H. M. J. Underhill (1855–1921); Oxford Antiquarian, Artist, and ‘Provision Merchant’

MEGAN PRICE

SUMMARY

Recently a wooden box was discovered in the basement of the Institute of Archaeology containing over forty hand-painted lantern slides, the work of H. M. J. Underhill, a hitherto neglected figure. Henry Underhill, an Oxford grocer, was a man of wide intellectual interests and abilities, who used his slides to illustrate his lectures on natural history, folklore, British prehistory, and archaeology, and who made significant contributions to local scientific societies and journals in late nineteenth-century Oxford. This article explores his life, his social and cultural background, the development of his intellectual interests, and his legacy, especially his contribution to archaeology. As one who was not a member of the university, his career illuminates the relationships between both town and gown and amateur and professional historians.

In 2003 a wooden box labelled ‘Underhill Slides: The Great Stone Circles of Britain’ was discovered in the basement of the Institute of Archaeology at 36 Beaumont Street. The box contained over forty exquisitely hand-painted glass lantern slides, showing British prehistoric sites such as the Rollright Stones (see Plate 13), Wayland’s Smithy, Avebury, Stonehenge, and Stanton Drew. A signature, ‘H.M.J.U. 1895’ was painted on each image, and the date and details of the sources were noted on the corner of each mount, but there was no indication of the artist’s identity. It was immediately apparent, however, that these slides offered far more than a traditional form of nineteenth-century magic-lantern entertainment; the images presented a unique visual record of the British prehistoric landscape as it still remained in the late nineteenth century.

The 1891 census and Kelly’s Directory reveal ‘H.M.J.U.’ to be Henry Michael John Underhill, a grocer living at 7 High Street, Oxford. The unfolding history of Henry Underhill and the way in which he used his slides to share information about natural history, folklore, and archaeology helped to reveal evidence of a large network of Oxford people from both ‘town and gown’ who shared a mutual interest in scientific discoveries about the past. Current histories of archaeology often overlook the contributions made by individuals like Henry Underhill. However, by the late nineteenth century, Underhill and amateurs like him, whose social position had prevented them from being members of national societies such as the British Archaeological Association, the Royal Archaeological Institute, or local county societies,1 were participating in the intellectual climate of an increasingly educated, articulate, and socially mobile population.2

Underhill had no direct association with Oxford University; he was never an undergraduate, although he contributed a great deal to its developing field of natural sciences through his support of the Oxfordshire Natural History Society and Field Club (ONHS), which was founded by members of both town and gown. From the 1870s many social and intellectual relationships emerged and were maintained among amateurs and professionals in Oxford through their creation
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Fig. 1. Henry Underhill (1855–1920). Underhill Collection, Folklore Society. (By kind permission of the Folklore Society.)
and membership of this society, which eventually, in 1901, became amalgamated with the older, more traditional, university Ashmolean Society.3

As well as being a citizen and grocer in Oxford, Underhill devoted his time to running the Sunday school at George Street Congregational Church4 and the Band of Hope Temperance Society. The only published reference to Underhill’s work is in Robert Gunther’s *Early Science in Oxford*.5

After his death, in 1920, Underhill’s activities in Oxford became neglected in civic and university circles and by the societies that he had helped to found. What follows is an attempt to reawaken interest in the achievements of this remarkable local man and to demonstrate that many of the intellectual changes in approach to the human past that emerged nationally during the latter half of the nineteenth century are reflected in his contributions to local scientific societies and journals.

**HENRY UNDERHILL OF OXFORD**

Henry Michael John Underhill was born at 7 High Street, Oxford, in 1855 (see Fig. 1).6 His father, also Henry, was a city alderman,7 a position that suggests the family had a certain civic status.8 The Underhills had been a prominent trading family in Oxford since the first quarter of the century: Michael Underhill, Henry’s grandfather, had founded the grocery business at 7 High Street, and it remained H. S. Underhill & Sons until 1920.9 The 1851 census shows that Michael Underhill and his wife employed twenty-three staff and lived above the shop10 with their two children, three servants, their married son, Henry (Henry Scrivener Underhill, Henry Underhill’s father), his wife, Annie, and his servant.

In the 1891 census Henry Underhill senior and his wife, Annie, and two servants were still living above the shop, with Henry, 36, and Maud, 27, who were both unmarried. In 1896, following the death of Henry Underhill senior, the shop in the High Street (see Figs 2 and 3) passed to Henry junior, who then became the proprietor and manager of the business until his own death in 1920. The business was sold in 1921 to the International Stores,11 and it is now occupied by Ryman’s Office Supplies.

From about 1910 Underhill’s shop in the High Street appears to have been less prosperous.12 This was possibly due to national political and economic factors, but it also coincides with a gap in the evidence for Underhill’s public and intellectual activities. He had been ill for fifteen months during 1908 and 1909,13 and the combination of both his illness and the pressure of business may help to explain the decline in his contributions to various societies from about 1900.

