Book Section:

Reid, J (2017) Archaeology and Anthropology. In: Holmes, J and Ruston, S, (eds.) The Routledge Research Companion to Nineteenth-Century British Literature and Science. Routledge , London; New York ISBN 9781472429872

Archaeology and Anthropology

Julia Reid, University of Leeds

Archaeological and anthropological enquiry traversed the borders of discipline, discourse, and genre with notable freedom throughout the nineteenth century. Even by the end of the Victorian period, archaeology and anthropology were not yet fully professionalized, and literary writers, archaeologists, and anthropologists engaged in productive dialogue, blurring the boundaries between scientific and literary writing. There is now a growing interdisciplinary scholarship recognizing these interconnections and exploring the importance of literary elements in these sciences and the place of archaeological and anthropological themes, concerns, and motifs in novels and poetry. The present chapter argues that scientific and literary writers engaged in a common endeavour to explore connections between past and present. The first half of the chapter examines how literary and scientific writings on archaeology evoked the passage of time as a narrative of counterpoised loss and preservation. The second half demonstrates that anthropology brought to the surface archaeology's partially submerged concern with empire, nation, and 'race'. It investigates the fraught preoccupation with civilization and savagery, with self and other, which ran through Victorian anthropology and literature.

Archaeology: 'From Their Dead Past Thou Liv'st Alone'

The burgeoning of interest in archaeology across the nineteenth century expressed the era's peculiarly urgent attention to the past. Victorians' belief in their own modernity paradoxically entailed this absorption in the past, and shaped the period's strongly historical imagination.

The 'nineteenth century's unprecedented historicism', Chris Brooks observes, 'was the corollary of its unprecedented consciousness of its own present' (3). Archaeology and the other historical sciences embody, in part, recuperative attempts to connect with a rapidly vanishing past: they constitute responses to the accelerating pace of social and cultural change. For scientific writers as well as novelists and poets, the work of excavation became a way of putting past and present into contact with each other, and of tracing the endurance of the past into the present.

Historians emphasize that the nineteenth century saw archaeology's almost complete transformation into a professional discipline. William Stiebing evokes its passage from an 'adventuresome hobby' for amateur enthusiasts to an 'academic discipline' which was rigorously scientific, objective, and professional (24). Virginia Zimmerman judges that Augustus Pitt Rivers's development of precise excavation techniques between 1880 and 1900 represented archaeology's 'final move away from antiquarianism and its associations with the Romantic view of the landscape' and its 'complete transformation into a science' (2008 101). These years, certainly, saw the emergence of modern archaeology as a discipline, as Pitt Rivers and others, including the Egyptologist W. M. Flinders Petrie, evolved systematic excavation methods, stratigraphic dating techniques, and meticulous recording and preservation practices.

Yet throughout the period archaeological cultures were heterogeneous, as amateur and professional, élite and popular, and scientific and literary discourses co-existed and engaged in creative dialogue. Amateur archaeology flourished, with an impressive growth in the number of local societies. Archaeological audiences were multiplicitous. Flinders Petrie sensed the fractured nature of the readership and, in his popular works, sought to reach 'the

large number of readers who feed in the intermediate regions between the arid highlands and mountain ascents of scientific memoirs, and the lush – not to say rank – marsh-meadows of the novel and literature of amusement' (1). 'High' and 'low' archaeological cultures were not as distinct as Petrie's hierarchical model suggested. Popular entertainment and educational discourses were fused, for example, in the public presentation of Egyptian artefacts in the early nineteenth century: as Sophie Thomas notes, the British Museum helped to fashion the Crystal Palace's Egyptian Court, a 'compelling blend of spectacle and public education' (19).

The literary and the scientific imagination were also entwined in nineteenth-century archaeological cultures, as Alexandra Warwick and Martin Willis have recently argued (1-2). Indeed, Romanticism, romance, and science were closely linked in the classic archaeological texts. The Assyrian archaeologist A. H. Layard's best-selling *Nineveh and Its Remains* (1849) is a work of travel writing or adventure fiction as much as an archaeological report. Infused with local colour, the text narrates a series of adventures, from robbery to the conflict between the Kurds and Chaldaeans (Layard 263, 126, 133, 140-1). Layard's narrative is imbued by the Romantic Sublime, recording his awed 'intoxication of the senses' (63). He evokes the uncanniness of the scene as he approaches 'the time-worn ruins of Al Hather', which 'rose in solitary grandeur in the midst of a desert … as they stood fifteen centuries before' (Layard 75). The sense that barriers between past and present are dissolving emerges through the language of dreams and visions: recalling the buried sculptures he has seen, Layard is 'half inclined to believe that we have dreamed a dream, or have been listening to some tale of Eastern romance', and imagines that 'when the grass again grows over the ruins of the Assyrian palaces' others will 'suspect that I have been relating a vision' (333). The frequency of the 'dream' motif in archaeological writings, as Warwick contends, points to

scientists' recognition that 'empirical observation' alone could not allow 'the comprehension of archaeological sites' (83).

Even with the rise of the professional excavation report in the 1880s, as David Gange observes, archaeologists continued to publish 'narrative and descriptive works' (47), and these were often better known at the time. Alongside his technical field reports on Egyptian sites, for instance, Petrie published popular works like *Ten Years' Digging in Egypt 1881-1891* (1892), which emphasized the archaeologist's emotional responses rather than professional objectivity. *Ten Years' Digging* appeals to popular interest in the heroic explorer and in the act of discovery. In one gothic scene, Petrie's attempts to open a sarcophagus see him spending a 'gruesome day, sitting astride of the inner coffin, unable to turn my head under the lid without tasting the bitter brine in which I sat' (93). When he eventually retrieves the mummified body, Petrie's tone becomes reverent: 'Tenderly we towed him out to the bottom of the entrance pit … and then came the last, and longed-for scene, for which our months of toil had whetted our appetites, – the unwrapping of Horuta' (94).

The 'archaeological imagination', as Warwick and Willis term it, was not contained by the boundaries of genre, discipline, or discourse (1). Professional archaeologists, popularizers, and literary writers participated in mutually influential dialogue. Literary writers engaged with the work of archaeological writers: as we shall see, Edward Bulwer Lytton's *The Last Days of Pompeii* (1834) emphasizes his debt to the antiquarian William Gell's works on the Pompeian excavations, and Dante Gabriel Rossetti's 'The Burden of Nineveh' (1856, 1870) footnotes the work of Layard (Lytton 31, Rossetti 25). Equally important, and less fully explored to date, is the countervailing influence of literary texts on non-fictional treatments of archaeology. Percy Bysshe Shelley's sonnet 'Ozymandias' (1818) clearly articulated the

interest in Egyptian archaeology aroused by Napoleon's Egyptian campaign. It is unsurprising that later literary tradition was influenced by Shelley's ironic rendering of the tyrant's inscription ('"My name is Oᴢʏᴍᴀɴᴅɪᴀs, King of Kings. / Look on my works ye Mighty, and despair!"') and his suggestion that, in the 'decay / Of that Colossal Wreck', the sculptor's art alone survived (ll. 10-11, 12-13). More unexpectedly, 'Ozymandias' proved influential for later Egyptologists: E. P. Weigall's *Guide to the Antiquities of Upper Egypt* (1910) cited the poem to identify 'a fallen granite colossus' (Weigall 252, Janowitz 47).

