



Harry Longueville Jones, FSA, Medieval Paris and the heritage measures of the July monarchy

Pryce, Huw

Antiquaries Journal

DOI:

[10.1017/S000358151600024X](https://doi.org/10.1017/S000358151600024X)

Published: 01/09/2016

Peer reviewed version

[Cyswllt i'r cyhoeddiad / Link to publication](#)

Dyfyniad o'r fersiwn a gyhoeddwyd / Citation for published version (APA):
Pryce, H. (2016). Harry Longueville Jones, FSA, Medieval Paris and the heritage measures of the July monarchy. *Antiquaries Journal*, 96, 391-314.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S000358151600024X>

Hawliau Cyffredinol / General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

HARRY LONGUEVILLE JONES, FSA, MEDIEVAL PARIS AND THE HERITAGE MEASURES OF THE JULY MONARCHY

Huw Pryce

Huw Pryce, School of History, Welsh History and Archaeology, Bangor University, Bangor, Gwynedd LL57 2DG. Email: a.h.pryce@bangor.ac.uk

*This paper explores the hitherto overlooked influence of France on the archaeological interests and approach of Harry Longueville Jones (1806–70), whose best known contributions to archaeology centred on Wales. Focusing mainly on the period down to his co-founding of *Archaeologia Cambrensis* (1846) and the Cambrian Archaeological Association (1847), it analyses Jones's engagement with both archaeological monuments and heritage measures in France. The discussion assesses the significance of his recording of medieval churches in and around Paris while resident in the city c 1834–1842, including an unpublished report he submitted to the Minister of Public Instruction in 1840. Attention is also given to his role as one of the corresponding members for England of the French government's Comité historique des arts et monuments. Lastly, Jones is placed in the context of other British responses to the institutions established by the July Monarchy to study and safeguard historic monuments in France.*

Harry Longueville Jones (1806–70) is well known for his contribution to Welsh antiquarianism as co-founder of *Archaeologia Cambrensis* in 1846 and the ensuing Cambrian Archaeological Association (CAA) in 1847, initiatives with which he remained closely involved until his death. Yet, while clearly opening an important new phase in the study of the Welsh past, those initiatives may also be seen as the culmination of Jones's increasing engagement with archaeological developments over the previous decade whose main focus lay, not in Wales, but in France. This article argues that these earlier archaeological interests and endeavours, hitherto largely overlooked, have a twofold significance. First, they throw revealing light on the making of Jones as a self-styled archaeologist thereby providing essential background to the assumptions and approaches he brought to the study of Welsh antiquities. Second, they offer a notable instance of the influence on British antiquarians and

others of the July Monarchy's measures to survey and protect historic monuments in France.

BACKGROUND

Previous scholars have considered Jones's various interests and accomplishments, which extended well beyond archaeology.¹ However, coverage of these has been uneven. For example, his contributions to the Manchester Statistical Society, of which he became a corresponding member in 1838, have been briefly noticed, while studies of Victorian periodicals and literary culture have highlighted his staunchly Tory political views in some of the twenty-seven essays he published in *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* in the 1840s. In particular, Jones has been portrayed as exemplifying a paternalist vision of a hierarchical, organic society under the leadership of the landed aristocracy, a reaction to radical political, social and economic change inspired by a romantic medievalism that also informed his approach to archaeology, as we shall see.² By contrast, much more attention has been given to Jones's interest in education, above all as Her Majesty's Inspector for Church Schools in Wales (1848–64).³ This appointment helped to sustain his archaeological endeavours by providing him with the financial security he had previously lacked, thanks to an annual salary of £600, as well as ample opportunities to combine his official duties with visits to monuments across the length and breadth of the Principality.⁴

Assessments of the significance of Jones as an archaeologist have focused on his role in the formation of the CAA and its journal, *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, his close involvement with these until his death in 1870, and aspects of his interpretation of archaeological evidence in Wales.⁵ An important theme to emerge from this work is Jones's commitment to a critical, 'scientific' approach based on fieldwork combined, where appropriate, with analysis of written sources, which contrasted sharply with the fanciful bardic interpretations of the Welsh past espoused by his initial collaborator, the Revd John Williams Ab Ithel (1811–62), a divergence of views that helped to precipitate the latter's break with the CAA at the end of 1853.⁶ As far as Welsh archaeology is concerned, then, Jones has been located in a narrative of scientific progress.

The origins of his interest in the archaeology of Wales have, on the other hand, received little consideration, perhaps because it has been too readily assumed that Jones was Welsh and therefore that no explanation was needed. If so, the assumption requires qualification, as Jones was not only born and raised in London and educated at Cambridge but could claim Welsh descent only through his paternal grandfather, Thomas Jones of Wrexham (d 1799).⁷ Nevertheless, this partial Welsh pedigree may account for an early interest in Wales and its antiquities evident in his first publication, issued shortly after becoming a fellow of Magdalene College upon his graduation in 1828: a finely produced elephant folio volume, *Illustrations of the Natural Scenery of the Snowdonian Mountains* (1829). The ambitious scale of the enterprise was matched (and financed) by the securing of 137 subscribers. These almost certainly included two paternal uncles. Most striking, though, was the appearance of members of the royal family and aristocracy, headed by Princess Mary, Duchess of Gloucester (1776–1857), to whom the volume was also dedicated (a connection possibly facilitated by her residence at Gloucester House in Jones's birthplace of Piccadilly).⁸ Replete with engravings of fifteen drawings he had made, the work was markedly sympathetic to Wales and the Welsh language, as shown by its reliance on the grammatical and lexicographical works of William Owen [Pughe] (1759–1835), whose controversial Welsh orthography it reproduced.⁹

Jones explained that his aim was '[t]o supply a partial deficiency in the topographical illustration of Britain', and that he had not focused on antiquities as these had already been adequately treated by previous writers, notably Thomas Pennant (1726–98).¹⁰ Accordingly, as its title suggests, the work deals mainly with the landscape, and only one of the drawings includes an ancient monument (fig 1). Yet the book contains an annotated table of antiquities in Caernarfonshire as well as descriptions of individual monuments in the main text which show that Jones had already developed antiquarian knowledge and interests in two important aspects.¹¹ First, he drew extensively on earlier antiquarians of Wales, notably Pennant and Sir Richard Colt Hoare (1758–1838) but also, among others, Henry Rowlands (1655–1723) and Browne Willis (1682–1760).¹² Second, his comments on churches, evidently based on personal observation, display a familiarity with recently adopted terms for medieval architecture styles in England, especially Decorated Gothic and Perpendicular Gothic as influentially defined by Thomas Rickman in 1817.¹³ There is also early evidence of Jones's dislike of modern restoration that took insufficient

notice of a church's original architectural features.¹⁴ On the other hand, this scholarly and critical approach coexisted with a romantic, and at times Gothic, sensibility, most apparent in the evocation of episodes in the history of Conwy castle, where the visitor 'will often remember, with a pleasing regret, the solemn silence of its halls and the intricate gloom of its passages'.¹⁵ While he continued to be captivated by the romantic allure of archaeological sites,¹⁶ his accounts of these from the 1840s onwards demonstrate a capacity for systematic survey and description that is largely absent from his volume in 1829. This difference in approach (and genre) resulted from an increasing engagement with developments in archaeology gained while living in Paris.