Many of the Underhills were founder members of George Street Congregational Church14 and played an active role in its maintenance. The Underhills also supported several educational and charitable schemes in Oxford. They helped to found a ragged school for the non-sectarian
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10 H.O.107/1728/1/1.
11 Closed 1933, *VCH Oxon*, 4, p. 422.
12 Scott Diaries, 31, 20 March 1911. The diaries are unpublished and owned by a distant relative.
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Fig. 2. Exterior of shop, photographed by Henry Underhill in the 1890s. Underhill Photographic Collection. 
(By kind permission of Oxfordshire County Council Photographic Archive.)
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Fig. 3. Interior of shop, showing the new electric lighting. Underhill Photographic Collection.
(By kind permission of Oxfordshire County Council Photographic Archive.)
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education of the poorest children of the city, and Henry Underhill senior was one of the founders of both the Oxford Boys’ and Girls’ High Schools. Henry’s younger sister, Maud, was the first girl to be enrolled on the register of Oxford Girls’ High School in 1875 in the company of many of the daughters of university teachers and local businessmen.

Henry Underhill had no active official political life himself, but entered into the social life of Oxford through the religious, philanthropic, and intellectual organizations supported by his family. In his obituary, Harry Paintin, a local journalist, described him as ‘a quiet, unassuming man who disliked confrontations and was deeply involved with the Oxford Temperance Society, especially the junior branch of the Band of Hope, and was also President of the George Street Congregational Sunday School’. Many of the finely painted lantern slides he created between 1889 and 1894 were to show to local children at these societies (see Fig. 4). The slides, particularly those depicting folk or fairy tales, were often part of the entertainments put on by George Street Sunday School or the Band of Hope. After Henry’s death, his sister, Annie Elizabeth Maud (1866–1946), with whom he had shared a house at 231 Woodstock Road, distributed his lantern slides, photographs, and technical equipment to relevant museums and societies in Oxford and beyond, including over two hundred of them to the Folklore Society.

THE UNDERHILLS AND THEIR SOCIAL CONTEXT

A unique source of information about the Underhill family and their social background is the diaries of Mabel Scott Underhill (1860–1949). In 1904 Mabel married Henry’s younger brother, Edward (1859–1924). Her diaries provide details of her life in Oxford between 1894 and 1924. Like Frank Bellamy’s privately published account of the Oxfordshire Natural History Society, the diaries provide a polarized view of local events, but they are also a valuable cultural archive. While they betray a rather superficial mind and indifferent education, they are a revealing eyewitness account of the social confusions experienced by a middle-class woman living between town and gown, for although married to an Oxford don, Mabel still had family connections in ‘trade’. The Underhills owned a ‘High Class Provision’ business in the High Street, which was central to the financial support of the family, and Mabel found adjusting to this situation after her marriage difficult. She felt her brother-in-law, Henry, was ‘very dull, stiff and old-fashioned’, and she showed little interest in his social or intellectual activities in natural history, archaeology, and philanthropic education. Nevertheless, her diaries are an exclusive source of social commentary and, like the work of Violet Butler in 1912, they are one of the few accounts that reveal the lives of both civic and academic communities in nineteenth-century Oxford.

By the nineteenth century, Oxford had a small elite of manufacturers and tradesmen, some possibly university graduates, who could move comfortably in the upper echelons of both town and gown. Well-connected Oxford families like the Morrells or the Lucys, however, were unlikely to socialize with the local grocer.

17 Paintin, ‘Obituary’, p. 5.
18 A note with the archive of his entomological notebooks at the Museum of the History of Science states ‘lent by Miss Underhill, 1935’, but fortunately they were never reclaimed: Oxford, Museum of the History of Science, MS Underhill.
19 See n. 3 above.
21 Ibid., 26, Dec. 1904.
Fig. 4. Fairyland Poster designed by Underhill. Bodl. MS G.A.Oxon 4* 270. (By kind permission of the Bodleian Library.)
The majority of the civic community from which the Underhills came was composed of small traders, artisans, and college servants. There appeared to be no great concentrations of labour within the community, and there was a wide gap between rich and poor. The discontinuity in the demand for goods and services during university vacations often caused chronic underemployment amongst the working population.