At the heart of the archaeological imagination, uniting both its literary and its scientific articulations, was the desire to explore not only the past but, crucially, the connection between past and present. The archaeological artefact, as Zimmerman demonstrates, embodied for Victorians a paradoxical reminder of both evanescence and preservation (2008 2-9). Archaeologists imagined the passage from past to present as marked by obliteration and loss; but they emphasized too the possibilities of survival and reconstruction. In *Ten Years' Digging*, Petrie evoked the destruction of the historical record – it was 'heartrending' to see 'the pile of papyrus rolls, so rotted that they fell to pieces with a touch' (33) – but also its resurrection through his labours. His excavations, he wrote, offer a 'glimpse of the prehistoric age in Egypt': 'we begin to see a great past rising before us, dumb, but full of meaning' (Petrie 145, 152).

Nowhere was this duality of annihilation and preservation more potent than in nineteenth-century responses to Pompeii and Herculaneum. Excavations at these sites, already a topic of fascination to British readers in the late 1700s, received a boost when Napoleon conquered the Kingdom of Naples in 1806 (Stiebing 152-3). As nineteenth-century Britons were well aware, the towns' catastrophic extinction ironically ensured their survival in the historical

record (Easson 105, Zimmerman 2008 108-25). Among the many nineteenth-century literary authors to engage with the excavations were Felicia Hemans and Bulwer Lytton. Hemans's poem 'The Image in Lava' (1828) meditates upon the impression of a woman and baby found in the sand at Herculaneum. The speaker contrasts the pair's sudden and agonizing destruction with the 'immortal' nature of the mother's 'love' for her child (ll. 41, 37). Hemans's insistence that 'I could pass all relics / Left by the pomps of old, / To gaze on this rude monument / Cast in affection's mould' (ll. 33-6) shares with much writing on Pompeii an emphasis on 'the individual and the quotidian' (Zimmerman 2008 108) and on 'Roman domesticity' (Easson 100). But for Hemans, this 'rude monument' also proffers a gendered moral: 'Empires from earth have pass'd, / And woman's heart hath left a trace / Those glories to outlast!' (ll. 35, 6-8).

Bulwer Lytton's *The Last Days of Pompeii* (1834) similarly explores the twinned processes of destruction and survival. The novel's fictional account of Pompeii's 'last days' is punctuated by discussions of the archaeological 'trace' left by the characters, buildings, and artefacts (Lytton 420). As Angus Easson observes, the novel offers a 'teasing mingling of fiction and reality' (106). Bulwer Lytton repeatedly directs his readers to archaeological sites and museums where they will be able to see, for example, the impressions left in the sand by '[t]he skeletons which, re-animated for a while, the reader has seen play their brief parts upon the stage' (428, 420). The motif of reanimation was, Zimmerman shows, characteristic of nineteenth-century writing about Pompeii (2008 111). But Bulwer Lytton shifts the emphasis onto the authority of the literary writer to 'people once more those deserted streets, to repair those graceful ruins, to reanimate the bones which were yet spared to his survey; to traverse the gulf of eighteen centuries, and to wake to a second existence – the City of the Dead!' (v).

Bulwer Lytton himself and subsequent scholars have noted his indebtedness to Gell (Lytton 31, Easson 100-4, Zimmerman 2008 114). Equally striking is the author's battle for cultural authority with 'antiquaries' and archaeological writers: a struggle over who can best interpret the traces of the past (Lytton 27, 76 n.). Invoking Walter Scott, Bulwer Lytton claims that the novelist's knowledge of the 'human passions and the human heart' makes him more 'at home with the past' than the 'learned' antiquary (viii-ix, x, 70, 73). In fact, Bulwer Lytton's novel points to the generic instability of archaeological writing. The author describes his novel as a 'history' and hints that he could write a 'curious and interesting treatise' on the ancient world (Lytton 421, 423). He casts himself as an archaeological field worker, 'inspecting the strata' to adjudicate between 'theories' about Pompeii's destruction (Lytton 427). He asserts that his 'description of that awful event is very little assisted by invention, and will be found not the less accurate for its appearance in a Romance' (Lytton 427). Mediating between different genres, Lytton also playfully addresses a heterogeneous audience, directing 'the learned reader' and 'the reader who is *not* learned' respectively to original Latin sources and English translations (425).

In a subtler vein than Bulwer Lytton's novel, Thomas Hardy's poetry and fiction explore the writer's ability to animate the past and to transcend time. Hardy's interest in archaeology is well known. He joined the Dorset Natural History and Antiquarian Field Club in 1881 (Radford 2013 212), and he wrote essays and letters to the newspapers on archaeological topics. Hardy's fictional and poetic landscapes are marked by history (Welshman 222-3). Traces of the past are everywhere, from the presence of Stonehenge at the end of *Tess of the D'Urbervilles* (1891) to the ancient British fort in his short story 'A Tryst at an Ancient Earthwork' (1885). Archaeological excavation brings the present into contact with the past: as the narrator in 'A Tryst' observes, 'by merely peeling off a wrapper of modern

accumulations we have lowered ourselves into an ancient world' (Hardy 1977 325). Even in the absence of artefacts, the narrator believes that he can hear 'the lingering air-borne vibrations of conversations uttered at least fifteen hundred years ago' (Hardy 1977 321). Despite these 'lingering … vibrations', the story emphasizes obliteration and loss, a process that is compounded by unethical archaeology: a 'professed and well-known antiquary' violates the archaeological site, exhuming a human skeleton which disintegrates 'under his touch' (Hardy 1977 321, 323, 326). Similar anxieties about archaeological ethics, and about the effacement of the past, inform Hardy's poem 'The Clasped Skeletons' (1928), which opens with a poignant question about the excavation of an ancient British barrow near his house: 'O why did we uncover to view / So closely clasped a pair?' (ll. 1-2).

In the face of this obliteration, Hardy saw it as the poet's task to connect with the past and hence to transcend time. In the section of *Poems of the Past and Present* (1901) entitled 'Poems of Pilgrimage', two sonnets inspired by Hardy's visit to Italy dramatize an intimately entwined past and present. Hardy casts himself, Ian Ousby notes, as a 'poet-pilgrim' to the past (54). The first sonnet, 'In the Old Theatre, Fiesole', opens with the words 'I traced the Circus' (l. 1). The verb gestures towards both a physical act (walking round the amphitheatre) and an act of poetic reconstruction. The reanimation of the past in fact falls to a child who shows the speaker an 'ancient coin / That bore the image of a Constantine' (ll. 3-4). Evoking the idea of a resurrection, the poet notes that the child 'had raised for me' (l. 6) a shared past (see Zimmerman 2012 74). The past which is 'raised' by the child is a heritage shared across the ancient Roman Empire: Hardy need only 'delve' in his 'plot of English loam' to find 'Coins of like impress' (ll. 9-11). The next sonnet in the sequence, 'Rome: On the Palatine', intensifies this sense that past and present are intimately fused. Walking across the Palatine, the speaker reaches 'Caligula's dissolving pile' (l. 4), the present participle indicating

effacement of the past yet also hinting at the melting of barriers between past and present. The visit to Caesar's house brings the past to life, as strains of music 'Raised the old routs Imperial lyres had led' (l. 12). The sonnet's final couplet evokes an ecstatic transcendence of time, describing how the music 'blended pulsing life with lives long done / Till Time seemed fiction, Past and Present one' (ll. 13-14).

