5

Research Training in the Humanities in British Universities, *c.*1870–1939: Classical Studies, History, Philosophy

Janet Howarth

Introduction

'Post-graduate study, except in some branches of science, has not grown to any great dimensions in British Universities.' As a British Council pamphlet of 1946 admitted, this was an acknowledged area of weakness.[1] In 1938–9 only just over 2% (1,175) of Britain's 50,000 full-time university students were humanities post-graduates.[2] Resources available to them were meagre by comparison with their peers in the sciences. It was not until 1957 that State Studentships were introduced for graduate study in the humanities. Often post-graduates worked in isolation, without the companionship provided by the scientists' laboratories. The one exception was archaeology, which attracted support from the public as well as classical scholars. The British Schools at Athens (1886) and Rome (1901) were funded largely by public subscription; later benefactions made possible the creation of the Oxford University Ashmolean Museum of Art and Archaeology (1908) and, in London, Mortimer Wheeler's Institute of Archaeology (1937).[3] London's Institute of Historical Research became however in 1921 the first purpose-built centre for research in the humanities in Britain, opening in temporary premises, the 'Tudor Cottage' in Malet

[1] Sir Ernest Barker, *British Universities* (London, 1946), 20.

[2] A. H. Halsey (ed.), *British Social Trends since 1900* (Basingstoke, 1988), Table 7.1, 270; Renate Simpson, *How the PhD Came to Britain. A Century of Struggle for Postgraduate Education* (Guildford, 1983), Table iii, 166.a.

[3] H. Waterhouse, *The British School at Athens: The First Hundred Years* (London, 1986); A. Wallace-Hadrill, *The British School at Rome. One Hundred Years* (London, 2001); D. B. Harden, *Sir Arthur Evans, 1851–1941. A Memoir* (Oxford, 1983), 11–14; Negley Harte, *The University of London, 1836–1986* (London, 1986), 230–3.

Janet Howarth, *Research Training in the Humanities in British Universities,* c. *1870–1939: Classical Studies, History, Philosophy* In: *A Global History of Research Education: Disciplines, Institutions, and Nations, 1840–1950*. Edited by: Ku-ming (Kevin) Chang and Alan Rocke. *History of Universities* XXXIV/1, Oxford University Press (2021). © Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/oso/9780192844774.003.0006

Street, and moving to the newly-built Senate House in 1938.[4] The ancient collegiate universities of Oxford and Cambridge were rich in resources—endowments, libraries, archives, museum collections—but these were not devolved to departments. There were as yet no graduate colleges.[5] Oxford's History faculty, the largest in the country, had no faculty building until 1957.[6]

The introduction of research degrees was also a late development in Britain. It was complicated by Oxford and Cambridge traditions. Since the Middle Ages they had awarded senior doctorates in Divinity, Law, Medicine and (occasionally) Music. To these were added at Cambridge in 1883 and Oxford in 1900 research doctorates in modern subjects, the Doctor of Letters (Litt.D or D.Litt.) and Doctor of Science (Sc.D or D.Sc.). These were degrees awarded by each university to its own graduates for published work: the Oxford statute stipulated that this must include 'an original contribution to the advancement of learning or science' and be 'of sufficient merit', and the candidate must be at least 39 terms from matriculation.[7] The doctor in this tradition was a mature scholar, his expertise acquired over many years. Late-Victorian university reform brought pressure for degrees, which, like the continental PhD, were awarded to junior scholars for a piece of supervised research. These took various forms. In 1895 Oxford created the B.Litt. (Bachelor of Letters) and B.Sc. (Bachelor of Science)—two-year degrees open to graduates of any university. Cambridge resisted this model until the 1920s, creating instead a path to the BA by research. The newer universities, including London, tended to award MAs by dissertation. Some universities—including London and the Scottish universities—also awarded senior doctorates. The introduction of a (more or less) uniform two-year PhD or DPhil came about in 1917–20, primarily to enable graduates from American and colonial universities to get the professional qualifications they needed in Britain rather than Germany. But as late as 1961–2 a majority of Britain's university teachers in Arts subjects (53%, compared with 21% in the physical and biological sciences) had no higher degree.[8]

The slow and patchy development of research training in the humanities reflects well-known features of British university history: the delay of over half a century before the Humboldtian ideal of the research university

[4] D. J. Birch & J. M. Horn (eds.), *History Laboratory: The Institute of Historical Research, 1921–96* (London, 1996).

[5] K. V. Thomas, 'College Life, 1945–70', in B. H. Harrison (ed.), *The History of the University of Oxford,* Vol 8, *The Twentieth Century* (Oxford, 1994), 210–11.

[6] Bodleian Library, OUA FA 5/3/2, f.33; Sir Maurice Powicke, 'The Maitland Library'.

[7] *Oxford University Gazette*, 22 Feb., 1900, 321.

[8] A. H. Halsey and M. A. Trow, *The British Academics* (London, 1971), 209.

found support, late secularisation of Oxford and Cambridge, slow progress in developing universities in London and elsewhere, low take-up of higher education (under 3% of the age-group in 1939), and—above all—the absence of state control of universities.[9] In the words of the Asquith Commission on Oxford and Cambridge (1922), that was regarded as 'a precious part of our intellectual and moral heritage. . . . The ways of thought and feeling of the modern British community are hostile to any development in the direction of State control of the academic spirit.'[10]

Martin Daunton has argued that we should see the organization of knowledge in Britain as a distinctive model with its own rationale, 'a "mixed economy" of provision and funding, with a preference for voluntarism and the market over the state.'[11] The state did give financial support to institutions that facilitated and engaged in research activities—museums, galleries, the Public Record Office, the Royal Commissions on Historical Manuscripts and Monuments—and there was a vigorous tradition of amateur scholarship and research outside universities, promoted by learned societies.[12] Universities, operating within this mixed economy, had considerable latitude to develop their own norms. Public enquiries of the period record the prevailing state of academic opinion. From the 1870s the university's role in advancing learning and research was accepted; and Robert Anderson concludes that 'Oxbridge Reformed' had 'striking achievements in research, even if this was not always integrated with teaching in the approved German way.'[13] It became good practice (if not always followed) to appoint research-active university teachers. The Asquith Commission stressed the

> extreme importance that provision should be made to secure, between the graduation of a student and his being called upon . . . to undertake full teaching work, an interval, during which he would have an opportunity of carrying out a programme of advanced study or research.[14]

Yet resistance to a mandatory research qualification remained strong for nearly half a century. The Robbins Report on Higher Education (1963)

[9] See R. D. Anderson, *European Universities from the Enlightenment to 1914* (Oxford, 2004), and *British Universities Past and Present* (London, 2006).

[10] *Report of the Royal Commission on Oxford and Cambridge Universities* (Cmd 1588: London, 1922), 14.

[11] M. Daunton (ed.), *The Organization of Knowledge in Victorian Britain* (Oxford, 2005), 18.

[12] P. Levine, *The Amateur and the Professional: Antiquarians, Historians and Archaeologists in Victorian England, 1838–1886* (Cambridge, 1986).

[13] Anderson, *British Universities*, 49.

