

Rethinking Antiquarianism

Tim Murray
La Trobe University
(t.murray@latrobe.edu.au)

This paper provides the opportunity to discuss the rationale for a new collaborative research project directed at creating a global history of antiquarianism. Conventional histories of archaeology, particularly those by Daniel (e.g. 1976) and to a certain extent Trigger (1987, 2006), stress that antiquarians were in essence amateurs and dilettantes, perfect figures of their age, exemplified by the brilliantly scatty John Aubrey, or by Walter Scott's grotesque pastiche Jonathan Oldbuck. However, following ground-breaking work by Arnaldo Momigliano (see e.g. 1966, 1990), and later by Alain Schnapp (e.g. 1996) for some time it had become clear that this was an inaccurate rendering – one designed to stress the scientific credentials of the disciplines that grew out and away from antiquarianism: the modern cultural sciences of history, sociology, anthropology, art history, archaeology, and history of religion. For Schnapp, especially in his *Discovery of the Past*, the division between amateur and professional (a distinction also explored with profit by Phillipa Levine (1986)) was not the cause of the triumph of archaeology (or any one of the other disciplines) over antiquarianism, and it is ill informed to interpret antiquarianism as a wrong-turning on the pathway to archaeological enlightenment. In this view antiquarianism was, and perhaps still is a full-fledged and (more important) *continuing* body of thought and practice.

This notion of continuity, including the probability that it has the potential to morph into a kind of *neo-antiquarianism*, is worthy of much further discussion, but at this point I just want to indicate that disciplinary history (with the exception of Schnapp (1993) and Rosemary Sweet (2004)) generally has not been kind to antiquarians or antiquarianism. Part of my object in this paper is to argue that by exploring the social and cultural worlds of antiquarianism (both past and present) we might be able to redress that imbalance.

I will exemplify these explorations through a very brief discussion of the construction of remote British history in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, where the foundations of what I have called the *interactionist* methodology of antiquarianism were laid.

My approach here is based on the idea that, up until the middle of the nineteenth century, the antiquarian was a key link between the past and the present. Following Schnapp I assume that, as opposed to the historian whose task was to comment on texts, the antiquary was responsible for the management of material remains of the past – be they objects or monuments.

Constructing Remote British History

In this paper I will focus discussion on William Camden's demolition of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *History of the Kings of Britain*, and his replacement of it by an account broadly indicative of sixteenth and seventeenth century English antiquarian practice. I do this to illustrate the means by which material things could acquire significance as historical documents within a broader socio-political and historiographic context. The focus on Geoffrey also illustrates how the inductive philosophy of science of the period could readily articulate with socio-political context to dispatch his account as being essentially mythopoeic. There is a neat contrast here between the fate of Geoffrey's *History*, and that of Hesiod's *Works and Days*, or Lucretius' *On the Nature of the Universe*, two mythopoeic discourses that fared rather better when the Three Age System was formulated by Thomsen in the early nineteenth century.

I will outline the rise of, and the causes of changes to, a new antiquarian methodology and then go on

to discuss some of the links between it and the wider social context of antiquarian knowledge during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. This new methodology, which I have called 'interactionist', allowed antiquaries to plausibly relate new sources of information (the 'ethnographic other', field monuments, coins and inscriptions) with old sources of evidence and interpretation, such as the Bible and the Classical ethnographies such as the *Britannia* and *Germania* of Tacitus. This interactionist methodology became the hallmark of English antiquarian practice during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In discussing the causes of changes to this new methodology I shall emphasize three important shifts in the context of antiquarian practice.

First, the increasing historical importance of the material phenomena remains of the prehistoric British past, and of material culture associated with the 'ethnographic other'.

Second, connected with the first, the increasingly complex picture of the pre-Roman British past where the historical relationships of items of material culture could not be plausibly established through the interactionist methodology alone.

Third, the shift from empiricist to rationalist (romantic) frameworks of interpretation and justification during the eighteenth century – typified by the later work of Stukeley.