Hardy's writings – like nineteenth-century writings about Pompeii – emphasize the relationship between the individual and history. More overtly political concerns about nation and empire also powerfully moulded archaeology, as scholars have recently explored. Archaeological practice and writing articulated a desire to understand Britain's place in the world as much as an interest in the excavated cultures. 'Biblical education', Gange observes, encouraged Britons to see 'a historical destiny passed down from the ancient Near East to themselves' (51), and the work of British archaeologists amplified this sense of connection with the ancient world. Speaking of his Assyrian excavations, for example, Layard recorded his 'wonder' that 'far distant, and comparatively new, nations should have preserved the only records of a people once ruling over nearly half the globe; and should now be able to teach the descendants of that people … where their monuments once stood' (316). Literary engagements with archaeology, too, address questions about nation, empire, and Britishness. Dante Gabriel Rossetti's 'The Burden of Nineveh' and H. Rider Haggard's Egyptological gothic fiction exemplify, in different ways, the use of archaeology to probe the relationship between imperial Britain and the ancient world.

Rossetti's poem 'The Burden of Nineveh' (1856, 1870) takes as its subject the 'winged lion or bull' discovered by Layard in the ancient Assyrian city of Nimroud, a site which the archaeologist identified with the Biblical Nineveh (Layard 50). Rossetti began writing the

poem in 1850, a few weeks after the statue arrived in London, while the country was in the grip of 'Assyriamania' (Malley 2012 24, Stauffer 378). The poem acknowledges its debt to Layard (Rossetti 25). Layard had emphasized the artefact's power to 'conjure up strange fancies' (50) and to connect the present with the imagined past of remote antiquity. Rossetti too, passing 'A wingèd beast from Nineveh' in the 'swing-door' of the British Museum, is inspired to a waking dream about the statue's history (ll. 8-10). He addresses the bull as the sole link with the ancient past of the Assyrian priests: 'From their dead Past thou liv'st alone' (l. 48). However, Layard's account of appropriating and transporting Assyrian artefacts to the British Museum had expressed imperial self-confidence (89, 95, 106). By contrast, Rossetti's depiction of the relationship between the British Museum's Assyrian and Egyptian artefacts, which are 'All relics here together' (l. 107), emphasizes the misreadings of history. As Andrew Stauffer demonstrates, Rossetti's winged bull is 'a figure for imperial hubris and the confusions of history it engenders' (379). Assyria's aggressive imperialism, Stauffer observes, made it a 'dark mirror' of imperial Britain, with Nineveh's destruction prompting 'anxieties about England's future past' (370, 372). Rossetti's poem also looks uncertainly to the future, evoking a day when the bull god will once again set sail:

> In ships of unknown sail and prow,
> Some tribe of the Australian plough
> Bear him afar, – a relic now
> Of London, not of Nineveh!
>
> (ll. 177-80)

Rossetti's description of London as 'this desert place' (l. 186) where visitors confuse the bull god for a British artefact resonates with T. B. Macaulay's famous portrayal of 'some traveller from New Zealand [who] shall, in the midst of a vast solitude, take his stand on a broken arch

of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St Paul's' (228). Like Macaulay's New Zealander, the future responses to the 'relic' imagined by Rossetti invoke an unsettling model of the cyclical decline and fall of empires.

By the end of the century, Rossetti's disquiet about imperial Britain's connections with the 'dead Past' assumed a new form. Imperial gothic fiction used archaeology to explore the relationship between imperial Britain and the ancient world, amplifying and sensationalizing Rossetti's disquiet yet providing reassuring conclusions. Egyptological gothic tales, by Haggard, Arthur Conan Doyle, Bram Stoker, and others, were particularly popular during Britain's informal occupation of Egypt (1882-1914). These years also saw the flourishing of British Egyptology, which served to 'buttress… the British understanding of their own imperial power' (Deane 2008B 388). Haggard's short story 'Smith and the Pharaohs' (1912-13) dramatizes the threat posed by the resurgent past, as the mummies housed in the Cairo Museum are raised from the dead. In this tale, Haggard (who was himself a keen amateur Egyptologist) seems at first to evoke Egyptologists' uneasy conscience. Smith, an amateur Egyptologist, falls in love with the British Museum's bust of the ancient Egyptian queen Ma-Mee. He travels to Egypt and excavates her tomb, an act which, he reluctantly realizes, is a 'violat[ion]' (Haggard 1921 15). He finds himself locked in the Cairo Museum, where the reanimated mummies accuse him of grave-robbing. However Ma-Mee reveals that Smith is the reincarnation of her lover, and he is pardoned because love prompts his actions. Ma-Mee ends by promising to Smith an everlasting 'union' (Haggard 1921 65). The representation of 'mummies as elusively seductive brides' in this and other tales, Bradley Deane argues, represents 'Pharaonic Egypt as a symbol of enduring power that could complement Britain's own' (2008B 406). Haggard's novel *She* (1886-7) can also be read as a 'mummy' fantasy which unsettles but eventually confirms Britain's imperial power. Ayesha's 'swathed

mummy-like form' (Haggard 1991 142) is a problematic object of desire. As Nicholas Daly notes, Ayesha destabilizes the imperial/archaeological project: a 'collector in her own right', she is an 'exotic object' turned 'subject' (107-8). In due course, though, the explorers reassert their domination over her. The men's victory over Ayesha, like the antique potsherd's revelation of an Egyptian past 'embalmed in an English family name' (Haggard 1991 37), suggests that modern-day Britain is the true inheritor of an ancient Egyptian heritage. In *She* as in his other Egyptological fiction, Haggard uses archaeology to meditate upon modern British imperialism and, ultimately, to vindicate white presence in modern-day Africa.

For Haggard and other literary writers as much as for the scientists, then, archaeology offered a means to explore urgent questions about the present as well as the past. Reanimating Egyptian mummies, Pompeiian citizens, or Assyrian priests, literary and scientific writers emphasized not only the ravages of time but also their own ability to transcend mortal limits and to bring the past to life. Archaeological debate moved fluidly across the boundaries of fiction and non-fiction, as novelists, poets, and travel writers played their part alongside archaeologists in sustaining the public appetite for archaeological narrative and spectacle.