JONES IN PARIS: THE APPEAL OF THE MIDDLE AGES AND THE PRESERVATION OF HISTORIC MONUMENTS

After his marriage c 1834 had required him to resign his Cambridge fellowship, Jones took up residence in the French capital, and remained there until he moved to Manchester in March 1842.¹⁷ Deprived of the income from his fellowship and probably with little other financial means, he may have been attracted to Paris owing to the lower cost of living than in England, in common with others among the city's numerous English inhabitants at that time.¹⁸ Jones supported himself as a writer and journalist, contributing to *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* and other periodicals as well as working alongside William Makepeace Thackeray (1811–63) on the newspaper *Galignani's Messenger* and updating *Galignani's New Paris Guide*.¹⁹ Many of Jones's writings in Paris comment on political, social and educational issues of the day, including the initiatives under the July Monarchy (1830–48) to record and preserve the historic monuments of France driven especially by François Guizot (1787–1874), historian, liberal reformer and dominant figure in the Orleanist regime.²⁰ The most important of these for the present discussion was the *Comité historique des arts et monuments* (Historical Committee on Arts and Monuments), under the authority of the Minister of Public Instruction. Originating in 1834 as part of what became known as the *Comité des travaux historiques*, but only established as a separate committee in 1837, its remit was 'to make known all the monuments of art in France';²¹ accordingly, its main task was the organisation of detailed surveys, based on questionnaires and other information supplied by its members and

correspondents, and to identify monuments needing protection or conservation. Its role as a body dedicated to recording and giving expert advice distinguished the *Comité* from the *Service des monuments historiques*, headed by the Inspector General of Historical Monuments, first Ludovic Vitet (1830–4), then Prosper Mérimée (1834–60), and supported from 1837 by a *Commission des monuments historiques* responsible to the Minister of the Interior. This had limited funds available for conservation, whose allocation was governed from 1840 onwards by a system whereby certain monuments were officially classified as Monuments historiques.²²

Jones was presumably predisposed to view these developments favourably by the antiquarian interests already evident in his work on the topography of north-west Wales, interests he continued to pursue after his arrival in Paris. He visited the private museum of Alexandre Lenoir (1761–1839) in 1835, and attended a lecture course on ‘Christian archaeology’ given by Adolphe Napoléon Didron (1806–67) and Albert Lenoir (1801–91), speaking respectively on architecture and on art and sculpture, in the Bibliothèque du Roi from late May to July 1838.²³ For Jones, attendance at these lectures both reflected and further stimulated a deepening engagement with archaeology in France that led to his writing a lengthy article that appeared in *The Foreign and Quarterly Review* in October 1838. This reviewed the lectures together with publications reflecting recent French approaches to (mainly medieval) art and architecture, namely two volumes by Alexandre du Sommerard and the annual reports for 1838 of the *Comité historique des arts et monuments* and *Commission des monuments historiques*.²⁴ (Baron Taylor and Charles Nodier’s *Voyages pittoresques et romantiques dans l’ancienne France*, a multi-volume work published from 1820 onwards, is also listed at the head of the article, but Jones only referred to this briefly by way of contrast with the more recent developments that chiefly engaged his attention.)²⁵ The publication of the article may in turn explain why Jones was nominated as one of the *Comité*’s eight corresponding members from England in January 1839, although it was only during the subsequent fortnight that he submitted a copy to the *Comité*, which evidently approved of its noticing ‘the archaeological movement which is starting from France and giving an impetus to England’.²⁶ Further recognition of his antiquarian qualifications came with his election in February 1840 as a member of the Société de l’Histoire de France, founded by Guizot in 1833, and as a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries of London in June 1841.²⁷

The article of 1838 not only reveals that Jones had developed his knowledge of antiquarian scholarship, in both Britain and France, since the publication of his volume on north Wales nine years earlier but also offers valuable insights into why he had become attracted to medieval Paris and the heritage measures of the July Monarchy. One stimulus for its composition may have been an article by Thomas Wright (1810–77) in the same periodical two years earlier. This focused sympathetically on Guizot's initiatives to publish French historical sources, including the history of the arts, and noticed the establishment of the *Comité*'s immediate predecessor in January 1835.²⁸ However, rather than merely reprising Wright, Jones offered his own perspective. Evidently drawing on a wider range of sources than the French works it reviewed, his article provided a perceptive and wide-ranging comparison of approaches in Britain and on the Continent, especially in France, to 'the study of the arts, the architecture, and the manners of the middle ages' from the seventeenth century onwards.²⁹ This celebrates the achievements of British antiquarians from William Camden onwards, while also acknowledging the contribution of their French counterparts, notably the Benedictines; condemns the neglect of historic monuments in France that reached its nadir during the French Revolution; and welcomes the changes instigated by the July Monarchy to survey and protect 'national antiquities' and the associated emergence of 'the Modern Archaeological School of France'.³⁰

At first sight, Jones's praise of the July Monarchy seems out of keeping with his condemnation of it in *Blackwood's Magazine*, where he was amongst its harshest critics, declaring that, in moral and political terms, 'we have nothing, absolutely nothing, to wish to imitate from the French'.³¹ Moreover, it might be thought that his belief that the aristocracy were the natural leaders of society would have engendered little sympathy for measures that smacked of the centralizing ambitions of the French state. However, his attitude to the French aristocracy was decidedly ambivalent. There is nothing to suggest support for the legitimist nobility who remained loyal to the Bourbon dynasty after the abdication of Charles X in 1830, some of whom responded to their political marginalisation through engaging in antiquarian pursuits in the provinces.³² Much as he hoped for an eventual restoration of aristocratic rule, Jones recognised that the prospects for this were poor. In part, this was due to the severe impact of the French Revolution. But he held that blame also rested with the 'old aristocracy [for] having passed a suicidal sentence on themselves since 1830, by

tacitly withdrawing from the political scene'.³³ In addition, the aristocracy of western Europe had a poor track record when it came to 'national monuments'. Thus, while in France the Catholic Church and religious orders 'were two powerfully conservative causes that kept together the traditional taste and monuments of the middle ages', the aristocracy had been slow to appreciate a duty 'closely concerning their own honour' to protect 'national antiquities' that were 'the works of their ancestors'; it was only 'the revolutionary violence of popular tumults' that at last instilled in them 'a true perception of [. . .] the sublime and beautiful of the middle ages'.³⁴ For Jones, then, conservation and conservatism went hand in hand. As he put it in 1845, 'efforts [. . .] for the preservation and study of national antiquities [. . .] would help the genius of true conservatism, and would foster respect for all that is venerable in our National History'.³⁵ He interpreted the heritage measures of Louis-Philippe's government in a similar light when he maintained that these sought 'to obliterate the traces of the great revolution' – something of an exaggeration given the regime's desire to reconcile the revolutionary and monarchical traditions.³⁶

