of A AR 1920: 16). That year also saw the I of A sell duplicate artifacts that it held in order to raise funds. This aspect is considered more closely in the next section. The fact that the I of A was having to sell off duplicates in the 1920s in order to stay financially afloat is significant when one compares the I of A's post-war situation with the early 1900s. For example, when the I of A was given artifacts from Cyprus in 1904, the Institute received so many objects that it had to put out advertisements in order to give away duplicate items to Public Museums (*The Times* 1904).

The following year, in 1921, the HSR in the AR mentioned that the collections had been properly arranged: "That the Egyptian rooms on the Second Floor are in such good order as they are is almost entirely due to the kindness of Miss Williams...". Meta Williams was at that time the Institute's Assistant Secretary. Alongside a number of artifacts from excavation in Cyprus, the same Hon. Secretary's Report noted how objects had been presented from an excavation carried out by the Egyptian Exploration Society (EES), formerly the EEF:

"The presentation...of certain objects from the excavation of the Egypt Exploration Society at Tel el Amarna is referred to elsewhere. At the present moment we are expecting a consignment of antiquities from Cypriote tombs, obtained by Professor Garstang during his recent visit to Cyprus" (I of A AR 1921: 18).

The AR for 1922 shows that progress was maintained in the arrangement of Egyptian artifacts:

"The main gift made...during the Session is one from the Egypt Exploration Society, who have again presented us with a selection of objects from their excavations at Tell el-Amarna. Within the last few days a further case has been received from them containing a portion of the wonderful painted plaster pavement found by them last winter in the building know as Maru-Aten at Tell el-Amarna" (I of A AR 1922: 17).

Gifts from the Cyprus Museum also arrived during the same session. It included a "...group of pottery from a Cypriote tomb from the Bronze Age and several smaller groups of Iron Age date" (I of A AR 1922: 20). It was also reported that the sale of duplicate artifacts had almost come to an end that year.

The generosity of the EES remained consistent in 1923, when another gift was made: "The Egypt Exploration Society has laid us under fresh obligation by the gift of five specimens of papyri from Oxyrhynchus" (I of A AR 1923: 17). Despite the indications in 1922 that the sale of duplicate antiquities had "virtually come to an end" (I of A AR 1923: 18), it did not. In fact it carried on into 1923 (I of A AR 1924). In 1924, the Institute benefited by way of artifacts through the work of W. B. Emery, previously a student at the I of A, who had also been its Assistant Secretary. Emery began working for Sir Robert Mond in 1924. The Hon. Secretary's Report in the AR discussed Mond's excavation at Thebes, and highlighted how the I of A were to benefit from this:

"We understand that a portion at any rate of the antiquities found in these excavations will be presented by Mr. Mond to the Institute, and, indeed, we have already received an earnest gift" (I of A AR 1924: 17).

The benefits to the I of A of Emery's work for Mond, are reminiscent of the I of A's early days, when it benefitted from the finds of EC excavations.

For 1925 and 1926, the Annual Reports document little with regard to the LC. The primary concern in both of these years was the artifacts that Mond was to give to the Institute. The Hon. Secretary's Report for 1925 commented how:

"It is not yet decided what proportion of the finds at present within our walls from this source will eventually remain with us, but it is clear from Mr. Mond's words that we are not to be the losers by our connection to his work" (I of A AR 1926: 19).

There was, however, a secondary concern in the same report; one which was linked to the acquisition of artifacts via relations with the Sudanese Government:

"We are in treaty with the Soudan (sic) Government in respect to some very valuable duplicates from the Khartoum which have been

offered in exchange for our certain publications” (I of A AR 1925: 19).

Despite the uncertainty with regards to the finds in Mond’s excavation, the Institute managed to make a potential deal to increase its holdings. The next year brought greater clarity with regards to which artefacts would remain within the Institute from those which had been left by Mond. The extent of the agreement made with Sudan also became clearer:

“Five painted mummy cases, fruits of Mr. Mond’s work, are for the present, at any rate, striking decorations of our Egyptian Museum. The centre case therein has also been enriched by a set of antiquities from Dr. Reisner’s excavations in the Sudan. These comprise Ushabti figures of several Kings of the Ethiopian Kingdom of the seventh century B.C.; pottery, beads, and cooper objects from tombs of the Middle Kingdom in the Sudan; and beads of the Meroitic period in Meroe. These valuable duplicates have been given by the Khartum Museum in exchange for certain of our publications, the main portion of which were the property of the University Press...” (I of A AR 1926: 16).

In stark contrast, the AR for 1927 shows no additions to the LC. As discussed in Chapter 2, it was in 1927 the Hon. Treasurer’s report referred to the growing financial deficit as a “debt far greater that the Institute has had to bear” (I of A AR 1928: 28). The following year, with a worsening financial situation, the Committee of the I of A voted to open negotiations to sell the collection (I of A AR 1929). The decision to sell is discussed in the following section. Nevertheless, despite its financial troubles of 1928, the Institute still received several additions to its collections:

“Our Egyptian collections have this year become enriched by the objects bequeathed by the late Mr. James Smith, which legacy became operative on the death of his widow last December. The collection possesses a special value in that the objects which it contains come almost entirely from excavations by Professor Garstang, and therefore have a recorded history. ..the quality of the collection is very high. It contains, in particular, a fine series of scarbs, beads and amulets, and, above all, a series of large gold earrings from an untouched Eighteenth Dynasty tomb at Abydos... It is hardly necessary to add that it is not the intention of the Committee to include these objects in any sale of the collections that may be contemplated” (I of A AR 1929: 15).

In 1929, the HSR in the AR referred to the year as being “uneventful” (I of A AR 1930). This state of affairs can be attributed to the monetary situation, which meant there was little that could be done to enhance the

collection. The search for a buyer for the LC did however continue. The following year, in 1930, the I of A underwent a failed sale attempt, as discussed in the next section.

4.6: Disposal: Feast and Famine

In 1904, Garstang sent a letter to the Editor of *The Times*, which was published on 18 February. It read:

“Sir, The Beni Hasan Excavations Committee finds itself able to offer to a number of museums in the United Kingdom and the Colonies a set of Ancient Egyptian Pottery...The gifts will be allotted to the public museums firstly, by which is understood museums of towns or institutions which are open free of charge to the public. Educational Institutions accessible to limited numbers are not debarred, but no grant can be made under any circumstance to private individuals. Applications from the continent of Europe and America subject to these conditions would be considered equally...”
(*The Times*, 1904:7).

Clearly the Institute had more artifacts at its disposal than it could house. This fact was confirmed by Jones, who noted in a letter, which was discussed in Section 4.4.1, that the 1904 excavation season yielded 160 crates, which were brought back to Liverpool from Beni Hasan (Jones 1904). Similarly, it was noted that while Garstang was at Abydos in 1906:

“The sheer amount of material excavated by Garstang meant that he felt it necessary to save the trouble and expense of packing and sending the objects which were already well represented among the excavated material or might, one suspects, be of less aesthetic interest to his backers” (Snape 1986: 33).

Consequently, Garstang reburied the extra pieces in several caches. In another instance during that season’s excavation, Garstang also had to resolve what to do with over 100 Coptic stelae (Snape 1986).

An instance in which there was an attempt to dispose of artefacts can be seen in a letter from Garstang to Danson dated 7 September 1906. In this letter, Garstang discussed problems that had been encountered with the sale of duplicate antiquities in the LC:

“...Mr Newberry has expressed himself so strongly in disapproval of this[?] case that I have decided to postpone the matter until he may have an opportunity of expressing the situation to yourself. I feel I had not realised the full extent of some of the points he urges. It

would probably be desirable for us to employ an Agent if we wished to advertise the matter at all; and it will be undesirable for me to sign a certificate for objects sold through an Agent, as that course will be so liable to misrepresentation by people in Egypt not fully grasping the situation, and might lead to difficulties between myself and the Dept. of Antiquities, which does not favour any form of dealing. Of course our private sales will still continue and I shall be glad to sign certificates for such; these will be in that case evidence of a business transaction. However, I should like to discuss the matter with you and Newberry ..." (Garstang 7 September 1906).

As there is no record that Garstang commenced with the sale of duplicates, it would so appear that the three concerned - Newberry, Garstang and Danson - failed to reach an agreement on the matter.

A successful sale did however occur that year, following the discovery of a bronze head of Augustus at Garstang's excavations at Meroe, in Sudan. The EC sold the piece to the BM for £1050 (Art Fund 2012). As noted in Section 4.5, the years between 1910 and 1914 proved to be financially challenging. On 11 November 1910 Garstang wrote to Danson asking informally if he would agree to the sale of some of the objects in the LC in order to raise capital:

"This of course is a private negotiation and except by selling some of our property, I don't see how for the moment we could avoid something of the kind ..." (Garstang 11 November 1910).

There is, however, no record of any sale taking place. It is therefore assumed that nothing occurred, just as in the case of the proposed sale in September of 1906.

In June 1914, however, the I of A did not find itself in a desperate position monetarily. Yet by 1920, just two years after the Great War had ended, the Institute was in such financial difficulties that it was forced to start selling off its duplicates.

Snape (1986) refers to a general letter written by T. E. Peet, dated 29 April 1920, which was circulated by the I of A, and announced the intentions for sale of duplicates:

"The Institute of Archaeology is about to disperse by sale of a certain number of duplicate objects from its Egyptian collections. These consist mainly of predynastic material from Neqada and Hierankopolis; XIIth dynasty objects from Beni Hasan; XIIth & XVIIIth from Abydos and later stuff from Esna. It occurs to us that the opportunity is a good one either for a large museum, anxious to

fill gaps; or for a smaller museum to obtain groups representing those periods” (Peet 1920; cited in Snape 1986: 42).

As a result of the I of A’s offer, the Public Museum purchased some of the material. In a letter sent from Forbes to Peet on 17 May, Forbes made several requests regarding the purchase:

“As you are aware, the Committee have purchased the selected Egyptian Antiquities from the Institute for £23.10.00 subject to confirmation by the General Committee. In the meantime will you please [send] Dr. Clubb an a/c for the same so that we can have it in readiness to pass for payment. Will you please have all the date specimens looked up and say when we can send them” (Forbes 17 May 1920).

There were further sales of duplicates over the course of 1920. The overall success of this venture was discussed in the 1920 AR:

“The sale of duplicates, from our Egyptian collections sanctioned last year by our last Annual General Meeting has proceeded through the year. The amount realized is over £400, only part of which appears in the present Balance Sheet, while part will fall into the next. Of this sum no less than a third is due to the sale of strings of Egyptian beads. In this connection the Institute is under a very great obligation to Mrs. James Smith, who has not only threaded some three hundred strings of beads, but also arranged others of our duplicate objects in an attractive and saleable form. We still have a few objects to dispose of” (I of A AR 1921: 17).

The portion of the £400 that was recorded on the AR Balance Sheet was £107.4.6. The following year, in 1921, the I of A continued to sell, but not with the same degree of success:

“The sale of duplicates from our Egyptian Collections is proceeding, though very slowly. We still have for sale a few of the bead necklaces which have proved so popular” (AR of the I of A 1922: 18).

The amount shown in that year’s balance sheet was £321.2.6. If the amount shown on the 1920 Balance Sheet (£107.4.6) were added to that amount then the total raised by sales was £428.7.0.

In 1922, the AR reported on what was thought to be the final year of the sale:

“The sale of duplicates from our Egyptian collections has continued slowly throughout the Session, but may be regarded virtually as at an end. We can, however, still dispose of some fine strings of Egyptian beads” (I of A AR 1923: 18)

The amount recorded in the AR for the sales concluded in 1922 were to a total of £7.4.6. It was in 1923 that the I of A finally ended this activity:

“Further, a much larger sum was realised by the sale of antiquities during 1922-3 than in the previous year” (I of A AR 1923: 18).

The further sale of antiquities for 1923 came to £28.9.0.

With regard to the distribution lists for the duplicates sold, Snape notes that: “...unfortunately no distribution list for objects dispersed in this way has been located and the exact quantity and recipients of the material remain uncertain” (1986: 42). What can be discerned is that sales were made to Bolton Museum and as far away as the Metropolitan Museum in New York (Snape, 1986).

Despite its efforts, the Institute’s actions only served to tourniquet its hemorrhaging coffers. After another three years of financial difficulties, a decision was made over the disposal of surplus artifacts at a General Meeting of the Committee on 29 December 1927:

“5. The Hon. Treasurer presented his report. After discussing the unsatisfactory financial position the following motion was passed: “that the executive Committee be instructed to consider the question of the disposal of superfluous objects in the collection and empowered to act in the matters as they may consider advisable” (I of A Minute Book 1927: 52).

At the same meeting, a further decision was made to recall pieces from the Public Museum:

“9. It was agreed that the Egyptian Monuments now on Loan in the City Museum should in accordance with the Director’s request be removed forthwith and placed in the cellars pending finding a purchaser” (I of A Minute Book 1927: 54).

4.6.1: The attempt to sell the Loan Collection (1928-1930)

Five days after the Committee’s decision to sell, while in the United States, Garstang sent a letter to Peet on 5 January 1928, outlining a plan of action for the sale of the LC. He announced that an agent, Nils Lind of the American Colony Stores, could aid in finding a buyer, and it appeared that Lind was looking for a seller to represent. As a consequence, Garstang engaged Lind to act as an agent for the Institute in the sale of the Egyptian collection. See appendix C-1: (c). On the same day that Garstang sent his

letter, Lind sent one of his own to Peet confirming the arrangements he had made with Garstang. See appendix C-1: (d).

A very important aspect of this letter is the list that Lind included to help facilitate the sale. As the potential for sale developed, his requirements were to become a subtle point of contention between him and the I of A. As will be seen below, this contention was shared by potential buyers.

Three weeks later, on 18 January 1928 Droop wrote to Lind, responding to his requests. Droop asked that someone be sent to look at the collection on the latter's behalf:

“Your letter of Jan. 5th and one from Professor Garstang have been received. We are making every effort to send over to you a rough catalogue of the objects in the collection which we are offering for sale, with photographs and other illustrations of as many pieces as possible, within three days. When these documents are ready we shall reply in detail to your letter.

It would of course be very satisfactory if your could appoint some agent of yours in this country to come and view the collection and it would also be a good thing if you could arrange for any intending buyer in America to meet Professor Garstang during his visit, for he has an intimate knowledge of the collections, which is largely the product (and herein lies part of its value) of his excavations” (Droop 18 January 1928).

A week later, Droop wrote to Garstang. His letter concerned the amount the collection was to be sold for, as well as the aspects of the collection, which were available for purchase. See appendix C-1: (e). In voicing his concerns, Droop incidentally raised an interesting point. When discussing what could be sold as, “...the actual Egyptian collection owned by the Institute...”, Garstang's statement with reference to selling the “Entire collection”, created some confusion with regard to what the Institute was attempting to sell. This is because the AR concerning that year referred to the collections of Egyptian artifacts on display as the ‘Loan Collection’ (AR of the I of A, 1929:2); in the same way that the ARs had done since 1906, and as was discussed in Section 4.5. The term used by Lind to describe what was being sold was “the entire collection”, however the items listed in the letter by Droop were being held back from purchase.

Droop responded to Lind's requests in a letter dated 8 February, in which he included the views of the Institute with regard to the sale. These ran in five points (note: Droop leaves out "1."). See appendix C-1: (f).

On 14 February, Droop sent another letter to Lind continuing the topic discussed in his previous letter:

"In continuation of my letter of 8th inst. I beg to enclose a photograph which should be added to those already sent.

Is of an ancient Egyptian Weaver's reed. We also posses modern examples of the same thing to go with it for comparison.

This is an object of considerable rarity, interest, & value & should not have been omitted from any list of the Institute's collections.

P.S. I beg that the photograph may be attached to those already sent and returned with them" (Droop 14 February 1928).

In the above Droop explained the contents of a photograph that he had sent to Lind with the description. Although, it is not noted in Droop's previous letter, he had apparently sent Lind photographs, however the note identifying them no longer exists.

The information from Droop was not enough. In turn Lind replied to Droop on 29 February, asking for more in order to aid his efforts in the sale. See Appendix C-1: (g). What Lind seemed to be asking for was a basic catalogue for the collection, which brings to mind his first letter sent in January. His second request implies that the information that he was sent by the Institute was insufficient, and did not entirely enable him to fulfill his end of the agreement. Why was the I of A unable to meet his request? The answer could lie in the fact that there was no formal catalogue of the Loan Collection, which theoretically should have included the Egyptological holdings.

On 4 May, Lind wrote to Garstang to settle minor financial matters and to update him on his progress in finding a potential buyer. See appendix C-1: (h). By this time, Lind seemed to have found a number of potential buyers and things seemed to be progressing well. Further news came to Garstang by way of a letter, dated 13 October, from the director of the Toledo Museum of Art, Blake-More Godwin. This was as a result of an earlier meeting between Lind and Godwin. See Appendix C-1: (i).

From Godwin's letter, it would appear that the I of A had attracted a party interested in buying its collection. Yet the same problem surfaced again; after reviewing the material on the collection that the I of A had provided to Lind, Godwin had asked for more information about its contents. His request reinforces the suggestion that the Institute had not provided Lind with adequate information to properly relay the contents of its collection.

The same day, Godwin wrote to Peet informing him of his meeting with Lind and requested further information about the artifacts for sale. See appendix C-1: (j). Godwin was clearly very interested in the collection, to the point that he became very specific about the type of information that he required in order to "come nearer to reaching a conclusion." Four days later, Lind sent a letter to Peet to inform the Institute of Toledo Museum's interest in the collection. See Appendix C-1: (k).

At the point this letter was written, it would appear that Lind was on the verge of success. The third paragraph, however, seems to indicate what could be perceived as a growing sense of frustration with the Institute's inability to provide the necessary information that would allow him to complete the sale. Droop responded to Godwin's letter to Peet almost two months later, on 5 December, and discussed what the I of A was willing to do to supply Godwin with further information, as well as including suggestions as to how the matter might be resolved. See appendix C-1: (l).