Anthropology: 'A Solid Layer of Savagery Beneath the Surface of Society'

Anthropology brought to the fore the questions about nation, 'race', and empire which lurked beneath archaeological explorations of past and present. Anthropology and archaeology were in many ways entwined, both developing out of antiquarian cultures. The two disciplines remained conjoined in amateur societies, popular culture, and exhibiting practice, which routinely presented archaeological artefacts and indigenous peoples as twin 'survivals' from the past. Mathilde Blind's poem 'The Beautiful Beeshareen Boy' (1895) poignantly evokes

the yoking together of archaeological and anthropological 'others', describing a boy from an Egyptian desert tribe:

> Shipped to the World's great Fair –
> The big Chicago Show!
> With mythic beasts and thin
> Beetles and bulls with wings,
> And imitation Sphinx,
> Ranged row on curious row!

(ll. 91-6)

Like archaeologists, anthropologists engaged in creative dialogue with literary writers. The late-Victorian period saw the first steps towards professionalization, with anthropology's founding father, E. B. Tylor, appointed Keeper of the University Museum at Oxford in 1883 (Stocking 264). Because the discipline still lacked full professional status, the boundaries between anthropology and literature were fluid. As a newly interdisciplinary scholarship has demonstrated, literary and anthropological discourses cross-fertilized one another (MacClancy 24-32). Scott Ashley points to the importance of creative writers in the 'prehistory of ethnography' (18), urging that the work of 'ethnographic *flâneurs* like [J. M.] Synge or … Robert Louis Stevenson' should be 'incorporated within the histories of anthropology, or the rich cultural context in which the discipline was founded risks being thinned'. Critics have also recently explored the literary qualities of anthropological texts, from Tylor's 'poetic Romanticism' (Logan 108) to the 'romantic' and 'poetic' elements infusing A. C. Haddon and C. R. Browne's ethnographic writings on the Aran Islands (Ashley 17, 11). Brad Evans locates the high-water mark of the relationship between literature and anthropology in a later period, the interwar years, 'when poets and

anthropologists seemed to share the same project with regard to the elucidation of authentic cultures' (437). But this interdisciplinary dialogue was arguably at its richest during the Victorian period when, as we shall see, anthropologists and literary writers joined in exploring the connections between past, present, and future, and between their own and other cultures.

A fraught preoccupation with the past ran through nineteenth-century anthropology and literature, shaping anthropological writings by Tylor, Andrew Lang, and J. G. Frazer, and literary work by Walter Scott, George Eliot, Thomas Hardy, H. Rider Haggard, Robert Louis Stevenson, and others. Tylor's foundational work, *Primitive Culture* (1871), which applied evolutionary methods to the field of culture, offered an undeniably hierarchical model of cultural progress. He proudly proclaimed that 'the science of culture is essentially a reformer's science' (Tylor 2:410). His influential doctrine of 'survivals' – customs and beliefs which have persisted 'by force of habit into a new stage of society' and provide 'proofs and examples of an older condition of culture' – evinces his debt to Enlightenment rationalism (Tylor 1:15). Through anthropology, he teaches, surviving superstition 'lies open to the attack of its deadliest enemy, a reasonable explanation' (Tylor 1:15). Building on the Scottish Enlightenment's stadial theory, Tylor calls his work 'a development-theory of culture' (2:100). For Tylor, the 'savage state in some measure represents an early condition of mankind', with present-day 'savages and barbarians' still 'produc[ing], in rude archaic forms, man's early mythic representations of nature' (1:28, 1:286). Tylor's scheme is temporally brutal: as Johannes Fabian argues, the nineteenth-century anthropologist engages in a 'denial of coevalness', casting the anthropological object as distant in time (35, 31). Anne McClintock too analyses Victorian culture's reading of the colonized 'other' as 'anachronistic', 'the living embodiment of the archaic "primitive"' (30). Gender ideologies

also centrally shaped anthropology's hierarchical narrative, which equated femininity and primitivity, and traced the gradual progress from matriarchy or matriliny to patriarchy (Reid 2015).

Despite the emphasis on unilinear, hierarchical development, however, Tylor's 'science of culture' harbours surprising tensions. Christopher Herbert emphasizes the duality of the Tylorian survival, which demonstrates both 'the transcendence of the primitive' and 'the opposite, its inescapable persistence' (432). Indeed, Tylor stresses similarities as well as distinctions between present and past, European self and racial other. The theory of the soul, he writes, 'unites, in an unbroken line of mental connexion, the savage fetish-worshipper and the civilized Christian', adding that 'there seems no human thought so primitive as to have lost its bearing on our own thought, nor so ancient as to have broken its connexion with our own life' (Tylor 1:453, 2:409). Tylor's project, Deane observes, is 'founded upon a complicated and unstable tension between past and present', in which nostalgia for a lost past coexists with an emphasis on 'taxonomies of cultural difference' (2008A 216-17).

The duality of the 'primitive survival' was at the heart of the nineteenth-century dialogue between anthropology and creative writing. An equivocal response to the past can be found, long before Tylor's day, in Walter Scott, who was also indebted to Scottish Enlightenment stadial theorists (Richards 125-30), and who passed on his ambivalence to a cluster of Scottish anthropologists, notably Lang and Frazer. In Scott, belief in progress is tempered by an elegiac and romantic attraction to the savage past. Frank Osbaldistone in *Rob Roy* (1818) articulates this duality, describing himself as 'a supporter of the present government upon principle' (1995 37) but valuing the fierce 'loyalty and duty' of the rebellious Highlanders. A hierarchical model of cultural development – and an attendant principle of '"salvage"

ethnography' (112), in James Clifford's term – structures Scott's novels. Thus *Waverley* (1814) aims to 'preserv[e] some idea of the ancient manners of which I have witnessed the almost total extinction' (Scott 1986 340). The act of preservation is only possible because the past no longer poses a threat. Yet Scott's negotiation of past and present was complex. As James Buzard discusses, Scott's 'performance of the role of autoethnographer on behalf of a "Scotland" he appears to have known himself to be fabricating' was 'highly self-conscious and ambivalent' (63). In *Waverley*, for example, the observation that the Highlanders' appearance 'conveyed to the south country Lowlanders as much surprise as … an invasion of African negroes, or Esquimaux Indians' (Scott 1986 214) might suggest the hierarchical Comparative Method, but it also offers a wry commentary on Lowland perceptions of Highlanders.

An equivocal relationship to the 'savage' past similarly underlies the work of those Scottish anthropologists who were influenced by Scott: Lang and Frazer. Both men were indebted as much to Scott as to Tylor, underlining the role of creative writers in the early history of anthropology (Crawford 1992 157). Indeed Lang, who applied Tylor's anthropological method to comparative mythology, claimed that Scott 'first called attention in England to the scientific importance' of fairy-tales (1873 619). Meanwhile, Frazer's epic work, *The Golden Bough*, is 'literature' as much as 'science', according to Robert Crawford (1990 28). Frazer's debt to Scott, I suggest, expresses their shared ambivalence towards progress. Critics commonly see Frazer as a 'rationalist' with an 'animus against religion', who saw 'human development' as 'linear' and 'progressive' (Connor 66-7). Certainly, the second edition of *The Golden Bough* (1900) advanced an apparently progressive account of the passage from magic through religion to science. Nostalgia for a lost world of belief, however, marks Frazer's depiction of the 'inevitable … breach[ing]' of religion's 'venerable walls' by the

'battery of the comparative method', an assault in which he participated: it was, he observed, a 'melancholy … task to strike at the foundations of belief' (1900 1:xxii). As Robert Fraser judges, Frazer's ostensible secularism is belied by an attraction to myth, ritual, and religion (11-15). Frazer also amplifies and darkens Tylor's understanding of survivals. Like Tylor, he evokes the persistence of the past. But Frazer's account, by the second edition of *The Golden Bough*, is more threatening in tone: he warns that the 'solid layer of savagery beneath the surface of society' poses 'a standing menace to civilisation' (1900 1:74), and continues dramatically '[w]e seem to move on a thin crust which may at any moment be rent by the subterranean forces slumbering below'. Frazer's narrative, Herbert observes, offers a 'Gothic refraction' of Tylor's theory, intimating 'the uncanny latency of horrific primitive practices in modern-day Christianity' (432).