His assessment of the political situation may help to explain why Jones appears to have been fairly detached towards the efforts, led by the notable Norman antiquary and legitimist Arcisse de Caumont (1801–73), to develop provincial antiquarian societies independent, and sometimes sharply critical, of the state's initiatives.³⁷ There is no evidence that he visited Caumont or attended his congresses, unlike a substantial number of British antiquarians at this time, including other corresponding members of the *Comité* such as Rickman, Whewell and Pugin. Nor, when he came to establish the CAA, did Jones follow the example of Charles Roach Smith, who reportedly urged Thomas Wright that the body, later called the Société française d'archéologie, founded by Caumont in 1834, could serve as a model for the British Archaeological Association.³⁸ True, Jones acknowledged that provincial antiquarians had contributed to the formation of 'the New Archaeological School of France', strongly imbued with a taste for the Middle Ages. Thus he praised Caumont as an important pioneer of the French antiquarian and archaeological movement, and celebrated the formation of antiquarian societies in French *départements*.³⁹ Nevertheless, Jones was even more admiring of Guizot,⁴⁰ and had no doubt that provincial developments had only been brought to fruition by the central government's imposition of a coherent and well-funded programme of studying, classifying, and preserving historic monuments.⁴¹

Jones did not explain the July Monarchy's heritage measures in purely political terms. He also pointed to 'a secret influence', promoted by the king, in favour of 'the works of art and monuments of the middle ages', as well as the upsurge in romantic medievalism given early expression by Chateaubriand and stimulated above all by Victor Hugo's evocation of medieval Paris in his novel *Notre-Dame de Paris* (1831).⁴² The work of Taylor and Nodier was also praised for 'popularizing the taste for medi-aeval [sic] antiquity'.⁴³ There can be little doubt that Jones, too, shared this passion for the Middle Ages and found Paris an ideal place in which to indulge it. He noted that 'the rage [...] for the Moyen Age' had seized both 'the common people' and 'the upper classes of society'. Among the former, young men had adopted the clothing, long hair and beards associated with the fifteenth century, whereas the latter amassed antiquarian collections and also refurbished 'their feudal chateaux' and erected 'Gothic villas'. In addition, 'even shops and cafés are built in the pointed style', an especially fine example being the Café Musard on the rue Vivienne (and thus close to Galignani's premises).⁴⁴

If he was struck by how the medieval influenced contemporary culture, what impressed Jones most about Paris was the unrivalled opportunity it offered to experience the Middle Ages themselves.

There are few English visitors of the gay metropolis of France who give themselves the trouble, or who like to expose themselves to the not always pleasant task of piercing through the older parts of the town in search of the remains of the middle ages, with which it still abounds. The heart and core of Paris remains in many respects the same as it was centuries ago; the width of the streets, the height of the houses, the wretched pavements, the dirt and the stench, are in many a quarter that we could point out much about the same as they were in the time of Francis I [king of France 1515–47].⁴⁵

Likewise a few years later Jones wrote that enough remained in the Rue Saint Denis 'to show it is a child of the middle ages; and like so many other children of the same kind, it contributes to make its mother Paris, as compared with the modern-built capitals of Europe, a town of former days'.⁴⁶ However, like other contemporaries with romantic sensibilities, Jones also thought that there were limits to the exotic allure of

medieval Paris, for all its aesthetic appeal. Thus, while enthusing that ‘[t]here is more of colour, of light and shade, of picturesque, fantastic outline, in a hundred yards of the Rue St Denis, than in all the line from Piccadilly to Whitechapel’, he took pains to reassure his readers that ‘we never dined there! *Oh non! il ne faut pas faire ça!*’⁴⁷ Likewise, by February 1840 he resided with his family at 28 rue Bréda, in a recently developed neighbourhood south of Montmartre situated at a safe distance from the city’s malodorous medieval core.⁴⁸

While inspired by romantic medievalism, in engaging with the French Middle Ages Jones did more than take pleasure in their aesthetic delights. He also studied medieval churches and other buildings and campaigned for their preservation. Here he shared the objectives of the bodies set up under the July Monarchy to record and protect France’s artistic and archaeological heritage, including the *Comité* of which he became a foreign corresponding member in 1839. As the first official recognition of his antiquarian credentials, the status of corresponding member of the *Comité* probably mattered more to Jones than to the other seven corresponding members for England nominated in 1839, all of whom had well established reputations in relevant fields, with two having the added distinction of being MPs.⁴⁹ These were all older than Jones apart from the Gothic Revival architect and designer A. W. N. Pugin (1812–52), who was the only English corresponding member known to have attended a meeting of the *Comité* in Paris (during a visit to inspect the restoration of the Sainte Chapelle in May 1844), when colour plates he exhibited from his forthcoming *Glossary of Ecclesiastical Ornament and Costume*, together with samples of neo-medieval vestments he had designed, elicited an enthusiastic response.⁵⁰ Thomas Rickman (1776–1841), William Whewell (1794–1866) and Henry Gally Knight (1786–1846) had published extensively on medieval architecture and had previous connections with France, while the illustration, collection and preservation of antiquities numbered among the accomplishments respectively of John Britton (1771–1857), John Heywood Hawkins (1802–77) and John Gage Rokewood (1786–1842), the last of whom was also Director of the Society of Antiquaries of London.⁵¹

In thanking Didron for his appointment as an English corresponding member, Jones undertook to publicise the work of the *Comité* among his compatriots and also to send reports on analogies and differences between the antiquities of England and those of France.⁵² He thereby signalled his readiness to conform with the *Comité*’s expectation that foreign corresponding members would contribute to the study of

French art both by commenting on stylistic developments revealed by illuminated manuscripts in libraries across Europe, and by providing information on French paintings, statues, seals and other artefacts held abroad.⁵³ As we shall see, Jones was quick to fulfil the first undertaking, and after his relocation to Manchester in 1842 went some way towards fulfilling the second by offering observations on English medieval architecture in Calais, reporting on Roman and medieval antiquities in north Wales, and requesting information on Celtic place-names in Savoy and Switzerland.⁵⁴ However, unlike other English corresponding members, based in England, he did not initially report on artefacts and sites in Britain.⁵⁵ Rather, his immediate focus remained the historic monuments of France. In particular, he took advantage of his continuing residence in Paris to examine the city's medieval churches and other buildings, and by the summer of 1839 he had begun a concerted attempt to survey some of these.⁵⁶

JONES AND MEDIEVAL FRENCH CHURCHES

On 27 February 1840 Jones sent the Minister of Public Instruction a lengthy report in French on his survey of Paris churches, which was considered by the *Comité* the following month (fig 2).⁵⁷ This provides the fullest testimony to Jones's archaeological endeavours in Paris, and was intended as part of the preparation for

a work, to be published in London, on the medieval monuments and architecture of Paris and its environs [...] I have accordingly visited all the monuments of the capital that are more or less connected with the Middle Ages, and for quite a large number I have made drawings, drawn up plans and taken notes.⁵⁸

The drawings and plans have not survived, and the projected publication never appeared, although after his return to Britain Jones offered a chronological assessment, based on his own observation, of the medieval architecture of central Paris in the *Archaeological Journal*.⁵⁹ This also briefly alludes to the interest of 'the medieval edifices of a circle of ten miles radius' of the city.⁶⁰ However, the only evidence of his survey of these is the report submitted to the Minister of Public Instruction, which consists of descriptions of forty-nine churches in the departments

of the Seine (S) and Seine-et-Oise (SO). (Thirty-six of the churches described lay in the former, in contrast to thirteen in the latter, whose survey Jones had still to complete.)⁶¹ However, coverage was far from comprehensive, and stands in contrast to the detailed coverage demanded by the *Comité*'s questionnaire in its thirty questions on medieval churches in each commune.⁶² This was mainly because the work formed the basis of a projected publication on medieval monuments, and therefore Jones deliberately focused his attention on churches dating from the Middle Ages and Renaissance.⁶³ Accordingly, fourteen churches dating from the seventeenth century onwards were usually only listed with a brief indication of date. Much the same was true of the well known medieval churches of Saint-Denis (S), Montmartre (S), the chapel of Ste Geneviève at Nanterre (S), Montmorency (SO) and Poissy (SO), which were named 'only for the record' with barely any further comment. Moreover, the descriptions of the remaining thirty churches vary considerably in length.⁶⁴ Likewise, though he claims to have recorded the dimensions of the churches surveyed,⁶⁵ Jones gave no measurements in the report, which merely indicates, with respect to twenty-seven of the churches, that many were 'small', some of 'medium size', and only one, Rueil (SO), 'large'.