The social position of nineteenth-century shopkeepers has been neglected in academic studies of Victorian history, and they are often relegated to the role of onlooker or dependant in the historical process. According to Michael Winstanley, shopkeepers could be ‘the focus of resentment from below and mild scorn and condescension from above’. Victorian literature contains many examples of how they were viewed by contemporary society, from Charles Dickens’s Uriah Heap to H. G. Wells’s Mr Polly. Brock and Curthoys suggested that in Oxford the citizen described in nineteenth-century novels and memoirs was conventionally ‘the ingratiating and importunate tradesman, attending hat in hand at the side entrance of the college for the condescension of an order’. This observation is indeed supported by various accounts of the Underhill family. Apart from Mabel’s impression of ‘the shop’, a note in the Magdalen College archives reports that the undergraduates regarded Henry Underhill’s younger brother, Edward, Mabel’s husband, … with mild scorn for his want of background, coming as he did from a family in ‘trade’. He was christened ‘Squish’ from his kinship real or imaginary with a grocer of his name in the High Street; Underhill had all the spongy pliancy of the article in question without any of its pungency or flavour.

In the 1880s Edward Underhill was a Classics tutor at Magdalen, and there was frequent ridicule from college members as the family delivery van brought his weekly supply of groceries to the door.

After his father died, in 1896, Henry Underhill, his mother, sister, and one servant moved to 20 Bardwell Road, Oxford. Although this address was in the fashionable new suburb of North Oxford, it appears that Mabel still found the Underhills ‘beyond the pale’ socially, as Henry continued to work ‘at the shop’. Despite the contempt in which nineteenth-century tradespeople were held, and the belief that shopkeepers were not ‘academic theoreticians or philosophers’, such a distinction is oversimplified; between 1870 and 1900 in Oxford discoveries in natural history and prehistory were becoming part of the common intellectual ethos. The evidence for the life and work of Henry Underhill and his associate George Claridge Druce (1850–1932) shows that both men made a significant contribution to the social and intellectual life of the university and the city. Druce’s Flora of Oxfordshire was a major scientific study that has lasting value to this day.

30 Scott Diaries, 26, Nov. 1903.
31 Ibid., 26, Jan. 1904.
32 Winstanley, Shopkeeper’s World, p. ix.
EARLY INTELLECTUAL AND ARTISTIC DEVELOPMENT

Henry and his brother, Edward, were pupils at Christ Church Cathedral School in Oxford. Unfortunately no nineteenth-century records of the school exist, as they were burnt during an outbreak of ringworm in the early twentieth century, but the record of alumni for Magdalen College lists Edward Underhill as having attended Christ Church Cathedral School, and Henry Underhill’s journal later confirms this.35

Henry’s journal for 1871 contains further comments about his progress at school and includes details of his visits to ‘Mr Riviere’s’, which seemed to take place twice weekly during the school day. On 3 February he noted that Mr Riviere ‘expatiated on “My System of National Education”’.36 William Riviere (1806–76) was a professional artist and private teacher, who took pupils in Oxford at his studio in Park Town and later at his house, 36 Beaumont Street (now the Institute of Archaeology), where he died in 1876.38 Underhill appears to have had regular drawing lessons with Riviere at the university galleries in Beaumont Street, now the Cast Gallery, where he particularly mentions in his journal drawing classical figures, such as Marcus Aurelius and Laocoön.39 Riviere’s impact on the young boy’s artistic talent was probably very strong and can be seen later in Underhill’s accurate scientific illustrations.

The only primary source containing details of Henry Underhill’s early scientific work is the collection of exquisite notebooks at the Museum of the History of Science (see Plate 14). There are eight sketchbooks altogether and a small notebook, which began on 13 January 1871. Although the archives describe them as ‘Entomological Notebooks’, notebook 7 is a small, three-by-five-inch diary, kept between January and March 1871, which gives a detailed account of Underhill’s daily life during one term at Christ Church School. This supplies details of his educational and artistic training and provides valuable information about his early fascination with natural history. His observations and records of biological specimens are noted in minute detail, and their accuracy suggests that he had access to a variety of scientific information then available in Oxford.

Notebooks 5 and 6 contain records of the books on natural history that Underhill had used to make notes on drawings at ‘The Camera’ or ‘The Radcliffe’, the new Radcliffe Science Library opened at the University Museum in 1861.41 The books appear to be the standard reference materials of the day, often written by amateur clergymen-naturalists – for example, An Introduction to the Study of Microscopic Fungi by Cooke and Sowerby (1865), and Common Objects of the Microscope by J. G. Wood (1861).42

Underhill noted in his diaries that he regularly subscribed to two popular science journals, Hardwicke’s Science Gossip and the Journal of Postal Microscopy. The latter journal, founded in 1839, consisted of a network of subscribers and contributors who maintained a regular postal exchange of specimens of natural history. These could almost be called ‘specimens of curiosity’, as they were obtained from all over the world and exchanged by individuals to create microscopic slide collections at home.