Throughout the nineteenth century, literary writers shared anthropologists' interest in narratives of development and survival, engaging with anthropological ideas to explore the relations between past, present, and future, and between civilized and 'savage'. The remainder of the chapter first examines how Eliot and Hardy turned an anthropological gaze on English provincial and rural life, arguing that Eliot's fiction offers a critical scrutiny of anthropologists' pursuit of evolutionary origins, and that Hardy unsettles a unilinear model of temporal development. It then considers the late-Victorian Romance revival, scrutinizing the use and subversion of anthropological discourse by writers including Haggard and Stevenson.

Eliot's fascination with origins, progress, development, and survivals aligns her with contemporary anthropologists. This preoccupation had diverse intellectual roots, stemming originally from her interest in the German critics Ludwig Feuerbach and David Strauss. She read Tylor and his fellow evolutionary anthropologists J. F. McLennan and John Lubbock,

and she shared with these evolutionary anthropologists an important intellectual heritage (Eliot 1996A 19, 312-14, Eliot [n.d.] 31, 44-5). Eliot, Tylor, and Frazer were all influenced by the French Positivist Auguste Comte, whose 'Law of Three Stages' itself drew on Enlightenment stadial theory (Logan 69-71, 90, Richards 173). Eliot and Frazer also shared a love of Scott and were both interested in comparative philology, which 'practised a linguistic theory of survivals long before Tylor' (Richards 173). These complex lineages coalesce around a pursuit of evolutionary origins, a quest which impelled the anthropological project and which Eliot examined with an interested but critical eye.

Eliot's fiction offers a quasi-anthropological study of provincial life, as critics have often recognized. Her realism, according to P. M. Logan, served as 'a domestic form of Victorian ethnography' (68), viewing 'provincial life as if it were a less-developed form of her own advanced culture'. In *The Mill on the Floss* (1860), the 'Fetish' doll which Maggie Tulliver 'punished for all her misfortunes' (Eliot 1996C 28) exemplifies this anthropological approach. Fetishism – the anthropomorphic interpretation of the world long associated with the 'primitive' mind – was the first of Comte's 'Three Stages'; Tylor renamed it 'animism' (Logan 90). Eliot's depiction of Maggie's fetishism coincides with these contemporary constructions of primitive culture. *Silas Marner* (1861) offers a more sympathetic portrayal of animistic religion. Self-reflexively commenting on the realist novel, warning against inflated claims to objectivity, the narrator remarks of Silas's reluctance to abandon the old gods, 'The gods of the hearth exist for us still; and let all new faith be tolerant of that fetishism, lest it bruise its own roots' (Eliot 1996B 137). The sympathetic yet detached tone of Eliot's narrative voice has, indeed, led critics to read her novels as resonating more strongly with twentieth-century ethnography than with Victorian anthropology. Buzard and

Clifford interpret Eliot's fiction as 'metropolitan autoethnography' (Buzard 12) and her narrators as engaging in 'participant-observation' *avant la lettre* (Clifford 114).

Turning a proto-ethnographic gaze inwards on English provincial communities, Eliot also reflects critically on the quest for origins which underlay nineteenth-century anthropology and comparative mythology. At the heart of her concern is the relationship between past and present: the 'vital connexion' between the 'world's ages' (Eliot 1997 198) explored in *Middlemarch* (1871-2). The pursuit of origins embodied in Casaubon's 'Key to all Mythologies' is associated with the dead past of theology, with Casaubon 'the ghost of an ancient', trying to 'reconstruct a past world' (Eliot 1997 58, 16, 17). As Ian Duncan explains, Casaubon 'toils in the theological old regime of comparative mythology' (17), unaware of its transformation through German philology and biblical criticism – a transformation which was ultimately to pave the way for Tylor's anthropology. Casaubon's error is less his ignorance of German than his insistence on a backward-looking narrative of degeneration: 'all … mythical systems', he believes, are 'corruptions of a tradition originally revealed' (Eliot 1997 22). Casaubon's approach to the past is sterile, lacking the 'vital connexion' with the present and future felt by the artist Ladislaw. The word 'connexion' recurs in Dorothea's yearning for 'a binding theory which could bring her own life and doctrine into strict connexion with that amazing past, and give the remotest sources of knowledge some bearing on her actions' (Eliot 1997 79). In contrast with Casaubon's stultifying orientation towards past alone, Dorothea and Ladislaw embrace future evolutionary possibilities, mysteriously feeling the 'stirring of new organs' (Eliot 1997 461, 209). *Daniel Deronda* (1876) too meditates upon the evolution of religion, focusing on cultural and racial inheritance. It uses Tylorian language, describing the Cohens' charity towards Mordecai, for example, as 'a "survival" of pre-historic practice, not yet generally admitted to be superstitious' (Eliot 1967 449). For Duncan,

the novel plays with evolutionary temporalities, contrasting the 'prehistory' embodied by Grandcourt and Gwendolen with the promise of Deronda as a rejuvenating 'future human type' (30). The opening of *Daniel Deronda* famously focuses readers' attention on the quest for origins, asserting, 'Men can do nothing without the make-believe of a beginning' (Eliot 1967 35). The search for a 'beginning', Eliot suggests here, is deeply problematic yet an inevitable part of human nature.

While Eliot focused on anthropology's quest for origins, Hardy was preoccupied by endings. He used archaeology, as we saw, to bring the present into contact with a near-obliterated past, and his interest in anthropology served a similar aim: 'to preserve … a fairly true record of a vanishing life' (1978A 477). This aim resonates with Clifford's '"salvage" ethnography', but Hardy was not quite an 'outsider' in relation to the obsolescent society he delineated (Clifford 112-13), and his works advanced a radical uncertainty about the salvage ethnographer's hierarchical model of cultural development. His anthropological lore drew as much on personal memory and local antiquarian writings as on Tylorian theory (Radford 2013 214-15). Respect rather than condescension, moreover, marked his 'record of a vanishing life'. His description of the reddleman in *The Return of the Native* (1878) as a 'nearly perished link between obsolete forms of life and those which generally prevail' (Hardy 1978B 59) was significantly echoed in his obituary of his mentor, the Dorset philologist and poet, William Barnes: 'the most interesting link between present and past forms of rural life that England possessed' (Hardy 2001 66-7). *The Return of the Native*, indeed, unsettles the relations between past and present, querying evolutionary anthropology's progressivist narrative. The novel offers, in many ways, a Tylorian reading of peasant life, describing mumming, for instance, as a 'fossilized survival' (Hardy 1978B 178). But elsewhere it eschews Tylor's model of hierarchical development. In an image which tellingly pairs decay and preservation,

