non-professional worker, historically the mainstay of the subject in this country. Those with an interest in the past should on no account be made to feel excluded from its orthodox study, and this is especially true at a time when spiralling unemployment is leading to increased leisure.

At the same time, archaeology must be seen to be relevant to the wider issues of society. This is not just a case of the subject's aims but also of the communication of these to the general public. The ley hunters' description of archaeologists as being involved in a kind of boring and methodical treasure hunt, irrelevant and inward-looking, may indicate the way in which many people see our discipline. It seems strange that the popularisation of archaeology is so often done in terms of objects and artefacts rather than interesting and useful knowledge. Strange, too, that little attempt is made to explain the developments in method and theory in the subject over the last two decades at a popular level. The lessons to be drawn from ley hunting are that if archaeology fails to stress the immanence and relevance of the past, and to encourage popular participation at every level, then in a nominally free society others will always be ready to fill the void.

References

Atkinson, R. J. C. 1982 in 'Spirit of the Ley Hunter'. The Ley Hunter 90:21-2.
Burl, A. and J. Michell. 1983 The Great Debate. Popular Archaeology 4(8):13-18.
Childe, M. 1982 Discovering Churchyards. Shire Publications.
Crawford, O. G. S. 1953 Archaeology in the Field. Phoenix House, London.
Daniel, G. E. 1972 Editorial. Antiquity 46:4.
Devereux, P. and I. Thomson. 1979 The Ley Hunters Companion. Thames and Hudson, London.
Devereux, P. and R. Forrest. 1982 Straight lines on ancient landscapes. New Scientist 96(1337/1338):822-6.
Garner, A. 1963 The Moon of Gomrath. William Collins, London.
Hadingham, E. 1975 Circles and Standing Stones. Heineman, London.
Hitching, F. 1976 Earth Magic. Cassel, London.
Hunter, J. et al. 1974 Essex Landscape: The Historic Features. Essex County Council.
Michell, J. 1969 The View over Atlantis. Garnstone, London.
Morrison, A. 1978 Pathways to the Gods. M. Russel, London.
Petitpierre, R. (ed.) 1972 Exorcism. The findings of a Commission convened by the Bishop of Exeter. S.P.C.K., London.
Robins, D. V. G. 1982 The Dragon Project and the talking stones. New Scientist 96(1328):166-71.
Screeton, P. 1974 Quicksilver Heritage; the Mystic Leys: Their legacy of ancient wisdom. Thorsons, Wellingborough.
Watkins, A. 1925 The Old Straight Track. Methuen, London.
Watkins, A. 1927 The Ley Hunters Manual. Pentacle, Bristol.
Williamson, T. and E. Bellamy, in press. Ley Lines in Question. Heineman, London.
Wilson, C. 1972 Mysteries Granada, London.

STONEHENGE, GENERAL PITT-RIVERS, AND THE FIRST ANCIENT MONUMENTS ACT

Christopher Chippindale

When Sir John Lubbock began, in 1870, to prepare legislation to protect prehistoric and other ancient sites, he had in mind their defence against careless destruction by their owners for the sake of some trivial advantage. The Jockey Club, for instance, had during the 1860s mutilated the Devil's Dyke where it runs across Newmarket Heath because scouts and tipsters had been using it to sneak views of the racehorses in training. A century later, that kind of damage by landowners -- whether less or more accidental -- continues. A more contemporary threat is the one that follows from the overwhelming response of a well-educated, well-meaning and interested public. No aspect of the heritage is immune. Historic houses and, especially, gardens take a fearful onslaught. The main tracks up Snowdon are only prevented from degradation into broad stony swathes by a programme of restoration and repair. Hadrian's Wall has suffered badly, and so have the more famous Wessex sites. The access paths to Wayland's Smithy and West Kennet chambered barrows are pounded mud all the year round, liquid or dried as the season falls. At Avebury, the ends of the bank segments, the favourite places to scramble up, are losing their grass cover. The path up Silbury Hill has been so eroded that the Hill is now permanently closed and must be viewed from a distance.

The damage is usually very local, for the tourist is an unusually gregarious creature. The only other visitors you see at the barrow-groups only half a mile from Stonehenge will, most likely, be archaeology students on a university field-trip. Where the millions of eager feet do tread, the damage can be appalling, both directly (through erosion of paths and grass cover) and indirectly (through the damage caused to the attraction itself by the facilities provided there). Land's End has been a notorious case in this respect. Some kinds of archaeological sites, such as the Palaeolithic painted caves, cannot begin to bear the numbers; and for most of these, not just for Lascaux, a presentation to the non-specialist public through the medium of an entirely artificial replica must be the answer.