34 Judith Curthoys, Christ Church Archivist, personal communication.
36 Ibid.
38 Obituary, Jackson’s Oxford Journal, 2 Sept. 1876, p. 7. Between 1850 and 1870 Riviere was a well-known genre artist, and with his son Briton he worked on the frescoes in the original debating hall of the Oxford Union, completing the work started in 1857 by the Pre-Raphaelite painters.
39 Underhill Archive, Notebook 7.
40 Ibid.
In 1875, with his cousin Frank J. Allen (1854–1942) from Somerset, who was also a keen naturalist and the son of the editor of the *Journal of Postal Microscopy*, Underhill contributed to a series on natural history, including 'Notes on the Diptera' in *Hardwicke's Science Gossip*.43 The articles were illustrated by black-and-white prints made from Underhill's watercolours in his sketchbooks. According to George McGavin, Curator of Entomology at the University Museum of Natural History, these printed reproductions in no way do justice to Underhill's techniques or the accurate detail of the colour shading.44 (See Plate 15.)

**UNDERHILL'S LECTURES**

Underhill began to lecture to the ONHS in 1887. Bellamy lists the topics he covered: ‘Spiders’ (1887), ‘Insect eyes’ (1888), and ‘Microscopic organisms from ponds (1889)’. Other lectures included 'Artistic Japan' (1890), 'Painting lantern slides' (1891), and 'A holiday in Norway' (1892).45 All lectures were illustrated with his hand-painted lantern slides, but at present no slides from his entomological lectures have been traced. The subject matter, however, coincides with his early sketchbooks in the Museum of the History of Science and his articles in *Hardwicke's Science Gossip*.

It is very likely that in the early 1890s Underhill’s interest in folk tales was influenced by the writer Andrew Lang (1844–1912), who during the 1880s and 1890s published a series of popular folk tales that contributed towards the trend for exploring folk traditions as survivals of an ancient past.46 The boundaries between academic disciplines were still fairly fluid in the late nineteenth century, and there was often a collective interest in natural history, folklore, archaeology, and anthropology. These ideas were examined by archaeologists, anthropologists, and folklorists, such as Edward Tylor (1871), Arthur Evans (1895), and MacRitchie (1893). In time their academic research became described as a science, and their methodologies were acknowledged to be legitimate forms of knowledge.47

In 1891 the members of the International Folklore Congress, led by Tylor and Lang, visited Oxford to tour the Pitt Rivers Museum.48 It is quite likely that as a committee member of the ONHS Underhill was involved with this event. In February 1893, possibly having been inspired both by Lang and the Folklore Society’s visit, Underhill adopted the ‘Folklore’ theme for his inaugural lecture as ONHS President. His lecture on ‘The age and distribution of folk tales’ was given ‘in the presence of the committee’, which included prominent Oxford academics such as E. B. Tylor, E. B. Poulton, and H. Balfour.49 The local press reported that Underhill’s lecture was ‘beautifully illustrated with magic lantern slides. He recited four tales from Russia, Japan, Ireland and England respectively, for each of which he had drawn between twenty and thirty pictures. ’50 The use of the word ‘recited’ suggests that Underhill may simply have told the tales and did not attempt to analyse their content. The same afternoon Underhill had previously given the same lecture ‘to a juvenile audience of nearly 400 children, in the Large Lecture Room of the Natural History Museum’.51 This children’s event may have been the inspiration for the annual series of
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44 George McGavin, Curator of Entomology, Oxford University Museum of Natural History, personal communication, 2002.
46 *The Blue Fairy Book* (1889) and *The Yellow Fairy Book* (1894), illustrated by H. J. Ford (1860–1941).
48 International Folklore Congress, October 1891.
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'Lectures to Children', officially inaugurated in 1894, which are given in the Museum of Natural History to this day under the aegis of the Ashmolean Natural History Society.

In Underhill’s illustrations of the folk tales ‘Dapplegrim’ in 1891 and ‘Guleesh’ in 1893 it is possible to identify references to local archaeological sites in the background. Some are merely ‘quotations’, such as his use of megaliths and a suggestion of Silbury Hill, but the landscape used for the Irish tale of ‘Guleesh’ is clearly the British earthwork at Ashdown, known as Alfred’s Castle, on the Berkshire Ridgeway (see below). This juxtaposition of archaeological landscape and folk tales was probably his own invention. He painted the site at Ashdown again for his collection of ‘Ancient Stone Circles of Britain’, completed between 1894 (see Plates 16 and 17).

UNDERHILL AND THE ANCIENT BRITISH LANDSCAPE

Underhill’s antiquarian interests in the British past may have been encouraged by the regular ONHS field trips, which were often led by experts of the day. He may also have attended lectures on prehistory given by Arthur Evans to the Ashmolean Society in 1888. These lectures remain unpublished, though five handwritten manuscripts still exist.