Despite its partial coverage and summary nature, the report illuminates two facets of Jones's engagement with the medieval buildings of Paris that would later characterise his approach to churches and other monuments in Wales: recording and campaigning.⁶⁶ In addition to fieldwork, he had drawn on published antiquarian accounts, namely 'the great and scholarly work of the abbé Lebœuf, and the great topographical collection of the Bibliothèque du Roy', as well as the plans and illustrations of the abbey church of Montmartre published by Albert Lenoir in the first instalments of his *Statistique monumentale de Paris* (1840–67).⁶⁷ Jones also spoke to the priests of the communes he had visited, stating that they had been unfailingly polite and welcoming, with several standing out for their 'zeal for archaeology and enlightened knowledge' (an assessment entirely in line with the *Comité*'s expectations of the clergy).⁶⁸ Accordingly he would tell his compatriots 'what an admirable passport the simple title of foreign archaeologist may be in the suburbs of Paris, and likewise, as I have already often had the fortune to find, for many departments of France' – a revealing indication both of his self-identification as an archaeologist and of his travels beyond Paris.⁶⁹ Jones added that he had distributed numerous copies of

the *Comité*'s forms among the clergy, and suggested that its printed *Instructions* could be very useful if disseminated more widely in the suburbs.⁷⁰

Together with other evidence, the report sheds valuable light on how Jones understood the monuments he studied, especially with respect to the classification and evaluation of architectural styles. As we have seen, in keeping with the medievalist taste of the time, Jones privileged churches and other buildings of the Middle Ages and Renaissance. However, he discriminated between different periods within that era, albeit, in contrast to his publications on such monuments, without recourse to current stylistic terminology (apart from one reference to a modern restoration, mentioned below). This is particularly evident in the distinctions drawn in the report between different phases of fabric. In part, this was simply a matter of descriptive identification. For example, at Colombes (S) he attributed most of the church to the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the surviving apse and possibly the tower to the tenth century.⁷¹ In addition, though, such dating evidence was also often linked to assessments of a building's significance informed by two distinct, though sometimes overlapping, criteria: archaeological significance and aesthetic beauty. In his introductory comments Jones stressed that churches of the tenth to twelfth centuries possessed especial archaeological value.⁷² This could be seen as consistent with the growing appreciation of Romanesque architecture by both British and French writers over the previous two decades. However, Jones never describes these churches as beautiful, highlighting instead their primitive and unsophisticated nature, a view that seems to echo earlier condemnations of the Romanesque as 'uncouth, rude, and unformed'.⁷³ The same is true of his later reference to 'the heavy Romanesque (*Romane*) period'.⁷⁴ By contrast, beauty was a quality he reserved for Gothic of the late twelfth to fifteenth centuries and the Renaissance architecture that followed, which Jones later referred to as 'the closing style of the middle ages'.⁷⁵ The distinction is clear in his description of Deuil (SO). On the one hand, 'the nave with its aisles is probably of the ninth or tenth century, of a remarkable simplicity and rudeness of workmanship'. However, 'the choir in the apse is of the more beautiful epoch of the thirteenth century', with a series of columns behind the stalls 'of an exquisite workmanship [...].'⁷⁶ Likewise the mainly early thirteenth-century churches of Arcueil (S) and Vitry (S) were both deemed 'very beautiful'; in the former, the capitals in the nave were 'of a very unusual boldness' and 'the small columns of the galleries and side aisles [...] of a remarkable elegance and purity'.⁷⁷

From a later period, Aubervilliers (S) was a ‘beautiful church’ of the fifteenth century, remarkable for its bold arcades and delicate capitals, its tower, bearing the date 1541, ‘a very beautiful example of the Renaissance’.⁷⁸

This last comment was consistent with Jones’s praise of French Renaissance buildings as being more magnificent than their sixteenth-century English counterparts in his review article of 1838.⁷⁹ This formed part of a comparison of French and English architectural styles in which Jones also insisted, in contrast to William Whewell and Robert Willis (1800–75), on the superior merits of French Flamboyant architecture over most examples of English Perpendicular.⁸⁰ On the other hand, he agreed with ‘all French and British authorities of weight’ that the Decorated style which came to an end in England shortly after 1400 marked ‘the perfection of Pointed architecture’, citing the examples of Rouen, Amiens and Lincoln.⁸¹ By 1846, though, Jones explained his choice of fourteenth-century architecture as a model for a new church he was designing on the grounds that this constituted ‘the truly national style’ of England, without any parallel in France, thereby implicitly rejecting the privileging by Didron – in common with the architects Lassus and Viollet-le-Duc – of thirteenth-century French Gothic as a universally applicable style.⁸² In his treatment of architectural styles, then, Jones showed himself to be both widely read and independent-minded, informed by comparisons between England and France and adopting an eclectic terminology that combined elements from Rickman with frequent use of ‘pointed’ as a general descriptor for Gothic.⁸³

The report submitted to the Minister of Public Instruction in 1840 also drew attention to the condition of the churches described and, where necessary, sought to secure their preservation. Montreuil (S) and Stains (S) were well maintained, the western façade of the former a recent construction ‘in the pointed style (*style ogival*)’, following the drawings of M. Molinos, architect of the department; likewise recent repairs at Poissy (SO) had been ‘conducted with great intelligence’.⁸⁴ By contrast, though, Arcueil (S) and Fontenay-sous-Bois (S) ‘are in a state of degradation that is very painful to see’. The original plan of Arcueil had been spoiled by earlier alterations, soil surrounding the church was causing dampness, and children were using stones from it ‘for their ballistic exercises’; indeed, on his last visit Jones had seen stones fall into the nave. He stressed that the priest had long appealed in vain to the communal authorities to undertake repairs; moreover, although the architect of the department had now drawn up a plan for these, the priest feared that ‘many of the

most precious details would disappear if these repairs were not made under the control of some very enlightened archaeologists and architects'. Accordingly Jones concluded that the building merited full attention from 'the conservators of public monuments'.⁸⁵ At Fontenay-sous-Bois the situation was even graver, as the department's architect had responded to the church's 'deplorable state' by ordering its almost total demolition. However, Jones held that the church could be repaired, mainly by reducing its height and providing a new roofing without wooden beams.⁸⁶

In early March 1840, shortly after submitting his report to the Minister of Public Instruction, Jones warned the *Comité* of several other monuments under threat, including the church of Saint-Julien-le-Pauvre and the conventual college of the Bernardins, on the left bank of the Seine, a fourteenth-century edifice which was in danger of being converted into a barracks for the municipal guard.⁸⁷ The following year Jones alerted readers of the *Gentleman's Magazine* to the latter building's importance 'as a *chef d'œuvre* of Gothic Architecture', illustrated with a drawing he had made of the college (fig 3), and elaborated on the threats it still faced, while noting that these had been temporarily checked by the freeze on new building projects owing to 'the absurd project of the fortifications of the city of Paris' (a controversial scheme inaugurated in April 1841).⁸⁸