With both Lind and Godwin in agreement that more information was required from the Institute in order to sell the collection, Droop comes across as if he was in a state of unacceptance. With the I of A's severe financial situation in mind, it seems strange that the staff of the Institute would not be willing to work harder to conclude a sale, which would in turn solve their monetary difficulties. Indeed, despite the letters from Lind and Goodwin, nothing came from the interaction between the I of A and the Toledo Museum. Godwin's letter of 13 October is the last piece of correspondence from Toledo regarding this subject in the SACE archives.

On 13 December 1928, Droop wrote to the auction house, Spink & Son Ltd., (called Spink hereafter), with regard to the collection:

"This Institute possesses a collection of Egyptian Antiquities & is disposed to attempt their sale. I have therefore been directed to enquire whether you could send a representative to view the collection and give us an idea of its selling value; and, if so, what would be your fee for so doing" (Droop 13 December 1928).

As this letter shows, the I of A attempted to open an additional route for the sale of its collection. Spink responded to Droop the following day:

"We thank you for your letter of the 13th inst., and note that your Institute is disposed to attempt the sale of its collection of Egyptian antiquities. Before setting our fee for a valuation, we should like to know whether you wish us to give you a valuation of the price we should be prepared to give for the pieces, or of what the collection is likely to realise selling by auction, or by private treaty to a collector" (Spink & Son 14 December 1928).

Droop responded to Spink's inquiry regarding the method of transaction in a letter dated 15 December:

"In reply I can only say that as we desire to sell the collection to the best advantage we should wish to have a valuation on all three of the vases which you mentioned, & would ask for your fee for that.

Without at present finding ourselves in the matter before we know your fee [.] I would say at once that it would be a convenience to us if the valuation could be in our hands before Jan. 10th" (Droop 15 December 1928).

The reference of the 10th is unknown, as is that of the "three vases". This bit of the correspondence appears to have been lost, as it was not contained in the letters detailed here. Nevertheless, Spink replied to Droop's enquiry on 18 December:

"In reply to your letter of the 15th inst., we beg to say that we should be glad to do the three full valuations of the Egyptian objects already referred to on a $21\frac{1}{2}\%$ = $2\frac{1}{2}\%$ basis, plus our out-of-pocket expenses. In the event of our purchasing the objects, the fee would be waived" (Spink and Son 18 December 1928).

With Spink informing the I of A of the rates that it would be charged for valuations, it is clear from the following piece of correspondence from Spink that Droop had responded to the letter dated the 18th. That letter, however, appears to have been lost. In Spink's response to Droop on 21 December, it was noted that:

"We are in receipt of your esteemed letter with reference to the Egyptian Collection, and understand that the matter is to remain in abeyance until New Year" (Spink and Son 21 December 1928).

What is clear from the letter is that Droop had for some reason put a halt to negotiations with the auction house until the New Year. After a year of negotiations and attempting to sell the collection, the decision to sell was commented upon in the AR:

“From the Hon. Secretary’s point of view, the chief event of the year has been the initiating by Professor Garstang, following on a vote of the Committee, of negotiations for the sale in America of the Institute’s Egyptian collection, excluding a sufficiency of types for teaching purposes and certain specified objects.

The negotiations which, it is hoped, will eventually placed the finances of the Institute on a sound footing, have not yet been brought to a conclusion, and it is not at present possible to say more than that they are proceeding” (I of A AR 1928:13).

On 14 January 1929, Droop wrote to Spink again:

“...I beg to inform you that a meeting held this morning my committee not to proceed further at the present time in the matter of the valuations of the Egyptian Collection of this Institute” (Droop 14 January 1929).

The following day, Spink sent this reply to Droop:

“We are in receipt of your letter of the 14th insti. (sic), and note that you do not propose to go further into the questions of valuation at this present time” (Spink & Son 15 January 15 1929).

At this point it becomes clear that the Institute decided not to use Spink for the sale, but the reason for this is not known unknown. On 15 January Droop sent a letter to Lind regarding Godwin and his work in attempting to sell the collection. See appendix C-1: (m).

This letter is the final correspondence on the part of the I of A with regard to the Toledo Museum. It is clear that the Institute had limits with regard to what it was willing to do in order to make the sale. Despite ending negotiations with Godwin and Spink, the I of A appears to have put all of its focus into Lind’s efforts, ultimately giving him a time limit of a year to make the sale.

The AR for 1929 stated the following in regard to the sale:

“The negotiations on foot for the sale of the Egyptian collections have as yet reached no result. The position is, however, so far improved in that a representative of the American Colony Stores, who have the matter in hand, made a thorough inspection of the collections in the early summer so that the firm, by knowing exactly

with what they are dealing, should be in a better position to arrange a sale" (I of A AR 1929:14).

The AR remained optimistic about the sale of the collection, despite the fact that there appeared to be limited options that would help the I of A find a suitable buyer.

The final pieces of correspondence between Lind and Droop were in January and February 1930, a year after their last communication. On 30 January, Droop wrote to Lind:

"I am directed to by my C=tee [Committee] to refer to my letter of the 15th January 1929, and to inform you that, the period of the sale agency of the American colony stores for the sale of the Institute & Egyptian collection having now elapsed this in accordance with the notice given you in the last paragraph of the letter, my committee now holds itself free to deal elsewhere.

I am however to add, that in the event of a sale being effected in the future through the American Colony Stores, my Committee considers that the conditions of paragraph 2 of the verbal agreement made between the American Colony Stores and Professor Gartstang as reported in your letter of 5th January to Professor Peet should be adhered to" (Droop 30 January 1930).

As no buyer had been found for the LC over the course of 1929, after Droop's letter of January of the same year, the arrangement with Lind therefore ceased in 1930. Nevertheless, the Institute remained open to the idea of selling through Lind, if the opportunity were to present itself in future. Lind sent his response to Droop on 18 February:

"We beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of January 30th in regard to your Egyptian collection. We also appreciate the decision contained in the second paragraph of your letter.

We have been negotiating with two separate parties for some time and we sincerely trust something may yet develop before long" (Lind 18 February 1930).

In the Hon. Secretary's Report of 1930 AR, it was reported that:

"It is regrettable to have to state that no progress has been made during the year with the hoped-for-sale of the Egyptian Collection. The insurance of that and of our other collections has now been put on a satisfactory footing" (I of A AR 1930:16-17).

With this final entry in connection to the sale of the collection, it appears that there was no longer the same requirement to sell the artifacts. What is

however, perhaps most significant is that the attempt to sell the artifacts had resulted in such complete failure.

4.7: Conclusion

It is in this chapter that the *modus operandi* of the benefactors responsible for the LC becomes much clearer. It was as a consequence of members of the EC, namely Rankin and Garstang, that the collection housed at the I of A was started. Yet, with the advent of the Institute, the endeavors of the EC members were not directed toward education, as Section 4.4.1 in particular has demonstrated. Their focus appears to have been placed on the profit that could be derived from their subscription to Garstang's excavations via the purchase of shares. Jones' letters also aids in demonstrating Garstang's support for this practice. The correspondence that Jones sent to his parents while in the field, which contained anecdotes regarding appraisals made by Garstang, points towards the archaeologist playing an active role in the process of profit-making.

As shown, while the EC was a separate entity to the I of A, it was tied to the Institute via the affiliation established in 1905. Further, the EC was also tied to the I of A by way of the Institute's General Committee, due to the fact that various members of the EC were also members of the I of A's Committee; these included Brunner, Rankin, Danson and Price. Similarly, in the cases of Brunner, Rankin and Danson, all three played a consistent role as benefactors to the I of A at various points during its first decade.

In Chapter Two it was shown that Kelly (1981) observed that excavation was a higher priority to the Institute than teaching. Equally, as discussed in Chapter Two, it could be said that excavation was also a higher priority than the financial security of the I of A. Every year during the I of A's first decade, the EC commenced with its yearly expedition, originally in Egypt, and subsequently to the Sudan. Excavations took place regardless of the state of the I of A's finances. Taking into consideration that the EC and the Institute were separate entities, an immediate question arises is: what did

one have to do with the other? If the same people that were aiding the Institute were also investing in excavations, and were making money from expeditions, why then was more not being done to ensure the financial stability of the Institute in the longer term? Why did the EC need the I of A? An answer be that the I of A legitimized the EC's exploits by allowing the EC to give the impression to outsiders that it was involved in research through excavation. All that would have been required consequently to keep the Institute afloat. This therefore brings to mind the question: was the LC merely a repository for the EC's cast off artifacts? It is answering this question that will be one of the focuses of the Conclusion.

For as long as the EC was active, the ARs show that the LC received a steady stream of artifacts for the majority of the time that the I of A and Excavation Committee were affiliated. Section 4.6 demonstrated that, from as early as 1906, the LC was viewed as a potential source of income. Yet when Garstang attempted to utilize the LC in 1906 to provide revenue, he was met with objection from Newberry. Later, when Garstang attempted to sell pieces as a result of the financial problems of 1910, he then had Newberry's support, along with other members of the I of A Committee. The sale, however, did not take place. It was not until after the War, in 1920, that the I of A, with the approval of its Committee, was forced to sell duplicates from the LC due to mounting monetary pressures. This phase of sales lasted until 1926. In 1927, with increasing financial difficulties, the Committee decided to sanction the sale of the Egyptological collection. As explained, it was during the following year that the I of A attempted to sell the collection, with Lind acting as an agent in the US.

The primary cause for the failure to sell the collection can be laid at the door of the I of A itself. From his first letter, Lind was clear about what information would be required order to sell the LC; i.e. a catalogue accompanied by photographs. In Garstang's absence however, Droop, as the Institute's co-secretary, took charge of administering the responsibilities of the Institute in this process. He failed to provide Lind with what he required, and only sent him a few photographs, hand drawn pictures and a list of items which he felt were the highlights of the collection. Even after the Toledo Museum expressed more than a firm interest in the collection, Droop insisted,

with the backing of the Committee, that the interested parties come to Liverpool to look at the LC. The greatest fault of the I of A in all this would appear to have been that the Institute did not work hard enough in fulfilling the goal of the LC's sale. This consequently seems counter-productive for an institution which was forced to attempt the sale of its collection out of financial desperation. Therefore, did the Institute truly want to sell the LC, and ultimately, was the I of A simply its own worst enemy? All the evidence that has been presented and discussed to this point suggests that this could well have been the case.

CHAPTER FIVE

External Relations - The Institute of Archaeology and the Liverpool Corporation's Library Museum & Arts Committee

5.1: Introduction

It was established in the last chapter that the collection at the I of A grew extensively during its early years, principally via the structure and function of the EC. Furthermore, the last chapter highlighted that while its collection rapidly grew, the I of A referred to the collection it housed as the LC, with the exception of the first two years of its existence, rather than as a 'museum'. The incidents of 1906 have been a reoccurring subject throughout the previous chapters. As Chapter Four suggested, the reason for the Institute's use of the term LC rather than 'museum' was as a consequence of tensions between the I of A and the Public Museum. It is the catalyst for the cause and effect of these tensions that is the focus of this chapter.

After a brief discussion of the primary material used in this chapter, Section 5.3 looks at the developing relationship between the I of A, U of L, and the Library, Museum and Arts Committee (LMAC) from 1904 onwards. The LMAC was the Liverpool City Corporation's governing body for the municipal libraries and museums. In this section the relationships between the bodies are broken down into three sub-sections. It will be seen that a 'Scheme' for a closer relationship between the I of A, U of L and the LMAC was suggested and formulated in 1905. Section 5.3.1 looks at the initial relations between the I of A and the LMAC via the Public Museum. Section 5.3.2 demonstrates how the LMAC initiated a 'Scheme' for further co-operation between itself and the University. The 'Scheme' eventually expanded to include the Institute of Archaeology. Thereafter, Section 5.3.3 charts the development and structuring of this 'Scheme', a process which

primarily involved three specific individuals; A.W.W. Dale, as a representative of the University, Sir William Forwood as the Chairman for the LMAC committee, and F. J. Leslie, another LMAC committee member.

Section 5.4 reviews a report that was assembled the Special Sub-Committee (SSC) of the LMAC, which was the source of the tensions that occurred between the I of A and the LMAC. The report was the accumulation of ideas contained within the 'Scheme'. Entitled *Suggestions for Further Co-operation between the Library, Museum and Arts Committee, The Liverpool University, and the Archaeology Institute* (SSC 1906), it set out a proposal that looks today more akin to what would be called a 'hostile takeover'. Indeed, the suggestions contained in the document were to expose not only serious problems concerning the relationship between the Public Museum and the I of A, but the dynamics between both bodies and the University of Liverpool.

Section 5.5 studies the I of A's written response to the report. That response served to aid in defining the Institute's role in context to the University and other affiliated bodies, such as the EC.

5.2: Literature

The material used in this chapter comes from the SJSC, the City of Liverpool Central Library Record Office, and the Maritime Archive and Library Reserve Store (MALRS). The material from the SJSC in this chapter includes Dale's letters, the Minutes of the University Committee, the University Calendars, and the Minutes Book of the I of A Special Committee, as well as the Minutes Books of the I of A. Various original sources that concern the dispute are also located in the Liverpool City Library Record Office. The most significant data relevant to this chapter was collected from the Minutes of the LMAC, plus newspaper clippings relating to the same committee. The material sourced from the MALRS was letters pertaining to Danson.

5.3: Definition and the expansion of relations between the U of L, I of A and LMAC

5.3.1: The original relations between the I of A and the LMAC

From its inception in 1904, the I of A appears to have sought good relations with the Public Museum. As discussed in Section 4.6 of the previous chapter, on 19 February 1904 Henry Ogg Forbes, Director of the Public Museum sent a letter to the EC in response to the advertisement made by the I of A making surplus artifacts available to museums:

“The Director of the Corporation of Liverpool begs to apply for ref of “Ancient Egyptian pottery of the XI Dynasty”, as offered by the Beni Hasan excavation committee in the Times of Feb 18 1904. The Museums under the charge of the Director are open to the public and free of charge” (Forbes 19 February 1904).

Later that year, according to the catalogue for exhibition, from July 7 - 23 1904 the finds from the Beni Hasan excavations from that season were exhibited at the Society of Antiquaries in London. On July 27, Forbes sent another letter, this time to Garstang: “Kindly send the director a copy of your Illustrated Catalogue, for which please find stamps enclosed to cover cost of the same & oblige...”

Two months later, Forbes sent a further letter on 27 September to Garstang, in which he appeared to be paying money to the EC. This would have presumably been for excavations for the up-coming 1904-1905 season:

“I am desired by the Director to say that the Beni Hasan Excavation Account for carriage of Egyptian Antiquities, went forward in the usual course to the City Treasurer fir payment, & will no doubt be discharged at an early date” (Forbes 27 September 1904).

The AR for 1904-05, however, does not show a contribution from the Public Museum toward to the excavation. This begs the question why Forbes, as Director, would contribute toward the excavation if the Public Museum was not a member of the EC. It can only be assumed that, although the Public Museum was not a part of the committee, they had contributed, yet were off the record. The sense of this letter is clarified to some extent in Section 5.4.

Taking the correspondence from Forbes into account, it is possible to see that the I of A and the Public Museum were in consultation with

each other prior to, and during, the Institute's first year. Similarly, Garstang, as the Secretary to the Institute's General Committee, was a key advocate in the idea that the Institute could benefit from having a close relationship with the Public Museum. He went as far as to suggest that, under the right circumstances, the Institute would be willing to "be combined" with it. By December 1904, Garstang had proposed a definition of the I of A's self-perceived role and its mission, in addition to establishing the parameters around which it was open to be merged with the Public Museum. These were recorded in the minutes of the 2nd AGM of the Institute's General Committee:

"The Institute of Archaeology is established for the purposes of teaching, study and research. Its museum and library are intended to be of an educational character, and to be used for educational purposes. The Committee have no desire to accumulate collections without reference to their use still less to set up a Museum of Archaeology that might seem to compete with the museum of the city. They fully recognize the risk of overlapping, and friction that would result from divided interests. If an arrangement (1) securing adequate facilities for teaching study and research, (2) establishing relations between the Museum and Arts Committee of the Corporation and the Committee of the Institute, and (3) uniting both bodies in common research work, could be brought about, the Committee of the Institute are of the opinion that it would be desirable (provided that the consent of the donors could be obtained) that their collections should be combined with those of the City Museum, provided always that the interests of the Institute should be thereby adequately secured. Proposal seconded by the Vice-Chancellor" (I of A Minutes 15 December 1904: 41).

This same proposal, which had been seconded by Dale, was subsequently entered into the minutes of the 26th University Council meeting on 31 January 1905. It was agreed that "...the following resolution of the University Institute of Archaeology be entered in the minutes..." (UL Council Minutes 1905: 1). As a consequence of this decision, it reinforced the Institute's position for potential involvement with the Public Museum.

5.3.2: "Expanding Co-operation"

After the I of A made its position with regard to working with Public Museums clear at both its AGM and the U of L Council, nothing appears to have occurred. Yet when Dale received correspondence from

the LMAC's Museum Sub-Committee (MSC) in late February 1905 and thereafter, it appears that the Institute was kept at arms length to any proposed changes.

On 27 February, Dale was in receipt of a letter from the MSC. This informed him that a resolution had been passed by the Sub-Committee, which offered the U of L use of its collections and amenities. In addition it stated the following:

“Facilities Provided At The Museum[:] That Sir William Forwood, Professor Paterson, and the Chairman (Mr. J. Harrison Jones) be appointed to meet with the University Authorities with a view of co-operation in its work” (U of L Council Minutes 1905: 9).

A day later Dale sent this reply:

“Facilities Provided at the Museum. I write to acknowledge the receipt of the resolution passed by the Museum Sub-Committee and since confirmed by the Library Committee. It shall be laid before the University Council at their next meeting” (Dale 1905: 714).