[14] Asquith *Report*, 105. *Cf* the British Academy's Rockefeller Report, *Research in the Humanities and the Social Sciences* (London, 1961), 13.

maintained that 'in the humanities, in particular, insistence on a higher degree or substantial publication as a *sine qua non* of appointment to a junior lectureship would be disastrous.' In the British idea of a university, its educational and social functions, transmitting a common culture and forming 'cultivated men and women' still ranked alongside its contribution to research.[15]

In such a decentralised and unprescriptive system, one way of exploring what research training was actually available in the humanities is to look at the experience of a sample of British scholars of recognised distinction: Fellows of the British Academy (FBAs). The Academy was set up in 1902 to represent historical, philosophical and philological studies, and its *Proceedings* publish memoirs of deceased Fellows, written by their peers. Its claims to include the preeminent scholars in each field can be contested—the first woman FBA, Beatrice Webb, was elected in 1932—but these memoirs can tell us something about how researchers in a range of Arts disciplines might acquire their expertise.

The British Academy Sample

The sample analysed here consists of 138 FBAs who died between 1930 and 1970—mostly second and third generation academicians, though they include five of the original Fellows. They represent three fields, classical studies (including archaeology), history and philosophy. At a time when boundaries between disciplines were inconsistently drawn and scholars often worked in more than one field these categories are however inevitably inexact. I have followed the Oxford practice of classifying ancient historians with classicists and—perhaps more questionably—included archaeology with classical studies, despite the fact that some archaeologists worked on prehistory and not all were classically trained. In these years it was not unusual for university teaching to take individuals into fields not touched on in their undergraduate degrees. Over a third (19) of the historians in the sample had not taken a BA degree in History (or Modern History, as it was termed at Oxford), most coming to it from a classical background. In 1914 73% of Oxford college scholarships were reserved for classicists: the ablest students were normally expected to read the four-year classical BA course, Literae Humaniores.[16] In our FBA sample, no less than 63 (46%) had read Lit. Hum., though some came to

[15] *Higher Education: Report of the Committee Appointed by the Prime Minister under the Chairmanship of Lord Robbins 1961–63* (Cmd 2154, London, 1963), 6–7, 101.

[16] R. Currie, 'The Arts and Social Studies, 1914–1939', in Harrison (ed.), *The Twentieth Century*, 110.

Table 5.1 Universities attended by FBAs: first and second BAs

	Oxford	Cambridge	London	English civic univs	Scottish univs	Wales	Irish univs	Other	No univ. education
Historians	29	10	3	6	-	1	1	-	1
Second BA	4	1							
Classicists/ archaeologists	23	20	1	-	6	-	1	4	3
Second BA	8	3							
Philosophers	13	5	-	1	7	-	-	3	-
Second BA	4	7							

Table 5.2 Universities at which FBAs in the sample held professorial chairs

	Oxford	Cambridge	London	English civic univs	Scottish univs	Wales	Irish univs	Cwlthh Univs	US Univs	Other
Historians	5	8	9	8	4	3			2	
Classicists/ archaeologists	11	9	4	6	6	3	1			2
Philosophers	6	2	2	5	7	3	1	2	4	1

it as graduates of other universities, while others went on to take a second BA in History or Theology at Oxford.

All but four were university-educated but by no means all had academic careers in universities. The sample includes museum directors, officials at the Public Record Office, and independent scholars with private means or employed in various professions – the civil and armed services, the church, the law, architecture. Most had BA degrees from Oxford or Cambridge (Table 5.1). These include second BA students: there was a well-trodden path to Oxbridge for ambitious graduates from the Scottish universities and (especially for historians) from the new English civic universities. Professors who became FBAs (Table 5.2) were more widely distributed, reflecting the expansion of the civic universities and the federal universities of London and Wales, and the increased openness of professorial appointments in Scottish universities. Their careers mostly fell within the decades between the 1890s and 1950s.

The Scholar's Life Cycle and Credentials

Table 3 summarises the types of further academic study undertaken by scholars in the sample after graduating, and academic distinctions earned in the course of a lifetime. In brief, it shows that the post-graduate phase of their career, insofar as it was used to acquire research skills, was more likely to be spent studying abroad or for a second BA degree at Oxford or Cambridge, or writing an essay or dissertation that might win a university prize or college fellowship, than in acquiring a research degree or post-graduate diploma. Historians and classical scholars were more than twice as likely to have a higher doctorate (usually D.Litt/Litt. D) than a post-graduate research qualification. But the accolade that most FBAs could expect towards the end of a distinguished career was the honorary doctorate—valued especially because it was bestowed unasked, and often by more than one university (the historian G. M. Trevelyan acquired no less than 13, F. G. Kenyon, Greek scholar and Director of the British Museum had 12).[17] Like the British Academy Fellowship itself, or—for the minority whose work bridged the arts/science boundary—a Fellowship of the Royal Society, an honorary degree signified recognition by one's peers at a national and even international level.

The memoirs that record the achievements of FBAs are not indifferent to credentials, but they treat the formation of a scholar as the product of a lifetime, in which the post-graduate years might or might not have special

[17] G. Clark, 'George Macaulay Trevelyan, 1876–1962', *PBA,* 49 (1963), 375–86; H. I. Bell, 'Sir Frederic George Kenyon, 1863–1952', *PBA,* 38 (1952), 269–94.

Table 5.3 Postgraduate study or training, higher doctorates, honorary degrees, FRSs: Classicists/archaeologists, historians, philosophers in the FBA sample

	Study abroad	2nd BA	Post-graduate research degree or diploma	Prize essay or dissertation	Higher doctorates	Honorary doctorates	FRSs
Historians (51)	24 (47%)	13 (25%)	7 (14%)	19 (37%)	16 (31%)	36 (71%)	2
Classicists/ Archaeologists (58)	34 (59%)	12 (21%)	6 (11%)	15 (26%)	13 (22%)	42 (72%)	4
Philosophers (28)	10 (36%)	11 (39%)	8 (29%)	11 (38%)	8 (28%)	16 (55%)	1
Total 138	68 (49%)	37 (27%)	21 (15%)	45 (33%)	37 (27%)	94 (68%)	6

significance. Often the emphasis is on family and schooling. Many had a family background in the learned professions or learned societies. The archaeologist Arthur Evans, for example, belonged to the fourth generation of his family to include a Fellow of the Royal Society: his father, a wealthy paper manufacturer, was an amateur geologist, archaeologist and numismatist who became President of the Society of Antiquaries.[18] Schools of various types – public, grammar, even the private school 'run by a brilliant classic' that educated the shipbroker's son and future philosopher G. F. Stout—might provide classical training to an exceptional standard of scholarship.[19] It was common for high-flying graduates to support themselves by teaching while waiting for the chance of a university post. At Winchester, the City of London School and Dulwich College boys studied comparative philology before they went to university.[20] M. R. James found inspiration for his life's work as a schoolboy at Eton, working on manuscripts and incunabula in the College library.[21] It was at Ruthin School in North Wales that I. A. Richmond became interested in

[18] J. L. Myres, 'Sir Arthur Evans, 1851–1941', *PBA,* 27 (1941), 323–57.

[19] C. A. Mace, 'George Frederick Stout, 1860–1944', *PBA,* 31 (1945), 307–16. On 'the high standard of work in the classics at many schools in England and Scotland' see Gordon Williams, 'Eduard Fraenkel, 1888–1970', *PBA,* 56 (1970), 438 note 1.

[20] G. C. Richards, 'Alfred Chilton Pearson, 1861–1935', *PBA, 21* (1935), 449–63; C. Bailey, 'Robert Seymour Conway, 1864–1933', *PBA,* 22 (1936), 434–44; 'Sir F. G. Kenyon'.