These campaigning efforts had mixed results. The condition of the Bernardine college still caused concern in 1845.⁸⁹ On the other hand, Jones's appeal to the Minister of Public Instruction had some effect, as his report was sent to the *Comité*, which in turn forwarded his information to the Minister of the Interior, expressing the hope that the church of Fontenay-sous-Bois would be preserved from mutilation and that that of Arceuil would receive the urgent repairs it required. By 27 May 1840 a copy made of the report had been made for the Minister of the Interior, who agreed that the Inspector General of Historic Monuments would visit those churches whose archaeological merit and state of degradation made them eligible for financial support from the budget allocated to ancient monuments.⁹⁰ Although such support appears not to have been immediately forthcoming, the church of Arcueil was classed as a Historic Monument in 1850. Moreover, the plans mentioned by Jones for its restoration were carried out in the early 1840s by their author, the departmental architect Auguste Molinos, while Fontenay-sous-Bois was restored by Molinos's successor, Claude Naissant, a few years later.⁹¹

THE COMITÉ HISTORIQUE DES ARTS ET MONUMENTS AS AN EXAMPLE
FOR GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

Although Thomas Wright had previously touched on Guizot's initiatives to treat art and architecture as sources for the French past, including surveys conducted by Mérimée as Inspector General of Historic Monuments,⁹² Jones's article in 1838 on the restoration and revival of France's medieval architectural heritage appears to have been the first substantial account of the *Comité* and related institutions in an English-language publication. Both contributions to *The Foreign and Quarterly Review* were symptomatic of a wider interest in the institutions established under the July Monarchy to record and preserve historic monuments among the antiquarian-minded in Great Britain and Ireland, and more widely in Europe, in the following years. Indeed, the *Comité* won increasing renown in Europe, thanks in part to its appointment of foreign corresponding members.⁹³ Accordingly it came to be regarded as a model for the study and preservation of historic monuments whose influence extended well beyond France and informed efforts to develop national archaeology elsewhere.

Its energetic secretary Didron was quick to make this influence a matter of patriotic pride. In May 1840 he claimed that the *Comité* had inspired proposals to establish analogous bodies in Austria and Great Britain and to extend state protection from ancient to Byzantine monuments in Greece:

Thus the archaeological movement in which France has taken the glorious initiative is destined to propagate itself in Europe; and the monuments of Christian architecture, unappreciated and ruined and destroyed down to the present, will be placed under the protection of the governments themselves.⁹⁴

However, while such declarations reflect the *Comité*'s aspirations, the evidence adduced in their support was slender, and their fulfilment depended on factors beyond the *Comité*'s control. True, many states were introducing measures to preserve historic monuments from the early nineteenth century onwards.⁹⁵ However, the process was prolonged, and the extent to which it was indebted to the *Comité* and other institutions established under the July Monarchy varied. With respect to the last

example cited by Didron, the royal decree of 1837 prohibiting the destruction of Byzantine monuments and subsequent measures to the same end, while consistent with the *Comité*'s concern to safeguard medieval Christian art and architecture, resulted above all from the legitimizing priorities of the regime of Otto, first king of Greece (1833–62).⁹⁶ On the other hand, the steps taken to preserve heritage by German states, especially Prussia from the early 1840s, were modelled on the French government's initiatives (though not primarily the *Comité*).⁹⁷

The *Comité*'s influence beyond France was greatest on individuals with antiquarian and archaeological interests. Harry Longueville Jones is an early and important example. His sympathetic account of French heritage measures in 1838 maintained that Great Britain had much to learn from its continental neighbour: not only were the recommendations of the Commission on Historic Monuments 'applicable to other countries besides France', but he urged 'young English architects [...] to profit by the example of their brethren of France, who are now turning the traditions of the middle ages to profit, in the embellishment of the capital'.⁹⁸ He subsequently kept to his commitment to publicise the *Comité*'s work in the press. In April 1839 he sent the *Gentleman's Magazine* a translation of the questionnaire prepared by the *Comité* for its correspondents, prefaced by a letter suggesting 'that a similar set of questions might be modified and adapted to the antiquities of the British islands, and circulated on the authority of any competent body – and none more fit than the Antiquarian Society'. He further recommended they be sent to all the parish clergy of England as well as 'the local antiquarian and scientific or literary societies of Great Britain'.⁹⁹ Jones also planned, together with Thomas Wright, to publish an English translation of the *Comité*'s *Instructions*, complete with woodcuts taken from the accompanying plates.¹⁰⁰ Although this appears not to have materialised, it is likely that further reports of the *Comité*'s activities in the *Gentleman's Magazine* were indebted, at least in part, to Jones.¹⁰¹

As the reference to Wright indicates, Jones was not alone in turning to the measures of the July Monarchy for inspiration in promoting antiquarian endeavours in Great Britain and Ireland. In November 1838 the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) sought information about the institutions responsible for historic monuments from the French Minister of the Interior.¹⁰² By April 1839 the Liberal MP Joseph Hume had requested two copies of the *Comité*'s reports, circulars, questionnaire and *Instructions*, and also declared his intention of pressing for the establishment of a

comparable institution in England.¹⁰³ Both John Britton and Jones made similar undertakings the following year.¹⁰⁴ In 1841 Hume secured the appointment, under his chairmanship, of a parliamentary Select Committee on ‘National Monuments and Works of Art’ which received detailed evidence from Britton, who strongly advocated establishing a body on the lines of the *Comité* in order to help ensure the preservation of cathedrals and other historic public buildings in England.¹⁰⁵ However, these and other attempts to establish a British equivalent of the *Comité* and other French heritage bodies proved unsuccessful. Thus when Thomas Wyse, MP for Waterford, pressed in June 1845 for the appointment of a royal commission to consider how best to establish ‘a Museum of National Antiquities in conjunction with a Commission for the conservation of National Monuments’, his motion was defeated after the Chancellor of the Exchequer objected that such matters were the responsibility of private owners rather than the state and that they could result in considerable expenditure.¹⁰⁶

Wyse had already demonstrated a concern for the study and preservation of antiquities in 1843, when he urged the government to follow the example of the French *Comité* by arranging for ‘a well-digested classification’ of monuments in order ‘to complete a general and complete outline, if no more could be attained, of the antiquities of Ireland’. This formed part of his evidence to a Select Committee established as the result of a campaign to persuade the British government to continue publication of the historical memoirs produced by the Topographical Department of the Irish Ordnance Survey, following the suspension of the scheme in 1840 after the appearance of only one volume, on the parish of Templemore, Co Londonderry (1837).¹⁰⁷ Wyse’s references to the *Comité* were noticed favourably by several commentators who stressed the value of the memoir scheme.¹⁰⁸ However, neither that testimony nor the Select Committee’s report recommending continuation of the memoirs overcame the opposition of Peel, who announced their termination in July 1844.¹⁰⁹