Notwithstanding what have come to be considered as the 'excesses' of practitioners such as Stukeley, and the confusion of others such as Colt-Hoare, that led many observers to doubt whether the 'true' history of the remote British past could ever be established, the rude stone monuments, barrows, and other items of material culture remaining from pre-Claudian times, were still recognized as the products of historical human action, although precisely *whose* action remained a matter for conjecture and debate.

I think that the forces which led to the recognition of the historical and 'ethnological' importance of material things also conditioned the methodological status of material things as supplements to other more culturally familiar data sets, perspectives, methodologies and problems. The interactionist methodology of English antiquarianism had to allow practitioners to do two things. First, to marshal all available ethnographic, material cultural, and textual evidence to counteract what were considered to be irrational or mythological histories, and second, to grade (implicitly or explicitly) the historical reliability of all the sources of evidence as testaments to the human past.

Significantly the history which antiquarians either sought to write, or to contribute to, was the history of Britain in its mental, moral and political particulars. Ethnographic generalization was, therefore, practically mediated by textual and material cultural analysis. New socio-political contexts and new relationships to the past demanded new histories. Monmouth's *History*, written around 1136, had served old contexts and was one of the first major victims of the new methodology. The standard discussions of the *History of the Kings of Britain* debate many issues concerning the sources of the work and its reception by scholars even in Geoffrey's own time. Its influence, however, is unquestioned. Sir Thomas Kendrick's superb study (1950) is a chronicle of that influence, charting the objections to the work from antiquarians such as Polydore Vergil, Leland, William Camden and John Speed. It is the antiquarian objections to the work that most concern me here, because the sixteenth and seventeenth century antiquaries marshaled the product of a different historical methodology against it. Principal among these antiquaries was William Camden, who became the archetypical English antiquary as much because of his education and political connections, as well as because of the enormous influence of his great work *Britannia* (1586).

A concern with the past thus had direct political, social and economic consequences for many who were in the Tudor (and later Stuart and Georgian) power structures, or who sought entry to them. The best example of the usefulness of the past, apart from Parliament's obsession with precedent and the functioning of common law, was provided by Henry VIII when he sought justification for the split with Rome and the foundation of a Church of England. The appointment of John Leland as the

first King's Antiquary is significant testimony to seriousness of Henry's appeal to the traditions of British history.

The task of reconciling the ancient descriptions of Europe with the political geography of the sixteenth century implied that collection and analysis would also include the need to provide the fullest possible description of the entire basis of ancient social and cultural life. Such detailed descriptions subsequently provided clear evidence of differences and similarities in customs and laws – both within Britain, and between Britain and Europe as a whole, that could broaden the understanding of history itself. The development of county histories such as Lambarde's *Perambulation of Kent* (1576) and John Stow's *Survey of London* (1598) are cases in point. Significantly, the actual visitation of places mentioned in the histories was not regarded as being essential, given that the authority of previous authors was accepted.

But William Camden adopted a different course, and in doing so raised the possibility that the analysis of material remains could play a greater role in sifting 'objective' histories from mythopoeic historical 'recreations'. So what caused the change in methodology to include an accent on actual observation and an increased emphasis on the incorporation of material objects as authorities potentially on a par with the written documents? And also what changed antiquarian studies from being set apart from the concerns of the age to a source of national interest?

Clearly the spirit of Baconian empiricism had much to do with the scepticism of other than direct observation or eyewitness accounts. Yet this scepticism most certainly was not applied to the Bible, or to the more general and derivative Classical ethnographies. In fact these, and the new ethnographies from the Americas were to become the standards, the givens, the bedrock assumptions of English antiquarianism of the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Clearly the prescription that evidence of the senses was more powerful than the authority of ancient authors had a role to play in the new emphasis on visiting the sites and cataloguing coins and inscriptions. But equally clearly, there were practical difficulties encountered by an empiricist epistemology when it came to 'filling the gaps' in the material cultural record. It transpired that material culture, after it had been subjected to proper scrutiny and classification, would be used along with the ethnographic data to flesh out the historical record.

What was rational, what was plausible, would be determined by the degree of fit between the Classical and Biblical authorities on the one hand and the material culture and ethnographies on the other. Yet this interactionist methodology was closely constrained by 'cultural' and political determinants of what was plausible to believe about the past. In the event, the weight of plausibility was to rest with literary sources.