The MSC resolution was read at the respective U of L Council meeting on March 14, where it was agreed that representatives be sent to meet with those from the MSC. Dale subsequently sent another letter to the Town Clerk detailing the decision:

“On February 27 you wrote to me, forwarding a resolution of the City Museum Sub-Committee. The Council of the University have appointed representatives to meet those appointed by the committee for the purposes of discussing the facilities provided by the Museum, and of considering what common action may be possible. When could we meet? Our representatives are: - the Vice-President of the Council (Mr. J.W.Alsop), Dr. Caton, Mr. John Rankin and myself” (Dale 1905: 714).

A meeting was set for May 19. It was confirmed in a letter from Dale, informing the Town Clerk that he would be sending out notices (Dale 1905:768).

Although the minutes from the May 19th meeting appear to have been lost, the effect of the meeting is seen in the records of the U of L Council, dated 6 June 1905:

“5. The Vice-Chancellor reported that at the interview, representatives of the City Museums Sub-Committee and the Representatives of the University held on 19 May, 1905, the City authorities stated that they were anxious to co-operate with the University in any educational and scientific work that could be undertaken in common, and would willingly consider any scheme

that might be submitted to them for making the Library and the Museums more serviceable to students” (U of L Council Minutes 1905: 21).

What is clear from these documents is that the University Council was taking firm steps towards co-operating with the MSC. Furthermore, it can be seen that Dale was leading the increasingly closer relations between the two bodies. This is apparent not merely because it was mentioned in the minutes that Dale had “reported...that the City authorities stated that they were anxious to co-operate”, but the frequency of his letters also increased steadily as the situation developed.

On 16 June, Dale sent a response to a letter from FJ Leslie, a Liverpool councillor and a member of the LMAC. Although the letter from Leslie appears no longer to exist, Dale’s reply was as follows:

“I am greatly obliged to you for your letter and the suggestion it contains. If you will be good enough to do us the service that you offer, the Registrar will send full information to all the teachers that you appoint” (Dale 1905: 917).

Without the contrast of Leslie’s initial letter, Dale’s response seems cryptic. Despite the fact that only one side of the exchange remains, it is important to note the reply, as the content will come up again later in the chapter. Activity related to the ‘Scheme’ between the U of L and the LMAC went quiet temporarily and there was no further correspondence, official or otherwise, for the next three months.

In July 1905 a sample of Garstang’s finds from Esna was displayed at the Public Museum. This exhibition was recorded in the AR of 1906:

“The fruits of these excavations were exhibited in the Public Museums of Liverpool during July of the Present year, and Mr. Garstang wishes to express his appreciation of the courtesy and the facilities extended to him by his colleague Dr. Forbes, Director of the Public Museums and by the President and Committee of that Institution” (I of A AR 1906:15).

This exhibition demonstrated a broadening of the relationship between the I of A and the Public Museum. It also aids in suggesting that the LMAC was becoming increasingly aware of the success that the I of A had had during its last two seasons of excavation. Beginning with Forbes request for artifacts and a catalogue of the prior year’s finds, as discussed in Section 5.3.1, and the exhibition held at the Public Museum in July 1905, this all

served to help in explaining the actions of the LMAC discussed later in this chapter.

On 22 September the I of A passed a resolution consenting to a donation being made to the City's Public Museum:

"That this Institute do present the Public Museum of the City of Liverpool (w/the approval of the University Council), a wooden painted and inscribed sarcophagus of the XII dynasty; and (with the full approval of the donors) a series of Egyptian antiquities from the gifts made by Mr R. Brocklebank, Sir John Brunner, Bart., and Mr J. Rankin, to the Institute, 1905" (I of A Minutes 1905: 41).

The donation consisted of 18 items, all of which were listed in detail in the 13 December 1905 entry in the I of A Minute Book. The reasons for the gift were not revealed until a later date, and as a result, they are discussed in Section 5.4 of this chapter. By donating to the Public Museum, however, the Institute reinforced what was written in its mission statement; that it sought to establish "relations between the Museum and Arts Committee of the Corporation and the Committee of the Institute" (I of A Minutes 1904: 41).

On September 23, Dale sent a letter responding to what would appear to be Forwood's re-initiation of correspondence between the U of L and the LMAC:

"I have only just come back to work and find your letter awaiting me here. The British Association Meeting in South Africa has carried off two of the men whose concurrence to any scheme is essential; and for some weeks before they actually started, both, as they hold official positions were so engrossed with preparations they could not think of anything else. They will be here again in a few days and as soon as they are here I will take up the task again.

To an outcast the problem would be simple enough but to the person working under a constitutional system who must persuade and cannot compel, the difficulties are great. The Library and the Botanical Department I can see my way with: the Natural History Department is the real rock, but I do not despair of bringing [William Abbott] Herdman in" (Dale 1905: 176).

This letter sheds light on the extent to which Dale was helping guide the U of L's involvement in the 'Scheme' with the MSC. From it one can see that Dale had convinced the Library and the Botany department to co-operate. Yet he had had trouble elsewhere. The "difficulties" he referred to become clear at the end of the letter, when he wrote about Herdman, the then

Professor and Head of the Natural History department. What is still unclear, however, is to what exactly the Library and Botany department had agreed. A larger question that is raised by the subtext of the letter relates to Herdman's opposition to the 'Scheme'. Why was he not agreeing to something that the other two academic departments and the University itself supported? The lack of material concerning the department of Natural History, as discussed in Chapter 2, renders this question unanswerable.

On 6 October, Dale responded to a letter from Garstang. His earlier correspondence does not survive, yet Dale's reply was clearly inquiring about the I of A collection:

"Many thanks for your letter. Will you kindly come and see me, if possible to-morrow morning? Without some talk with you I do not feel sure of my ground in answering the questions that may be put to me in Council as to the tenure of various collections held by the Institute. My own personal feeling is strongly in favour of the course which the Committee are now taking, and I hope that this decision if carried through will lead to developments as at present unforeseen" (Dale 1905: 247).

Dale's letter remains ambiguous. Was he was looking for support for the 'Scheme' from the Institute? Was he attempting to request that the I of A join the Library and the Botany department? A larger question that arises from this is: was Garstang informed in full about the proposed 'Scheme' at the meeting which Dale requested? As noted in Chapter 2, Dale was not only the Vice-Chancellor and on the U of L Council, but he was also on the I of A's committee. With this fact alone, one could assume that Dale would discuss the 'Scheme' with the I of A committee. Yet the lack of evidence, and his somewhat vague letter, leaves room for speculation.

While the questions regarding the I of A's knowledge of the 'Scheme' through Dale remain unanswered, Garstang and other members of the I of A could have become aware of the 'Scheme' via a newspaper article, printed in *The Liverpool Courier* on 21 October. This is the first written reference concerning the 'Scheme' to be printed publicly. The article reported that:

"The following is from an [LMAC] meeting and was a portion of the speech given by Sir William Forwood: Negotiations were still proceeding with the object of bringing those institutions into closer

touch with the University. He felt very strongly that those two great bodies should be linked together in mutually supporting and assisting each other in the higher education of the city" (*The Liverpool Courier* 21 October 1905).

It is unknown for certain whether Garstang read this article, which is more than likely than not. If he did, it is likely that it would have raised further questions for Dale.

By 1 November, the 'Scheme' began to become much clearer. On that day Dale sent Forwood an official response to the MSC's proposal. See appendix D-1: (a). With the proposal in mind, it becomes clearer why Herdman would have been opposed to it. One could suggest that co-operation may have been taken as a threat to the Zoological collection. However, given Dale's 1 November letter, his ability to "persuade" was unimpaired and Herdman had changed his position and decided to take part. With closer inspection, the letter to Forwood brings to mind another question: Why was the I of A not brought in to the 'Scheme'? Looking again at Dale's 6 October letter to Garstang, and that of 23 September to Forwood, one would have thought the I of A and the collection it housed would have seen Dale's powers of persuasion in action. Equally, the inclusion of the I of A would have been logical. This is due to the Institute's statements regarding co-operation with the Public Museum in the Minute Book entry of 14 December 1904, a position also known to the University Council and confirmed in their minutes of 31 January 1905.

A few weeks later, on 23 November, Dale replied to a letter from Garstang:

"I have kept your letter of November 17th by me for some days hoping to learn more about the scheme. But though I have asked one or two people they could tell me nothing - definite the points that suggest themselves are these:

1. Who are the provisional committee?
2. What is the relation of the School proposed to the existing School?
3. What is the wide and comprehensive end?" (Dale 1905: 412).

Despite the fact that Garstang's letter of 17 November is missing, it can be assumed he was enquiring about the 'Scheme'. Dale was, again, being vague with him. Keeping their prior exchange in September in mind, it begs the

question why Dale had not yet fully informed Garstang about the 'Scheme'. This question becomes even more relevant as events progressed. On 1 December at a meeting of the LMAC, Dale's letter of 1 November was entered into the Minutes:

“Read: Letter dated 1st November 1905 addressed to the Chairman from the Vice Chancellor of the University of Liverpool submitting for the consideration of the Committee a series of suggestions for a closer arrangement between the LMAC and the University.

Resolved: That the letter be referred to a Special Sub-Committee Consisting of the Chairman [Forwood], Deputy Chairman [Robert Durning Holt], Alderman [Joachim Nicolas Stolterfoht], Councillors Leslie, [Dr William] Permewan, [John] Lea, [Arthur] Crosthwaite, Colonel W. H. Walker MP and A.M. Paterson to deal with the matter.

Resolved: That a copy of the letter be sent to each member of the LMAC.

Resolved that the next meeting of the General Committee be held on Fri. Dec. 22 1905 at 9:45 am” (LMAC Minutes 1906: 292).

The meeting marked the beginning of the Special Sub-Committee (SSC) as an entity. More importantly, it was the first time that the 'Scheme' was mentioned in the minutes of the LMAC. The initial letter that was sent on 27 February 1905 from the Town Clerk to Dale, regarding the resolution that had been passed, was not referred to in the LMAC minutes, and it appears to have been that specific correspondence which initially began the exchange between the two bodies with regard to the 'Scheme'. Yet the only records concerning this are Dale's letter in response to the Clerk, and the entry in the U of L Council Minutes. By the end of 1905, communication via correspondence and formal meetings between the U of L and the LMAC had occurred for the better part of a year. Thus, without any other entries made in the LMAC Minutes regarding the 'Scheme', the impression is that it was initiated by the University, and specifically through Dale's letter of 1 November 1905.

5.3.3: Development of the 'Scheme'

On 5 December 1905, the University Council put forward a resolution that the I of A should create a Special Committee to investigate

co-operation with the LMAC. Three days later, a meeting was convened of the Special Committee on the Chair of Classical Archaeology and the Relations between the City Council (LMAC), the University and the Institute of Archaeology, at which Dale was present. The following motions were passed:

“4. That the next meeting should be held at 3 p.m. on Monday, December 18; that the Institute of Archaeology should be asked to send representatives, and that Sir William Forwood and Dr. Permewan should be invited to attend for the purpose of the informal conference.

5. That the Museum Sub-Committee should be asked to appoint representatives to confer with the committee” (Minutes of the Special Committee 1905: 1).

According to Dale's day book, he wrote six letters on the 9 December. The first four were to Forwood, Permewan, the Director of the I of A (Garstang) and the Chairman of the MSC (presumably Leslie). All were informed about the meeting that had been agreed for the 18 December. The fifth and sixth letters were to James Alsop and Sir John Brunner. It is these two letters that potentially begin to answer the question regarding Dale's position vis-à-vis the I of A's involvement in the 'Scheme'. See Appendix D-1: (b) to see the letter Dale wrote to Alsop.

It can be argued that in the first paragraph, Dale was referring to his letter of 25 September, which was discussed earlier in this chapter. The letter to Alsop finally clarifies Dale's position on the I of A in the context of the 'Scheme.' This is seen specifically where he says that he hopes the MSC understands that the I of A was not under the control of the University, and that the University could not speak for it. These lines may explain why the I of A was not included in the 'Scheme'. But then, regardless of the University not having control over the collection, one continues to question why Dale, especially with the Institute's Mission Statement in mind, did not formally approach the Institute with the 'Scheme'. The sixth and final letter sent on 9 December was to Brunner. It is by far the most informative of the six. See appendix D-1: (c).

This letter provides a way of understanding what had taken place in the previous 9 months. Yet it can also be analyzed as Dale potentially confiding in Brunner. If this is the case, it offers an insight into their personal relationship. The initial steps in early 1905 between the bodies are carefully outlined by Dale, but for some reason, he left out the first letter of 27 February 1905 that informed the University Council of the resolution of the MSC with regard to museum facilities. Dale went on to outline his 'struggles' with Zoology and Herdman. What are noteworthy are his comments regarding the I of A and the relationship between it and the University. Dale goes into more detail in this letter than that of the same date to Alsop.

Another point worth emphasizing in the letter to Brunner is that Dale had been reminding the MSC and its representatives for 7 months that the I of A and the University were "separate bodies." It is clear that Dale was concerned that the MSC comprehended this point, not least in the way he wrote about it to both Alsop and Brunner. The question that therefore arises here is: after 7 months of repeated reminders, why was Dale still worried that the MSC did not understand that the I of A and University were separate entities? At the other end of the scale, why was Dale worried that a "false impression" would be created at the meeting? Further, why would the "Corporation" have thought that it had been "misled" if Dale had been telling them for 7 months that the I of A and the U of L were separate bodies? It seems that there are subtle contradictions in Dale's letter. The larger question is: what was Dale actually saying to the LMAC and its sub-committees? If he was being as direct with them as the letter to Brunner would have him believe, then how can there be any concern over false impressions and the members of the Corporation being misled? The current evidence does not answer any of these questions.

In keeping with what was agreed on 8 December, at the meeting of the I of A's General Committee on 15 December, representatives were chosen for the meeting of 18 December with members of the MSC, the I of A, and the U of L Council:

"3. Read - a communication from the Vice Chancellor of the University asking for the nomination of representatives of the Institute to attend a committee meeting of the University Council to consider matters relating to the post in the Classical Archaeological other matters relating to the Institute.

Mr F. C. Danson, Vice President, and Mr. Wm Grisewood, Hon: Auditor, were appointed representatives of the institute for this purpose" (Minutes of the I of A 1905: 54).

It is important to note that, because of his imminent departure for Egypt for the Lent season, Garstang would not have been unable to attend the meeting. This was confirmed by a letter dated 15 December from Dale to William Grisewood, which informed him of the meeting: "You have been appointed by the I of A as one of their representatives; ... Mr Garstang is just setting out on expedition..." (Dale 1905: 496). Garstang, however, was present at the meeting on the 15th where the representatives were chosen to meet with the MSC members three days later. While this point may not appear significant here, it does become relevant later.

As scheduled, the meeting between the I of A, University and the MSC took place on 18 December. The respective minutes reported the following:

"Present: Sir John Brunner (Chairman), Mr. Alsop, Mr. Harrison Jones, Mr. Muspratt, Mr Hugh R. Rathbone, Mr. Rankin, Mr. B.S. Johnson, Professor Mackay, and the Vice-Chancellor.

Sir William Forwood, Councillor F.J. Leslie, and Dr. Permewan, members of the Museum and Library Committee of the Corporation, and Mr. Grisewood, representing the Institute of Classical Archaeology, were also present.

1. A memorandum of the proceeding of the previous meeting was read.
2. A statement by the Chairman was followed by a general discussion. No resolution was moved, and it was agreed that the committee should adjourn until the special committees appointed for the purpose had met and conferred" (Minutes of the Special Committee 1905: 2).

Of those listed as present at the meeting and who were to have been representing the University, four were also on the I of A's General Committee; Mackay and Dale with Brunner and Rankin. As previously discussed, Brunner and Rankin were Vice-Presidents of the Institute, besides being members of the EC. Similarly, as Grisewood was representing

the I of A in place of Garstang, all this inadvertently placed five members of the I of A committee at the meeting.

The minutes specifically state, “No resolution was moved...” Further, all the representatives should “adjourn” until the various committees had “met and conferred.” Bearing these words in mind, it is important to observe what transpired four days later at the General Committee of the LMAC. At its meeting held on 22 December, the following resolution was put forward:

“Resolved: that in addition to the matters already referred to the Special Sub- Committee appointed to consider a series of suggestions for a closer relationship between this committee and the University there be also referred to such Special Sub Committee the consideration of the relations between this committee and the Archaeology Institute” (LMAC 1905: 299).

These lines are the first time the I of A was mentioned in the minutes of the LMAC. Just as worthy of note, however is that the donation made to the Public Museum that same month, which was entered into the I of A Minutes seven days beforehand, is not mentioned in the LMAC minutes for the next two years. Equally, according to the minutes for both the I of A and the University Council, there were to be no further joint meetings regarding the ‘Scheme’ for the remainder of the year. Neither the LMAC, MSC, nor the SSC have any entries in their minutes of the meeting of 18 December taking place. What has been discovered are references to the meeting made in other documents; i.e. in letters and reports (which are reviewed later in the chapter).

All this points to the fact that the resolution made on 22 December was decided upon independently by the SSC and the LMAC, despite what had been decided at the meeting of the 18th. Nevertheless, the effects of the decision made on 22 December were to be felt into the following year. They were to develop into something that would threaten the independence of the I of A and its entire collection.

5.4: The LMAC Report

In early 1906 the LMAC released its Annual Report (LMAC-AR) for 1905. That report reveals two key points. The first is that this is the only acknowledgement, in print, of the 1905 gift to the Public Museum by the I of A, discussed in Section 5.3.2. The relevant excerpt from the section entitled, 'General Report', is as follows:

"We have received a valuable contribution from the Egyptian Archaeological Society, which is supported by some of our leading Liverpool citizens, and under, the personal direction of Mr. Garstang, has conducted very successful explorations at Edfu, Kom el Ahmar, &c" (LMAC AR 1905: 5).