In Lecture 5 Evans suggested that megalithic stone circles such as Stonehenge were associated with the cult of the departed. They were not places of ‘sepulture’ [sic], but were often found in the immediate neighbourhood of ancient interment. He suggested that megalith building was ancestor worship displayed through ‘an advanced representative of the sepulchral form of architecture’. Later, in 1888, Evans connected this theory of ‘the cult of departed spirits’ with current ideas emanating from folklore and mythology and suggested that these could explain the legends of ‘warriors turned into stone’, such as those at the Rollright Stones and Carnac.

The lantern slides that first initiated this search for their creator were the forty-one hand-painted miniatures illustrating the sites, and in some cases the plans, of the British megalithic monuments of the Rollright Stones, Stonehenge (see Plate 18), Avebury, and Stanton Drew.

The collection provides a unique record of British megaliths as they appeared in the nineteenth century. The images of the Rollright Stones, Stonehenge, Avebury, and Wayland’s Smithy contain information that is available nowhere else, and as such they are an exceptional resource for their archaeological history. They are also a resource through which the social and cultural issues involved in the growth of British prehistory can be examined.

The preparation of the slides was a lengthy process; it seems to have taken Underhill about three months to complete each image. They were painted during the winter, using information from sketches and notes made the previous summer. Each slide carries the information of the date sketched, for example ‘Aug 24th, 1895’ and the date painted ‘Nov. 4 to 6 1895’. He scrupulously acknowledged the material he had used from earlier antiquaries, such as William Stukeley at Stonehenge and Avebury and C. W. Dymond at Stanton Drew.

52 Folklore Society Archives, Underhill Collection (uncatalogued).
56 Ibid., Lecture 5, p. 8.
60 Ibid.
The lecture that accompanied these slides, ‘Great Stone Circles’, was given to the ONHS on 8 February 1896. According to the local press, ‘Mr Arthur Evans, Keeper of Antiquities at the Ashmolean Museum, and Professor Poulton, Hope Professor of Entomology, were both in attendance and a long and interesting discussion took place afterwards.’

This lecture was Underhill’s first with a purely archaeological theme. It has not been possible to trace the details of the content of his talk, but an examination of contemporary material that explored the meaning of the prehistoric landscape might suggest the direction that his research was taking. By the mid-nineteenth century there was an increased interest in megalithic monuments, both in academic and popular circles. Many theories about the stone circles persisted; earlier ideas of John Aubrey and William Stukeley, who had connected the building of the stone circles with the Druids, had not been entirely discounted. Yet because of the plethora of theories, some more rational than others, the academic world was again beginning to take the study of stone circles seriously. Towards the end of the century this culminated in the British Association’s 1899 Commission to ‘formally study the Age of Stone Circles’. At the same time the general public, including popular ‘friendly societies’ such as the Ancient Order of Druids, were creating their own mythologies about the monuments.

The circumstances of Underhill’s lecture suggest the flexible relationship between amateurs and professionals in Oxford and of their willingness to share their mutual interests in the ‘discovery’ of a British prehistory. Many of these interests had been stimulated by the intellectual and religious enquiries which emerged from the middle of the nineteenth century. In Oxford, for example, the debate over the theories of human origins between Huxley and Wilberforce, which took place at the 1860 summer meeting of the British Association in the University Museum, heralded for many a more open exchange of scientific ideas.

Underhill’s talk on ‘Great Stone Circles’ took place in the same museum thirty years later to an interested group of both academic and lay people. The wide-ranging nature of the audience at Underhill’s talk suggests that in Oxford the subject of British prehistory had not by then become completely professionalized, and that it was of a general rather than specialized interest.

In 1895 Underhill’s office of President of the ONHS and his term of committee membership ceased. His father died suddenly in 1896, leaving the management of H. S. Underhill & Sons to him. From then on he appeared to concentrate more on photography, developing his own negatives and producing photographic lantern slides at home. He became a member the Oxford Camera Club in 1897, but did not take on such a prominent role as he had in the ONHS, from which he announced his resignation in 1902.

Underhill lectured to the Oxford Camera Club from 1900, but his topics were mainly on technical issues. He entered his photographs and photographic lantern slides in local competitions, and although some of his work ‘achieved honourable mention’, he never received one of the higher prizes. It may be that the medium of photography did not, as he believed, ‘have a soul’.
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70 Paintin, ‘Obituary’, p. 5.
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photograph entitled ‘Light and shade’ shows Wayland’s Smithy before its restoration in the twentieth century (see Fig. 5).

In 1907 Underhill completed a 'Photographic study of windmills', most of which were collected in Oxfordshire, Warwickshire, Berkshire, and Buckinghamshire. At the Annual Congress of Archaeological Societies in 1894 it had been proposed that local archaeological societies should ‘record in a photographic archive categories of prehistoric, Roman and Anglo-Saxon remains; ecclesiastical architecture; domestic architecture; village scenes; ethnographic subjects; objects of natural history and portraits of historical significance’. In 1897 the OAHS (not then amalgamated with the Oxfordshire Archaeological Society) set up a sub-committee with members from the Oxford Camera Club and the ONHS to coordinate the project for Oxfordshire.