[21] S. Gaselee, 'Montague Rhodes James, 1862–1936', *PBA,* 22 (1936), 418–33: See also C. Webster, 'Benedict Humphrey Sumner, 1893–1951', *PBA,* 37 (1951), 359–72; C. R. Boxer, 'Edgar Prestage, 1869–1951', *PBA,* 44 (1958), 199–206.

Roman Britain; and at Westminster that C. C. J. Webb developed 'the habit of reflection which was to turn him at last into a professional philosopher.'[22]

On the other hand, aspiring academics might gain expertise in various ways after graduating. Percy Gardner made the reputation and scholarly contacts that won him professorial chairs at Cambridge and Oxford in his sixteen years as an employee in the British Museum's coins and medals room.[23] Others learned their trade by archival, cataloguing or editing work, participation in archaeological digs and what Arthur Evans called the 'school of rough travel', or by contributing to collective publications. The historians Charles Firth, T. F. Tout and A. E. Pollard wrote hundreds of biographies for the *Dictionary of National Biography* (which began in the 1880s as a commercial venture with the publishers Smith, Elder & Co.).[24] Frank Stenton and James Tait developed their wide-ranging knowledge of medieval sources while researching for the *Victoria Histories of the Counties of England*, which also started as a commercial undertaking.[25] Local record and historical societies provided medievalists especially with opportunities for self-training in research.[26] Contributors to the new learned journals in the 1880s and after found their articles scrutinised by interventionist editors, such as R. L. Poole and C. W. Previté Orton at the *English Historical Review*.[27] G. E. Moore, in his 26 years as editor of *Mind*, 'took enormous trouble in corresponding, in his own hand, with contributors and in suggesting improvements in exposition'.[28] Some kinds of expertise could only be acquired outside universities. R. H. Tawney's approach to economic history was shaped by his early years as a tutor in working-class adult education.[29] The diplomatic historian Harold Temperley's advice to the modern historian was that he 'should train himself for research by travel and by study of men, as much as by study of books'.[30] Temperley was one of half a dozen historians in the sample whose experience of wartime service and/or at the Paris Peace Conference was

[22] Eric Birley, 'Sir Ian Archibald Richmond, 1902–1965', *PBA,* 52 (1966), 293–302; W. D. Ross, 'Clement Charles Julian Webb, 1865–1954', *PBA,* 41 (1955), 339–47.

[23] G. Hill, 'Percy Gardner, 1846–1937', *PBA, 23* (1937), 459–69.

[24] G. Davies, 'Charles Harding Firth, 1857–1936', *PBA,* 22 (1936), 380–400; V. H. Galbraith, 'Albert Frederick Pollard, 1869–1948', *PBA,* 35 (1949), 258–74; F. M. Powicke, 'Thomas Frederick Tout, 1859–1929', *PBA,* 15 (1929), 491–518.

[25] Doris M. Stenton, 'Frank Merry Stenton, 1880–1967', *PBA,* 54 (1968), 315–423; F. M. Powicke, 'James Tait, 1863–1944', *PBA,* 30 (1944), 379–400.

[26] W. A. Pantin, 'Herbert Edward Salter, 1863–1951', *PBA,* 40 (1954), 219–39.

[27] C. C. J. Webb, 'Reginald Lane Poole, 1857–1939', *PBA,* 25 (1939), 311–20; M. D. Knowles, 'Charles William Previté-Orton, 1877–1947', *PBA,* 33 (1947), 351–60.

[28] R. B. Braithwaite, 'George Edward Moore, 1873–1958', *PBA,* 47 (1961), 298–310.

[29] T. S. Ashton, 'Richard Henry Tawney, 1880–1962', *PBA,* 48 (1962), 461–82.

[30] Harold Temperley, *Research and Modern History* (London, 1930).

formative.[31] Others, such as the medieval ecclesiologist A. H. Thompson and the pioneers of (respectively) Portuguese and Slavonic Studies, Edgar Prestage and R. W. Seton-Watson, took up university posts only after developing new fields of study by freelance work.[32]

The philosopher A. N. Whitehead, who held appointments at Cambridge, Imperial College London and Harvard, took the view that 'the valuable intellectual development is self-development, and . . . it mostly takes places between the ages of sixteen and thirty. As to training, the most important part is given by mothers before the age of twelve'.[33] Whitehead's own education at the public school Sherborne had prioritised classics, religion, and 'a good deal of mathematics'; he commended its 'combination of imaginative appeal and precise knowledge'.[34] In writing of his undergraduate life at Trinity College Cambridge, where he read Mathematics, Whitehead dwells—as do many authors of British Academy memoirs—on the intellectual influence of friends, both contemporaries and dons, as well as 'formal teaching':

> Incessant conversation . . . started with dinner at about six or seven, and went on till about ten o'clock in the evening. . . Groups of friends were not created by identity of subjects for study. We all came from the same sort of school, with the same sort of previous training. We discussed everything – politics, religion, philosophy, literature. . . This experience led to a large amount of miscellaneous reading. . . Looking backwards across more than half a century, the conversations have the appearance of a daily Platonic dialogue.

The select Apostles' Society meetings on Saturdays from 10 pm into the small hours were 'the concentration of this experience'.[35] 'Absolute candour was the only duty that the tradition of the Society enforced', according to Henry Sidgwick. W. C. Lubenow has suggested that 'modern Cambridge philosophy was shaped' by its discussions.[36]

Whitehead recalled his time at Trinity without nostalgia:

> As times changed, Cambridge University has reformed its methods. Its success in the nineteenth century was a happy accident dependent on social circumstances which have passed away – fortunately.[37]

[31] G. P. Gooch, 'Harold Temperley, 1879–1939', *PBA,* 25 (1939), 355–93. The others were G. P. Gooch, Lewis Namier, R. W. Seton-Watson, B. H. Sumner and C. K. Webster.

[32] D. Douglas, 'Alexander Hamilton Thompson, 1873–1952', *PBA,* 38 (1952), 317–32; G. H. Bolsover, 'Robert William Seton-Watson, 1879–1951', *PBA,* 37 (1951), 345–58.; 'Edgar Prestage'.

[33] A. N. Whitehead, *The Aims of Education and Other Essays* (London, 1932), 1.

[34] Dorothy Emmet, 'Alfred North Whitehead, 1861–1947', *PBA,* 33 (1947), 293–306.

[35] A. N. Whitehead, 'Autobiographical Note' in *Essays in Science and Philosophy* (New York, 1947), 7–8.

[36] W. C. Lubenow, *The Cambridge Apostles, 1820–1914: Liberalism, Imagination and Friendship in British Intellectual and Professional Life* (Cambridge, 1998), 33, 57.

[37] 'Autobiographical Note', 8.

Yet he exemplifies the importance for his generation of school and undergraduate experience, and the fact that originality and impeccable scholarship could be achieved without standardized forms of professional training.