Stonehenge, the most famous archaeological site in Europe, is naturally as much under siege as any; and the cumulative effect of individually well-intentioned and sensible decisions over the last 50 years has left it with among the worst of all possible worlds. The lavatory arrangements contrive to be both intrusive and inadequate. The car-park is very close but, since the pressure of numbers has forced the closure of the central sarsen building, the Stonehenge everybody knows (at least in silhouette) and wants to see, has nevertheless to be observed

(Archaeological Review from Cambridge 2:1 (1983))

from a distance. As concern and public debate as to the best future for Stonehenge continue, it will be interesting to see whether the preferred solution is for a modest development of facilities on conventional lines (although even this may mean parking for 1000 cars at no great distance away), or for a radical 'high-tech' approach more on the lines of the Jorvik project in York, which will steer visitors in electric caddy-cars through an underground reconstruction of the Viking town. The purpose of this paper is not to explore those possibilities, nor the many fearsome threats to its environment Stonehenge has already survived this century (Chippindale, in press), but to look back to late Victorian times, when its problems first became intractable. Even a hundred years ago, with a hundredth of the visitors seen nowadays, Stonehenge could present an insupportable kind of welcome to the tourist of taste. Instead of a gaunt Druidic[1] temple lonely on the empty plain, you would find it "ringed with a cordon of waggonettes and flecked with the light foam of summer blouses".[2] The Times and all responsible opinion agreed something would have to be done about Stonehenge, but what? Since Stonehenge was listed on the schedule[3] of the 1882 Ancient Monuments Act, it fell into the domain of General Pitt-Rivers as Inspector of Ancient Monuments. As a first instance of the modern problem of how a monument is to survive public interest, the case of Stonehenge and General Pitt-Rivers is worth examining, especially since it involved the judgment of the best field archaeologist of the period.

Sir John Lubbock's Ancient Monuments Bill, first introduced in 1873, never did become law. The landed interests in both the Commons and the Lords were too strong for any measure that included an element of compulsion, and Lubbock would not drop a reserve element of compulsion from his Bill; for what purpose did it serve to protect only those monuments whose owners wanted to have them protected, leaving unprotected all those with hostile or indifferent owners? The 1882 Act, a compromise measure promoted by Gladstone's Liberal Government, was permissive only. General Pitt-Rivers, as the Inspector of Ancient Monuments, could ask owners to transfer their monuments into State care, but he could do nothing if they refused. Accordingly, the sites which came under the Act in the first few years, such as Kit's Coty House, Arbor Low, and Silbury Hill (owned by Lubbock himself), were those whose sympathetic owners had the best of intentions towards them. If a site was under some threat, like the Danes Camp hillfort in Northamptonshire which was being quarried away for ironstone, the owner invariably refused the General's overtures.[4]

In the case of Stonehenge, Pitt-Rivers knew to expect a firm refusal. Sir Edmund Antrobus, Bart., the owner of Stonehenge and the 5000-acre Amesbury estate, had spoken strongly against the Lubbock Bill in the House of Commons as needless meddling in

matters that were the preserve of responsible private owners. The Stonehenge barrows (which had been raped by the score and with uncommon thoroughness by William Cunnington not much more than 60 years previously) seemed to him a great deal safer in his own hands than in those of the archaeologists.[5] In fact the Antrobus family had gone to a great deal of trouble over the years to preserve Stonehenge. Soon after acquiring it, they had appointed, in 1823, the antiquarian Henry Browne as its attending guardian, allowing him to sell guidebooks and give lectures in exchange for looking after the place - stopping visitors from damaging the stones or the grass, from lighting fires and from picnicking among the stones. Often, doubtless, the guardian was absent or unable to act effectively, but the intention was there. Sir Edmund, announcing himself as the "proprietor of Stonehenge", pitched in with tackling miscreants when he saw them and with sending in his under-gamekeeper to evict the colony of Stonehenge rabbits. The worst single problem was the hammering-off of chunks of stone, so that on busy days "a constant chipping of the stone broke the solitude of the place". Usually these were just souvenirs; sometimes (Stonehenge petrology being the intellectual fashion as Stonehenge astronomy has been recently), they were for purposes of archaeological science. Sir Edmund complained to a "distinguished archaeologist" that three young relatives of his had tried to carry off part of a sarsen; the archaeologist (who was it, one wonders), in replying, explained he had already part of the stone in question and therefore had no need to acquire any more of it (Chippindale 1983).