By contrast, the Young Irisher Thomas Davis (1814–45) invoked French example to urge all sections of Irish society to ensure the protection of the island’s historic monuments without assistance from the government.¹¹⁰ In Britain, too, the *Comité* proved most influential in the unofficial sphere, as antiquarian and related societies identified with its objectives. RIBA claimed to have similar aims to the heritage agencies established by the July Monarchy, though not the *Comité*

specifically, as early as November 1838.¹¹¹ By 1844, thanks to Albert Way, both the Society of Antiquaries and the British Archaeological Association (BAA) had formed links with the *Comité*, and Thomas Wright went so far as to maintain that the BAA was analogous to the French body.¹¹² Likewise Didron numbered among the forty ‘Honorary Foreign Members’ of the Archaeological Institute, being explicitly described as ‘Secretary to the “Comite [sic] des Arts et Monuments”’.¹¹³ On the other hand, from 1845 the Ecclesiastical Society gave a cooler welcome to the *Comité*’s restoration projects.¹¹⁴

There were parallels elsewhere in Britain and Ireland, then, for Jones’s efforts to ensure that French example informed the initiatives he took with respect to Welsh antiquities in the mid-1840s, as co-founder of *Archaeologia Cambrensis* and the CAA. A full assessment of the impact of those efforts on the CAA lies beyond the scope of the present discussion.¹¹⁵ However, they merit attention as evidence of the continuing influence on Jones of connections and approaches established over the previous decade. That he kept an admiring eye on developments in France is shown by his subscribing to Didron’s *Annales archéologiques*, founded in 1844, and the warm recommendation, almost certainly from his pen as editor, of both that and other French archaeological publications in *Archaeologia Cambrensis*.¹¹⁶ Indeed, he claimed to Didron that *Archaeologia Cambrensis* was modelled on the *Annales Archéologiques*, explaining, in phraseology tailored to his French recipient, that it was intended ‘above all for the Bretons of England and France’, and requesting help in finding correspondents from Brittany.¹¹⁷ He thus turned to a figure at the heart of the ‘archaeological movement’ in France in order to try and ensure that his archaeological project in Wales had Breton connections.

Jones again acknowledged his debt to France and emphasised the importance of the French government’s heritage measures in the opening article of the first issue of *Archaeologia Cambrensis* in January 1846.¹¹⁸ This also announced that the journal would ‘follow the example of the French Government Commissions, and [.] print sets of instructions, questionaries [sic], or formularies, by which the antiquary will be greatly aided in his operation, from knowing *what*, and *how*, to observe’.¹¹⁹ Such a set of questions duly appeared in the next number of *Archaeologia Cambrensis* in April 1846, where they were presented as the first of several. They specifically covered ‘Celtic remains’ (thereby echoing the *Comité*’s *monumens Gaulois*, and likewise corresponding to what we would call prehistoric monuments), and described as

having been ‘derived partly from the “Instructions” and the “Questionnaire” issued by the Comité Historique in France’.¹²⁰ Jones was thus swift to adapt for his archaeological project in Wales what he had envisaged as applicable to British antiquarianism generally in 1839. However, although he continued to mirror the *Comité’s* categories of monuments by publishing ‘Antiquarian questions and instructions’ on Roman remains later in the year, these marked the end of the series.¹²¹

As well as adapting forms issued by the *Comité*, Jones sought its members’ support for the CAA. His efforts had met with success by December 1846, when Sir Stephen Glynne, first president of the CAA, was reportedly ‘very glad to hear of the accession of such distinguished foreign archaeologists, more especially M. Didron whose reputation as an Ecclesiologist is well known to him’.¹²² Didron himself quoted in the *Annales archéologiques* from the letter Jones had sent from Manchester soliciting his support. This celebrated the success of *Archaeologia Cambrensis* and announced Jones’s intention to establish the CAA. Jones added that the association would hold its first congress the following year, to which he hoped foreign members would come, especially from Brittany. Didron stated that he had ‘eagerly accepted’ the invitation to act as the association’s secretary for France, and urged all French archaeologists who wished to be involved in the Welsh initiative to inform him immediately so he could pass their names on to Jones.¹²³ The first list of members of the CAA in 1847 duly included both Didron and Mérimée, designated respectively *Sécrétaire du Comité historique des arts et monuments* and *Inspecteur général des Monuments Historiques*, together with another member of the *Comité*, Le Vicomte Héricart de Thury (1776–1854).¹²⁴ Although no Breton or French representatives attended the CAA’s first congress, a complete set of the *Comité’s* publications, together with engravings from Lenoir’s *Statistique monumentale de Paris*, were exhibited to the delegates at Aberystwyth in September 1847.¹²⁵ Moreover, Jones remained in contact with Didron until at least 1854, and continued to extol the virtues of French archaeology and the support it received from the French government a decade later.¹²⁶

Nevertheless, it is difficult to avoid the impression that the connections he had sought to foster with France had only a limited, and diminishing, impact on his archaeological project in Wales. While Didron and other French archaeologists acknowledged that *Archaeologia Cambrensis* and the CAA had a place in the wider

European archaeological movement they wished to encourage, it is unlikely that they envisaged anything more than conventional contact through correspondence and reciprocal reports of publications and other activities.¹²⁷ Moreover, it seems that even regular correspondence had ceased by the 1860s, as Didron continued to be named as the CAA's corresponding secretary for France until 1870 (and was briefly resurrected in 1873), despite having died on 13 November 1867.¹²⁸ This suggests in turn that, for the CAA, Didron's most important contribution was the prestige his name conferred on the organisation – an instance of the mainly symbolic significance of such correspondents.¹²⁹

CONCLUSION

The significance of Harry Longueville Jones as an antiquarian cannot be understood simply by casting him in the role of a founding father of Welsh archaeology. Rather, an adjustment of focus allows us to situate him also in the context of a significant phase of Anglo-French dialogue in the late 1830s and 1840s which influenced British antiquarianism as well as efforts to secure legislation for the preservation of historic monuments. What differentiated Jones from other British antiquarians of the period was his extended residence in Paris, and the advantage he took of the opportunities this gave him to extend his antiquarian interests by engaging closely both with French historic monuments and with the official measures taken on their behalf. This experience deeply informed his approach to archaeology in a way that set him apart from his fellow English corresponding members of the *Comité historique des arts et monuments*, none of whom owed such a direct debt to France or used their position as corresponding members to intervene on behalf of French historic monuments in a way comparable to Jones in his report to the Minister of Public Instruction. Moreover, Jones's study of medieval churches in Paris and its environs, based on extensive fieldwork, had no close parallels among contemporaneous British antiquarian scholars. Although anglophone readers could find information on a number of the city's medieval buildings in illustrated topographical volumes, tourist guidebooks and publications on medieval architecture, the coverage of these works was much less comprehensive and systematic than that attempted by Jones.¹³⁰ True, that project remained incomplete and Jones never published the book he planned to write on the medieval monuments of Paris. Nevertheless, while the full potential of his work was

never realised, some of its fruits appeared as periodical articles which, by highlighting the richness of Paris's medieval heritage, made a distinctive contribution to British antiquarian writing of the day.