The second point in the LMAC-AR was raised originally in Section 5.3.1, which dealt with a payment handled by Forbes for the Public Museum to the EC. It states:

"Through the generosity of T. Brocklebank... J. R. Paton...E. Whitely... J. W. Hughes...Mrs. E. E. Whitley... J.W. Hughes...the Director was able to benefit to the extent of one-tenth share in the results of explorations carried on by Mr. Garstang at Edfu, Kom el Ahmar, Hierakanopolis, Esna, and Hissayeh, Egypt" (LMAC AR 1905: 76).

The contents of both entries are shown in the 'Acquisitions' section of the LMAC-AR. The list of artifacts acquired through the EC ends with "from the excavations by Mr. Garstang" (LMAC AR 1905: 90). The second entry ends the same as the first with the exception of a minor addition; "presented by the Committee of the Institute of Archaeology (Liverpool University)" (LMAC AR 1905: 91). These two excerpts from the LMAC AR show that the Public Museum had benefitted from Garstang's 1904-1905 excavations. Later in this section it will be shown how they intended to gain from the following years' excavations as well.

On 20 January 1906 Dale sent a letter to Leslie marked 'PRIVATE':

"Many thanks for your kindness in sending me a copy of the draft report. It appeared to me wiser that it should be discussed without any comment of mine, as there is nothing in it to which, personally, I feel any material objection: the points of difficulty have appeared where I expected them; and so far as the University is concerned, I do not anticipate any serious difficulty in getting the scheme through. For the Institute I cannot speak. But if Brunner and Rankin are rightly involved, that will settle it.

One other thing that I must add – for your own information solely. Special and particular allusion to Paterson's membership offer in Museum's Sub-committee is likely to increase rather than to lessen friction and antagonism. With some people the thing has become an obsession, - I can use no other terms. I do not share the feeling, for I know the value of his work; but I have to take account of it" (Dale 1906: 574).

Dale's continued support for the LMAC is shown in this letter, which marks a crucial point. He was in favour of the Report, in that "...there is nothing in it to which, personally, I feel any material objection...", and he was confident in "getting the scheme through." Dale here appears to have been much more confident than he was in his letter of 9 December, except for the line: "...for the Institute I cannot speak." This recalls the December letters to Alsop and Brunner. Furthermore, reflecting on the meeting of 18 December, all three parties agreed to do nothing. So why did Leslie, the Chairman of the SSC, send Dale a Report that included suggestions for the I of A? Why was the I of A not sent a draft copy of the report in which it was included?

As it mentions the 'Scheme', a connection can be made that the report also included Botany, Zoology and the University Library. Dale's lack of surprise and full support for the Report lends weight to the idea that he must have had prior knowledge of it. This may also explain why Dale's letters of 6 October and 23 November 1905 come across as vague. Although a motive for hiding knowledge of this report from Garstang has yet to surface, it appears that this was most likely the case given the circumstances. The 'Paterson' to whom Dale refers was Dr A. M. Paterson, Professor of Anatomy in the University and a member of the SSC. It is not clear, however, why his potential appointment to the MSC could have caused antagonism or friction. According to the LMAC Minute Books he had been affiliated with the committee as far back as 1904.

On 2 February 1906, at a meeting of the LMAC, a report was distributed entitled *Suggestions for Further Co-operation between the Library, Museum and Arts Committee, The Liverpool University, and the Archaeology Institute*. From hereon referred to as the Report, the core of this document dealt with the relationship between the City Corporation, the University and its

Library, and the Botany and the Zoology departments. It primarily dealt with the suggestions outlined by Dale in his letter to Forwood of 1 November. Indeed, that letter was reprinted in the final pages of the *Suggestions*, which only serves to strengthen the case for believing that Dale had had prior knowledge of the Report.

Within the *Suggestions*, the issue of the I of A was not raised until page 8. The following is the section of the Report that dealt directly with the I of A. See Appendix D-1: (d).

There are several inaccuracies in the Report that will be discussed at length later. For immediate purposes, however, certain points should be highlighted. First, irrespective of the Report being inaccurate, the SSC desired two things: the I of A's collection and the I of A itself. In the case of all three departments, the SSC was of the opinion that the best form of co-operation was for duplicates in the Zoological and Botanical collections, along with the entirety of the collection housed by the I of A, to be placed in the Public Museum and to be integrated into its own collection. This was an audacious attempt on the part of the LMAC and its Sub-Committee to acquire artifacts.

Such a ambitious effort makes one speculate about the impetus for their recommendation. In the Report it is commented that the "...fact that the University of Liverpool was concerned in the formation of a separate museum has already given rise to much misconception and adverse comment..." This leads one closer to the potential catalyst for the SSC's actions in publishing the report. It can be argued that the SSC was not pleased that the I of A 'museum' existed and that the U of L had aided in its development. If this was the case, one is looking at an instance in which the Public Museum felt threatened by what was referred to by the I of A and the U of L as a 'teaching collection'.

The Report states that "...it [the Institute's collection] could not hope to be as comprehensive as the one on William Brown Street..." If this was true, then why had the LMAC suddenly taken a position that was tantamount to an aggressive acquisitions policy?

At a meeting of the LMAC on 2 February, there occurred another significant event. The minutes recorded the following resolution: "That the sum of £100 be paid forthwith to Mr John Garstang being the amount of the committee's share in Mr. Garstang's Exploration in Egypt" (LMAC Minutes 1906: 304). It seems audacious and yet ironic that, considering all that was contained within the Report, in which the LMAC initiated a campaign to take over the I of A, members were also resolving to pay for their stake in Garstang's exploration to Esna. It therefore appears to be a case of giving with the one hand, and taking with the other.

The following day *The Liverpool Daily Post* ran an article, which summarized both the meeting of the LMAC from the day before, and the Report itself. The first half of the article dealt with the meeting. According to the correspondent, it was Leslie who presented the Report. With regard to the Library, Leslie is said to have mentioned that "...the suggestions would operate to the advantage of the University and included an exchange of information; the giving of increased facilities for University students using the library..." The article went on to discuss Leslie's view on the Public Museum:

"...that the committee and the public would derive practically from the whole of the benefit. The professors of the University in botany, zoology, anatomy, &c., were prepared to join the scheme of lectures given in the Museum throughout the winter. University students would be brought into touch with Corporation collections, duplicate specimens would be presented to the Museum, and the professors would co-operate with the director in regard to giving expert advice in the arrangement of the Museum. The present division of archaeological objects was something like the position of one man having an index of all the volumes of an encyclopaedia except volumes 7, 9, and 11, which were in the possession of someone else at a distance. It was proposed to hold a further conference with the University authorities, so that a mutually satisfactory arrangement can be reached" (*The Liverpool Daily Post* 3 February 1906).

The writer of the article also included the Committee's reaction to the report:

"The Chairman [Forwood] congratulated Mr. Leslie upon his excellent report (hear, hear), which meant the practical drawing together of the University and this group of buildings, a co-operation would greatly increase the educational power of the University and the public usefulness of the Library and Museum. Dr. Permewan emphasised the personal indebtedness of the committee to Mr. Leslie. The University had shown its sense of the value of the

Museum by appointing Dr. Forbes reader in ethnology (hear, hear).
The report was adopted" (*The Liverpool Daily Post* 3 February 1906).

The second half of the article outlined the Report, giving a point-by-point summary of the recommendations made by the SSC. One of the most interesting features of the article is that it gives an insight into what actually took place during the LMAC meeting, and serves to add colour to proceedings that would normally only have the minutes as a record.

Leslie seemed to have been confident in the advantages of the 'Scheme', and that it would serve the greater good of all parties involved. Forwood's position was also made clear for the article mentions what he had said with regard to the Report. He felt that it would "...increase in educational power of the University..." and he went on to include the improvement of the Public Library and Museum. A few lines prior to that Forwood was noted as saying that the "...practical drawing together of the University and this group of buildings..." would give Leslie credit to his labours.

It is at this point that Dale's letter of 16 June 1905 returns to the forefront. This was the letter that referred to an offer made by Leslie, the specifics of which Dale omitted in his response. What is clear is that Dale would have "...the Registrar...send full information to all the teachers" that Leslie wanted to appoint. The impression is that Forwood was crediting Leslie with having brought the various bodies into a closer contact. The efforts made by Dale on behalf of the University for the 'Scheme' have already been demonstrated in this chapter. Yet it should also be mentioned that Leslie and Dale had been working together from almost the beginning of the exchange that created the 'Scheme', as Leslie's "drawing together" would not have been possible without Dale's assistance.

Dale wrote to Leslie again on 17 February, thanking him for the copies of the Report and informing him that the representatives appointed on 5 December could meet with the SSC. He informed Leslie that "I will consult the [University] President and will arrange for a meeting, after submitting any proposed arrangement to you, at the earliest possible date" (Dale 1906: 691). He ended the letter by requesting 10 more copies of the

Report. By requesting more copies and quickly arranging a meeting, Dale kept things moving. In contrast, however, his next letter to Leslie on 2 March had a slightly different tone. See Appendix D-1: (e).

The fact is clear that Dale saw the draft of the Report before it was released. Therefore he knew about what had been written with regard to the I of A. Subsequent to the time that he saw the draft, Dale wrote to Leslie twice. Why then were the facts that were emphasized in the letter of 2 March not underscored in that of 20 January? The answer may lie in a letter that Garstang sent to Danson from Egypt, which was also dated 2 March:

“Mr Grisewood has told me that you attended the meeting of the Committee of Robbers and saved our Institute. Just a line to warn you to give away all your antiquities before the City Council decide to put them in the museum! Who is to say they will not demand our shirts next: some ? are certainly qualified ...

However, gratefully, thank you for your help. I have written to tell Mr Rankin what I think now of the whole business, which I hold in genuine suspicion: Mr Rankin can put a stop to it and I trust he will do so, cost what it may ...” (Garstang 2 March 1906).

Not only does this letter indicate that Danson, while not listed as being present in the minutes, attended the meeting of 18 Decemeber 1905, but it also gives an impression that Garstang was disturbed, and even taken aback by the whole incident. This is reinforced by his references to the SSC as a “Committee of Robbers.” He finishes with the sense that he had no prior knowledge of the SSC’s plans, which corroborates the fact that Dale had not been forthcoming with the necessary information. It may be that the date - 2 March - was a coincidence, yet it would seem that both letters were born out of activity taking place in reaction to the Report.

A second letter sent from Dale to Leslie, also dated 2 March, requested another 35 copies of the Report for the University Council. This letter also mentioned that “I understand the portion of the Report dealing with the Institute of Archaeology is not to come before the Council officially. If I am mistaken, kindly let me know” (Dale 1906: 753). This line lends to what Dale seemed to be hinting at in his prior letter of the same day: “A little delay, I think, will do no harm.” It would appear that the

'Scheme' had lost its momentum and was now encountering further obstacles.

The University Council met on 13 March and the following was put forward with regard to the Report:

"9. Report of a Special Sub-Committee of the Library, Museum and Arts Committee of the City of Liverpool, was received and considered.

Agreed:-

- (a) 'That the Report be referred to the Committee already appointed by resolution of Council (Minute 6, (c) of 5 December, 1905) together with representatives appointed by the Institute of Archaeology in pursuance of the above resolution.'
- (b) 'That the Committee be empowered to refer the section of the Report relating to the Archaeological institute (pp. 8-10) to the Committee of the Institute, and to request that the Committee to furnish such information as they may think necessary to Council, to correct or to supplement this part of the report.'
- (c) 'That the Committee be also empowered to forward the Library, Museum and Arts Committee or to the special sub-committee, such statement as they may think desirable for correction of information" (University Council Minutes 1906: 69).

Whatever had or had not been done by way of informing Garstang, the Council itself was seen as being supportive of the I of A. Section (b) made the Council's position even clearer in that it suggested that the I of A's Committee "correct or ... supplement this part of the report." With the University giving the I of A the opportunity to submit an independent rebuttal, it served to strengthen the fact that the I of A was a separate body from the U of L.

On 29 March 1906 Leslie resigned from the LMAC; the reasons why are unknown. The following is his letter of resignation to the Committee:

"My membership ... has of course come to an end in consequence of my resignation from the Council. I very much regret that this is so, as my connection with the Library committee and its work, has been exceedingly pleasant and congenial to me.

May I be permitted, through you, to express to the members of the Committee my great regret at ceasing to be one of their number, and to thank them for their unvarying kindness and courtesy I have met with their hands at all times while I have been on the Committee" (LMAC Minutes 1906: 328).

There was no other explanation presented by Leslie for his resignation as Chairman of the SSC, other than his membership coming to an end. Despite the fact that he resigned his post, it was by no means the end of his involvement with the SSC or the I of A.

Leslie received a letter from Ms. F. Davey, the I of A's Assistant Secretary, on 24 April. Although Davey signed the letter, its tone suggests it was dictated by Garstang, who was in Egypt at the time it was sent. Davey wrote:

"I have forwarded to Mr Garstang ... a copy of the printed Report of Sub-Committee (sic) (2nd Feb. 06). Mr Garstang has also received a communication from the University asking that the Committee of the Institute of Archaeology should take it into consideration, and he wishes to express to you his desire to further the general wish for co-operation, and so far as the work of the Institute and Public Museums is mutual, has no doubt but that the Committee of the Institute will give cordial consideration to any proposal for that purpose. Mr Garstang regrets that the Institute was not communicated with before the Report was printed, as they had no knowledge that these considerations were taking place, and that fact has, perhaps not unnaturally caused some displeasure among members of the Committee, especially as the Report itself contains fundamental misconceptions which might have been avoided. However there need be no anxiety on that score, and you may be assured that the Institute will give careful consideration to that and other matters involved. In accordance with the understanding arrived at with the representatives of the Institute on more recent Committee meetings this will be done on Mr Garstang's return from Egypt, and he is expected now in a few weeks" (Davey 24 April 1906).

Garstang's position is quite clear. He had not been informed of the SSC's intentions prior to the Report of 2 February 1906. He also managed to portray the I of A's Committee in a light that showed not only their irritation with the situation, but also conveyed a sense of solidarity within the same committee. This confirmed by the last line, where it refers to what the representatives of the I of A had agreed to at the meeting of 18 December 1905, and their decision to wait for Garstang's return from Egypt before they proceeded. The letter also gives the impression that Garstang was trying to placate Leslie and the SSC in an attempt to stop any further movement on their part. This is implied where he speaks of "co-operation" and "cordial consideration".

The following day, on 25 April, Leslie responded indirectly to Garstang via a letter to Davey. See Appendix D-1: (f). As one would expect in letters of this sort, Leslie retaliated by mentioning the meeting at the 'Education Office.' It can be assumed that the meeting Leslie referred to was that of 18 December 1905, as at this point in time there is only the one meeting between all three parties on record, before the release of the Report. Further, one must keep in mind one very important line from the minutes of that meeting: "No resolution was moved..."

The only resolution that was passed in regard to the relationship between the U of L, the I of A and LMAC was by the SSC itself on 22 December 1905. This presents various scenarios that could explain Leslie's position. Firstly, he was confused about what had taken place at the meeting of 18 December. Second, he was possibly not being forthright in his version of events; or third, there was another meeting of all three parties for which there is no correspondence or minutes taken. Given the thoroughness with which the University Council kept its records, the last option seems least likely. Finally, as four of the University representatives who were at the meeting on 18 December were members of the I of A committee, is it possible that the ideas listed regarding the I of A in the SSC report were indeed discussed? In Garstang's letter of 2 March to Danson, he commented that Danson "saved our Institute". With this in mind, is it therefore possible that, although the idea may have been discussed, Danson had in fact kept it from going any further?

As Leslie had left the Special Sub-Committee on 29 March 1906, he forwarded Davey's letter and his own response to Forwood, the Chairman, on 25 April. The following note accompanied them:

"Enclosed I send you a letter which I have received today received from the Assistant Secretary of the Institute of Archaeology, together with copy (sic) of my reply. I am very sorry to have had to leave the work of the Special Sub-Committee half done, but have no doubt someone else will easily be found to take up the Chairmanship and carry on the negotiations" (Leslie 25 April 1906).

On 1 May the U of L Council agreed:

"5. The report of the Committee (appointed by resolution of the Council, Minute 6 (c) of 15 of December, 1905) on the report of the Special Sub-Committee of the Library Museum and Arts Committee

of the City of Liverpool (Minute 9 of 13 March, 1906) was submitted.

Agreed:-

“That the report be adopted” (U of L Council Minutes 1906: 72).

This resolution was clearly a result of the decisions at the meeting of 13 March 1906.

On 16 June 1906 an article was printed in *The Liverpool Courier*. It made reference to the association between the LMAC and U of L:

“...They [the LMAC] had made an advance towards bringing the institutions into closer touch with the University. It had long been evident that in the interests of higher education this ought to be done, and they were glad to welcome a scheme of co-operation, which had already met with the approval of the Committee and the Senate of the University...they had received a valuable contribution from the Egyptian Archaeological Society, which was being supported by some leading Liverpool citizens, and, under the personal direction of Mr. Garstang, had conducted very successful explorations at Edfu, Kom el Ahmar &c” (*The Liverpool Courier* 16 June 1906).

The article creates the impression that relations between the LMAC, U of L and I of A were amicable, and that the ‘Scheme’ was moving ahead. Similarly, the way in which the gift that the I of A gave to the LMAC is acknowledged as part of the article, can be said to have suggested to the public eye that the relationship between the latter bodies was indeed good. This therefore contrasts with the preceding discussion herein, which has shown that a tense situation had developed between the I of A and the LMAC. While although the ‘Scheme’ was moving forward as far as the U of L and the LMAC were concerned, the I of A’s involvement in the ‘Scheme’ was about to come to a halt.

With the support of the U of L Council for the ‘Scheme’ still in place, on 21 June the I of A Committee met to discuss the LMAC’s Report. See Appendix D-1: (g).

5.5: The I of A’s Response to the LMAC Report

It is evident from the minutes of the I of A that the Institute had decided to write a response to the SSC’s draft. In fact, a handwritten

complete draft of the Institute's response was entered into the Minute Book on 21 June 1906 (pp. 65-74). This draft is identical to its printed version. What is unclear, however, is the date that the I of A's response report was released. The U of L Council Minutes record a receipt of the I of A's report on 15 October. With the report having been completed for almost three months by that point, it seems unlikely that it would have come out at such a late date. What is clear then is that the report was printed and released sometime between June and October.