Research Training in Universities: Adapting the BA Degree

Early moves towards formal research training in the humanities at Oxford and Cambridge took the form of changes in the BA curriculum, providing opportunities for specialized study as well as a liberal education.[38] In History this involved the introduction of Special Subjects based on primary sources. In Lit. Hum. at Oxford periods of Greek and Roman history were designated for study 'as far as possible in the original authors', and there were optional Special Subjects for the ablest candidates.[39] Cambridge classicists gained an advantage by dividing the Tripos into two Parts. Part I (in itself a qualification for the BA degree) provided a general course mainly on language and literature; the minority of students who also took Part II could choose to specialize in literature, history, philosophy, archaeology or philology. The four-year Oxford Lit. Hum. degree, on the other hand, gave students in their first five terms a literary curriculum with an emphasis on translation and composition (Honour Moderations, or 'Mods'), followed by seven terms of ancient history and philosophy ('Greats'). Classical literature was not promoted to a place in Greats until 1968. But space was made, under the influence of T. H. Green, for the inclusion of modern alongside classical philosophy, while the study of Roman history became more professional, with new ventures into Romano-British archaeology. Research interests not adequately represented in Greats were catered for, from the early twentieth century, by Diploma courses in Classical Art and Archaeology, Anthropology, and Geography. Lectures and advice from post-holders who taught these courses were not confined to diploma students. As Professor of Classical Archaeology, Percy

[38] Christopher Stray (ed.), *Classics in 19th and 20th Century Cambridge: Curriculum, Work and Professional Life* (Cambridge, 1999), and *Oxford Classics: Teaching and Learning, 1800–2000* (London, 2007); Peter Slee, *Learning and a Liberal Education. The Study of Modern History in the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge and Manchester, 1800–1914* (Manchester, 1986); D. S. Goldstein, 'History at Oxford and Cambridge: Professionalization and the Influence of Ranke', in G. G. Iggers and J. M. Powell (ed.), *Leopold von Ranke and the Shaping of the Historical Discipline*, (New York, 1990), 141–53.

[39] Oswyn Murray, 'Ancient History', in *The History of the University of Oxford*, vii, M. G. Brock and M. C. Curthoys (eds.), *Nineteenth-Century Oxford* (Oxford, 1997), Part 1, 536–7, Part 2, 335.

Gardner 'gave personal instruction to 757 men and 129 women, not to mention those who merely attended his lectures'.[40]

At both universities controversy over syllabus reform lasted well into the twentieth century. Cambridge historians, for example, were divided between advocates of a course that was 'a school for statesmanship' and those who wanted more specialized historical options and less social science.[41] Conflict over the place of research training in the Modern History School, and of research qualifications in college teaching appointments, resonates through British Academy memoirs of Oxford historians.[42] This was an important issue: a First Class degree was often treated not merely as a necessary condition, but as a sufficient qualification, for appointment to a tenured college Fellowship.

By the turn of the century a case could in fact be made that an Oxford or Cambridge Honours degree did prepare the ablest undergraduates for research. The aim of the Modern History School was 'in the case of those who aim at a high class, to teach the principles upon which the study and criticism of original authorities should be pursued'.[43] The ecclesiastical historian H. M. Gwatkin maintained that

> In Cambridge either the Theological or the Historical Tripos will now give an excellent training in historical method. A man who goes through either, and takes a good place in his Second Part, has laid a broad foundation for future work, and made a good start with the critical study and comparison of original writers. . . though he may still want special help from the philosopher, the antiquarian, the palaeographer, the economist or the teacher of languages.[44]

Still more confident and circumstantial were claims made for Greats in a later symposium on examinations edited by the educationist Philip Hartog. Candidates brought to Lit. Hum. 'the precision of thought' that came with a thorough command of Latin and Greek. In philosophy they were

> generally expected to make themselves particularly intimate with Plato's *Republic* and the *Nicomachean Ethics* of Aristotle, to follow the development

[40] 'Percy Gardner', 464.

[41] G. Kitson Clark, 'A Hundred Years of the Teaching of History at Cambridge, 1873–1973', *Historical Journal*, 16/3 (1973), 535–53.

[42] For example, 'C. H. Firth'; C. G. Robertson, 'Sir Charles Oman, 1861–1946', *PBA,* 32 (1946), 299–306; R. W. Southern, 'Sir Maurice Powicke, 1879–1963', *PBA,* 50 (1964), 275–304. For a survey of this dispute, see J. P. Kenyon, 'Sir Charles Firth and the Oxford School of Modern History', in A. C. Duke and C. A. Tamse (eds.), *Clio's Mirror: Historiography in Britain and the Netherlands* (Zutphen, 1985), 163–83.

[43] A. H. Johnson, *Faculty of Arts. Honour School of Modern History* (Oxford, 1900), quoted in Slee, *Learning and a Liberal Education*, 128.

[44] In W. A. J. Archbold, *Essays on the Teaching of History, by F. W. Maitland and Others* (Cambridge, 1901), 9.

> of thought from Descartes to Kant or later, and to think out for themselves a position which will enable them to give reasoned and consistent answers to at least the more central questions with which philosophy is concerned.[45]

In ancient history they were 'required by statute to use the original authorities', and that meant that 'superficiality [could] be treated [by the examiners] as unpardonable'. The expectation was that students would 'apply their minds to the whole of the evidence for their particular problem', guided by the weekly tutorial with their philosophy and history tutors. The one technical qualification provided by this intellectual training was 'an ability to study, and if necessary teach, philosophy and ancient history'.[46] The Cambridge classicist F. E. Adcock, known for the 'poise and style' of his own writing, noted that Tripos examiners were required to 'have regard to the style and method of the candidates' answers and . . . give credit for excellence in these respects'; and that 'the growth of stereotyped standards' was avoided by the discretion and autonomy given to examiners.[47] At both universities it was claimed that examiners valued evidence of independent thought and did not seek standard answers from Honours candidates.[48] Charles Oman, who did a lot of tutorial teaching in both ancient and modern history before he became a professor, warned pupils that for a high class 'some originality' was needed. His own technique was to 'set essays that involved some problem of deduction or comparison, and that could not be answered by paraphrasing. . . a textbook or manual'. As an examiner he saw how easy it was to detect a 'particular clever turn of words that came from a common tutor' in answers from candidates from the same college.[49]

Moves to interest undergraduates in research are recorded from the late 1870s.[50] Examples of research-focused teaching figure in several FBA

[45] Sir Philip Hartog (ed.), *The Purposes of Examinations. A Symposium* (London, 1938), 30–5. The article on Greats was written by the Camden Professor of Roman History Hugh Last in consultation with the philosopher R. G. Collingwood.

[46] Ibid, 38, 40.

[47] N. G. L. Hammond, 'Frank Ezra Adcock, 1886–1968', *PBA,* 54 (1968), 425–34.

[48] For a contrary view, that teachers and students 'relied on mindless cramming as a route to a high class of honours', see Reba N. Soffer, *Discipline and Power. The University, History and the Making of an English Elite, 1870–1930* (Stanford, 1994), 137–8. The examiners' reports cited are however open to a different interpretation. Boards of examiners were dominated by tutors: these were internal reports, circulated for the private information of colleagues. Comments on the shortcomings of candidates were intended as constructive criticism. The most frequent complaint is of the poor quality of candidates in the lowest classes.

[49] Sir Charles Oman, *Memories of Victorian Oxford* (London, 1941), 149. On tutorial teaching practices at Oxford see also Robert Currie, 'The Arts and Social Studies', in Harrison (ed.), *The Twentieth Century*, 130–1.