The discussion of British origins was central to the intellectual and political background of *Britannia*. Geoffrey's story of Brutus and family had held sway, despite continuous criticism, since the twelfth century. The first major attack on it, during the sixteenth century, most closely associated with Polydore Vergil, Robert Fabyan and John Rastell, was based on an argument that Geoffrey's *History* completely lacked verification from any ancient source. Kendrick has shown that Tudor nationalists did not react favourably to the attack, or to Polydore's attempts to justify it. In the debate that followed, the traditional basis for understanding the earliest periods of British history was questioned and the construction of British history itself became problematic. The issue became one of methodology and epistemology: how were accounts of the remote past to be justified? Any solution would have political ramifications.

Ortelius may have encouraged Camden to "acquaint the world with Britain", but Camden's real goal was to "restore Britain to its antiquities and its antiquities to Britain", but the glory of Britain would be best served by the establishment of a clear and rationally defensible history that linked it to Rome. It would also be effectively served by a justification of the Anglo-Saxon dominance of British (read English) power structures. Camden's attack on Geoffrey's British history was as much an attack on its

racial elements as it was on its fabulous nature. There was a great deal at stake.

Camden dismissed the Brutus story as a myth, one of those myths that have nationalist justification by disguising “the truth with a mixture of fable and bring in the gods themselves to act a part... thereby to render the beginnings either of a city or of a nation, more noble and majestic”. However, Camden did not mention another vital aspect of such myths, the explanation of a past that was beyond direct observation or written documents, although he does hint at the importance of such explanations given the investment of national or ethnic pride in their particular constitution.

By Camden’s time Classical, particularly Roman, accounts had become the foundation of an understanding of the pre-Roman British past. However, Camden added an extra dimension through his discussion of monuments and artifacts (particularly coins), as well as the customs and languages of France and Britain. Clearly, if any new account was to convince the lawyers and the English educated public of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, it had to be broadly based and admit rational assessment by the lights of Baconian empiricism.

The supply of written documents (including the depth of their textual exegesis), of Roman and post-Roman inscriptions, and of descriptions of field monuments had greatly increased since the Middle Ages, providing a broad base from which to begin writing the history of a past that had left no contemporary written documents. The analysis of material remains thus became a way of establishing the reliability of claims made on the basis of written documents that sometimes gave divergent testimony. An important issue here is that Geoffrey’s history assumed a kind of authority itself, based in part on the fact that it was an agreeable reconstruction to many people, but also because it was *written*. An attack on Geoffrey’s work implied an equally critical attitude to the Bible and the Classical authorities. In practice, these core areas of antiquarian ‘culture’ were not examined with anything approaching the vigour that was reserved for Geoffrey and other ‘fabulists’.

What Geoffrey had constructed out of chronicles, king lists, folk tales, and his own imagination, Camden made from the Biblical and Classical sources and the surviving monuments and artifacts. A final issue remains here, and concerns whether the goals of Geoffrey’s history matched those of Camden’s. Both had national and political goals, both sought to glorify the nation through its past, and both had racial interests. Geoffrey sought to attain his goals by way of myth couched in terms of a Biblical and folkloric background to give it a measure of plausibility. Camden stressed the fact that he had chosen another path. His stated authorities were his senses and the exercise of logic, but in practice these were constrained by the *a priori* of the Bible and the Classical authorities. Thus, for Camden it was not just a matter that these authorities impregnated his supposedly hypothesis-free observation statements, far more than this. Camden’s *Britannia* above all represents an extension of the Roman histories by means of enrolling the monuments, coins and inscriptions as supplements to Classical documentary sources.

By virtue of the success of *Britannia* and through his contacts with other antiquaries and historians such as Sir Robert Bruce Cotton and John Speed, Camden influenced much of the style of sixteenth and seventeenth century English antiquarian debate. Indeed, successive editions of *Britannia* (especially the 1695, 1722 editions), acted as a kind of barometer of antiquarian methodology, or at least a point of departure for other antiquaries, through to the end of the eighteenth century. In sum, Camden’s methodology, based as it was on the squaring of Classical and Biblical authorities and the material cultural evidence, became the cornerstone of the interactionist methodology to be developed and used by generations of English antiquaries who were to follow him.