Another tiresome, though less continual, problem for the proprietor was the pestering by archaeological societies for permission to explore and/or restore Stonehenge. Earlier in the Antrobus era one Captain Beamish had been allowed to dig, but he was the last (he went down many feet in the traditional spot, just in front of the Altar stone, with no result of note). In 1864 the Wiltshire Archaeological Society was refused permission to dig, after Sir Edmund had been advised by one of the national societies (Chippindale 1978). Then the archaeologists produced, in 1870, a high-level committee of the British Association for the Advancement of Science to do the job, so there could be no question of a parochial lack of expertise. They were refused, too (Lane-Fox 1870). Next it was the turn of the Society of Antiquaries, who sent a committee of four to recommend on the best means of preservation (Milman et al. 1881). At least one archaeologist, in Sir Edmund's view, took to vandalism: Henry Cunnington (another of that great family of Wiltshire archaeologists) cutting the ground away round the bluestone lintel to spy a better sight of it (Chippindale 1978:111).

Through the 1880s, as the visitors and the contradictory advice flooded in -- to restore wholesale or in part, to straighten or not to straighten the leaning stones, or to dig a

ha-ha round the entire site -- Sir Edmund stuck to his principles. He would allow neither excavation nor restoration, only any necessary support on the grounds of safety. (Some stones were propped with timber in 1881 on his architect's advice.)

Sir Edmund and Sir John Lubbock were old adversaries from the debate on Lubbock's Ancient Monuments Bill, and Lubbock had been a member of the 1870 British Association committee set up to excavate Stonehenge. General Pitt-Rivers (Colonel Lane-Fox, as he then was) had also been a key member of that committee. So Pitt-Rivers cannot have been surprised to receive refusals to the several requests he made to Sir Edmund to place Stonehenge into State care. The archaeologists did not easily give up. A four-man committee of the Wiltshire Archaeological Society (with Henry Cunnington tactlessly among its members) made a very critical report on the state of Stonehenge in 1886, complaining that "there was a caretaker, but there was very little evidence of any care being taken" (Stonehenge Report 1886). The same year Lubbock publicly expressed his concern about Stonehenge, insisting in a letter to the Times that "when an owner allows a monument of national interest to fall into ruin ... the nation should have the option of purchase at a fair price".[6] In 1887 Pitt-Rivers made an inspection, and drew a sketch and sections of the shored-up trilithon. His report does not survive[7], but one can be confident it was highly critical.

There matters remained for some years, with both sides dug into fixed and hostile positions. During the later 1880s, as the limitations of the Ancient Monuments Act became increasingly apparent to him, Pitt-Rivers grew disillusioned with it, and came to believe that a policy of transferring monuments into State care was not the most effective approach. It was better to encourage and assist owners to look after monuments themselves, since it was "irrational to expect the Government to provide caretakers for every monument" and impossible "for a single Inspector to stand sentry" over them all (this was a major factor in prompting him to resign the paid Inspectorship in 1890). But the enmity between the two sides was too strong, and the divergence of views between two men of commanding temperament too great, to allow compromise in the case of Stonehenge. When, in February 1888, yet another learned committee was proposed to report on and investigate Stonehenge, again formed by the British Association (in whose anthropology section Pitt-Rivers was prominent), the General was once more invited to be a member; but the Commissioner of Works warned him against accepting the invitation, as he thought it "inconsistent with my official position under the Act to take any active part in a campaign against Sir E. Antrobus".[8]

In retrospect, it can be seen how fortunate Stonehenge was to escape archaeological investigation in the later nineteenth century. Even Pitt-Rivers's advanced methods would have been defeated by the complex and confused stratigraphy of Stonehenge, and he would not have hesitated, unlike the archaeologists of our less confident era, before excavating the entire site if it promised to yield interesting results.

Shaw Lefevre, as first Commissioner of Works (the minister responsible for administering the Act) left Pitt-Rivers very much to carry out the Inspectorship as he thought fit. In the early 1890s, reports of the state of Stonehenge continued to be so alarming that he called Pitt-Rivers out of retirement to re-inspect Stonehenge, on 26 September 1893, after yet another gruelling summer's worth of trippers. Pitt-Rivers found little to have changed since his last inspection in 1887, though at least things had not got worse. Names were still being scratched; leaning stones were still being used as slides by children; the rats that lived on the picnic scraps were still burrowing under the stones. No upright stones had actually fallen, but they certainly would and "more probably soon than later" - a fact recognized by Antrobus's "useless and unsightly" wooden props. When the stones did fall there would be a "great outcry", and "those responsible for neglecting monuments will be greatly blamed for it". The General did admit Sir Edmund's good intentions, and conceded that the place was "to some extent in charge of a Photographer" (this was Mr. Judd from Shrewton, an up-to-date version of the "attending illustrator", who had a monopoly of the trade in souvenir photographs in exchange for £10 a year and responsibility for keeping visitors in order). But Judd was not always there in summer, still less in winter.