[50] For an 1879 Oxford class 'for the discussion of and the illustration of the principles of textual criticism' see S. Harrison, 'Henry Nettleship and the Beginning of Modern Latin

memoirs in our sample. William Ridgeway's Part II archaeology students at Cambridge were taught

> not to be satisfied with superficial conclusions, but to probe deeply into the matter in hand and strip off the layers to reveal the kernel of truth within. They learnt . . . to go back as far as possible to the first authority. They were told that method, attention to detail, thoroughness, and accuracy are the hallmarks of the true scholar. . . They learnt further the use of anthropological parallels, the value of self-criticism, detestation of humbug, caution against plausible theories, and the necessity of first collecting the evidence and then determining what conclusions can logically be drawn from it.[51]

A. C. Clark, Corpus Professor of Latin at Oxford (1913–34) is described by a pupil as taking a class

> through his own text of Cicero's *Philippics* in a way which opened up the vast possibilities of Textual Criticism. We saw the possibilities of his own special methods and it is still second nature, when faced with a textual dislocation, to count the letters (with or without the help of a pin).[52]

John Laird, an Edinburgh graduate who came South to read Moral Sciences at Cambridge, felt that as a pupil of McTaggart, Moore and Russell he 'began all over again':

> I came to prefer dialectic to history, more special to broader inquiries, a grain of proof to a bushel of sweeping suggestion, and I did my best to be as candid as I could. . . In Cambridge. . . we followed an argument in the spirit of adventure. . . In our view nothing was final but the rules of sound navigation, and everyone seemed ready to be argued out of his fundamental conception of the term before.[53]

At Oxford, too, studying philosophy could be a strenuous experience. The Socratic method, wrote the author of R. R. Marett's memoir, was the 'true Oxonian method of teaching':

> The apt student – I paraphrase the master's [Plato's] words – gives himself and his teacher no rest until he finds perfection or at least progresses so far that he can be his own guide, with none to lead him.[54]

For serious students, the Balliol historian A. L. Smith set an equally demanding standard. According to one pupil, the Edinburgh graduate

Studies at Oxford' in Stray, *Oxford Classics*, 112. On the origins of the Stubbs Society and the King's College Politics Society, see Soffer, *Discipline and Power*, 169–72.

[51] F. H. Stubbings, 'Alan John Bayard Wace, 1879–1957', *PBA,* 44 (1958), 263–80.
[52] C. Bailey, 'Albert Curtis Clark, 1859–1937', *PBA,* 23 (1937), 513–25.
[53] W. S. Urquhart, 'John Laird, 1887–1946', *PBA,* 32 (1946), 415–32.
[54] H. J. Rose, 'Robert Randolph Marett, 1866–1943', *PBA,* 29 (1943), 357–70.

James Eadie Todd – not an FBA, but a future professor at Queen's University, Belfast – Smith treated lectures as 'a subsidiary method of teaching, primarily adapted to the needs of the low-brows', but his own tutorials were on a quite different level:

> You read your essay to him; if it was a good one the effect was to stimulate him… He rose from his chair… pouring out… a torrent of criticism, of leading questions, of points missed… On a good day, the whole thing reminded you of a superbly able counsel tearing to pieces the speech of his opposite number… Smith gave you illuminating points, and criticisms and references, but on principle he never elaborated them. He expected you to go away and work them out or look them up and then write a revised precis of your original essay. If you did this, you got all that he had to give you; if you did less, you got next to nothing from him.[55]

The Modern History School was however the main target for critics of the system of tutorial teaching for examinations: 'The historical teaching of history has been practically left out, in favour of the class-getting system of training'.[56] That charge, made by William Stubbs in the 1870s, was quoted by his pupil and early-twentieth century successor as Regius Professor, Charles Firth, in a provocative inaugural lecture. Firth's attack on the examination system was taken seriously and he won minor concessions: from 1908 candidates could offer an optional thesis, and essays entered for university prizes could be submitted for assessment. But the fundamental issue—how to combine preparation for unseen examinations with training for research—remained unresolved. An alternative approach, giving undergraduates hands-on research experience, was developed in the Manchester History Department by two Oxford-trained medievalists, T. F. Tout and James Tait. Tout taught third-year Special Subject classes in the Freeman Library (a History room in the University Library) in German seminar style, setting each student a topic to research in printed primary sources. He also introduced a compulsory undergraduate thesis, an example that was followed in some other civic universities.[57] Manchester History graduates who went to Balliol for a second BA were not always happy there. 'The confident way in which [A. L. Smith] made generalizations, and weighed moral influences, made any pupil of Tout's hair stand on end', according to V. H. Galbraith.[58] Both he and F. M. Powicke went back to Manchester as research fellows; both were, as critics of the Oxford

[55] H. A. Cronne, T. W. Moody and D. B. Quinn (eds.), *Essays in British and Irish History in Honour of James Eadie Todd* (London, 1949), 126–7.

[56] C. H. Firth, *A Plea for the Historical Teaching of History* (Oxford, 1904), 30.

[57] Slee, *Learning and a Liberal Education*, 153–61.

[58] H. W. C. Davis, R. H. C. Davis and R. W. Hunt, *A History of Balliol College* (Oxford, 1963), 241.

system, to return there as Regius professors. It fell to Powicke to give an account of the Modern History School for Hartog's 1936 symposium. To the question, 'how far does the examination fulfil its purpose?', he gave a hesitant response.

> The man who wishes to pursue his studies farther is sufficiently equipped on taking his degree to be able to do so, provided that he is willing to learn and to go slowly.

The need was however, 'to do something to drive home to undergraduate students the truth that they are only on the fringe of a vast and unfathomable study'.[59]

Pupils claimed that Powicke himself achieved this in a Special Subject class on 'Church and State in the Time of Edward I' that 'gave... undergraduates a new idea of historical research'; but his plan to divide the Oxford BA course, so that Part II students could be taught alongside postgraduates, came to nothing.[60]

Fellowships, Essay Prizes, Study Abroad

At the ancient universities an initiation in research often came through the fellowship and prize systems, the main routes to advancement for the academically ambitious. In the late nineteenth century colleges offered short-term 'prize fellowships' without teaching obligations to support young graduates while they established a professional career: these were awarded at Oxford normally by examination and at Cambridge by dissertation.[61] These fellowships and essay prizes were a mark of distinction that might even in exceptional cases compensate for missing a First Class degree.[62] Before the First World War almost all Oxford-trained historians who won an essay prize 'went on to conspicuously successful academic careers.'[63] So did a graduate of University College London, T. F. T. Plucknett, who won the Royal Historical Society's Alexander Prize and made his career as a legal historian at Harvard and the London School

[59] Hartog, *Purposes of Examinations*, 43–4.

[60] 'Sir Maurice Powicke', 288.

[61] A. J. Engel, *From Clergyman to Don. The Rise of the Academic Profession in Nineteenth-Century Oxford* (New York, 1983), 257–66. Lord Curzon, *Principles and Methods of University Reform* (Oxford, 1909), 182 records that by then there were 'nearly twenty' fellowships 'assigned to Research or... to some object of special or advanced study'.

[62] See, for example, H. L. Bell, 'Arthur Surridge Hunt, 1871–1934', *PBA,* 20 (1934), 323–36; C. M. Bowra, 'John Dewar Denniston, 1887–1949', *PBA,* 35 (1949), 219–32; J. M. Hussey, 'Norman Hepburn Baynes, 1877–1961', *PBA,* 49 (1963), 364–73.

[63] Soffer, *Discipline and Power*, 176, 263–4 note 60.

of Economics.[64] Even an unsuccessful entry for an essay prize might awaken interest in what became a life's work, as in the case of P. S. Allen, editor of the *Opus Epistolarum* of Erasmus (recently described as 'one of the great monuments of English learning').[65] In the FBA sample, the priority for Oxford classicists seems to have been competing by examination for a Craven Fellowship: this gave £200 a year for two years of 'advanced study', two-thirds of which had to be spent abroad. But when classicists and philosophers did win essay prizes, the work submitted could be substantial and research based, marking out the author's future field of work and destined for publication.[66] The same can be said of the fellowship dissertations submitted by Cambridge candidates. Some FBAs who did not write prize essays or dissertations had instead published substantial books by the age of 30.[67] These first exercises in research, though produced without formal supervision, fulfilled the same function in the formation of a scholar as a thesis submitted for a research degree.