Hardy describes the wind singing in the 'mummied heath-bells'; he imagines, too, a reaction that is mingled, at once primitive and civilized: 'an emotional listener's fetichistic mood', he suggests, might coexist with 'more advanced' thought (Hardy 1978B 105-6). The novel's plot also expresses doubt about the relations between past, present, and future through its depiction of Clym Yeobright, the 'native' of the title who is 'educated for an as yet non-existent future' (Beer 38). Despite his identification with progress, Clym longs to return to a past embodied in the heath: his solitary walks in the 'prehistoric' landscape see him 'seized' by the 'shadowy hand' of the 'past', which 'held him there to listen to its tale' (Hardy 1978B 56, 449). Clym's attempt to return, as Gillian Beer and Andrew Radford argue, is marked by frustration and loss (Beer 38-53, Radford 2003 87-94). The novel's temporal uncertainties are never resolved. If Clym fails to return, the narrative itself arguably enacts a different kind of 'return', an imaginative renewal of Hardy's folk materials (Beer 53). This renewal could be understood as an act of '"salvage" ethnography', yet the novel's accent on obliteration and obsolescence undermines its own attempt to reanimate a 'vanishing' past.

Where Eliot and Hardy directed their anthropological gaze inward on provincial and rural life, the late-Victorian Romance Revival turned it outward to empire and adventure. Dramatizing colonial or historical encounters, Haggard, Rudyard Kipling, Conan Doyle, Stevenson, and others explored Frazer's 'subterranean forces slumbering below' – the primitive survivals supposedly represented by racial others and European peasants, or to be found lurking in the depths of the civilized self. The imperial romance shared anthropology's central concern with the relations between civilization and savagery, and between past, present, and future. Lang, who was both scientific popularizer and literary writer, played a catalyzing role in the cross-fertilization of anthropological and literary discourses at the *fin de siècle*. He deployed an evolutionary vocabulary to champion the romance genre, hailing the

love of romance and adventure as a 'survival of barbarism' (Lang 1887 689) and lauding its capacity to rejuvenate a jaded and effeminate modernity. He also lent anthropological support to romance novelists, acting, for example, as Haggard's informal ethnographic adviser (Reid 2011 2).

Romance novelists engaged in divergent and often complex ways with the relations of civilization and 'savagery'. The theory of survivals, as we have seen, was double-edged, suggesting both hierarchical progress and the endurance of the evolutionary past. Anthropology was, additionally, poised on the brink of a new cultural relativism at the *fin de siècle*, as its confident vision of hierarchical evolution was increasingly challenged by a nascent appreciation of cultural plurality (Reid 2006 141-2). Mary Kingsley, travel writer and ethnographer of West Africa, exemplifies the 'inconsistent pluralization of *culture'* (Buzard 6) which characterized this transitional period. Romance writers too were caught between Victorian anthropology's unilinear evolutionism and an incipient cultural relativism. Critics have emphasized the romance's complicity with imperialism's evolutionary hierarchies (Low 2-99, 264-5, McClintock 232-57). Certainly, the genre's deployment of anthropological discourses often served to legitimate imperial power and naturalize racial hierarchies. In Conan Doyle's *The Sign of Four* (1890), for instance, anthropological language casts the Andaman Islanders as a natural criminal type and works to divert attention from the potentially political motivations of colonial crime (68-9). However, other writers were more ambivalent in their scrutiny of the Tylorian survival, able to subvert as well as work within anthropological discourse.

Haggard's adventure fiction appears in some ways to challenge the ethnocentric assumptions which underlay Tylor's construction of the primitive survival. His novels evoke the

persistence of 'primitive' forces within the supposedly civilized: the eponymous narrator of *Allan Quatermain* (1887) observes that 'in all essentials the savage and the child of civilisation are identical' and that '[c]ivilisation is only savagery silver-gilt' (Haggard 1995 10). Haggard's celebration of a shared 'primitive' masculinity apparently forges cross-cultural bonds. In *King Solomon's Mines* (1885), the Zulu Umbopa and Sir Henry Curtis exemplify an ideal manhood: they are described as 'two such splendid men', and Sir Henry strikingly chooses to 'dress… like a native warrior' (Haggard 1989 200, 199). Yet, as in many of Haggard's novels, binaries between savagery and civilization are only collapsed, and cross-cultural bonds are only valorized, in order to understand and regenerate British masculinity. Sir Henry's affinity with Umbopa, like his heritage of 'Danish blood' (Haggard 1989 11), serves to fashion a heroic British manliness rather than to propose racial equality. As Gail Ching-Liang Low judges, 'Haggard's romantic appropriation of Zulu military culture' is marked by 'narcissism', and the 'cross-cultural dressing works in one direction only' (9, 60). Kipling's novel *Kim* (1900-1) demonstrates a similarly ambivalent engagement with anthropology's evolutionary hierarchies, celebrating cross-cultural encounter but restricting the ability to cross between cultures and races to the colonizers. Kim, though he denies his own essential whiteness, is accorded an authority and mobility which is denied to Hurree Babu, the native ethnographer who quotes Herbert Spencer and 'collect[s] folk-lore for the Royal Society' but still 'dread[s] the magic' that he investigates (Kipling 180).

Stevenson engages more subversively with evolutionary anthropology's narrative of evolutionary progress. As my own work shows, throughout his oeuvre, from his Scottish fiction to his South Seas travel writing and imperial romances, Stevenson questioned the portrayal of racial others as 'primitive survivals' and dramatized the endurance of savagery within supposedly civilized societies (Reid 2006 111-73). *Kidnapped* (1886) unsettles a

narrative of progress from a 'primitive' Highland culture to civilized modernity. The Lowland hero David Balfour initially sees Highlanders as barbarous survivals but moves towards a more sympathetic understanding, observing that '[i]f these are the wild Highlanders, I could wish my own folk wilder' (Stevenson 1994 101). From 1888 onwards, Stevenson's experiences in the South Seas led to an intensified mistrust of unilinear evolutionary narratives and an amplified perception of civilization's hidden savageries. The imperial romance 'The Beach of Falesá' (1892) undoes the ethnocentric assumptions embodied in the idea of superstition as 'primitive survival': superstitions in this tale are either imported by corrupt white traders as instruments of social control or valuable parts of a sophisticated and coherent Polynesian folk culture. Stevenson's South Seas travel writing, like his romance, celebrates cultural difference, pointing forward to the nascent relativism. *In the South Seas* (1896) prefigures twentieth-century ethnography's emphasis on the social value of superstition and ritual, observing, for example, that Polynesian taboo, far from being a 'meaningless and wanton prohibition', is 'more often the instrument of wise and needful restrictions' (Stevenson 1998 39, 40). Rejecting the characterization of superstition as irrational survival, Stevenson condemns missionaries who 'deride and infract even the most salutary *tabus*' and laments that 'so few people have read history and so many have dipped into little atheistic manuals' (1998 35, 65). The work condemns the harmful effects of colonialism on indigenous cultures and queries narratives of progress from savagery to civilization. Resembling an early ethnographic fieldworker, Stevenson advocates cultural immersion, yet he also acknowledges the barriers to sympathetic understanding. Trying to elicit folklore from a Pacific islander, he admits, 'I shall not hear the whole; for he is already on his guard with me' (Stevenson 1998 140).