The General thought sterner measures were in order. A resident policeman was necessary, at least in the summer, with a salary of perhaps £70 a year and a cottage built "within sight of the stones", so the constabulary could maintain surveillance at all times. The only remedy for instability in the standing stones was to raise inclining stones once more to the perpendicular, and to set their foundations in concrete or masonry. (Pitt-Rivers's report is ambiguous as to whether only the leaning stones or all the stones should be concreted.) A committee of the British Association (again!) should supervise the work, but the government should not make itself responsible unless prepared to incur the cost of maintenance. (Nor did Pitt-Rivers say who should finance the constable and his cottage.)[9]

Armed with this firm professional advice, Shaw Lefevre tackled Sir Edmund himself, sending him portions of the report and asking for his views. Those views were, as usual, uncompromisingly hostile; Sir Edmund noted Pitt-Rivers's admission that fewer names were being scratched and those only

superficially, insisted that children slid down only one stone, and pointed out that his keeper's gin traps dealt with the rats and rabbits. (The picnicking even drove him to sarcasm: "What steps can be taken to prevent visitors leaving a crumb from a sandwich in too great proximity to the Monument would, I think, puzzle the General.") For years he had been troubled with lunatic suggestions, whether for iron palings or a moat ("on a down plain which is nearly as thirsty as the Sahara") - and now the Inspector of Ancient Monuments wanted to build a cottage within sight of the stones![10]

This sturdy riposte, signed in the sternest high Victorian manner "Believe me yours very faithfully", seems to have so disconcerted the Office of Works that they were unable to compose a reply[11], leaving Sir Edmund once more to look after Stonehenge in his own manner, the General to retire back to the peace of Cranborne Chase, and the British Association once more to have nothing to do with it.

On balance one may sympathise more with Sir Edmund's attempts to interfere as little as possible, than with the General's confidence that the problems of Stonehenge and the public could be solved by vigorous action. There was a stone-fall in the end (though not quite in the General's own life-time), and it did lead to a public outcry, to the enclosure of Stonehenge with a wire fence, to the imposition of an admission charge, the appearance of a resident policeman with a cottage within sight of the stones, and to the restoration of stone 56, the leaning upright of the great south-western trilithon, to an upright position. There was an alarming period when Stonehenge was openly for sale if the price was right, and it was later sold by public auction. Sadly, much was lost when Colonel William Hawley made his ill-judged excavations in the 1920s. But it is equally true that Sir Edmund Antrobus did a considerable service in preserving Stonehenge from archaeological attention during his own day, against the best professional advice.

Notes

1. At the time, orthodox opinion still followed Stukeley in believing Stonehenge to be a temple of the Druids. Nineteenth-century ideas about Stonehenge are summarized in Chippindale (1983, especially pp. 141-56).

2. Letter signed 'Vacation Rambler', The Times, 14 September 1871, p. 6.

3. That did not mean it was 'scheduled' in the modern sense. It remained unprotected until such time as the owner signed a legal transfer placing it in State guardianship.

4. The history of the Act is detailed in my 'The first Ancient Monuments Act, 1882, and its administration under General Pitt-Rivers' (forthcoming).

5. Sir Edmund Antrobus, Hansard, 3rd series, Vol. 218 (1874), col. 589.

6. Sir John Lubbock, letter, The Times, 19 August 1886, p.4.

7. There is no copy in either the Pitt-Rivers papers or the Public Record Office.

8. General A. H. L. F. Pitt-Rivers, report on Stonehenge, 2 October 1893, in Public Record Office WORK 14:213.

9. ibid.

10. Sir Edmund Antrobus, letter to G. Shaw Lefevre, 12 January 1894, in Public Record Office WORK 14:213.

11. At least, no reply survives in the otherwise complete Public Record Office file.

References

Chippindale, C. 1978 The enclosure of Stonehenge. Wiltshire Archaeological Magazine 70/71:112.

Chippindale, C. in press. What future for Stonehenge? Antiquity, in press.

Chippindale, C. 1983 Stonehenge Complete. Thames and Hudson, London.

Lane-Fox, A. 1870 Proposed exploration of Stonehenge. Journal of the Ethnological Society, NS 2:1ff.

Milman, E. S., G. T. Clark, J. T. Mucklethwaite, and W. C. Lukis 1881 Report of the Stonehenge Committee. Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries. (2nd series) 9:10-15.

Stonehenge Report. 1886 Report of deputation to examine into the present state of Stonehenge. Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine 23:102-7.