In addition, Jones stands out among British antiquarians in his commitment to the July Monarchy's measures to preserve historic monuments in France. He was the first to provide a detailed account of those measures in an English-language publication and among the earliest to urge their applicability to Britain. Moreover, while the government rejected calls to follow the lead of its French counterpart with respect to heritage, Jones ensured that the French institutions informed the initiatives he took to promote Welsh archaeology through the establishment of *Archaeologia Cambrensis* and the CAA. Although his efforts in this regard were almost certainly less successful than he had hoped, they merit attention as a notable instance of French influence on antiquarian endeavour in Britain. More specifically, they represent a significant attempt to adapt the model of an officially supported movement for the recording, study and protection of historic monuments in a major European state to the very different context of a small stateless nation. By contrast, and unlike some other British antiquarians, Jones seems to have attached much less significance to the provincial antiquarian organisations associated with Arcisse de Caumont. This was probably because, though by no means hostile to these, Jones considered the French government's measures to be more effective – a view presumably reinforced by his close association with the latter as a corresponding member of the *Comité* who had engaged with the historic monuments of France and the official steps taken to preserve them largely from a Parisian perspective facilitated by his residence in the French capital. Although the focus of his archaeological work shifted from France to Wales after his departure from Paris in 1842, Jones continued to admire French example. Indeed, almost thirty years later he signalled his enduring identification with the institutions established under the July Monarchy on the title page of a collection of his writings, published in the year of his death, which names the author as 'H. Longueville Jones, M.A., Membre correspondant du Comité historique des arts et monuments'.¹³¹

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am very grateful to Nancy Edwards for commenting on earlier drafts of the article, to Adrian James for searching for material relating to Jones in the SAL archives, to Rodolphe Leroy for sending me copies of parts of his thesis, and to the journal's two referees for their helpful suggestions.

¹ For short biographical accounts, see Anon 1871; Williams 2008.

² Aston 1934, 3–4, 143, 144; Roberts 1977, 158, 160, 162; Milne 1984, 385–6; Morris 2001, 686, 698 n. 26.

³ Williams 1990–1; 2000.

⁴ Salary: NLS, MS 4084, fol 153, Jones to Blackwood's, 27 Dec 1848.

⁵ Lloyd n.d., 11–15; Thomas 1978; Moore 2001, 8–10, 14–15; Edwards 2013, 22–4; Edwards and Gould 2013, 146–56.

⁶ Lloyd n.d., 13–14; Thomas 1978, 2–6; Edwards and Gould 2013, 146–9.

⁷ Lloyd n.d., 11–12.

⁸ Jones 1829, [iii], [vii]–viii; cf. Walford 1878, 286.

⁹ Compare Jones 1829, title page, 34–5, respectively with Owen 1803, I, s.v. Dôl, and Owen 1793, [ii].

¹⁰ Jones 1829, [v]. Pennant's importance for Welsh antiquaries is again emphasised in Jones 1846c, 12.

¹¹ Table: Jones 1829, 43–8.

¹² Jones 1829, esp 34, 48.

¹³ Jones 1829, 13–14, 46; Aldrich 2009, 62, 71–4.

¹⁴ Jones 1829, 30.

¹⁵ Jones 1829, 8.

¹⁶ Jones 1846a, 445–6; 1847, 154.

¹⁷ NLS MS 4061, fol 227v, Jones to A Blackwood, 12 Sep 1842. On Cambridge fellowships at this period, see Searby 1997, 95–102, 106–10.

¹⁸ Cf Ray 1955, 174. The large English population in Paris (and other French towns) was noticed in Jones 1840, 522. See also Mansel 2001, ch 5. Thomas 1978, 2, asserts that Jones's mother was buried in Paris, but no evidence is given and the suggestion that she was 'of French Longueville extraction' is incorrect.

¹⁹ Ray (ed) 1945–6), I, 358; II, 474–5. On Galignani's, see Barber 1961.

²⁰ Detailed discussion in Charmes 1886, I, cxvii–cxlvi, clxxxv–ccxvi. See also Poulot 1988; Bercé 2000, 24–7; Gerson 2003, 44–8.

²¹ BA, 1843, 1, 5.

²² Léon 1951, 124–30; Fermigier 1997, 1607–12

²³ Jones 1838, 11 n.*; *Galignani's Messenger*, 25 May 1838, 4; Gasparin 1838, 718b; Didron 1839, 245.

²⁴ Jones 1838; Sommerard 1834, 1838. The account strongly suggests that Jones was present at the lectures, which he states were not yet published: Jones 1838, 27, 32. For the earliest substantial French summary of Didron's lectures, see Didron 1839.

²⁵ Jones 1838, 1, 17–18.

²⁶ AN, F/17/13268 (23 Jan, 6 Feb 1839).

²⁷ *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de France*, 1840, 17; *Gent's Mag*, 1841, new ser, 16, 78. On the former society, see Leniaud 1998, 141–2. The only material in SAL's archives relating to Jones is a letter, dated 31 May 1862, in which he invites Fellows of SAL to attend the annual meeting of the CAA: Adrian James, pers comm, 18 Nov 2013.

²⁸ Wright 1836, esp 386–9.

²⁹ The summary of English developments in Sommerard 1838, vi, n. 2, is much briefer than Jones's coverage of these and lacks the latter's comparisons with the Continent.

³⁰ Quotations: Jones 1838, 1, 2, 13. See also Jones 1838, 18, which observes that the work of Taylor and Nodier lacked a 'severe technical character', in contrast to the requirements of 'the New Archaeological School of France'. Mérimée took a similar view: Fermigier 1997, 1602.

³¹ Jones 1841b, 100–1; Milne 1984, 386.

³² Goujon 2012, 309–10.

³³ Jones 1841b, 101. Cf Jones 1838, 7.

³⁴ Jones 1838, 2–4, 7. Cf Jones 1846c, 8.

³⁵ NLS, MS 4075, fols 131r–v, Jones to R Blackwood, 26 May 1845.

³⁶ Jones 1838, 14; Goujon 2012, 307–9.

³⁷ Bercé 1997; Chaline 1995, 197–207.

³⁸ Lewis 2004; Hill 2007, 64; Wetherall 1991, 100.

³⁹ Jones 1838, 13, 15, 27. For later praise of Caumont, almost certainly by Jones, see Anon 1848a, 357–8; Anon 1857, 237 ('that indefatigable antiquary, the parent of all Archaeological Associations, Foreign or British'). Caumont was later elected an Honorary Member of the CAA: Anon 1863, 3.

⁴⁰ Jones 1840, 522; Jones 1842, 4.

⁴¹ Jones 1838, 14, 18–28, 33–4; Jones 1840, 532–4; Jones 1841b, 102.

⁴² Jones 1838, 14–15.

⁴³ Jones 1838, 18.

⁴⁴ Jones 1838, 16. The café was fitted with stained glass and modelled on sixteenth-century architecture: *L'Artiste*, 1839, new ser, 1, 216. Edmund Sharpe observed similar medievalist fashions in Paris in 1835: Bullen 2004, 148–9.

⁴⁵ Jones 1839b, 356.

⁴⁶ Jones 1843, 526.

⁴⁷ Jones 1843, 526.

⁴⁸ *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de France*, 1840, 17. For the neighbourhood containing rue Bréda (now rue Henri-Monnier and rue Clauzel), see Marlès 1837–8, III, 535; Cazaux 2012, 41–2.

⁴⁹ The Comité's minutes list them by occupation, AN, F/17/13268 (23 Jan 1839): 'M. Gally Knight, membre du Parliament; M. J. Heywood-Hawkins, membre du Parliament; M. Whewel [sic], professeur de géologie, à Cambridge; M. Welby Pugin, professeur d'archéologie chrétienne, au Collège de Ste-Marie, à Oscott; M. Rickmann [sic] architecte à Liverpool; M. John Gage, à Lincoln's Inn; M. Britton, antiquaire à Londres; M. Longueville Jones ancien professeur du Collège de la Madeleine, à Cambridge.'