Conclusion

'[I]magination, the power of inward vision, is as necessary to science as to poetry', wrote Frazer, contesting the idea that there was an epistemological break between science and literature (1927 301-2). Indeed, as we have seen, the borders between scientific and literary writing were blurred as novelists, poets, archaeologists, and anthropologists engaged in a common endeavour to explore the relationship between past and present. Responding to contemporary perceptions of historical disjunction, these writers were centrally concerned to understand how far, and in what ways, the past persisted in the modern world. Their responses were complex, ambivalent, and often at odds with each other. Archaeological writings – both literary and scientific – variously assume authority to reconstruct the past or evoke the futility of attempts to conquer time; at times they express imperial self-confidence but at other times (or even at the same time) they appear haunted by the archaeological past. Anthropological writings too are equivocal: absorbed yet unnerved by the primitive survival, that 'menace' which, Frazer feared, threatened to erupt through the 'thin crust' of civilization. Moving across science and literature, the debate about the survival raised fundamental questions about the relationship between past and present, savagery and civilization, self and other, as writers used but also at times subverted an ethnocentric narrative of progress and transcendence.

Bibliography

Primary Texts

Blind, Mathilde. 'The Beautiful Beeshareen Boy'. *Birds of Passage: Songs of the Orient and Occident*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1895. 40-7. See *Victorian Women Writers Project*. <http://purl.dlib.indiana.edu/iudl/vwwp/VAB7026>. Accessed 25 September 2014.

Doyle, Arthur Conan. *The Sign of Four* [1890]. London: Penguin, 2001.

Eliot, George. *Daniel Deronda* [1876]. Ed. Barbara Hardy. London: Penguin, 1967.

———. *George Eliot's 'Daniel Deronda' Notebooks*. Ed. Jane Irwin. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996. [1996A].

———. *Silas Marner: The Weaver of Raveloe* [1861]. Ed. Terence Cave. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. [1996B].

———. *The Mill on the Floss* [1860]. Ed. Gordon Haight. Intro. Dinah Birch. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. [1996C].

———. *Middlemarch* [1871-2]. Ed. David Carroll. Intro. Felicia Bonaparte. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997.

———. *George Eliot's 'Middlemarch' Notebooks: A Transcription*. Eds John Clark Pratt and Victor A. Neufeldt. Berkeley: U of California P, [n.d.].

Frazer, J. G. *The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion*. 2nd edn, revised and enlarged. 3 vols. London: Macmillan, 1900.

———. 'Fison and Howitt' [1909]. Reprinted in *The Gorgon's Head and Other Literary Pieces*. London: Macmillan, 1927. 291-331.

Haggard, H. Rider. 'Smith and the Pharaohs' [1912-13]. Reprinted in *Smith and the Pharaohs and Other Tales*. New York: Longmans, Green, 1921. 1-68.

———. *King Solomon's Mines* [1885]. Ed. Dennis Butts. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1989.

———. *She* [1886-7]. Ed. Daniel Karlin. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1991.

———. *Allan Quatermain* [1887]. Ed. Dennis Butts. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995.

Hardy, Thomas. *The Complete Poems of Thomas Hardy*. Ed. James Gibson. London: Macmillan, 1976.

———. 'A Tryst at an Ancient Earthwork' [1885]. Reprinted in *Life's Little Ironies and A Changed Man*. Ed. F. B. Pinion. London: Macmillan, 1977. 317-26.

———. 'General Preface to the Wessex Edition of 1912'. *The Return of the Native*. Ed. George Woodcock. London: Penguin, 1978. 475-80. [1978A].

———. *The Return of the Native* [1878]. Ed. George Woodcock. London: Penguin, 1978. [1978B].

———. 'The Rev. William Barnes, B. D.' [1886]. Reprinted in *Thomas Hardy's Public Voice: The Essays, Speeches, and Miscellaneous Prose*. Ed. Michael Millgate. Oxford: Clarendon P, 2001. 66-7.

Hemans, Felicia. 'The Image in Lava' [1828]. Reprinted in *Victorian Women Poets: An Anthology*. Eds Angela Leighton and Margaret Reynolds. Oxford: Blackwell, 1995. 14-15.

Kipling, Rudyard. *Kim* [1900-1]. Ed. Alan Sandison. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1987.

Lang, Andrew. 'Mythology and Fairy Tales'. *Fortnightly Review* 13:77 (1873): 618-33.

———. 'Realism and Romance'. *Contemporary Review* 52 (1887): 683-93.

Layard, Austen Henry. *Nineveh and Its Remains: A Narrative of An Expedition to Assyria During the Years 1845, 1846, & 1847*. Abridged by the author. London: John Murray, 1867.

Lytton, Edward Bulwer. *The Last Days of Pompeii* [1834]. London: Routledge, 1877.

Macaulay, T. B. Review of *The Ecclesiastical and Political History of the Popes During the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, by Leopold Ranke. *Edinburgh Review* 72:145 (1840): 227-58.

Petrie, W. M. Flinders. *Ten Years' Digging in Egypt 1881-1891*. New York: Fleming H. Revell, [1892].

Rossetti, Dante Gabriel. 'The Burden of Nineveh' [1856; rev. 1870]. *The Pre-Raphaelites and Their Circle*. Ed. Cecil Y. Lang. 2nd edn. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1968, 1975. 23-8.

Scott, Walter. *Waverley; or, 'Tis Sixty Years Since* [1814]. Ed. Claire Lamont. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1986.

————. *Rob Roy* [1818]. Intro. Eric Anderson. London: David Campbell, 1995.

Shelley, Percy Bysshe. 'Ozymandias' [1818]. *The Complete Poems of Percy Bysshe Shelley*. Eds Donald H. Reiman, Neil Fraistat, and Nora Crook. 3 vols to date. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2003-. 3:326.

Stevenson, Robert Louis. *Kidnapped* [1886]. Ed. Donald McFarlan. London: Penguin, 1994.

————. *In the South Seas* [1896]. Comp. Sidney Colvin. Ed. Neil Rennie. London: Penguin, 1998.

Tylor, E. B. *Primitive Culture: Researches Into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Art, and Custom*. 2 vols. London: John Murray, 1871.

Weigall, Arthur E. P. *Guide to the Antiquities of Upper Egypt: From Abydos to the Sudan Frontier*. London: Methuen, 1910.

Secondary Texts

Ashley, Scott. 'The Poetics of Race in 1890s Ireland: An Ethnography of the Aran Islands'. *Patterns of Prejudice* 35 (2001): 5-18.

Beer, Gillian. *Open Fields: Science in Cultural Encounter*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1996.