Although Camden focused the bulk of his attention on coins, seals and other items of material culture bearing inscriptions, the methodology of comparison, rational reconstruction, and close observation of the empirical phenomena (be they field monuments or Church brasses) was matched by those antiquaries who concentrated on thunderstones, *ceramnia*, what we now know to be prehistoric stone implements. Lhwyd and Plot, to name only two antiquaries more inclined to natural history, without

qualm linked empirical observation of these fossils and their modern representatives with close textual and folkloric studies, in a way which anticipated important elements of the new interactionist methodology that was to become associated with the Three Age System.

Significantly, Camden and other antiquaries, having located a source for the British, and therefore a description of them drawn from the Classical and Biblical sources, paid scant attention to the need to ascertain whether those earliest Britons had changed before the time of the Romans. For them, it was enough to connect Japhet and Caesar without employing what they considered to be the kind of myth that caused the downfall of Geoffrey's *History*. Here the perceptions of 'everyday savage life' drawn primarily from the Amerindian ethnographies added colour and texture to an account which rated literary sources as far more authoritative than either ethnography or material culture.

However, by the mid-to-late seventeenth century such an implicit account was not enough. The cause of this appears to be the slow recognition (drawn largely from studies by topographers, antiquaries and others) that there was considerable variability in pre-Roman 'British' material culture (and in the societies and cultures of the 'ethnographic other') – a variability about which the Classical authors had been silent. Here the interactionist methodology began to change in the terms of the relative utility of its authorities, its object now was no more aligned towards the classification of material culture, and the establishment of meaning through comparison with the material culture of the 'ethnographic other', *before* the application of Classical and Biblical texts. An excellent and under-appreciated example of this attempt to reveal a reality of the past, not confined by the tastes and interests of the present, is supplied by the remarkable character of John Aubrey. Although Lhwyd and Dugdale both emphasized the importance of empiricism to antiquarian studies, Aubrey's own statement in the only recently published *Monumenta Britannica* (1981) enhances the liberating effect of the revised interactionist methodology for the seventeenth and early eighteenth antiquaries:

I do here endeavour (for want of written record) to work out and restore after a kind of algebraical method, by comparing them that I have seen with one another and reducing them to a kind of equation: to (being but an ill orator myself) make the stones give evidence for themselves.

This was easier said than done. For although Aubrey could query the utility of the Classical accounts, and perhaps even be wary of the application of ethnographic generalizations, nevertheless without them his 'algebraical method' could rarely achieve more than description and classification. The historical meanings of the various classes of field monuments and portable artifacts still had to be established. However, change in the interactionist methodology did not stop there. Additional tensions arose which were to occasion further doubts about the ability of antiquarian studies to banish the *a priori*.

Both Hunter (e.g. 1975) and Piggott (e.g. 1976) have effectively demonstrated that antiquarian methodology, so much a part of Baconian empiricism was, in the course of the 18th century to become increasingly difficult to adhere to as a result of the upswing in Romantic historicism and rationalism that had struck the sciences generally. Nonetheless critical elements of the interactionist methodology remained in the form of the authorities appealed to by Stukeley for what are now taken to be his wilder excesses of interpretation. In an important sense there were trends to a return of the primacy of the written text over the 'ethnographic other' and the empirical character of the material phenomena.

This is not to say that Stukeley was a Camden with a rather credulous attitude to Classical ethnography, oak groves and standing stones. Instead he, like Colt-Hoare, was responding to a different set of socio-political forces. He was also responding to an increasing need to establish the historical meaning of the by then confused state of inquiries into pre-Roman British antiquities. In such circumstances the Classical and Biblical authorities that had formed the essentially literary cornerstone of the interactionist methodology could only be used at the price of reduced empirical assessment. Although there were many who found Stukeley's accounts of 'barbarous Druidic rituals' among the henge monuments to be plausible, the fact remained that there were equally many who

were far from convinced as they contemplated the wide variability which now seemed to characterize pre-Roman British antiquities. Whereas Camden and others could readily establish the historical value of the coins, seals, and inscriptions they used (precisely because of the presence of writing on them), the task of later antiquaries such as Aubrey and Stukeley was made the more difficult when writing no longer came to the rescue.