Many FBAs had studied abroad, though it is not always clear what that entailed. Only two in our sample went so far as to take continental PhDs, both at the University of Leipzig. The philosopher G. D. Hicks studied there for four years; but R. L. Poole—whose work in the British Museum's manuscripts department had equipped him with technical training—was actually in Leipzig for only four months.[68] Many went abroad primarily to learn languages. Charles Firth, for example, 'spent some months in Hanover improving his German; [but] he never studied at a continental university.'[69] Although a keen advocate of the German professorial seminar, he had probably never attended one. Of the historians who did attend continental universities, A. G. Little—for many years Reader in Palaeography at Manchester—was introduced at Dresden and Göttingen

[64] S. F. C. Milsom, 'Theodore Thomas Frank Plucknett, 1897–1965', *PBA,* 51 (1965), 505–19.

[65] H. W. Garrod, 'Percy Stafford Allen, 1869–1933', *PBA,* 19 (1933), 381–407; J. B. Trapp, 'Percy Stafford Allen (1869–1933), Erasmian scholar', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography [ODNB].*

[66] Examples are: 'The Ethics of Savage Races', R. R. Marett's first venture into anthropology, which won the Green Moral Philosophy Prize in 1893; F. G. Kenyon, *The Palaeography of Greek Papyri* (Oxford, 1891), the first monograph on the subject published in any language; A. E. Taylor, 'Reciprocal Relations between Ethics and Metaphysics', published as *The Problem of Conduct* (London, 1891).

[67] Examples are: F. C. S. Schiller, *The Riddle of the Sphinx: A Study in the Philosophy of Evolution* (London, 1911); Harold Mattingly, *The Imperial Civil Service of Rome* (Cambridge, 1911); John Laird, *Problems of the Self* (London, 1917); I. A. Richmond, *The City Wall of Imperial Rome: An Account of its Architectural Development from Aurelian to Narses* (Oxford, 1930).

[68] W, G, de Burgh, 'George Dawes Hicks, 1862–1941', *PBA,* 27 (1941), 405–31: 'Reginald Lane Poole'.

[69] G. N. Clark, 'Sir Charles Firth', *English Historical Review,* 51, no. 202, April 1936.

to 'the principles and practice of the critical examination of original historical documents.'[70] R. L. Poole's son Austin 'learned in German seminars the groundwork of German history and method': his reputation was made by his chapters on German history in the *Cambridge Medieval History.*[71] H. A. L. Fisher, a Lit Hum. graduate, made the transition to Modern History by studying in Göttingen and Paris: he was remembered for combining 'the scholarship of the Sorbonne' with the 'literary power traditional in his English and Oxford surroundings'.[72] Fisher's pupil R. W. Seton Watson studied at Berlin, Paris and Vienna, earning an Oxford D. Litt. for his book *Racial Problems in Hungary* (London: Constable, 1908). G. P. Gooch attended lecture courses in Berlin and Paris that bore fruit in his classic survey of *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1913).[73] Other historians went abroad not to study at universities but in search of primary sources: Z. N. Brooke to the Vatican Library, the diplomatic historian C. K. Webster on a tour of continental archives before the outbreak of war in 1914, Richard Pares in the 1920s to archives in the United States and West Indies.[74]

British philosophers of an earlier generation had gained much from their visits to German universities: for philosophers in our sample the benefits were less obvious.[75] The moral philosopher W. R. Sorley studied theology at Tübingen and Berlin, but his early Idealist phase was influenced chiefly by T. H. Green, while Henry Sidgwick at Cambridge had provided training in 'the philosophical temper of candour, self-criticism, and regard for the truth.'[76] The Idealism of Green, Edward Caird and F. H. Bradley, though always controversial among professional philosophers, had widespread influence, but was not seen by its British adherents as derivative from Hegel.[77] A. S. Pringle-Pattison, who did work on Kant and Hegel, gained little from his time (1878–82) at a series of German universities, where Idealism was out of fashion.[78] Some philosophers

[70] F. M. Powicke, 'Andrew George Little, 1863–1945', *PBA,* 31 (1945), 335–56.

[71] V. H. Galbraith, 'Austin Lane Poole, 1889–1963', *PBA,* 49 (1963), 431–46.

[72] Gilbert Murray, 'Herbert Albert Laurens Fisher, 1865–1940', *PBA,* 26 (1940), 464.

[73] Herbert Butterfield, 'George Peabody Gooch, 1877–1968', *PBA,* 55 (1969), 311–38.

[74] H. M. Cam, 'Zachary Nugent Brooke, 1883–1946', *PBA,* 32 (1946), 381–93; S. Bindoff and G. N. Clark, 'Charles Kingsley Webster, 1886–1961', *PBA,* 48 (1946), 427–48; A. L. Rowse, 'Richard Pares, 1902–58', *PBA,* 48 (1962), 345–56.

[75] C. C. J. Webb's Academy memoir recalls the importance of German contacts for Ingram Bywater's Aristotle scholarship, and the influence of Hermann Lotze's Göttingen lectures on J. Cook Wilson.

[76] F. R. Tennant, 'William Ritchie Sorley, 1855–1935', *PBA,* 21 (1935), 393–405.

[77] C. G. Robertson and W. D. Ross, 'John Henry Muirhead, 1855–1940', *PBA,* 26 (1940), 381–8; R. G. Collingwood, *An Autobiography* (Oxford, 1939), 15–19.

[78] J. B. Capper and J. B. Baillie, 'Andrew Seth Pringle-Pattison, 1856–1931', *PBA,* 17 (1931), 447–89.

developed an interest in psychology while studying abroad: F. C. S. Schiller in the United States, where he became a friend of William James; Samuel Alexander and G. D. Hicks in Germany.[79] But A. N. Whitehead was among those of his generation who did not study abroad, despite the importance for his early work on mathematical logic of the ideas of Hermann Grassmann, and the influence of Giuseppe Peano and Gottlob Frege on the collaboration with Bertrand Russell that produced *Principia Mathematica* (1910–13).[80] G. E. Moore did not take Sidgwick's advice to spend a year or two at a German university:

> I had reasons for wishing . . . to reside in Cambridge and I still feel very doubtful whether I should have got as much benefit by studying in Germany as I did by staying at home.[81]

This was a golden age for Cambridge philosophy and its analytical style owed little to foreign influences.

In classical studies, however, there was not only a need to visit sites and museums but also a lasting sense of the superiority of German scholarship.[82] This was to be confirmed in the 1930s with the arrival of eminent refugees from Nazism, notably Eduard Fraenkel, Corpus Professor of Latin at Oxford (1935–53).[83] Well over half our classicists and archaeologists had studied abroad (Table 5.3). In most cases this did entail attendance at lectures and seminars at German universities, or residence at the British School in Athens or Rome. Arthur Evans spent a year at Göttingen. Lewis Farnell, inspired by German research culture while studying archaeology at Berlin and Munich, became a leader of the chief pressure group in Oxford for research and university reform ('The Club').[84] W. M. Lindsay was among the philologists who went to Germany as a graduate, returning to give Oxford's first palaeography lectures in the 1880s and publish his standard work, *The Latin Language* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1894).[85] German universities trained students in the latest developments in comparative philology, rigorous standards in textual scholarship and the contextual and interdisciplinary 'science of antiquity' (*Altertumswissenschaft*). 'As was then

[79] R. R. Marett, 'Ferdinand Canning Scott Schiller, 1864–1937', *PBA,* 23 (1937), 538–50; J. Laird, 'Samuel Alexander, 1859–1938', *PBA,* 24 (1938), 378–95; 'G. D. Hicks'.