The I of A's response report (from here referred to as the Response) was entitled: *Institute of Archaeology and the City Museum*. It comprised two parts:

"1. The Report of the Institute of Archaeology to the Council of the University on those portions of the Report of the Special Sub-Committee of the Library, Museum, and Arts Committee of the City of Liverpool, which relate to the Institute of Archaeology...

3. The Portions of the Report of the Special Committee referred to above" (I of A 1906: 1).

The Response was nine pages long and is condensed here. The I of A Committee began by expressing:

"...their regret that the [SSC] Report should have been drafted, published, and circulated, before the Institute Committee had an opportunity of placing the Sub-Committee in possession of the facts..." (I of A 1906: 3).

The Response was divided into five main points, with the fifth divided into a further five sub-points (5.A – 5.F). See Appendix D-1: (h). The first issue in the Response is one that has been a recurring theme throughout this chapter. Why was the I of A not informed about the SSC's Report or its intentions? It was established earlier in the chapter that Dale had full knowledge of the LMAC's intentions with regard to the I of A before the 2 February SSC Report was released. So, what were Dale's motives for keeping the information in the Report hidden from Garstang and the I of A? The result of his actions is made clear in the Response, as it details the misconceptions held by the LMAC. As stated prior, and in Dale's defence, it was seen through his letters of 9 December that he had tried to inform the LMAC repeatedly that the I of A was not under the control of the U of

L. Regardless of Dale's continued attempts, the LMAC had proceeded armed with incorrect information.

From the perspective of the I of A, the Response created a scenario in which the LMAC was seeking to obtain the Egyptian collection, a collection over which the Institute itself did not have full control. As the Response mentions, nearly all the pieces in the 'museum' belonged to the EC, which was merely affiliated to the Institute. Again, as established by the entry in the LMAC Minutes for 2 February, the LMAC had contributed on at least one occasion the sum of £100 to the EC. It is possible that the LMAC was making use of the EC without understanding how it functioned within the context of the I of A. With Garstang's established excavation record in mind (cf. Chapter Two), contributing money to the EC could have been seen as a solid investment for the LMAC, with the high potential of a good return.

Another key point was that the collection housed at the I of A was not purely Egyptological. As it was a 'teaching collection', it reflected the focus of the Institute, which was 'the study of Archaeology in all its branches'. Thus the 'museum' housed by the Institute supposedly reflected the various aspects of research undertaken by staff at the I of A. Another point of particular interest in the Response is the reference to the relationship between the British Museum and UCL; that in their case there was a lack of competition between the two bodies regardless of UCL's teaching collection. As was discussed in Chapter Three, there was no competition between the two bodies, thus the 'Response' was correct in its assertion.

Later on in the Response, the subject of "Aims" was addressed. It indicated the goals of the Public Museum, and the I of A's goals were not always the same. The Response therefore regarded any suggestions of competition as groundless. This opinion served to underscore the gift of Egyptian artefacts that had been given to the Public Museums in December of 1905, which was addressed in the same section. As discussed earlier in this chapter, it had been formally suggested on the 22 September 1905 and was endorsed by the donor; a list of pieces to be sent was approved on 15

December of the same year. According to the Response, this gift was meant to help fill the gaps in the Egyptian collection of the Public Museum, consequently putting a further end to the idea of competition on the part of the I of A.

The Response went on to say that, with regard to "Aims", that the I of A was willing to co-operate as long as the aims of both entities were the same. It went further in stating it would give "cordial" consideration to future suggestions by the LMAC. Finally, what seems to be a token of conciliatory gesture, or could alternatively be considered as an insult, the Response suggested that members of the I of A staff might deliver courses of lectures at the 'museum'. Of course this was in lieu of the Institute handing their collections over to the Public Museum.

Following the receipt of the Response one would expect to see a flurry of correspondence from the LMAC to Dale, or even from the I of A itself to Dale. This, however, seems to be far from the case. There is no mention of the Response by the LMAC in its Minutes Books or in any official correspondence. Furthermore, with regard to the I of A's part in the 'Scheme', no further mention was made. A letter from Garstang to Danson, dated 31 July 1906 sent from Egypt, is a document worthy of note because it provides a greater sense of Garstang's feelings over the matter:

"I fear I shall not be able to join you until the end of the week. I have been delayed a little in the packing ... and have been spending most of the day writing violent letters to Forbes and Permewan but the enemy is now defeated with great slaughter" (Garstang 31 July 1906).

It is the 1906 LMAC AR that gives an indication of the EC's feelings on the actions of the LMAC via the Lot received through the ballot by the Public Museum that year's subscription, as seen here:

"The Committee contributed on share – amounting to £100 – to Mr. Garstang's excavations on Upper Egypt, and received as their share – lot 6 – consisting of a large collection of objects – most of them, unfortunately, duplicates, and all of a very fragmentary condition, of specimens already in the Museum collection – from Esna, Adydos, Hierakonpolis, &c., which are detailed in the Caucasian section of this report.

It is to be regretted that with lot 6 the Mayer Museum received none of the objects collected in Nubia, which was the important site worked during the season. It had been hoped that in each lot there have been a fair set of objects from every site at which excavations

were made, and that all the material – important or unimportant – would have been divided among the ten shareholders. The Committee has not subscribed to the excavations of 1906 – 1907” (LMAC AR 1906: 82).

The lack of reference to the Response in the minutes of the LMAC is not so surprising, given the fact that when the donation was made by the Institute to the Public Museum, there was no documentation or acknowledgement of the gift recorded in the LMAC Minutes at that time. Ultimately it would appear, to all intents and purposes, that the LMAC let the ‘Scheme’ drop, at least with regard to the I of A. This is an unanticipated development given the effort on the parts of Dale and the LMAC as a whole. In the end, it had become an attempt to bully the I of A into handing over its collection, as the University had no authority to give it away.

What is clear is that the ‘Scheme’ was passed in relation to the U of L and the LMAC. What has yet to appear, however, is those parts of the ‘Scheme’ that were actually acted upon. Nevertheless, what did seem to go ahead was the arrangement between the University Library and the City Library. As outlined in the ‘Scheme’, each body selected a representative to be placed on the other’s committee.

The last recorded action in regard to this initial episode of the dispute between the I of A and the city is the University Council’s acknowledgement of the Response on October 16:

“15. A report of the Institute of Archaeology to the Council of the University on those portions of the report of the Special Sub-Committee of the Library, Museum and Arts Committee of the City of Liverpool, which relate to the Institute of Archaeology was submitted.

Agreed: -‘ That the report of the Institute, together with those portions of the report of the special Sub-Committee referred to, be printed and circulated among the members of the Council” (U of L Council Minutes 1906: 5).

This entry in the Council’s minutes marks the last mention of Report and in turn the ‘Scheme’ for over the next year and a half. The dispute for reasons that are still unknown, did not continue into 1907, which for all intents and purposes marks the end to the first major crisis faced by the I of A. Despite the trouble that the had ‘Scheme’ caused, it served to define with further

clarity the relationship between the U of L and the I of A. As Dale wrote in his letters to Brunner and Alsop in December 1905, the University and the Institute were “separate bodies”, thus emphasizing a clearer distinction of the Institute’s autonomy within in the context of the U of L. Another important point is the relationship of the I of A to its own ‘museum’. In the Response Garstang made play of the fact that the collection housed in the museum was a teaching collection and that it was not owned by the I of A, but was on loan from members of the EC. This idea was reinforced in the University Calendar. For example an entry made in the Calendar for 1905 reads:

“On the ground floor the series of Egyptian Antiquities provided by the munificence of various friends of the University, John Rankin, John T. Brunner, Ralph Brocklebank, the Rev. W. Macgregor and William Johnston from the excavations, made...” (University Calendar 1905: 145).

The entry in the 1906 Calendar is worded almost exactly like the prior entry, the one difference being:

“...presented to the Institute of Archaeology by [same as the 1905 entry]...from the excavations made during the past years in Egypt forms a basis for the arrangement of the collection...” (University Calendar 1906: 153).

In the 1907 entry ‘presented’ was replaced with ‘deposited’ (University Calendar 1907: 163). The use of the word ‘munificence’ in the 1905 entry leads one to believe that the I of A had been given a gift, as does the use of ‘presented’ in the second. The word ‘deposited’ in the third however, takes one back to what was expressed in the Report with regard to the loans of the EC. The reason for the change of wording must have been the SSC report. The 1906 Calendar was printed in January of that year, which explains why the wording had not changed, because at the time the entry of written the dispute between the LMAC and the I of A had not come to a head. Furthermore, the entries make a very important point: the I of A had no coherent or structured collection policy. In fact, what is clearly demonstrated is that it did not need one, as a collection was provided by the members of the EC either by loan. The initial dispute that arose between the two bodies served via the ‘Response’ not only defined its role in context

to the City of Liverpool and the University but also as a confident player in both arenas.

5.6: The Second Attempt to Link the Collections

5.6.1: Rebuilding the relationship

Despite the reactions that occurred to the LMAC's Report, namely the I of A's Response to the 1906 proposal, to Garstang's letters to Forbes and Permewan, and the EC's badly distributed Lot 6 to the Public Museum following the 1905-1906 excavation season in Egypt, the LMAC did not give up on the proposals it had put forward in its 1906 Report. As shown above, the LMAC's plans to create a closer relationship with the Institute in 1905 and 1906 only succeeded in distancing itself from the I of A, and so had an antithetical effect.

As it had in the past, the LMAC used the Liverpool press to make known its position in relation to the 'Scheme' and the Report. On 19 October 1907, in the LMAC's final meeting of the municipal calendar year, Forwood made a speech. A correspondent for *The Liverpool Courier* reported on his speech later that day:

"With regard to the Museums they [the LMAC] had made efforts to bring about a close alliance with the Liverpool University. The Liverpool Museum after the British Museum ranked as the Finest in the Country. (Hear, hear.) The Overtures to the University had been kindly received by the Vice-Chancellor Dale. And he hoped the differences would be got over and that the authorities of the University would feel that it would be much to the advantage of their own museum if it were transferred to the Liverpool Museum Building" (*The Liverpool Courier* 19 October 1907).

The following month, Forwood made another public comment regarding the LC that was again reported in the newspapers. From the *Liverpool Daily Post* on 16 November 1907:

"...he hoped the Committee would draw close to the University, and that the University Museum on Bedford Street would find its home within those walls (William Brown-street), where he thought it ought to be" (*The Liverpool Daily Post* 16 November 1907).

As these reports show, Forwood mentioned the LC at the I of A as the 'University Museum'. It therefore appears that, despite Dale's previous

attempts to make clear to Forwood that the relationship between the U of L and the I of A was not as he thought, Forwood had either not understood it or he was in denial over the type of association the University and the Institute.

Nevertheless, by the time Forwood wrote the 'General Report' in the LMAC's 1907 AR, his attitude concerning relations with the University, and by association with the I of A, appears to have begun to change:

"...The last twenty five years have...witnessed the establishment and rapid growth of our University, and have proved that the desire of our people for intellectual growth and culture was only dormant and was waiting for the opportunity to make itself manifest. And can we not claim...without presumption that our free Libraries and Museum ought to be the handmaids of the University? It would be possible to enlarge upon this mutual aspect of Library and University work, but its growth and development will have to be gradual... William B. Forwood, Chairman" (LMAC AR 1908: 4).

Forwood seems to have been waving a proverbial white flag in his report, seemingly realizing that his goals of bringing both institutions into closer relations with the Public Museum would take time to accomplish. Beginning the following year, however, changes in the relationship between the I of A and the Public Museums, which the LMAC had for sometime desired, began to occur.

Professor Newberry's report on the Dept. of Egyptology in the I of A AR for 1907-1908 very briefly mentioned that a student would be cataloguing Egyptian artifacts for the Public Museum. The I of A AR for the following year explained in greater detail the project that Newberry and one of his students had been asked to do:

"...In January he [Newberry] was asked by the Museums Committee of the Liverpool Town Council to undertake with one of his students a catalogue of the Egyptian Collections. Miss Meta Williams was appointed for this work and has been engaged on it under Professor Newberry's superintendence for the last year" (Annual Report of the Institute of Archaeology 1908: 17).

On 15 July 1908, the LMAC moved a resolution regarding payment to Miss Williams for the work she had carried out. See appendix D-1: (i). From the minutes, it can be concluded that the LMAC was clearly pleased with the work done by both Williams and Newberry. Possibly as a result of LMAC's

appreciation, Newberry sent a letter on 16 July to Dale. Regarding Meta Williams and her cataloguing for the Public Museum, he wrote:

“This cataloguing work...will...I venture to hope, bring about a better feeling between the town and our Institute of Archaeology than has been the case in the past” (Newberry 16 July 1908).

In conjunction with Newberry and William’s work, the Curator at the Public Museum, J. A. Clubb, reported the following in the LMAC AR for 1909:

“The Catalogue of the Egyptian collection has been compiled... and is now ready for printing. This important piece of work has been carried out by Professor Newberry, M.A., Brunner Professor of Egyptology in the University of Liverpool, assisted by Miss M. E. Williams. The Museums Committee has already expressed its high appreciation of the services so kindly rendered by Professor Newberry and I desire to take this opportunity of associating myself with this expression” (LMAC AR 1910).

Three years after the release of the LMAC’s Report, it seemed that relations between the latter and the I of A were improving. Yet, as will be discussed later, the likelihood of further problems between the Institute and the Public Museum was brought about in early 1910.

At the time Newberry and Williams were assembling their catalogue, a motion was passed by the LMAC over its involvement with the U of L and the I of A. The LMAC minutes for 11 November 1909 stated the following:

“Closer relations between the LMAC and the U of L.

Resolved:

That a Special Sub-Committee...Be appointed to consider and report upon the suggestions of the VC of the Liverpool University for closer relations between this Committee and the University and also to consider and report upon the relations between this and the Archaeology Institute” (Minutes of the LMAC 1909: 281).

It can be assumed that, as a result of the cataloging work carried out by Newberry and Williams, relations had improved between the I of A and the LMAC after several tense years. Therefore, the decision to appoint a Sub-Committee by the LMAC in order to readdress these “closer relations” could have come as a consequence of this. The “closer relations” can be interpreted as referring to ‘The Scheme’ once again. There is nothing in the archive of letters however, sent to or from Dale, or in the I of A archive,

regarding any form of notification from the LMAC regarding the motion passed for another seven months. That which occurred seven months later is discussed in the next section.

5.6.2: The Proposed Alliance

While by the end of 1909 an improvement in relations occurred between the I of A and the LMAC had occurred, the early part of the following year saw a threat to them. First, the satisfaction portrayed by the Public Museum over the work of Newberry and Williams did not last. In the minutes of a Sub-Committee report, dated 14 January 1910, Forbes voiced his displeasure: (See appendix D-1: (j))

Following Forbes' January 1910 report to the LMAC Sub-Committee, nothing more is reported to that committee regarding his clear dissatisfaction with Williams' and Newberry's work. Equally, there are no other records documenting Forbes discontentment over their work in the archives of the I of A or U of L.

Two months later, on 31 March, Leslie wrote to Garstang. This letter, detailed in Appendix D-1: (k), suggests that three years after the initial conflict between the LMAC and the I of A that Leslie still had his doubts about the purpose of LC. Any record of what was reported in the press regarding Leslie's comments does not survive. Further, Leslie's remarks, although made to the LMAC committee, were not noted in that committee's minutes. The second paragraph of Leslie's letter indicates that he had to be "convinced" that there was no competition on the part of the I of A. This attitude is reminiscent of the statements made by, and reported of, Forwood in 1907. In this particular case, it appears as if Leslie had not accepted the clarifications over the collection provided by the Institute in its Response. Nevertheless, as was the case in the statement made by Forbes in the Sub-Committee report, previously noted, nothing came of Leslie's letter to Garstang. In fact, no mention of it appears until the letter was

entered into the minutes of the 6th Annual Meeting of the I of A, which met on 27 October (I of A Minute Book, 1910).

If anything had come from either of these two documents, there could have been detrimental consequences for the still recovering relationship between the Institute and the Public Museum. However, given the fact that nothing occurred in response to either, it could be said that the association between both bodies was indeed on the mend.

Regardless of the tenuousness of the near incidents that occurred in the early part of 1910, on 2 June, two months after Leslie's letter, an informal meeting was held to discuss what was called the 'Museums-Institute Alliance Scheme' (referred to as the Alliance here onwards). The following are the 'minutes' taken for this informal meeting: (See appendix D-1: (1))

Point One in the minutes refers to a document that evidently showed the 'scope' of the I of A's work. That 'preliminary note' no longer exists as a separate document. It was, however, integrated into a Memorandum, which is discussed below.

The minutes of the informal meeting do provide a basic idea of what the LMAC and the I of A sought to arrange. They demonstrate not only a marked recovery in the relationship between the two bodies, but also show the first mutual attempt to create a new affiliation. Equally, as there were growing financial concerns in the Institute at that time, monetary incentives could have also been a factor in the timing of the Alliance. As was discussed in Chapter Two, the I of A had been dealing with increasing financial difficulties from the academic year 1907–1908 onwards; so much so that Rea, the Hon. Treasurer, had warned that the Institute had to find an alternative 'means' to secure its finances.