Consequently, the traditional reading (based on the greater authority of literary sources ably supplemented by lashings of the ‘ethnographic other’ and material culture) of the interactionist methodology began to break down. How could such authorities assist in the understanding of events to which they may well have not been witness? In the absence of a reliable ordering of pre-Roman antiquities, the interactionist method as practiced by Stukeley could only produce a frozen history. Meaning and, more importantly the basis of conviction, could no longer be considered to flow unproblematically from reason and the senses. The nature of British prehistory once again became shrouded in conjecture, and the two goals of the interactionist methodology – an attack on mythopoeic histories, and the grading of the reliability of sources of historical evidence – could not be convincingly attained.

What was urgently required was a means of sorting-out the nightmare of pre-Roman British antiquities, so that the interactionist methodology could function once again. In the event the ‘northern antiquaries’ were to come to the rescue, but in so doing the new emphasis on material culture, established by the Three Age System, was to effectively realign the authorities that had been the backbone of interactionism. No longer were Caesar, Strabo (or for that matter the Bible) to hold pride of place over the empirical character of the archaeological record, and the ‘ethnographic other’, as the framework in terms of which the meaning of the material phenomena of the prehistoric British past was to be made manifest. This at least was the methodological rhetoric used by its promoters. What really happened is, of course, another story.

New Perspectives: a Global Approach

I now outline the scope and rationale of a new research project in the history of antiquarianism that is being conducted by Alain Schnapp, Lothar von Falkenhausen, Irène Aghion and myself. The title of the project – *Traces, Collections, Ruins: Towards a Comparative History of Antiquarianism* – reflects the broad interests of the project team. Our project links historians, with art historians, philologists, archaeologists and anthropologists, and will undertake a comparative study of the practice, the epistemology and the history of antiquarians and antiquarianism on a global scale.

Our first aim is to define what is understood as antiquarian practice so that we might gain a clearer picture of what antiquarianism has been, is, and might yet become. There are numerous points of difference, as well as similarities between antiquarian traditions, and part of our goal is to establish whether there is an irreducible ‘conceptual core’ to antiquarianism, or whether it has a complex evolutionary history within and between different traditions.

One of my roles is to explore the complex relationships between antiquarianism and the writing of prehistory. The search for an understanding of pre-literate human societies is one of the most challenging of all investigations. Over the last five hundred years, the focus has sometimes been on the early history of Europe (for example the history of Britain prior to the Claudian invasion), while at other times the primary concern has shifted towards an exploration of the nature of ‘savage’ societies found by Europeans as the boundaries of Europe expanded to encompass the world. Of course, much of the history of European antiquarianism right up to the end of the nineteenth century is a tale of how pre-literate societies encountered by Europeans came to play a vital role in humanizing the world of preliterate Europe. This long-standing form of reasoning, which is described as analogical inference or ethnographic analogy, lies at the core of much contemporary archaeological theory.

Thus the first goal is to develop a detailed history of this field, so as to elucidate an overall comparative

history of antiquarian practice. This might be best described as the antiquarianism *of* preliterate societies, where such societies are mined for clues about the early histories of literate societies. The resulting histories or analyses have almost exclusively been the product of Europeans, or of the descendants of European settlers and colonists around the globe. However there is more to the issue than this. It has long been understood that histories resulting from the practice of the antiquarianism *of* preliterate societies have tended to make the past of such societies effectively ahistorical. Time for such societies is, to all intents and purposes, frozen, and the focus of analysis considers essence and stasis (something real, analyzable and stable as a form of analogy) instead of properly historical matters such as change, transformation and dynamism. Much has been written about the consequences of a lack of history and a great deal of work has been done to chart alternative paths.

The second goal is potentially more controversial and certainly much more difficult to reach. This is to extend this work (and its rationale) to a consideration of antiquarianism *in* pre-literate societies. By this I mean that by changing the focus of history-making to a concern with how contemporary indigenous societies (themselves now literate societies but directly descended from pre-literate societies observed at the time of contact) make history, create memorials, create heritage (both tangible and intangible) and create and mobilize memories, so we can gain a stronger sense of these societies as historical entities, in the present as well as the past.