[80] A. N. Whitehead, 'Autobiographical Notes', 10; Bertrand Russell, *The Autobiography of Bertrand Russell* (London, 1971 edition), i. 144–5.

[81] 'An Autobiography', in P. A. Schilpp (ed.), *The Philosophy of G. E. Moore* (New York, 1952), 6.

[82] Gilbert Murray, 'German Scholarship', in *Quarterly Review*, 443 (April 1915), 330–2.

[83] 'Eduard Fraenkel', 421–4, 435–42.

[84] R. R. Marett, 'Lewis Richard Farnell, 1856–1934', *PBA,* 20 (1934), 285–96.

[85] H. J. Ross, 'Wallace Martin Lindsay, 1858–1937', *PBA,* 23 (1937), 487–512. See also R. M. Dawkins, 'Peter Giles, 1860–1935', *PBA,* 21 (1935), 406–32; 'Robert Seymour Conway'.

the custom at the beginning of a professional career in classical studies', notes a biographer of F. E. Adcock, 'he attended the seminars of Wilamowitz in Berlin and Eduard Meyer in Munich from 1910 to 1911.'[86] There are critical comments on the scholarship of some academicians who lacked post-graduate training in Germany.[87] Gilbert Murray, professor of Greek at Glasgow and Oxford, is among them, although he began in 1894 a correspondence with the great Hellenist Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf—'Dear Friend and Teacher'—that lasted for many years.[88]

That said, there were classicists who achieved distinction without studying abroad. The Cicero scholar A. C. Clark travelled in search of manuscripts rather than training but his editions were nevertheless well regarded.[89] J. D. Denniston's definitive work *The Greek Particles* (1934) was a product of the English tradition of composition and translation: his mastery of idiom owed something to Oxford's Composition Club, seven classics dons who met to translate works of English literature into classical Greek.[90] Areas of recognised achievement in British classical scholarship included by 1914 numismatics, the study of Greek vase painting, papyrology and archaeology (above all, the excavations of B. P. Grenfell and A, S. Hunt at Oxyrhynchus and Arthur Evans at Knossos).[91] After the First World War German universities lost their hegemony—classics post-graduates might go instead to Vienna or Princeton.[92] Among the younger archaeologists in the sample, Dorothy Garrod took the Oxford Diploma in Anthropology before training at the Institut de Paléontologie in Paris, while the Australian Gordon Childe and the Leiden graduate Henri Frankfort trained as post-graduates in (respectively) Oxford and London.[93]

Post-graduate Research Training in Britain Before 1939

Opinion among academics remained divided as to how far research training for the ablest Honours students should become part of the BA course and how far it belonged instead to the post-graduate years. This lack of

[86] 'Sir Frank Ezra Adcock', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.

[87] 'F. G. Kenyon'; 'Cyril Bailey, 1871–1951', *PBA,* 1951; 'Gilbert Murray, 1866–1957', *PBA,* 1957.

[88] Gilbert Murray, 'Memories of Wilamowitz', *Antike und Abendland*, 4 (1954), 13.

[89] 'A. C. Clark'.

[90] C. M. Bowra, 'John Dewar Denniston, 1887–1949', *PBA,* 35 (1949), 219–32.

[91] 'A. S. Hunt'; 'Harold Mattingly, 1894–1964', *PBA,* 1964; Bernard Ashmole, 'Sir John Davidson Beazley, 1885–1970', *PBA,* 56 (1970), 443–61.

[92] F. E. Adcock, 'Martin Percival Charlesworth, 1895–1950', *PBA,* 36 (1950), 277–90; R. P. Winnington-Ingram, 'Amy Marjorie Dale, 1902–1967', *PBA,* 53 (1967), 423–46.

[93] Gertrude Caton-Thompson, 'Dorothy Annie Elizabeth Garrod, 1892–1968', *PBA,* 55 (1969), 339–61; S. Piggott, 'Vere Gordon Childe, 1892–1957', *PBA,* 44 (1958), 305–12: V. G. Childe, 'Henri Frankfort, 1897–1954', *PBA,* 41 (1955), 367–72.

clarity was one factor that complicated the task of introducing in British universities the types of training found in the German seminar, the École des Chartes and *École Pratique des Hautes Études* in Paris or the American graduate school. At Oxford, for instance, lectures in palaeography and diplomatic for classicists and medieval historians began in the 1890s, and were supplemented in 1908 by lectures on 'Sources of English History' and a seminar conducted by the eminent jurist and historian of English feudal institutions Paul Vinogradoff.[94] But the lectures were poorly attended: graduates studying for the B. Litt. were few and their research interests scattered, while few undergraduates found time for lectures that were outside the syllabus examined in the Schools. Vinogradoff's seminar, modelled on German practice, had a budget from the university and a room in All Souls' College, which also housed the 'Maitland Memorial Library.' Its members worked together on primary sources and published the results in a British Academy publication, *Survey of the Honour of Denbigh* (London, 1914), and nine volumes of *Oxford Studies in Social and Legal History* (Oxford, 1909–27). Most of them were, however, not students but young dons. Among those published in the *Oxford Studies* (though it is not known whether she attended the seminar) was the only woman historian in the sample, Helen Cam, then a Fellow of Girton College, Cambridge and later Professor of History at Harvard (1948–54).[95] 'It is no exaggeration to say that Vinogradoff's seminar provided the best course of training in the methods of historical research which at that time could have been obtained in the University of Oxford', claimed a former colleague: yet it attracted very few undergraduates or graduate students.[96] No more than four or five students attended Charles Firth's B.Litt. class on seventeenth-century British history. Low attendance at graduate lectures remained a perennial problem.[97] In classics, where post-graduate students were even scarcer, the most celebrated examples of the professorial seminar—Gilbert Murray's class on the art of translation and Eduard Fraenkel's seminar—were attended mainly by first and second-year undergraduates.[98] Philosophers were to develop seminar teaching

[94] C. H. Firth, *Modern History at Oxford, 1841–1918* (Oxford, 1920), 37, 46–9.

[95] C. R. Cheney, 'Helen Maud Cam, 1885–1969', *PBA,* 55 (1969), 293–310. Two Oxford women tutors who did attend the seminar were Ada Elizabeth Levett, a future Professor of History at Westfield College, London, and Eleanor Lodge, Oxford's first woman D. Litt. See Frances Lannon, 'Eleanor Constance Lodge, 1869–1936', *ODNB.*

[96] H. A. L. Fisher, 'Memoir', in *Collected Papers of Paul Vinogradoff* (Oxford, 1928), i. 32–9.

[97] Committee for Advanced Studies 1919–31, OUA FA 5/3/1.