Underhill became the Camera Club representative for this and created a collection of over sixty-four images of windmills, consisting of both painted and photographic lantern slides (see Plate 19). Copies of these images are now held at the Museum of the History of Science and at Oxfordshire Studies. The Underhill album of ‘Windmills at the Museum of the History of Science’ includes his handwritten explanations of the working mechanisms. As Tony Simcock, the Museum’s archivist points out, because many of these structures no longer exist, this is a valuable archive for industrial archaeologists.

At present there is very little evidence for Underhill’s intellectual activities after 1907. The photographic study of windmills seems to have been his last project until the end of the First World War. This may be due to personal difficulties with his health and increasing business responsibilities. On the other hand, he may have joined the local ‘war effort’, as from 1914 to 1915 he and his sister hosted a family of Belgian refugees.72

Underhill’s last photographic slides were taken in 1918 and 1919, during outings to places around Oxford, recording subjects such as ‘Along the Thames at Wolvercote’, ‘The River Dorn’, and ‘In Begbrook Woods’.73 He also revisited places along the Ridgeway, Wayland’s Smithy, Uffington, and the White Horse, possibly taking a short holiday, as indicated by a group photograph outside a cottage.

UNDERHILL AND THE MAGIC LANTERN

Lantern slides were used exclusively by Henry Underhill to accompany his lectures on natural history, folklore, and archaeology. During the late nineteenth century the lantern was used as a scientific instrument and as a medium for both visual education and entertainment. It accompanied lectures on literature, science, philosophy, and the fine arts.

It is possible that Underhill’s involvement with the children of the Oxford branch of the Band of Hope Temperance Movement during the 1880s first encouraged him to produce his own lantern slides. Many commercial slides available for loan from the National Temperance Society must have appeared crude to his artistic temperament.

Underhill’s techniques for painting lantern slides were influenced by his lessons with the artist William Riviere (see above) and through his practice of close observation of natural objects from studying microscopic creatures. According to his article on the techniques of creating lantern slides,74 it is probable that he presented exact replicas, or perhaps enhanced versions, of natural material or monuments and buildings, though his particular remit was accuracy of representation.

In 1925 a catalogue of Haverfield and Underhill slides was compiled by the Ashmolean
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73 Folklore Society Archive, Underhill Collection, ref. 1892.
Fig. 5. Wayland’s Smithy. Underhill Collection, Folklore Society Archives. (By kind permission of the Folklore Society.)
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Museum. The slides of prehistoric sites produced by Underhill were evidently exceptional for archaeological research, as the conditions set for borrowing suggest:

Slides … can be lent to bona fide lecturers … who are known to the Keeper of the Ashmolean, or who submit to him an introduction from some person known to and approved by him. The hand-coloured slides from the Underhill Collection, illustrative of Romano-British and prehistoric sites, cannot be lent except for use in Oxford itself, and must be taken out and returned by hand.

MEGALITHIC MONUMENTS

The Haverfield Catalogue indicates that originally the Underhill Collection contained sixty slides of megalithic monuments. Today eleven images of Stonehenge remain from the original eighteen and six slides of Avebury and the Rollright Stones (see Plate 20).

There is no record that Henry Underhill’s lectures on archaeology were ever published, but their contents can be inferred from the contemporary press reports, Bellamy’s account of Underhill’s involvement with the ONHS, and the list of his slides that were included in the 1925 Haverfield and Underhill collection. He always acknowledged information taken from other sources. As well as Stukeley’s works on Stonehenge and Avebury, which he consulted in the Bodleian, he also referred to more contemporary publications by those involved in similar research, particularly the work of Edgar Barclay at Stonehenge (see Plate 21).

Various drawings of Stonehenge have been in existence since the twelfth century, and surveys were carried out by Aubrey in 1666, Stukeley in 1740, Wood in 1747, and Flinders Petrie in 1880. By the 1820s the site had become dilapidated, stones had fallen or were being removed, and a guardian was appointed to prevent further damage. It was in this state that Underhill recorded the stones in 1895 (see Plate 22), drawing on Barclay’s reconstructions from his recently published book. The representations of Browne, Underhill, and Barclay appear similar, but not identical.

Underhill’s slides of Stonehenge are beautifully executed; the images of the megaliths and the surrounding landscape appear to be distinctive and accurate compositions, as his notes on the slide of the ‘View of Stone over which the sun rises on midsummer morning; view to Friar’s Heel from the interior’ would suggest. He painted six slides of the Rollright Stones on the Oxfordshire and Warwickshire border, showing that in 1895 they were on a bare heath. Though smaller than Avebury and Stonehenge, the sense of mystery at the Rollright Stones has been exaggerated by the folklore associated with them. In the late nineteenth century both Arthur Evans and Henry Taunt published accounts of the various legends of the stones, and their attraction continues to the present day.