A second meeting was held on 23 June 1910. The subject of that meeting was a formal proposal for 'closer union of the Institute of Archaeology and the Public Museums'. A three-part document resulted from the meeting. It consisted of a) the proposal itself; b) the minutes of

the meeting; and c) a memorandum that explained the background to the proposal. Appendix D-1: (m) refers to the first part of the document. The impression of the proposal in the first part is as an amicable one; both parties stood to benefit immensely from the symbiotic arrangement. As long as the members of the EC who had loaned pieces to the I of A agreed to their artifacts be moved to the Public Museum, while the Public Museum stood to gain the entirety of the LC. Further, the Public Museum would also benefit from continuing excavations carried out at Meroe and in Asia Minor and that were funded by their respective ECs, besides those in Central America and any other expeditions that the I of A became associated with. Similarly, by being affiliated with the I of A, the Public Museum would have had the distinction of being directly involved with international excavation and research. It also stood to gain from future donations to the Institute by external donors. As well, the Public Museum would acquire a cadre of in-house specialists. The LMAC would deepen strengthen its relations with the University by providing its support for the I of A's teaching for the U of L.

On the other hand, the I of A would have benefited from another source of support, besides keeping its connections to the University and retaining its autonomy. Equally, by moving artifacts to the Public Museum, the Institute would also have a larger space to house itself. Therefore, aligning itself with the Public Museum could have been the answer to the ever looming problem that the I of A needed to help overcome the financial difficulties that Rea had commented on in the AR three years previously.

The third part of the document included a Memorandum. It was directed at the Chairman of the MSC, Rathbone, although no addressee name was written in the document. The Memorandum outlined the course of events that led to the new proposal of Alliance. Due to its length (at six large pages), it has been condensed for purposes here. Initially, the Memorandum detailed the following:

"For several years past the desirability of a closer union between the Archaeological Institute of the Liverpool University, and the Museums Sub-Committee has been generally recognized.

At the dinner given on his retirement from the chairmanship of the Libraries Museums and Arts Sub-Committee, Sir William Forwood gave expression to this feeling, and stated that in his opinion the time had come for a scheme which would secure closer co-operation between Museums and the University.”

The document noted that in addition to the work done by Myres, the MSC requested that Newberry and Williams also do some cataloguing for the Public Museum:

“...at the same time Professor Newberry...undertook gratuitously to catalogue the Museums collection of Egyptian antiquities, and to assist him in this work Miss Williams...”

Newberry left to Egypt for the 1909-1910 excavation season. See Appendix D-1: (n) for what happened upon his return to Liverpool. At a meeting that took place at Newberry’s house, representatives from both the I of A and the MSC agreed that amalgamation, if possible, should take place. The position of the Institute at that juncture is seen in Appendix D-1: (o). An additional agreement that was reached at the meeting was that amalgamation could take place without interfering with the work of the I of A or the Public Museum. It was also agreed that the best way to avoid the disruption of their respective work was for the entirety of the Institute’s collections to be housed at the Public Museum, and that any work, inclusive of teaching, had to be carried out in close proximity to the collection.

With regard to expenses, see Appendix D-1: (p) for the Memorandum regarding this. This memorandum is unique amongst all the other sources used in this thesis. It was an account that, if not prepared by, was at the very least endorsed by both the parties involved in the Alliance. That said, it is impossible to know what both the LMAC and the I of A agreed to leave out of their accounts. The Memorandum also shows that Newberry acted as at least a part catalyst for the Alliance, a role that would have generally been attributed to Garstang. Instead, Garstang appears to have played more of a supporting role.

According to the Memorandum, the primary issue relating to the feasibility of actually executing the Alliance was a question of finance. The monetary issue was again conveyed 10 days after the meeting in an article

printed in *The Liverpool Courier* on 2 July. Here it was reported a comment made by Leslie regarding the Alliance:

“Further progress in the very desirable co-operation of the Museum Sub-committee with Scientific experts of the University is difficult,” he says, “until we can give them better facilities for instructing their students from the wealth of material either already in the museums or which they are prepared to bring there. Here is a unique occasion, to be seized by some generous donor, a friend alike of the University and the city” (*The Liverpool Courier* 2 July 1910).

As the records have shown, among the Committee members of the I of A were Rankin, Brunner and Danson, all Vice-Presidents, in addition to being members of the EC. Yet, the surviving documents that detail the negotiations between the LMAC and the Institute over the Alliance lack these three names, besides those of the other committee members. It was only Newberry, Garstang and Bosanquet who represented the I of A at the meetings with the LMAC. It could be assumed, however, that for the three to be involved in such an undertaking as the Alliance, they would have needed the full support of the Institute Committee.

The Committee most certainly must have been informed aware of the progress of the Alliance and any problems that were being encountered while attempting to establish it. If the Committee had not been consulted directly, members were likely to have become aware of what was occurring by July, when Leslie went public about the monetary difficulties that were standing in the way of the I of A and the LMAC. Further, as the Memorandum makes clear, outside help would be required in order to accomplish the goals of the Alliance. A question that arises, therefore, with regard to members of the I of A Committee is: was it possible that although they may have supported the move, members who had once been such staunch financial supporters to the Institute were now not willing to contribute the funds to facilitate the move of artifacts? This could have been a case of the Committee agreeing to one thing, yet actually desiring the opposite. With a lack of financial support for the Alliance, the Alliance would in turn ultimately collapse. Further, there is no evidence to suggest that they were under any obligation to support the Institute over the long term.

On 7 August, Alsop wrote to Dale about his concerns regarding University courses taught by the I of A in the event of a move to the Public Museum:

“I return the papers relating to the amalgamation of the two Museums: they are very good reading & shew that both sides are in earnest to in striving for a satisfactory arrangement. The only question is about the transfer of our Professors to William Brown Street but I think any ‘difficulty’ may be met by our stipulating that all our Degree Courses in these subjects should be held in or near the University.

P.S. Will you kindly get some one in the office to send me a type copy of these papers?” (Alsop 7 August 1910).

The letter from Alsop is the last piece of correspondence regarding the Alliance. His concerns were rendered void by the fact that, like the events of 1906, the Alliance did not happen. The reason for the failure is presumably that the LMAC and I of A were unable to raise the necessary interest in their amalgamation from potential funders, and thus the necessary capital.

While both the initial ‘Scheme’ of 1906 and subsequent attempt at an Alliance in 1910 were unsuccessful, the I of A maintained a cordial relationship with the Public Museum after 1910. As discussed in chapters Two and Four, certain staff members of the I of A joined the LMAC in the succeeding years. Similarly, the relationship between the Institute and the Public Museum continued via the lending of artifacts from the former to the latter, and through public talks given at the Public Museum by staff of the Institute. Ultimately, as seen in Chapter Four, the Public Museum purchased a number of duplicate artifacts from the LC in 1920. Nevertheless, in aid of the attempted sale of the LC in 1928, the I of A recalled pieces that had been loaned to the Public Museum with the aim of selling them thereafter.

5.7: Conclusion

Although the 1906 and 1910 attempts at amalgamation of city and institute did not succeed, they did have an important affect on the I of A.

The Institute was forced to define (in 1904) and then redefine (in 1906) itself and its relationships to both the U of L and EC. Starting with the U of L, both it and the I of A were forced to stress that they were separate entities, despite the Institute's growing financial dependence upon the University. Bearing this in mind, the U of L had no claim to the collections housed at I of A. Yet neither did the I of A. Save for donations and minor acquisitions, the bulk of the LC belonged to some of the members of the EC. Such members, following Garstang's excavations in Egypt, had placed the pieces in the Institute on the basis of a loan.

It was after the clarification of ownership in the I of A's Response to the LMAC's Report in 1906 that the I of A AR and the University Calendars ceased to refer to the LC as a museum. Thus, by its own reference within the AR, the I of A did not have a museum after 1906. Just as it had had prior to the founding of the Institute in 1904, as examined in Chapter Four, it held a 'loan collection'.

As seen in this thesis, different aspects of the change in the definition of the collection have not only been discussed in this chapter, but also in chapters Two and Four. The LC was now said to be used for reference and teaching, but was still open for public viewing. In Section 5.5, it was detailed that the I of A referred to the LC as a 'small loan collection' in its Response. Ceasing to use the term 'museum' appears to be an attempt to minimize what could have been construed as competition with the Public Museum. Equally, the Institute also found itself clarifying that it did not have a full catalogue for its collection. Thus, the overall result of the Report lead the I of A not only to define its relationships with other affiliated bodies, but also clarified that it only housed minimal holdings, ultimately placing a greater emphasis on its teaching. Despite all the I of A's clarifications, the emphasis of the Report, and subsequent comments in the press by the members of the LMAC in 1907, remained preoccupied with the collection.

This preoccupation extended to the attempted amalgamation of the I of A and the Public Museum in 1910. The primary issue for the LMAC always seemed to be the collection, but the overall Alliance of 1910 comes

across as a mutually beneficial arrangement for all parties concerned. However, as noted in Section 5.7.2, there was a lack of financial support from former I of A benefactors for the movement of the collection from the Institute to the Public Museum. The financial difficulties that the Alliance faced were concluded to be the reason as to why it collapsed.

The lack of support for the Alliance in 1910 could provide an insight in to Dale's tactics of 1905 and 1906. There is a possibility that he was concerned that the Scheme would not receive the Committee's support from the beginning. As he was a member of the I of A Committee, he potentially would have had a feeling for its position on the matter. Given the I of A's positive stance on the Public Museum, which was stated in its minutes from the 2nd AGM in 1904, had Dale been transparent about the intentions of the LMAC and allowed for the I of A to be apart of the planning process, the situation might have had a different outcome. After the second attempt at establishing closer relations had the same outcome as the first, in which both lacked financial support from the Committee's primary benefactors, two key questions come to mind. Did the I of A's Committee actually want a deeper relationship with the LMAC? Was the positive position set up by the I of A in 1904 in relation to the Public Museum merely a professional and public projection, and simply for keeping up appearances? Answers to these questions will be sought in the Conclusion of this thesis.

In summary, what is clear is that the I of A's involvement with the LMAC, for better or worse, served to define the nature and structure of its relationships with its two most important affiliates, the U of L and the EC.

CHAPTER SIX

Conclusion

6.1: A Brief Synopsis

The preceding chapters have reviewed the primary data concerning the history of the Liverpool Institute of Archaeology and its Loan Collection. This material, principally by way of letters, reports, annals of the University, the daily books of the University's Vice-Chancellor and minutes of various committees, has helped to illustrate a number of new and important facets in the history of both the LC and the Institute. Through the use of these original sources, this thesis has presented a fresh perspective on the I of A, and how the collection that it housed, began and was expanded thereafter.

Before discussing the I of A's collection in depth in Chapters Four and Five, Chapter Two provided a contextual history of the I of A, which examined the roots of the Institute, how it was established, and how it subsequently developed. Chapter Three thereafter considered the extent to which the Institute compared with other university collections in the UK during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, besides reflecting on aspects of John Garstang's experience as an assistant to Matthew Flinders Petrie. It was suggested that Petrie influenced Garstang in such a way that Petrie's practices in archaeological research were subsequently replayed and expanded upon by Garstang as he built up the LC. This became particularly relevant in Chapter Four, when taking into consideration the way in which Garstang acquired funding for his excavations through his Excavation Committees. Equally, Chapter Four documented the Loan Collection and how it changed and developed over the years, culminating in an attempt to sell the collection when the Institute faced deepening financial problems towards the end of the 1920s. Chapter Five ultimately aided in defining the relationship that the I of A had with the University, from both the perspectives of the U of L and Institute respectively. Further, Chapter Five

demonstrated that neither the University nor the Institute had control over the Loan Collection, but that the collection was in the first sense property of members of Excavation Committees. This chapter also outlined how and why the collection ceased to be referred to as a museum after 1906. The conflict that occurred between the Institute, the University and the LMAC consequently caused the I of A to state that what it held was a basic collection that existed purely for the purposes of teaching, which had been established via the loan of artifacts from members of the Excavation Committees. The I of A was therefore required to redefine what it had previously described as a Museum in 1904, as a Loan Collection after 1906.

6.2: Discussion of Collated Evidence

An essential feature that was ascertained through the historical narrative of the I of A explained in Chapter Two was that, first and foremost, the Institute relied upon a key number of benefactors to provide an income for its general maintenance and functioning. These benefactors included members of the Institute's (General) Committee, and other subscribers in addition to an annual grant given by the University to the I of A for its building and facilities. Similarly, one of the significant points to emerge in Chapter Two was that, while the U of L provided an annual grant to help the I of A with its upkeep, the Institute maintained autonomy in its research and the collections it housed. Yet, as was demonstrated, the reliance upon a small number of donors became an increasingly unsatisfactory and unstable means of monetary subsistence, ultimately impacting upon the Institute's financial solvency. The I of A appears never to have been able to maintain a long-term financial plan for itself, and thus, after the War in particular, the Institute suffered from a fluctuating income that consequently caused it to fall into a decade of decline in the 1920s.

With respect to the 'lecturing' responsibilities that the I of A offered in the U of L during the years studied here, Chapter Two argued that 'lecturing' should be viewed as having been a service that the Institute provided to the University. In this sense, the I of A was similar to the

LSTM, which was also an independent entity, but that provided teaching to University students. Chapter Two explained that the particular academic aspects of both these bodies should be considered as a service due to the fact that there were no contractual agreements or any other form of documentation that specifically outlined the obligations that either party had to the U of L or vice versa. The LSTM and I of A affiliation to the University it is argued was intended to be a point of distinction for the U of L. Equally, the I of A, in particular, was seen to have requested the use of the University's name as a point of status indicating that both the University and Institute enjoyed a reciprocal arrangement and mutually benefitted from each other, despite the fact that they were separate entities.

Having established a brief history to the I of A, Chapter Three subsequently considered how the Institute was connected to other university collections that were simultaneously established during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. By focusing on UCL, the MM, and the QUB, an interesting linkage emerged between them and the I of A. Petrie was found to be a connecting factor in all the institutions reviewed, either through training of the founders of the collections, supplying of artifacts (via excavation or donation), or by direct involvement with the collection, i.e. at UCL. One component highlighted in this chapter was the interrelations that occurred between people at these institutions as a consequence of Petrie's own influence. This was particularly relevant when considering links between Garstang and two of his excavation patrons, Jesse Haworth and Martyn Kennard at the MM.

Furthermore, the 'training' that Garstang was given by Petrie was argued to have consequently influenced the former's own practices in the field. Letters written by Harold E. Jones helped to shed light on Garstang's experience as an assistant to Petrie. It appeared that the experience that he had as one of Petrie's assistants, in which his work went unacknowledged, was replayed in his own treatment of Jones. Additionally, Petrie's influence on Garstang's own practices were noted in the context of Garstang arranging post-excavation exhibitions, besides his method in acquiring funding for excavations, argued to be an extension of Petrie's model.

Chapters Two and Three consequently provided a context in which to discuss the Loan Collection of the I of A in more depth in Chapter Four. Due to there appearing to be a lack of a formal museum catalogue of acquisitions and holdings, by attempting to chart the development of the collection from 1904 until 1930 via the Institute's Annual Reports, it was shown that the Loan Collection expanded rapidly during the Institute's first decade of existence. This was directly tied to the Excavation Committees, each of which were organized and managed as separate bodies that paradoxically were affiliated to the I of A through a formal resolution in 1905. Those ECs funded Garstang's excavations in Egypt and in the Sudan prior to the War. This chapter suggested, however, that the principal aim of the ECs appears to have been to acquire artefacts for potential profit following the private sale of artifacts from excavations, rather than merely endeavouring to finance archaeological research in connection with the Institute. It must be remembered that many of the members of the ECs were also members of the I of A committee, who were significant donors to the general funding of the Institute. The secondary focus of Chapter Four was the disposal of artifacts in order to obtain revenue to save an Institute suffering from economic difficulties in the post-War years, particularly in the 1920s. Thus the chapter highlighted the sale of duplicate artifacts from 1920 until 1926, followed by an attempted sale of the LC from between 1928 and 1930. Yet one of the main issues that appeared to arise in the attempted sale of the LC was the lack of a catalogue, which served to provide difficulties for the Institute to find a buyer. A catalogue of the artifacts was requested but could not be given to an interested party, consequently causing the I of A to fail in its goal of selling the LC.

In keeping with the study of the LC, Chapter Five focused on two significant events associated with the I of A and the Liverpool Public Museums. Firstly, it was seen that there was an attempt by the City Corporation and in particular its Libraries Museum and Arts Committee to take over the Institute and its collection in 1906, in an attempt to foster closer relations between itself and the University. The primary data used in this chapter showed that the events of 1906 began in mid-1905. Late in

1905, a draft report composed by the SSC of the LMAC revealed that the I of A was included in the scheme without Garstang's knowledge. The report was officially circulated in February 1906, and contained a number of alleged inaccuracies regarding the relationship of the Institute to the U of L, with further inaccuracies in context to the structure and functioning of the I of A. Later the same year, the Institute assembled its own response to the LMAC's report. It was subsequently shown that the working relationship between the I of A and the Public Museum suffered as a consequence of this incident until 1908, when solid evidence demonstrates a recovery by way of a cataloguing project that was performed by staff of the Institute for the Public Museums. Therefore relations improved between the Public Museums and Institute between 1908 and 1910, which culminated in an attempt at an alliance between, and amalgamation, the I of A and the Public Museums. It was noted that the proposed amalgamation in 1910 occurred at a time of financial hardship for the I of A, and was therefore considered a potential means of long-term financial stability. Nonetheless, the endeavour to form this alliance failed as a consequence of meager economic assistance from members of the I of A Committee, and the idea was not re-instigated subsequently.

6.3: Conclusion

Undeniably, Garstang was the principle catalyst for the LC collection housed at the I of A. As demonstrated in this thesis, the original source of the LC was Garstang's excavations in Egypt. Yet prior to his excavations that led to the formation of the LC, and in addition to the I of A's affiliation with the Excavation Committees, it is argued that Garstang's time spent with Petrie from 1899 until 1901 also acted as a stimulus for the LC. Despite Garstang having experience as an excavator before becoming Petrie's assistant, it was shown that Garstang acquired a template for what would become the structure of the EC as a consequence of his time with Petrie. The way in which the ECs were structured and how they funded Garstang's excavations can be argued to have been an expansion of the

model that Petrie used to divide up the finds between Haworth, Kennard and himself.