Already this approach has had significant impact in fostering a clearer understanding of heritage in non-western settings, as well as in postcolonial societies. Significantly, it links closely to the work of material culture analysts such as Susanne Küchler (2002) where anthropologists engage with issues of temporality and memory and their place in social ritual, and pose the important question: “is this antiquarianism in a different vein”? The question has also been posed with respect to song, language and story as the living “immaterial” heritage of indigenous peoples (although this clearly also applies to literate as well as pre-literate societies). Finally, an inquiry into antiquarianism *in* pre-literate societies also supports a stream of archaeological inquiry, begun by Richard Bradley (see e.g. 2002), into the place of the past (monuments, memories, landscapes, rock art) in prehistoric societies. I think that it is fair to say that this is all pretty rudimentary stuff at present, but there are interesting points of tension and intersection that indicate that it might be worth pursuing. It is also worth asking whether one can really speak of antiquarianism in preliterate societies without making the definition so elastic as to be uselessly ambiguous.

But the contemporary contexts of antiquarianism give us other things to consider. Chief among these is the importance of the antiquarian in local communities. Historians of archaeology (myself among them) have tended to concentrate analysis on demonstrating the complicity of our discipline in the foundation of nineteenth century nation states and empires. But what of the broader social roles of antiquarians? Of course authors such as Walter Scott delighted in making some pretty heavy-handed jokes at their expense, and the members of the British House of Commons were fond of raising the spectre of the woolly-headed antiquarian during debates linked to the passage of the First Ancient Monuments Protection Act (see e.g. Murray 1990). But there is no doubt about at least two things since the sixteenth century. First, antiquaries were the repositories of knowledge about local and regional histories. Second, this knowledge spanned landscapes, material culture and written documents. For these reasons alone antiquaries provided information and experiences that helped people shape identities and to understand the places they were living in.

In our new project we will search out this finer scale and explore the role of antiquarians and archaeologists in the creation of narratives about local landscapes, monuments, material culture, histories and memories. Although we accept that these narratives need not necessarily be different to or isolated from more general national or continental narratives, there is no warrant to assume that either outcome is inevitable.

Some Interim Observations

This very small example of new perspectives on antiquarianism is hardly substantial enough to allow

me to draw firm conclusions about the role of antiquarianism in contemporary society. Nonetheless it does provide another kind of example of a process of which we are very aware: the changing contexts of practice in archaeology. Here the link between places, objects, identities and histories that has become such a social and cultural force under the general rubric of heritage has the potential to gain great power.

New histories of antiquarianism and archaeology are being written in an attempt to make sense of these matters, and it is fascinating to contemplate the implications of developments such as a renewed interest in what were once deemed the ‘unscientific’ and ‘irrelevant’ perspectives of antiquarianism. Archaeology had its roots in antiquarianism, history, philology, ethnology, geology, and ‘natural history’ generally¹. From this grew the trunk that eventually branched out into various sub-disciplines (e.g. Biblical, Roman, Medieval, Scientific and ‘New’ Archaeology). The great meta-narratives of the history of archaeology have followed this approach, with ‘archaeological thought’ or ‘archaeological ideas’ having a common inheritance or ancestry in nineteenth century positivist European science. From this main ‘root-stock’, it eventually branched into sub-divisions and out into the world at large, fostering off-spring archaeologies differentiated by geography, tradition, sub-field or time period.

One of the roles of the history of archaeology is to challenge this meta-narrative and to demonstrate that there has been a great deal more variability of thought and practice in the field than has been acknowledged. Antiquarianism did not conveniently die-out with the advent of archaeology as a discipline, and its history and development has always involved multiple strands – in essence the existence of *other* possibilities and practices. Histories of archaeology and of antiquarianism should stimulate the explorations of these other possible archaeologies, past, present and future, and they should help us acknowledge the creation of world archaeologies, and the multiplication of interests and objectives among both producers and consumers of archaeological knowledge, will drive the creation of still further variability. However, part of any acknowledgement of alternatives and differences is the recognition of similarities that derive from a common inheritance. A significant issue in contemporary archaeological practice is the question of whether there is an irreducible disciplinary core, if archaeology as a discipline exists, and whether archaeologists working in different fields, or from different perspectives, have enough in common to engage in meaningful disciplinary conversation. I strongly believe that the history of archaeology has a vital role to play in ensuring that such conversations occur, and that they do so in an informed manner.