One of Underhill’s slides featured the bicycle he used to reach these sites. This aspect is reminiscent of the custom of earlier antiquaries, who included a rustic shepherd or ancient Druid in their illustrations to create the required atmosphere. Here the bike represents a late nineteenth-

76 Ibid., p. i.
79 Henry Browne, *An Illustration of Stonehenge and Abury [sic] in the County of Wilts: pointing out their origin and character, through considerations hitherto unnoticed* (Salisbury, 1823).
80 Oxford, Institute of Archaeology, Underhill Collection, slide 780.
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Fig. 6. Avebury photograph (undated). Underhill Collection, Institute of Archaeology. (By kind permission of the Institute of Archaeology, University of Oxford.) Compare with Plate 24.
century scientific researcher and his equipment, adding a further dimension to the antiquarian drawings of the Rollright complex (see Plate 23).

Such legends of departed ancestors being transformed into stone present interesting archaeological and anthropological theories. In the late nineteenth century, Evans’s theories suggested the multi-disciplinary manner in which intellectual knowledge and interpretation of these sites was already being investigated. Similarly the current excavations of the wooden henges at Durrington Walls suggest that the original wooden structures were later replaced by stone pillars, possibly representing the permanent presence of the ancestors or humans being turned into stone.84

Avebury had been explored by Aubrey in 1648–9 and Stukeley in the 1720s; however, by the late nineteenth century more ‘scientific’ examinations of the site were taking place. Despite these nineteenth-century investigations, most of Underhill’s plans and maps of the site appear to have been taken from Stukeley.85 He also painted at least eight slides from personal observation using his own photographs as an aide-memoire (see Fig. 6 and Plate 24).

SOME BURIED ROMAN CITIES OF BRITAIN: LECTURES OF JULY 1895 AND MAY 1897

Until 2004 it appeared that Underhill’s slides of the Great Stone Circles was a unique find. Although records indicated that in 1895 and 1897 he gave talks at the University Museum with ‘exquisitely painted lantern illustrations of Buried Roman Cities in England’, to the Annual Conference of the Midland Union of Natural History Societies,86 there was no surviving evidence of this collection until the slides were located during a further search of the basement of the Institute of Archaeology.87

Underhill was amongst the pioneers of late nineteenth-century Oxford who began to show an interest in Roman Britain, as more remains were being uncovered through quarrying, building, and more intensive farming methods.88 His Romano-British slides were prepared later than the Great Stone Circles. According to the slides listed in the Haverfield Catalogue, he created illustrations of Wroxeter (Uriconium), Silchester, Bath, and North Leigh. Originally there were forty slides, but only nine are still in the collection, five of which are of Silchester.

Silchester was excavated between 1890 and 1909 by the Society of Antiquaries and the results published in Archaeologia. Underhill’s slides are dated 1895, which suggests that he visited the site during the excavations. These slides are now missing, but according to the catalogue description, they showed recently excavated monuments, the South and West Gates, the Forum, the round Temple, and artefacts.89

In 1895 Underhill created slides of the Roman villa at North Leigh for the meeting of the Midland Union of Natural History Societies and showed them to the delegates in preparation for a day’s excursion.90 North Leigh was first excavated in 1813 by Henry Hakewell and contained many preserved ‘geometric’ mosaics.91 Underhill’s hand-drawn plan of the villa is schematic and shows symmetrically placed rooms, which do not tally with a more exact plan. This slide was signed by

---

85 Underhill Collection, slides 744, 747.
86 Oxford Chronicle and Oxford Times, 6 July 1895; Bellamy, Ashmolean Natural History Society, pp. 184, 338.
87 The Archivist, Deborah Harlan, found a box containing another fourteen hand-painted and photographic slides.
89 Hogarth, List of Haverfield and Underhill Collection, p. vii.
90 Bellamy, Ashmolean Natural History Society, p. 339.
91 Ibid., p. 275.
Fig. 7. Mosaic at North Leigh Roman Villa (undated). Underhill Collection, Institute of Archaeology.  
(By kind permission of the Institute of Archaeology, University of Oxford.)
Underhill, which suggests that he did not copy it from published material, but drew it from his own observations, possibly also using his own measurements.\(^{92}\)

Underhill’s photographs of the mosaic floor of North Leigh, possibly taken around 1895, are today of immense significance to Roman archaeology, as they record the design before its reconstruction in the 1920s (see Fig. 7). According to Grahame Soffe, ‘The Underhill photographic slides of North Leigh villa provide unique and vital information about the survival of the design of the mosaic pavement in the principal dining room or triclinium (Room 1) before the mosaic was re-laid in the early 1920s. It was assumed that the mosaic as we see it today is as originally discovered, but thanks to Underhill, that reconstruction can now be proved to be incorrect.’\(^{93}\)