What became the Loan Collection started with Garstang and John Rankin in May 1903, when they offered their personal collections to the University's so-called Department of Egyptology as a 'gift', with the condition that they were at the disposal of students for learning. However, the wording of the initial proposal for the donation written by Garstang to UC Liverpool stipulated a number of caveats under which the collections were being given. This implies that the main collection was a 'loan' from the beginning. Although, this collection was initially referred to as a Museum following the founding of the I of A in 1904, and was publicised as such in both the Institute's *Preliminary Prospectus* in 1904 and the University Calendar for 1905. It could be said, that between the loan of artifacts and the creation of an Institute, the appearance of a 'Museum' was created, in an effort to create a complete picture. Yet, as has been demonstrated, the title 'Museum' was brought into question when the activities of the Institute with regards to the museum were challenged by the LMAC in 1906. Consequently, the Institute chose to no longer refer to the collection as a Museum, but simply called it a 'Loan Collection' thereafter. At the same time, the I of A also downplayed the additions of artifacts made to the LC by members of the EC, in order to take attention away from the collection. This was contrary to the appearance that the I of A had fostered prior to 1906, especially when the contents of its 'Museum' had been boasted over three pages of its *Preliminary Prospectus* in 1904. Further, this collection was asserted to be for the purpose of teaching. Yet, as shown, the Institute applied very little emphasis to teaching until 1912, and for the majority of its existence. This premise was reinforced in Appendix A-1 which was discussed in the introduction. This consequently calls into question the necessity of a 'teaching collection' within an Institute that seemed to lack a focus on teaching.

Following the founding of the I of A in 1904, and its subsequent affiliation of Garstang's Excavation Committees to it in 1905, it can be argued that over the years the self-professed 'teaching collection' merely

became a by-product of the private sales that members of the ECs carried out following the excavations in Egypt. As such, it is suggested that it became a space in which EC members could deposit objects that were left over after the private sale of artifacts acquired through their shares in the finds of the excavation. Therefore, acting as a repository meant that the I of A did not create or develop an acquisitions policy for the LC and with the steady stream of pieces coming into the Institute, it may not have needed one. Season after season artefacts from EC funded digs, from Rankin in Particular, were deposited into the I of A, yet no record was kept of what exactly was deposited, save that which what was acknowledged in the ARs. This may therefore clarify why the collection was never formally catalogued. Equally, this helps to explain why an attempt to definitively trace the development of the exhibited collection was a challenge in this research. The failure to assemble a catalogue by the owners of the collection, or the I of A, was argued in Chapter Four to have been part of the undoing in the sale of the LC in 1930, adding increased credence to the premise of the LC being an artefact repository.

The evidence provided by the I of A's ARs concerning the Institute's finances suggest that the long-term prospects for the I of A were questionable, and it could be argued that the probability of the Institute being able to remain financially independent was unlikely. It clearly relied upon a key number of donors to maintain its day-to-day existence, which inevitably proved to be an unviable form of subsistence, particularly after the War. Yet the Institute underwent financial challenges prior to the War, which stood in contrast to the quantity of finds being excavated, and their respective values. It is interesting that several key members on the I of A committee, who frequently made grants to the Institute for general maintenance, were also members of the EC. Therefore, why did those members not seek to stabilize the I of A financially over the long-term? What has been demonstrated is that it appeared more important to those members of the ECs, who were also on the I of A's committee, that excavations took place every year, and that the necessary subscribers for each season's expedition were obtained, than it was to stabilize and provide

an enduring economic foundation for the Institute. This points to the idea that the excavations done in conjunction with the Institute were more important than the Institute itself. Thus, when the financial crisis deepened for the I of A after the War, the LC was seen as a way of helping the Institute to survive by members of the Committee. Ironically, therefore, with the outbreak of war in 1914 and the suspension of excavations and therefore the need for the ECs it was hoped that the EC's repository could be used to generate revenue when the decision was made by the Institute's Committee to sell the LC in December 1927.

It was also in 1927 that Garstang returned to Liverpool from Palestine that the committee agreed to sell the collection. The evidence shows that it was Garstang who helped drive the search for a buyer in the United States, making contact with Nils Lind of the American Colony Stores to act as the agent for its disposal. It should be kept in mind that this was not the first time that Garstang had attempted to sell parts of the LC, as seen in Chapter Four. Yet this latter search for a 'sale' did not succeed; if it had, there is a high possibility that the income generated would have provided the Institute with a significant level of financial stability that it had sought, besides potentially providing it with monetary independence. The failure to sell the collection appeared to rest upon the Institute and its inability to provide the required information that would have allowed for the sale to be successful. This was indicated in J. P. Droop's letters, which showed his refusal to take the necessary steps in sending the requested information. One of these requests was for a catalogue for the collection, which, as already established, did not exist. Ultimately, therefore, the LC was never sold.

It can be argued that the ECs indirectly wielded much influence over the I of A; the effects of which were felt, even after the ECs ceased to exist. The LC, that came to exist as a consequence of the EC, failed to materialise into anything profitable at a time of great need for the Institute. A similar situation occurred in 1910, when the Committee of the Institute failed to aid financially the amalgamation of the I of A with the city's Public Museums. Had this alliance occurred, the I of A would have had the

potential to obtain a degree of financial security, which it had not otherwise had. The Committee's response to the proposal for alliance was antithetical to that of 1906, when the actions discussed in Chapter Five were taken. In the case of 1910, it was inaction on the part of the Institute's benefactors to fund the I of A's move that prevented the alliance from coming to fruition. Thus, it would appear that the Committee had wanted to keep the collection at Bedford Street in order to keep the LC in its original accommodation, consequently forcing the I of A to remain as well. Could this lack of support have been a result of the influence of Committee members who were also members of the ECs? Would an amalgamation with the Public Museums have jeopardized the private sales that they were quietly engaging in? If so, it could then be stated that, just as the ECs owned and controlled the LC, it also held a heavy sway over the I of A through its indirect involvement with the Institute's committee.

In order to aid in the distillation of the final conclusion to this thesis, it is important to review the perspectives of the three main players in this work with regard to the LC collection; the LMAC, U of L and the I of A. At times, there are difficulties in defining the positions of these bodies, as there are instances in which there is a lack of conclusive evidence. In other cases, the documentation simply does not exist. For example, with regard to the perspectives of key individuals, there are no more than what is presented in this thesis. The remaining paragraphs here retrace the opinions that have already been outlined in this thesis in order to attempt to ascertain the views held by the three bodies, which will aid in bringing a more rounded perspective to the conclusion.

In the first case, the LMAC in its official statement on 2 February, 1906, as seen in section 5.4, states that the I of A had a museum. This is the only instance that an official LMAC document gave their position on the collections housed by the I of A. The assertion in that document was repeated by *The Liverpool Daily Post* on 3 February. It is known that this opinion did not change for some years. It was confirmed by the newspaper article and correspondences that members of the LMAC did not relent in their opinion even after the I of A formally clarifies what the LC was. The

two representatives of the LMAC that have been identified as having claimed that collections housed at the I of A constituted a museum were the city councilors F. J. Leslie and Sir William Forwood. Forwood was reported in the 19 October, 1907 edition of the *Liverpool Courier* as making reference to the “museum” and did so again in *The Liverpool Daily Post* the following month. In the LMAC’s General Report in its 1907 Annual Report, Forwood appears to begin to relax his views. However, it was never clear as to whether or not he ever comes to view that what was housed at the I of A was: a Loan Collection. As mentioned in 5.6.2, Leslie’s perspective appears through a letter sent to Garstang. In that letter it was noted that nothing “approaching a general museum” was being housed in the I of A. This would lead to the conclusion that Leslie perceived the LC to be a museum. Initially at least, the LMAC seems to have held firmly to the idea that the I of A possessed a museum. Later, as the Institute and the Public Museums became more friendly and the I of A fell into decline, this position no longer appears to have been a concern to the LMAC.

By contrast, the position held by the U of L appears to be far less clear than that held by the LMAC. The University itself never took a clear position as to whether or not the LC should have been regarded as a museum. The one real allusion that it made to it is found in the 1904 University Calendar where there is a reference to a museum. As seen in section 5.5, this changed from 1905 onwards and generally the term ‘collection’ was used by the U of L in reference to the LC.

In his capacity as the University’s Vice-Chancellor, A. W. W. Dale came the closest to giving an opinion. In section 5.3.2, in a letter to Garstang on 6 October, 1905 Dale referred to the “...the collections held by the institute...,” but he made no mention of a museum. Dale, however, did not appear to express concern over the status of the LC, as his preoccupation was with whether or not the LMAC was under the impression that the U of L had any control over the I of A. This was seen in section 5.3.3, with Dale’s 9 Dec 1905 letters; in particular those to J.W. Alsop and Sir John Brunner. This idea is further reinforced in section 5.4, in Dale’s letter to Leslie in which he stated, “For the institute I cannot speak”.

Later, in the same section, Dale reinforced the University's position in context to the I of A in a letter to Leslie dated 2 March, 1906. The correspondence makes the University's position perfectly clear; it did not own the collections housed by the I of A and could not control the Institute. Dale specifically used the term "collections" and made no reference to a museum. In the case of the U of L, it would appear that its concerns were different to those held by the LMAC and I of A. For the purposes here, it could be said that position held by the U of L was that it did not own the collection.

In the case of the I of A, just as with the LMAC, a very distinct official statement is to be found in section 4.5. At a graduation celebration on 4 July, 1904 the *Liverpool Post* reported a speech that stated that there existed in, '...a modest but effective museum...'. The same section cites the description of a museum in the Institute's 1904-05 *Prospectus* while the *AR* for 1905-06 also referred to a museum. The term 'Loan Collection' was used from 1906-07 onwards. The cause for the shift in terminology was discussed in greater detail in Chapter 5, with regards to the conflicts that ensued with the LMAC. Once again it was seen that the I of A only promoted itself as having a museum for the two academic years leading up to the conflict that began in 1906. In the Response, reviewed in section 5.5, the I of A defined the grouping of artefacts that it housed as, '...a small loan collection...'

In section 4.3, when the beginning of what was to become the LC was proposed by Garstang in a letter on 26 May 1903 to Dale, Garstang referred to the grouping of artefacts as a "collection" and there is no mention of any intention to start a museum. If Garstang made an individual statement as to whether or not the LC was a museum, it no longer exists. It can be surmised, however, given his position within the Institute and the official stance of the I of A that he at least publicly would have referred to it as a loan collection.

In summary, it can be argued that what the I of A had defined as the LC comprised minimal holdings at best, the bulk of the artifacts came from EC funded excavations, were mainly loaned by John Rankin and housed in

the Institute's buildings, which were similarly owned by another party. Referring to the group of artefacts housed in these buildings as the LC, it is ultimately concluded that the Institute of Archaeology at the University of Liverpool did not have a museum; it merely had the appearance of one.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Abydos Excavation Fund (EC) 1906
Contract and Conditions 10 November 1906 (Abydos Excavation Fund, Danson Archive at Maritime Museum Archive, Liverpool)(V:4-3).
- Alsop, J. W. 1910
Letter to Dale regarding Alliance Scheme (Official Communication 7 August 1910) (Special Collections, Sydney Jones Library, University of Liverpool) (P5b/2/3).
- Bosanquet, R. C. 1908
Letter to Danson about Gann's appointment (Personal Communication, 19-20 January 1908) (Danson Archive at Maritime Museum Archive, Liverpool) (V:4-2).
- Brunner, Sir J., Brocklebank, R., Rankin, J., & Johnston, W. 1904
Letter to the Council of the University of Liverpool regarding accommodation for the I of A. (Official communication, 20 June 1904) (Special Collections, Sydney Jones Library, University of Liverpool) (P5b/2/3).
- Dale, A.W.W. 1904-09
Letters of the Vice Chancellor IX-XIV. (Liverpool: University of Liverpool. Special Collections, Sydney Jones Library, University of Liverpool) (S2327- S2333).
- Davey, F. 1909
Letter to Danson regarding EC expenses (Official communication, 30 March 1909) (Danson Archive, Maritime Museum Archive, Liverpool) (D/D/V).
- Department of Zoology 1905
Commemorative Booklet for the opening of the Hartley Building (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press) (Special Collections, Sydney Jones Library, University of Liverpool).
- Forbes, H. O. 1904 (a)
Letter to Garstang regarding Beni Hasan artifacts (Official communication, 19 February 1904) (Archives of the Garstang Museum of Archaeology, University of Liverpool) (No Catalogue Number).

- Forbes, H. O. 1904 (b)
 Letter to Garstang regarding the Excavation Committee (Official communication, 27 September 1904) (Archives of the Garstang Museum of Archaeology, University of Liverpool) (No Catalogue Number).
- Garstang, J. 1903 (a)
 Letter to Dale, regarding Egyptian artifacts. (Official communication, 26 May 1903) (Special Collections, Sydney Jones Library, University of Liverpool) (P5b/2/2).
- Garstang, J. 1903 (b)
 Letter to Dale regarding Excavation Committee. (Official communication, 11 November 1903) (Special Collections, Sydney Jones Library, University of Liverpool) (P5b/2/2).
- Garstang, J. 1904 (a)
 Letter to Dale concerning the Excavation Committee (Personal communication, 13 February 1904) (Special Collections, Sydney Jones Library, University of Liverpool) (P5b/2/2).
- Garstang, J. 1904 (a)
 Letter to the Editor of *The Times* regarding gifts of Egyptian antiquities to museums (Published in *The Times*, 18 February 1904, p.7, Col. F).
- Garstang, J. 1904 (b)
 Letter to Dale, regarding plans for an Institute of Archaeology. (Personal communication, 21 February 1904) (Special Collections, Sydney Jones Library, University of Liverpool) (P5b/2/2).
- Garstang, J. 1904 (c)
 Letter to Dale, regarding accommodation for the I of A (Official communication, 21 June 1904 c1, c2, c3) (Special Collections, Sydney Jones Library, University of Liverpool) (P5b/2/3).
- Garstang, J. 1905
 Letter to Danson, regarding financial problems in the Institute (Personal communication, 5 August 1905) (Danson Archive, Maritime Museum Archive, Liverpool) (D/D/V).
- Garstang, J. 1906 (a)
 Letter to Danson regarding excavations (Personal communication, 30 July 1906) (Danson Archive, Maritime Museum Archive, Liverpool)(V:4-3).

- Garstang, J. 1906 (b)
 Letter to Danson regarding private sales (Personal communication, 7 September 1906) (Danson Archive, Maritime Museum Archive, Liverpool) (V:2-30).
- Garstang, J. 1909
 Letter to the Excavation Committee (Official communication, 17 July 1909) (Danson Archive, Maritime Museum Archive, Liverpool) (V:2-32B).
- Garstang, J. 1910
 Letter to Danson regarding sale of I of A artifacts (Personal communication, 11 November 1910) (Danson Archive, Maritime Museum Archive, Liverpool) (V:2-33C).
- Hilton Price, H. F. 1903
 Letter to Garstang regarding Excavation Committee (Personal Communication, 11 November 1903) (Danson Archive, Maritime Museum Archive, Liverpool) (D/D/V).
- Institute of Archaeology 1904-05
Preliminary Prospectus of the Institute of Archaeology (Liverpool: Institute of Archaeology, Special Collections, University of Liverpool)(SPEC R/LF379.5.A1.U55).
- Institute of Archaeology 1904-30
Annual Report and Prospectus (Liverpool: The University Press of Liverpool) (Special Collections, Sydney Jones Library, University of Liverpool) (SPEC R/LF379.5.A1.U55).
- Institute of Archaeology 1904-41
Accession Books (Archives of the Garstang Museum of Archaeology, University of Liverpool) (No Catalogue Number).
- Institute of Archaeology 1905 (a)
 Minutes of Special Committee on the Chair of Classical Archaeology and the relations between the City Council, the University, and the Institute of Archaeology. Liverpool: University of Liverpool. (Special Collections, Sydney Jones Library, University of Liverpool) (P5b/5/7).
- Institute of Archaeology 1905 (b)
 Minutes of Special Committee on the Chair of Classical Archaeology and the relations between the City Council, the University, and the Institute of Archaeology. 18 December 1905. (Liverpool: Institute of Archaeology. Special Collections, Sydney Jones Library, University of Liverpool) (P5b/5/7).

- Institute of the Archaeology 1906
 Institute of the Archaeology and the City Museum, report. Liverpool: Institute of Archaeology. (Archives of the Garstang Museum of Archaeology, University of Liverpool) (No Catalogue Number).
- Institute of Archaeology 1919
 The 1904 – 1919 Minute Book of the I of A. Liverpool: Institute of Archaeology. (Special Collections, Sydney Jones Library, University of Liverpool) (S149).
- Institute of Archaeology 1928-30
 Sale of Collection Archive (Archives of the Garstang Museum of Archaeology, University of Liverpool) (No Catalogue Number).
- Jones, H. E. 1903-07
 Letters to his parents (Jones Archive, National Library of Wales) (1944028).
- Leslie, F.J. 1910
 Letter to Garstang, regarding a meeting. (Personal communication 31 March 1910). (Special Collections, Sydney Jones Library, University of Liverpool) (P5b/2/3).
- Library, Museum & Arts Committee 1902-1907
Annual Report of the Committee of the Public Libraries, Museums, and Art Gallery of the City of Liverpool (Liverpool: C. Tinling & Co., Printing Contractors) (Liverpool Public Libraries) (H 027 406 LIB).
- Library, Museum & Arts Committee 1903-11
 The Minutes of the Library, Museum and Arts Committee. Liverpool: Library, Museum and Arts Committee. (Record Office, Liverpool Central Library, Liverpool) (352 MIN/LIB 1/23).
- Library, Museum & Arts Committee 1908-1915
 Miscellaneous Committee Minutes (Minutes of the Sub-Committee 1 May 1908-January 1915) (Record Office, Liverpool Central Library, Liverpool) (352 MIN/LIB 7/1).
- Library, Museum & Arts Committee Special Sub-Committee 1906
 Suggestions for further co-operation between The Library, Museum and Arts Committee, The Liverpool University, and the Archaeology Institute. (Liverpool: Library Museum and Arts Committee. Special Collections, Sydney Jones Museum, University of Liverpool) (P5b/5/7).
- Liverpool Public Libraries 1904-1928
Public Libraries News-cuttings: Volumes 1-2 (Contains Mercury, Courier, Daily Post, Evening Express, Freeman, Echo, The Porcupine)

(Record Office, Liverpool Central Library, Liverpool)(H Q027 4 CUT).