[98] 'Gilbert Murray'; Stephanie West, 'Eduard Fraenkel Recalled', in Stray, *Oxford Classics*, 214–15.

after the Second World War in a new and successful post-graduate course, the B. Phil., but it was in lectures and informal discussions among colleagues in the 1930s that the foundations of post-war Oxford analytic philosophy were laid.[99]

Manchester, with humanities departments that were relatively small and controlled by their professors, and London, re-founded as a teaching university in 1900, offered more favourable conditions for post-graduate education. Manchester's Professor of Latin (1903–29) R. S. Conway was an inspiring supervisor who

> would often set candidates for the MA degree to write theses on some subordinate part of the questions on which he was working – in Virgil or Livy or Cicero – and so gathered round him something like a school of research, the members of which afterwards went out as missionaries, to spread the enthusiasms which they had learnt.[100]

Tout's History Department gained a national reputation for medieval research and by 1920 had 25 postgraduate students, including five PhD candidates, two of them from Oxford. The Institute of Historical Research became a focus for research training on a larger scale, catering for graduate students from colleges of the University of London and open to visitors from other universities. By 1923 it accommodated six preliminary courses on historical sources and palaeography and seventeen graduate seminars.[101] It became the venue of the Anglo-American Historical Conference, first held in July 1921: and the first issue of the Institute's *Bulletin* included guidance from a committee of British and American scholars on how to edit a historical text.[102] The IHR could be seen as an English version of the research institute, the creation of its Director (1921–39) A. F. Pollard, who had his own vision of a postgraduate seminar as 'a group of scholars, young and old, meeting in a library, as scientists in a laboratory', an occasion when 'students and teachers discussed common problems arising from their work.'[103] Pollard's years as assistant editor of the *Dictionary of National Biography* shaped this vision. The book-lined rooms shown in early photographs of the Institute, without a fixed seminar table, may reflect memories of the Dictionary Office.

[99] G. J. Warnock, 'John Langshaw Austin, 1911–1960', *PBA,* 49 (1963), 345–63.
[100] 'R. S. Conway'.
[101] Birch and Horn, *History Laboratory*, 130.
[102] *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 1 (1923), 6–25.
[103] Sir John Neale, 'Professor A. E. Pollard', in *Essays in Elizabethan History* (London, 1958), 238–9; Birch and Horn, *History Laboratory*, 10. See also 'Training in Historical Research', *BIHR*, 31.

The IHR was not, however, the only focus for research education for historians in London.[104] The London School of Economics had provided a base for London's first lectures in palaeography and diplomatic.[105] Its Professor of International Relations C. K. Webster held a weekly seminar at his home, his wife dispensing tea. Sometimes 'conducted in the language of a continental member', it was remembered as 'a "cell" of that world-wide fellowship of international historians which Webster was to do more than any Englishman of his time to foster and sustain.'[106] London did not follow Manchester's example by introducing a BA dissertation, but it too featured source-focused Special Subject classes, designed to prepare Honours students for post-graduate work. R. H. Tawney's British Academy memoir prints the syllabus of his LSE class on 'Economic and Social England, 1558–1640', outlining his conception of History as concerned 'not with a series of past events, but with [understanding] the life of society, and with the records of the past as a means to that end.'[107] The medieval economic history seminar run by his pupil M. M. Postan with Eileen Power produced a collaborative volume, *Studies in English Trade in the Fifteenth Century* (London, 1933). It resembled a more collegial version of Vinogradoff's Oxford seminar.[108]

'Germanizing' tendencies had always had their critics, and British Academy memoirs suggest a predictable growth in anti-German sentiment. M. R. James 'disliked most things German, except their scholarship.'[109] At Cambridge there was a backlash against the notion of history as 'a science, a technique', associated with the German-educated *fin-de-siècle* Regius professor Lord Acton.[110] The stereotype of the dominant professor, with his 'school of disciples' or mission to '"organize" the studies of the younger dons', is sometimes repudiated.[111] G. E. Moore's phrase 'do your philosophy for yourself' expressed the individualist ethos of English scholarship.[112] The graduate seminar itself could be seen as problematic.[113] T. F. Tout was said to be 'incapable of thinking of his work with his pupils in the academic terms of "graduate instruction" or "seminars."'[114] At Oxford F. M. Powicke's 'informal meeting of tutors and research students

[104] On the Institute of Archaeology see Jacquetta Hawkes, 'Robert Eric Mortimer Wheeler, 1890–1976', *PBA,* 63 (1977), 483–507.

[105] G. W. Prothero, Presidential Address in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 16 (1902), xxii.

[106] 'C. K. Webster', 438. [107] 'R. H. Tawney', 471.

[108] Maxine Berg, *A Woman in History. Eileen Power, 1889–1840* (Cambridge, 1996), 209–10.

[109] 'M. R. James', 428. [110] 'C. W. Previté-Orton', 358–9.

[111] For example, 'G. F. Stout', 315; 'A. C. Clark', 524.

[112] 'G. E. Moore'. [113] 'Sir Charles Oman', 301–3; 'N. H. Baynes', 369.

[114] 'T. F. Tout', 505.

to read papers and discuss problems' was known as the 'Medieval Group' rather than 'seminar'; but even so, Richard Southern recalls, 'some did not like it.'[115] In G. M. Trevelyan's inaugural lecture, as in many memoirs, stress is laid on the help given instead 'in an unofficial way' by senior scholars to beginning researchers:

> If the Seminar be held as alien to the genius of this University, the friendship of older with younger scholars is not alien to our traditions.... The Cambridge University Historical Society exists in large part to foster such personal relations between the more experienced and the younger hands.[116]

In the 1920s and 30s pressure to adapt to American norms could be equally unwelcome. In the humanities the PhD was relatively slow to acquire status as a qualification. Renate Simpson has documented an attempt in 1930, with support from the Cambridge English, Classics and Moral Sciences Faculties, to abolish it in 'non-scientific subjects.'[117] Criticism of the PhD degree cannot be dismissed as just complacent chauvinism: it came from some scholars with a serious commitment to research training. V. H. Galbraith used his inaugural lecture in Edinburgh in 1937 to air discontents with the 'system of higher degrees granted for theses embodying an "original contribution to knowledge."' There was 'much to be said for it, and it [had] in any case come to stay.'

> Nevertheless I cannot think it altogether congenial to our native outlook... These 'original' theses are compiled in a very short time...[and] they are done by young people who have scarcely attained the equipment of a scholar by the time the thesis is completed... [T]he result, at its best, is apt to be the publication of an immature monograph, much less readable than it would have been if more slowly evolved.... [T]he student works in an atmosphere of anxiety and haste, at the very time in his career when leisure and time to think are most essential. He passes from the superficial study of wide periods to a specialisation that is too narrow, too intense and too hurried.[118]

In conclusion, then, it did not look in the 1930s as if further adaptation of British practice was likely to come about in the near future. Research training in the humanities clearly did have its limitations: it produced fewer scholars and a much lower output of scholarly work than European or American universities, and it relied on the presence in universities

[115] 'Sir Maurice Powicke', 288.
[116] G. M. Trevelyan, *The Present Position of History* (London, 1927), 24.
[117] Renate Simpson, *The Development of the PhD in Britain, 1917–59 and Since* (2009), 280–4.
[118] V. H. Galbraith, 'Historical Research and the Preservation of the Past', *History*, 22/8 (March 1938), 305–6.

(Oxbridge especially) of an elite of undergraduates from cultivated homes, often expensively educated, often with private means with which to buy 'leisure and time to think.' But the British tradition also had virtues that were prized, in a culture that valued quality over quantity of scholarship, literary merit and readability over mere originality, collegiality and individual insights over hierarchy and the 'research school.' Only with the expansion of British universities after the Second World War – and all that entailed, in terms of new sources of funding, more academic jobs and pressures for professionalization – were the conditions created in which attitudes would change.

University of Oxford