Brooks, Chris. 'Historicism and the Nineteenth Century'. *The Study of the Past in the Victorian Age*. Ed. Vanessa Brand. Oxford: Oxbow, 1998. 1-19.

Buzard, James. *Disorienting Fiction: The Autoethnographic Work of Nineteenth-Century British Novels*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2005.

Clifford, James. 'On Ethnographic Allegory'. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Eds James Clifford and George E. Marcus. Berkeley: U of California P, 1986. 98-121.

Connor, Steven. 'The Birth of Humility: Frazer and Victorian Mythography'. *Sir James Frazer and the Literary Imagination: Essays in Affinity and Influence*. Ed. Robert Fraser. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1990. 61-80.

Crawford, Robert. 'Frazer and Scottish Romanticism: Scott, Stevenson and *The Golden Bough*'. *Sir James Frazer and the Literary Imagination: Essays in Affinity and Influence*. Ed. Robert Fraser. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1990. 18-37.

———. *Devolving English Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1992.

Daly, Nicholas. *Modernism, Romance and the Fin de Siècle: Popular Fiction and British Culture, 1880-1914*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999.

Deane, Bradley. 'Imperial Barbarians: Primitive Masculinity in Lost World Fiction'. *Victorian Literature and Culture* 36 (2008): 205-25. [2008A].

———. 'Mummy Fiction and the Occupation of Egypt: Imperial Striptease'. *English Literature in Transition, 1880-1920* 51:4 (2008): 381-410. [2008B].

Duncan, Ian. 'George Eliot's Science Fiction'. *Representations* 125:1 (2014): 15-39.

Easson, Angus. '"At Home" With the Romans: Domestic Archaeology in *The Last Days of Pompeii*'. *The Subverting Vision of Bulwer Lytton: Bicentenary Reflections*. Ed. Allan Conrad Christensen. Newark: U of Delaware P, 2004. 100-15.

Evans, Brad. 'Introduction: Rethinking the Disciplinary Confluence of Anthropology and Literary Studies'. *Criticism* 49:4 (2007): 429-45.

Fabian, Johannes. *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes its Object*. New York: Columbia UP, 1983.

Fraser, Robert. 'The Face Beneath the Text: Sir James Frazer in His Time'. *Sir James Frazer and the Literary Imagination: Essays in Affinity and Influence*. Ed. Robert Fraser. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1990. 1-17.

Gange, David. *Dialogues With the Dead: Egyptology in British Culture and Religion, 1822-1922*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2013.

Herbert, Christopher. 'The Doctrine of Survivals, the Great Mutiny, and *Lady Audley's Secret*'. *Novel: A Forum on Fiction* 42:3 (2009): 431-6.

Janowitz, Anne. 'Shelley's Monument to Ozymandias'. *Philological Quarterly* 63:1 (1984): 477-90.

Logan, Peter Melville. *Victorian Fetishism: Intellectuals and Primitives*. Albany: State U of New York P, 2009.

Low, Gail Ching-Liang. *White Skins/Black Masks: Representation and Colonialism*. London: Routledge, 1996.

MacClancy, Jeremy. *Anthropology in the Public Arena: Historical and Contemporary Contexts*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013.

McClintock, Anne. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Context*. New York: Routledge, 1995.

Malley, Shawn. 'Nineveh 1851: An Archaeography'. *Journal of Literature and Science* 5:1 (2012): 23-37. <http://www.literatureandscience.org/issues/JLS_5_1/JLS_vol_5_no_1_Malley.pdf>. Accessed 16 September 2014.

Ousby, Ian. 'Past and Present in Hardy's "Poems of Pilgrimage"'. *Victorian Poetry* 17:1/2 (1979): 51-64.

Radford, Andrew. *Thomas Hardy and the Survivals of Time*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.

———. 'Folklore and Anthropology'. *Thomas Hardy in Context*. Ed. Phillip Mallett. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2013. 210-20.

Reid, Julia. *Robert Louis Stevenson, Science, and the Fin de Siècle*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

———. '"King Romance" in *Longman's Magazine*: Andrew Lang and Literary Populism'. *Victorian Periodicals Review* 44:4 (2011): 354-76.

———. '"She Who Must be Obeyed": Anthropology and Matriarchy in H. Rider Haggard's *She*'. *Journal of Victorian Culture* 20:3 (2015): 357-74.

Richards, David. *Masks of Difference: Cultural Representations in Literature, Anthropology and Art*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.

Stauffer, Andrew M. 'Dante Gabriel Rossetti and the Burdens of Nineveh'. *Victorian Literature and Culture* 33 (2005): 369-94.

Stiebing, William H., Jr. *Uncovering the Past: A History of Archaeology*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1993.

Stocking, George W., Jr. *Victorian Anthropology*. New York: Free P, 1987.

Thomas, Sophie. 'Displaying Egypt: Archaeology, Spectacle, and the Museum in the Early Nineteenth Century'. *Journal of Literature and Science* 5:1 (2012): 6-22.

<http://www.literatureandscience.org/issues/JLS_5_1/JLS_vol_5_no_1_Thomas.pdf

>. Accessed 15 September 2014.

Warwick, Alexandra. 'The Dreams of Archaeology'. *Journal of Literature and Science* 5:1 (2012): 83-97. <http://www.literatureandscience.org/issues/JLS_5_1/JLS_vol_5_no_1_Warwick.pd f>. Accessed 16 September 2014.

———, and Martin Willis. 'Introduction: The Archaeological Imagination'. *Journal of Literature and Science* 5:1 (2012): 1-5. <http://www.literatureandscience.org/issues/JLS_5_1/JLS_vol_5_no_1_WarwickWi llis.pdf>. Accessed 18 September 2014.

Welshman, Rebecca. 'Archaeology'. *Thomas Hardy in Context*. Ed. Phillip Mallett. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2013. 221-30.

Zimmerman, Virginia. *Excavating Victorians*. Albany: State U of New York P, 2008.

———. '"Time Seemed Fiction": Archaeological Encounters in Victorian Poetry'. *Journal of Literature and Science* 5:1 (2012): 70-82. <http://www.literatureandscience.org/issues/JLS_5_1/JLS_vol_5_no_1_Zimmerman .pdf>. Accessed 16 September 2014.

Further Reading

Malley, Shawn. '"Time Hath No Power Against Identity": Historical Continuity and Archaeological Adventure in H. Rider Haggard's *She*'. *English Literature in Transition 1880-1920* 40:3 (1997): 275-97.

Pearson, Richard. 'Archaeology and Gothic Desire: Vitality Beyond the Grave in H. Rider Haggard's Ancient Egypt'. *Victorian Gothic: Literary and Cultural Manifestations*

in the Nineteenth Century. Eds Ruth Robbins and Julian Wolfreys. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2000. 218-44.

Radford, Andrew. 'Making the Past Wake: Anthropological Survivals in Hardy's Poetry'. *Science in Modern Poetry: New Directions*. Ed. John Holmes. Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 2012. 167-80.

Sera-Shriar, Efram. *The Making of British Anthropology, 1831-1871*. London: Pickering and Chatto, 2013.