Museum-Institute Alliance Scheme 1910

Minutes and Proposal (2-13 June 1910) (Archives of the Garstang Museum of Archaeology, University of Liverpool) (No Catalogue Number).

Newberry, P. 1908

Letter to Dale, regarding the Cataloguing of the Public Museum Egyptological collection. (Personal communication 16 July 1908) (Special Collections, Sydney Jones Museum, University of Liverpool) (P5b/2/3).

Petrie, W. M. F. 1894

The Rescue of Egyptian History, *The Times*, 16 October 1894; Pg. 6; Issue 34, 396; Col B.

University of Liverpool 1937

Annals of the University of Liverpool 1834-1936 (Liverpool: University of Liverpool) (SPEC R/LF375.U55).

University of Liverpool 1903-1907

University of Liverpool Calendar (Liverpool: University of Liverpool) (SPEC S/LV371.C5)

University of Liverpool Council 1905-1906

The Minutes of the University Council. Liverpool: University of Liverpool. (Special Collections, Sydney Jones Library, University of Liverpool) (SPEC R/LF371.A4).

Watson, J. 1902 (a)

Letter to Forbes, Regarding Garstang. (Personal Communication 4 March 1902) (Special Collections, Sydney Jones Library, University of Liverpool) (File P5b/2/5).

Watson, J. 1902 (b)

Letter to Dale, Regarding Garstang. (Personal Communication 1 July 1902) (Special Collections, Sydney Jones Library, University of Liverpool) (File P5b/2/5).

Secondary Sources

Alberti, S. J. M. M. 2009

Nature and Culture: Objects, disciplines and the Manchester Museum (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press).

- Allen, A. 1983
The University of Liverpool Recorder: Museum and Teaching Collections in the University (Part II), No. 91, pp.93-96 (Liverpool: Editorial and Publishing of the University of Liverpool)
- Beard, M. 1999
 "The invention and (re-invention) of 'Group D': an archaeology of the Classical Tripos, 1879-1984," in *Classics in 19th and 20th Century Cambridge. Curriculum, Culture and Community*. Edited by C. Stray. Cambridge: The Cambridge Philological Society (Proceeding of the Cambridge Philological Society suppl 24).
- Blakemore Evans, G. 1992
Who Was Who II 1916-1928 A & C Black Publishers
- Boardman, J. 1985
 "One hundred years of classical archaeology in Oxford," in *Beazley and Oxford. Lectures delivered at Wolfson College, Oxford on 28 June 1985*. Edited by D. Kurtz, pp. 43-55. Oxford: Oxford University Committee for Archaeology.
- Bratton, F.G. 1967
A History of Egyptian Archaeology (London: Robert Hale).
- Carpenter, G. H. 1933
A Short Guide to the Manchester Museum (Manchester: Manchester University Press).
- Champion, S. 1998
 Women in British Archaeology: Visible and invisible, *Excavating Women: A History of Women in European Archaeology*. M. Díaz-Andreu & M. L. Stig Sørensen (eds) (USA: Routledge). pp. 171-192
- Crompton, W. M. 1920
 Jessie Haworth first president of the Manchester Egyptian Association, *Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society*, No. IX: pp. 49-52 (Manchester: Manchester University Press).
- Dawson, W. R. & Uphill, E. P. 1972
 Who was who in Egyptology: A biographical index of Egyptologists; of travellers, explorers and excavators in Egypt; of collectors of and dealers in Egyptian antiquities; of consuls, officials, authors and other whose names occur in the literature of Egyptology, from the year 1700 to the present day, but excluding persons now living. (London: Egyptian Exploration Society.) 2nd rev. ed.
- Díaz-Andreu, M. 2007
A World History of Nineteenth-Century Archaeology. Nationalism, Colonialism and the Past. Oxford: Oxford University Press

- Delaney, C. 1986
"A Son to Luxor's Sand": A Commemorative Exhibition of Egyptian Art from the collections of the British Museum and Carmarthen Museum (Wales: The Dyfed County Council).
- Downes, D. 1974
The Excavations at Esna 1905 – 1906 (Warminster: Aris & Philips Ltd).
- Dunlop, W. M. 2000
 Kingdon Tregosse Frost: First Lecturer in Archaeology at the Queens' University of Belfast, *Ulster Journal of Archaeology*, Vol.59: pp. 2-10
- Dunlop, W. M. 2007
 K. T. Frost and the Archaeological Museum at The Queen's University of Belfast, *The Lure of Greece*, Luce, J.V., et al. (eds) (Dublin: Hinds). pp. 33-41
- Drower, M. S. 1995
Flinders Petrie: A life in Archaeology (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2nd ed.).
- Drower, M. S. 2007
 Margaret Alice Murray, 1863 -1963, *Breaking Ground: Pioneering Women Archaeologists*, G.M. Cohen & M.S. Joukowski (eds), The University of Michigan Press. pp. 109 – 141
- Dunlop, W. M. & Hartwell, B. N. 2004
 The Catalogue of the Archaeological Museum at the Queen's University Belfast, Compiled by K T Frost in 1910, *Ulster Journal of Archaeology*, Vol.63: pp. 130-137
- Fox, A 1944.
 The place of archaeology in British education. *Antiquity* 18:153-7.
- Sachko MacLeod, D 1986
 Mid-Victorian Patronage of the Arts: F. G. Stephens's 'The Private Collections of England' Author(s): Reviewed work(s): Source: The Burlington Magazine, Vol. 128, No. 1001 (Aug., 1986), pp. 597-607
- Freeman, P. W. M. 2007
The Best Training-Ground for Archaeologists (Oxford: Oxbow Books)
- Freeman, P. W. M. (in prep.)
The Liverpool Institute of Archaeology 1904-1929/38
- Gardiner, A. H. 1934
Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, 20, 66–70
- Hankey, J. 2001
A Passion for Egypt (London and New York: I.B. Tauris Publishers).

- Haworth, J. 1913
 On the Progress of Egyptology in Manchester, *Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society* pp. 12-18.
- Kelly, T. 1981
For the Advancement of Learning: The University of Liverpool 1881-1981
 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press)
- Keppie, L. 2007
William Hunter and the Hunterian Museum in Glasgow 1807-2007
 (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press)
- Levine, P. 2002
 The Amateur and the Professional: Antiquarians, Historians and Archaeologists in Victorian England 1838 – 1886. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine 1920
Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine: historical record 1898-1920
 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press)
- MacGregor, A. 2000
The Ashmolean Museum (Oxford: University of Oxford, The Ashmolean Museum).
- MacGregor, A. 2001
The Ashmolean Museum: A brief history of the Institution and its collections
 (Oxford: University of Oxford, The Ashmolean Museum).
- Muir, R. 1944
Ramsay Muir: an autobiography and some essays, edited by S. Hodgson
 (London: Lund Humphries & Co).
- Murray, M. 1963
My First Hundred Years. London: Kimber
- Myres, J. L. 1915
The provision for historical studies at Oxford surveyed in a letter to the President of the American Historical Association on the occasion of its meeting in California, 1915. London: Humphrey Milford.
- Nicoll, W. R. 1908
"Tan Maclaren": The Life of the Rev. John Watson, D.D. (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company)

- Perry, G. 2007
The Trophies of Time: English Antiquarians of the Seventeenth Century.(Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Petrie, W. M. F. 1932
Seventy Years in Archaeology, (New York: H. Holt and Company).
- Petrie, H. F. 1952
Seven Memphite Tomb Chapels, British School of Archaeology in Egypt and the Egyptian Research Account LXV. (London)
- Pike, WT (ed.) 1911
Liverpool and Birkenhead in the 20th Century (Brighton: W.T. Pike & Co.).
- Pinch – Brock, L. 2007
The Short, Happy Life of Harold Jones, Artist and Archaeologist, Who Travels Sees More: Artists, Architects and Archaeologists Discover Egypt and the Near East, D. Fortenberry (ed.) (Oxford: Oxbow Books). pp. 31-40.
- Power, H. 1999
Tropical Medicine in the twentieth century: A history of the Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, 1898 – 1990 (London: Kegan Paul International)
- Ralston, I. 2009
 Gordon Childe and Scottish archaeology: the Edinburgh Years 1927-1946. *European Journal of Archaeology* 12:47-90.
- Rankin, J. 1921
A History of Our Firm being some account of the firm of Pollok, Gilmour and Co. and its offshoots and connections 1804-1920 (2nd edition), Liverpool: Henry Young & Sons Ltd
- Read, C. H. 1906
 Anthropology at the Universities. *Man* VI:56-9
- Reilly, C. 1938
Scaffolding in the Sky: a semi-architectural autobiography (London: G. Routledge & Sons).
- Russell, J. F. 1969
 Archaeological Material in the Teaching collection of the Department of Archaeology, Queen's University, Belfast, *Ulster Journal of Archaeology*, Vol.32: 109-111
- Shore AF (ed.) 1985
The School of Archaeology and Oriental Studies, University of Liverpool: Its history and its collection. (Private publication, Liverpool).

- Smith, P. J. 2009
A Splendid Idiosyncrasy: Prehistory at Cambridge 1915-50. British Archaeological Reports 485 Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Snape, S. R. 1986
Mortuary Assemblages from Abydos, Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Liverpool.
- Sweet, R. 2004
 Antiquaries: The Discovery of the Past in Eighteenth Century Britain. (London: Hambledon and London)
- The Liverpool Post*, 1904
 4 July
- The London Gazette*, 1892
 May 13
- The Times* 1986
 Egypt Exploration Fund, 14 November 1896, Pg 14, Issue 34,048; Col D.
- Trigger, B. G. 1989
A History of Archaeological Thought (Cambridge)
- Truscott, B. 1943
Red brick University (London: Faber)
- University Museums UK Group 2004
University Museums in the United Kingdom: A National Resource for the 21st Century, UK: University Museums Group UK.
- Wallace, C. 2011
 in prep Writing and Using the History of Archaeology, in a Biographical Dictionary Approach, PhD thesis in prep, Univ Liverpool
- Warhurst, M. 1978
 'The Danson Bequest and Merseyside County Museums', *Archaeological Reports for 1977-78*, 85-88.
- Woolf, D. 2007
 Images of the Antiquary in Seventeenth-Century England. Pearce, S. (Ed) *Visions of Antiquity: the Society of Antiquaries of London 1707-2007*. London: Society of Antiquaries of London - Archaeologia 111.

Internet Sources

- Altholz, J. L. 2004
'Renouf, Sir Peter Le Page (1822–1897)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press;
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/23381>, accessed 27 Jan 2010]
- Art Fund 2012
Head of Augustus, Emperor of Rome ('The Meroë Head') by Roman - The Art Fund national fundraising charity for works of art. 2012. Head of Augustus, Emperor of Rome ('The Meroë Head') by Roman - The Art Fund national fundraising charity for works of art. [ONLINE] Available at: <http://www.artfund.org/artwork/107/head-of-augustus-emperor-of-rome-the-mero-head>. [Accessed 16 January 2012].
- Atkinson, W. C. 2004
'Peers, Edgar Allison (1891–1952)', rev. John D. Haigh, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press;
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/35455>, accessed 30 April 2010]
- Bosanquet, E.S. 2004
'Bosanquet, Robert Carr (1871–1935)', rev. David Gill, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press;
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/31976>, accessed 15 Dec 2011]
- Brock, H. 2004
'Hunter, William (1718–1783)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press;
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/14234>, accessed 28 Jan 2010]
- Caygill, M. L. 2004
'Poole, (Reginald) Stuart (1832–1895)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press;
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22520>, accessed 27 Jan 2010]
- Cook, B. F. 2004
'Newton, Sir Charles Thomas (1816–1894)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press;
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/20051>, accessed 27 Jan 2010]
- Dick, F. 2004
'Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson, first baronet (1842–1919)', rev. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press;

[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/37236>, accessed 15 Dec 2011]

- Drower, M. S. 2004
'Petrie, Sir (William Matthew) Flinders (1853–1942)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press;
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/35496>, accessed 27 Jan 2010]
- Fagan, B. 2004
'Newberry, Percy Edward (1869–1949)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press; online edn, Oct 2006
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/35210>, accessed 15 Dec 2011]
- Greenaway, F. 2004
'Mond family (*per.* 1867–1973)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press; online edn, Jan 2011
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/51124>, accessed 19 Jan 2012]
- Gunn, B. 2004
'Peet, (Thomas) Eric (1882–1934)', rev. R. S. Simpson, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press;
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/35456>, accessed 30 April 2010]
- Gurney, O. R. 2004
'Garstang, John (1876–1956)', rev. P. W. M. Freeman, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press; online edn, May 2009
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/33341>, accessed 5 Feb 2010]
- Halliday, W. R. 2004
'Dawkins, Richard MacGillivray (1871–1955)', rev. David Gill, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press; online edn, May 2009 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/32749>, accessed 30 April 2010]
- Hammond, N. 2004
'Gann, Thomas William Francis (1867–1938)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press;
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/33319>, accessed 24 March 2011]
- Haycock, D. 2004
'Borlase, William (1696–1772)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press; online edn, Jan 2006
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/2910>, accessed 17 Jan 2012]

- Hunter, M. 2004
 'Ashmole, Elias (1617–1692)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*,
 Oxford University Press;
 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/764, accessed 27 Jan 2010]
- Killick, R. 2004
 'Forwood, Sir William Bower (1840–1928)', *Oxford Dictionary of
 National Biography*, Oxford University Press;
 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/47004, accessed 19 Jan
 2012]
- Knowles, Chantal 2004
 'Blackwood, Beatrice Mary (1889–1975)', *Oxford Dictionary of National
 Biography*, Oxford University Press; online edn, Jan 2010
 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/45781, accessed 11 Dec
 2011]
- La Rue, H. 2004
 'Balfour, Henry (1863–1939)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*,
 Oxford University Press;
 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/30557, accessed 5 Dec
 2011]
- Manley, D. 2004
 'Edwards, Amelia Ann Blanford (1831–1892)', *Oxford Dictionary of
 National Biography*, Oxford University Press;
 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8529, accessed 27 Jan
 2010]
- Mallowan, M. 2004
 'Murray, Margaret Alice (1863–1963)', rev. R. S. Simpson, *Oxford
 Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press;
 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/35169, accessed 27 Jan
 2010]
- Petch, A. 2006
 ny. "PRM [Pitt Rivers Museum] Teaching Introduction," in *England: the
 Other Within. Analysing the English Collections at the Pitt Rivers Museum*, pp.
[http://england.prm.ox.ac.uk/englishness-PRM-Teaching-
 Introduction.html](http://england.prm.ox.ac.uk/englishness-PRM-Teaching-Introduction.html). Oxford: www.
- Roberts, W. 2004
 'Price, (Frederick George) Hilton (1842–1909)', rev. Bernard Nurse,
Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press;
 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/35609, accessed 22 April
 2010]
- Sherrington, C. S. 2004
 'Boyce, Sir Rubert William (1863–1911)', rev. Claire E. J. Herrick,
Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, Oxford University Press;

[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/32007>, accessed 30 April 2010]

Smith, M. 2004
'Budge, Sir Ernest Alfred Thompson Wallis (1857–1934)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press;
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/32161>, accessed 27 Jan 2010]

The National Archive 2011
The Danson Family Archive, The National Archives | Access to Archives. [ONLINE]
[<http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/a2a/records.aspx?cat=136-dd&cid=0#0>, Accessed 22 December 2011].

Tweedale, G 2004
'Dawkins, Sir William Boyd (1837–1929)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press;
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/32750>, accessed 27 Jan 2010]

Williams, T. I. 2004
'Muspratt, James (1793–1886)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2007
[<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/19676>, accessed 16 Jan 2012]

Photographs

Bosanquet, R. C.
Media Page: R. C. BOSANQUET. 2012. Media Page: R. C. BOSANQUET. [ONLINE] Available at: http://www.clement-jones.com/wp01/wp01_076.htm. [Accessed 19 January 2012].

Dale, A. W. W.
Your Paintings - Frank Thomas Copnall paintings. 2012. Your Paintings - Frank Thomas Copnall paintings. [ONLINE] Available at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/arts/yourpaintings/artists/frank-thomas-copnall/paintings/slideshow#/9>. [Accessed 19 January 2012].

Mond, R. L.
In *Transactions of the Faraday Society Issue 0, 1938*. Royal Society of Chemistry. [ONLINE] Available at: <http://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlelanding/1938/TF/tf9383401369> [Accessed 19 January 2012]

Newberry, P. E.
Ashmolean – Eastern Art Online, Yousef Jameel Centre for Islamic

and Asian Art. 2012. Ashmolean – Eastern Art Online, Yousef Jameel Centre for Islamic and Asian Art. [ONLINE] Available at: <http://jameelcentre.ashmolean.org/collection/6/1272>. [Accessed 19 January 2012].

Peet, T. E.

Thomas Eric Peet facts - Freebase. 2012. Thomas Eric Peet facts - Freebase. [ONLINE] Available at: http://www.freebase.com/view/en/thomas_eric_peet. [Accessed 19 January 2012].

Petrie, M. F.

The friends. 2012. The friends. [ONLINE] Available at: <http://www.ucl.ac.uk/FriendsofPetrie/pages/About%20Friends.html>. [Accessed 19 January 2012]. ISBN Search Enter ISBN 10 Number: BETA

Brunner, J. T., Danson, F., Garstang, J.

Pike, WT (ed.) 1911

Liverpool and Birkenhead in the 20th Century (Brighton: W.T. Pike & Co.).

APPENDICES