Underhill’s photographs show different geometric motifs in each central circular device of the mosaic, whereas the reconstructed mosaic displays the same repeated pattern. This new evidence is to be included in a forthcoming volume of the corpus of Romano-British mosaics.\(^{94}\)

In May 1897 Underhill repeated the lecture on ‘Buried Roman cities in England’, where ‘the exquisitely painted slides met with universal admiration’.\(^{95}\) The *Oxford Chronicle* reported that ‘sixty four persons were present’, and that ‘questions and discussions followed, to which members contributed, by mentioning various other Roman remains known to them in this neighbourhood and elsewhere’.\(^{96}\) It would be useful to find further information about the audience and the sites they discussed, as possibly they included Arthur Evans’s work on the Roman Villa at Frilford,\(^{97}\) or George Rolleston’s work at the Saxon cemetery,\(^{98}\) which is now believed to be of Romano-British origin.\(^{99}\)

CONCLUSION

In October 1920 Henry Underhill died from cancer, aged 65, at his house at 231 Woodstock Road, North Oxford. He was buried in the family grave at Wolvercote Cemetery and over 120 people from town and gown attended his funeral.\(^{100}\)

Although Underhill’s intellectual legacy is much less substantial than that of his friend and contemporary George Claridge Druce, his work was part of a long tradition of meticulous, cross-disciplinary observations that existed before the development of academic professional boundaries. His lantern slides, illustrations, and educational activities provided a foundation from which others were later able to benefit. His microscopic slides were used to illustrate a lecture by the Hope Professor of Zoology at Oxford, E. B. Poulton (1855–1943) on ‘Caterpillars and insect eyes’ at a conversazione in Northampton in 1888, held by the Midland Union of Natural History Societies,\(^{101}\) and during the twentieth century Underhill’s scientific presentations continued to receive recognition. His natural history slides were lent to the Museum for the History of Science by his sister, Maud Underhill, in 1935 to complement a small exhibition on microscopy to celebrate the tercentenary of the seventeenth-century scientist Robert Hooke (1635–1703).\(^{102}\) Recently further evidence showed that Underhill’s work also caught the attention of twentieth-century

\(^{92}\) Underhill Collection, slide 715.
\(^{93}\) Grahame Soffe, personal communication, 2007.
\(^{95}\) Bellamy, *Ashmolean Natural History Society*, p. 185.
\(^{96}\) *Oxford Chronicle*, 19 May 1897, p. 7.
\(^{98}\) G. Rolleston, ‘Researches and excavations carried on in an ancient cemetery at Frilford, near Abingdon’, *Archaeologia*, 42 (1870), pp. 417–85.
\(^{100}\) Paintin, ‘Obituary’, p. 5.
\(^{101}\) Bellamy, *Ashmolean Natural History Society*, p. 329.
Fig. 8. Pastel of underwater creatures by H. M. J. Underhill, 1885. (Photograph by T. F. Higham.)
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academics. In 1949, writing on the links between science and art, the art historian Kenneth Clark noted the similarity between a pastel of underwater creatures created by Underhill in 1885 and the work of Paul Klee (see Fig. 8).\textsuperscript{103} At the time the pastel was displayed in the library of Underhill’s friend E. B. Poulton, at the University Museum in Oxford, and presumably was intended as a scientific document.

Throughout his adult life, Henry Underhill had been dedicated to education and the diffusion of scientific knowledge. Although he was without formal academic qualifications, he spoke to many scientific societies on natural history, folklore, and ancient British sites, using his hand-painted slides to display his knowledge of the past. Sometimes, as in the case of North Leigh, they provide a unique historical record. In Oxford he was well known for entertaining children with magic-lantern-slide tales and writing and producing plays for them. As the eldest son, it may be that his artistic, technical, and scholarly interests had to be put second to the business of running the family shop.

A close examination of the scale of Underhill’s intellectual interests increases our awareness of the lives of other similar individuals who were part of the historic classification of ‘town and gown’, ‘amateur’, or ‘academic’ in nineteenth-century Oxford, though such binary divisions often impose simplistic culturally determined identities. Knowledge of the activities of Underhill and other members of the ONHS, Frank Bellamy and G. C. Druce, provides an interesting insight into the work of members of amateur scientific societies within the city and university. It highlights the position of those who today have been overlooked, but who made valuable contributions to the growth of knowledge.

The chance discovery of his forgotten archives has restored this neglected Victorian grocer, a gifted illustrator, entomologist, and antiquarian, to a place in the social and cultural history of Oxford. (See Plate 25) Henry Underhill invested his talents and interests in the community and left a legacy to be unearthed. The full potential of this legacy, especially in relation to windmills and natural history, has yet to be realized.
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