Acknowledgments: This paper derives from a presentation at the symposium *Locality and Place in the History of Archaeology*, held at the Institute of Archaeology, University College London, March 2007. I thank Professor Stephen Shennan, director of the institute, for his support of this symposium, and for my stay at the institute during the first three months of 2007. Parts of the paper also derive from the 2007 Mulvaney Lecture “Reconsidering Antiquarianism in the History of Australian Archaeology”, given at the Australian National University in May 2007. I thank Professor Matthew Spriggs for his invitation to deliver the lecture.

References

- Aubrey, J. 1981. *Monumenta Britannica or a Miscellany of British Antiquities*. J. Fowles (ed). Toronto.
- Bradley, R. 2002. *The Past in Prehistoric Societies*. London: Routledge.
- Daniel, G. E. 1976. *A Hundred and Fifty Years of Archaeology*. London: Duckworth.
- Hunter, M. 1975. *John Aubrey and the Realm of Learning*. New York: Science History Publications.
- Kendrick, T. 1950. *British Antiquity*. London: Methuen.
- Küchler, S. 2002. *Malanggan: Art, Memory and Sacrifice*. Oxford: Berg.
- Levine, P. 1986. *The Amateur and the Professional: Antiquarians, Historians and Archaeologists in Victorian England, 1836–1886*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

¹ This discussion is drawn from the introduction written by Chris Evans and me to our forthcoming *Reader in the History of Archaeology*, to be published by Oxford University Press in 2008.

- Momigliano, A. 1966. *Studies in Historiography*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.
- 1990. *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Murray, T. 1990. The History, Philosophy and Sociology of Archaeology: the Case of the Ancient Monuments Protection Act (1882). In V. Pinsky and A. Wylie (eds) *Critical Directions in Contemporary Archaeology*, pp. 55–67. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Murray, T. and C. Evans. In press. *Reader in the History of Archaeology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Piggott, S. 1976. *Ruins in a Landscape*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Schnapp, A. 1997. *The Discovery of the Past*. London: British Museum Press.
- Sweet, R. 2004. *Antiquaries: the Discovery of the Past in Eighteenth Century Britain*. London: Hambledon and London.

In Search of Lost Time: From Localism and Regionalism to Nationalism, in the Work of Estácio Da Veiga

Ana Cristina Martins

Centre for Archaeology, University of Lisbon (Uniarq)
(ana.c.martins@netcabo.pt)

“...Only when the Peninsula is able to display the antiquities of its territory, can the most important problems related with human palaeontology and ethnography, be solved...” (Veiga, in Cardoso 2007: 446)

Introduction

S. F. M. Estácio da Veiga (1828–1891) was born in the Algarve region of Portugal, into a wealthy and aristocratic family. While he dedicated his life to the multidisciplinary study of the Algarve, it is his particular interest in the region’s archaeology that is the subject of the following paper.

Although his work can be regarded as pioneering for Portugal, it was the result of many practices in archaeology that Veiga himself often condemned and sought to transcend. The very title of his greatest historical reference work *Antiguidades Monumentais do Algarve* (Monumental Antiquities of the Algarve) reflects the concerns of work published by European historical societies since the Renaissance that focused on the study of forgotten or overlooked remains of the past. Its purpose in Portugal was also similar to these, that is to create awareness amongst the growing public of the importance of such remains.

Despite the title of this book, it was no outdated look at the past. On the contrary, Veiga, from the beginning worked at a national level, and he recognised the work of other scholarly societies, even though the latter’s methodology was sometimes unsystematic and created some difficulties in his pursuit of a methodical scientific outcome. This was the case with regard to the *Real Associação dos Archietos Civis e Archeologos Portugueses* (the RAPCAA or Royal Association of Portuguese Civil Architects and Archaeologists) who did not understand



Figure 1. S. F. M. Estácio da Veiga.