⁵⁰ BA, 1844–5, 3, 186–7; cf Hill 2007, 286, 303.

⁵¹ Lewis 2004, 273–4; Wroth 2013; Crook 2008; Kendrick 1941, 162; Cooper 2009.

The contributions of Britton, Hawkins, Rickman and Whewell are also noticed in Sommerard 1838, vi, n. 2.

⁵² AN, F/17/13268 (12 June 1839).

⁵³ Gasparin 1838, 716b; *BA*, 1843, 1, 17.

⁵⁴ *BA*, 1844–5, 3, 113–16; 1847–8, 4, 130–1, 377–9.

⁵⁵ *BA*, 1844–5, 3, 35–6, 81, 164, 173, 193–5.

⁵⁶ Jones, ‘Report’, p 17.

⁵⁷ Jones, ‘Report’; *BA*, 1843, 1, 175–6 (25 Mar 1840).

⁵⁸ Jones, ‘Report’; quotation at p 1.

⁵⁹ Jones 1844b and 1844c.

⁶⁰ Jones 1844b, 238.

⁶¹ Jones, ‘Report’, p 12. Although Jones described only a castle at Carrières sous Bois près Saint-Germain (SO), the total remains 49, as he included both the parish church and the chapel of Sainte Geneviève at Nanterre (S).

⁶² For examples of completed questionnaires, see AN, F17/2810/1.

⁶³ Jones, ‘Report’, p 3.

⁶⁴ From 1 line for Maisons-sur-Seine (SO) to 30 lines for Fontenay-sous-Bois (S):

Jones, ‘Report’, pp 5–6, 10.

⁶⁵ Jones, ‘Report’, p 2.

⁶⁶ For the first fruits of the latter, see Jones 1844a and 1844d; *Archaeol J*, 1844, 1, 380–1, 403–4.

⁶⁷ Jones, ‘Report’, pp 2, 7, referring to Lebeuf 1754–8. For Lenoir, see *BA*, 1843, 1, 243 (27 May 1840).

⁶⁸ Cf Gasparin 1838, 716b; *BA*, 1843, 1, 16.

⁶⁹ For his knowledge, evidently based on observation, of medieval buildings in Normandy, Calais, Clermont and elsewhere in France, see Jones 1838, 8–9, n. †; 1844b, 237–9; 1846b, 487; *BA*, 1844–5, 3, 113–14 (27 Mar 1844).

⁷⁰ Jones, ‘Report’, p 12; cf Anon 1839.

⁷¹ Jones, ‘Report’, p 5.

⁷² Jones, ‘Report’, p 3.

⁷³ Bullen 2004; quotation at 142.

⁷⁴ Jones 1844b, 238.

⁷⁵ Jones 1844c, 344.

⁷⁶ Jones, ‘Report’, p 9.

⁷⁷ Jones, ‘Report’, pp 4, 9.

⁷⁸ Jones, ‘Report’, p 4, and cf p 8 for the church tower at Villejuif (S) as ‘a beautiful monument of the Renaissance’.

⁷⁹ Jones 1838, 32.

⁸⁰ Jones 1838, 31–2.

⁸¹ Jones 1838, 31.

⁸² Didron 1846a, 129 (partly trans in Germann 1972, 143); cf Boucher-Rivalain 1998.

⁸³ For further stylistic comparisons, see *BA*, 1844–5, 3, 113–14; Jones 1844b and 1844c.

⁸⁴ Jones, ‘Report’, pp 7, 8, 10.

⁸⁵ Jones, ‘Report’, pp 12–13. It may be significant, though, that Jones did not explicitly criticise the architect (Auguste Molinos), whom he elsewhere praised for his work at Montreuil.

⁸⁶ Jones, ‘Report’, p 6.

⁸⁷ *BA*, 1843, 1, 139–41. Both buildings are described in Jones 1844b, 241; 1844c, 339.

⁸⁸ Jones 1841a, 592–7 (quotation at 597). Fortifications: Broglie 2011, 235, 355.

⁸⁹ Didron 1845a, 316–18; 1845b, 364–6.

⁹⁰ *BA*, 1843, 1, 175–6, 230.

⁹¹ Anon 2007 and 2015.

⁹² Wright 1836, 388–9.

⁹³ Leroy 2001, 172–3.

⁹⁴ *BA*, 1843, 1, 98.

⁹⁵ Brown 1905; Swenson 2013, 46–58.

⁹⁶ Brown 1905, 216; Hamilakis 2007, 81–3, 108–9, 112–15.

⁹⁷ Swenson 2013, 54–6.

⁹⁸ Jones 1838, 20, 33; also 27.

⁹⁹ AN, F/17/13268 (17 Apr 1839); Jones 1839a (quotation at 74).

¹⁰⁰ AN, F/17/13268 (17 Apr 1839); cf *Gent’s Mag*, 1841, new ser, 15, 82. Wright was nominated a corresponding member of the Comité on 26 Feb 1840: *BA*, 1, 1843, 120.

¹⁰¹ ‘French antiquarian intelligence’: *Gent’s Mag*, 1840, new ser, 13, 417–18, 523–5, 637–8; 14, 189–91, 298–9; 1841, new ser, 15, 82–4.

¹⁰² Swenson 2013, 57.

¹⁰³ AN, F/17/13268 (10 Apr 1839).

¹⁰⁴ *BA*, 1843, 1, 114–15 (12 Feb 1840).

¹⁰⁵ PP 1841, 99–100 (evidence of J Britton, 19 May 1841). See also Swenson 2013, 57–8.

¹⁰⁶ PP 1845, cc 1329–34.

¹⁰⁷ PP 1844, 45 (evidence of T Wyse, 25 July 1843). For the attempts to save the memoir scheme and its eventual demise, see Doherty 2004, 29–32, 200–10.

¹⁰⁸ Anon 1844, 12, 25.

¹⁰⁹ Doherty 2004, 32 and n. 97.

¹¹⁰ Davis 1883, 43–53.

¹¹¹ Swenson 2013, 57.

¹¹² BA, 1844–5, 3, 35–7, 148, 170; Way 1844, 6; *Archaeol J*, 1844, 1, 162. See also Lewis 2004, 276.

¹¹³ Anon 1845, 26.

¹¹⁴ Miele 2000, 214–16.

¹¹⁵ I intend to examine the foundation of the CAA and Jones's role in its development elsewhere.

¹¹⁶ *Annales Archéologiques*, 1845, 2, 17; Anon 1847b, 95; 1847c, 281; 1848b, 82; 1855; 1857.

¹¹⁷ Didron 1846a, 129–30.

¹¹⁸ Jones 1846c.

¹¹⁹ Jones, 1846c, 15.

¹²⁰ Anon 1846a; quotation at 135.

¹²¹ Anon 1846b; 1846c. It is unclear why the series was discontinued.

¹²² NLW, Papers of the CAA, L1, fols 69–70, John Williams [to Jones], 19 Dec 1846.

¹²³ Didron 1846b, 344–5.

¹²⁴ *Archaeol Cambrensis*, 1847, 2, 89, 90; BA, 1843, 1, 6.

¹²⁵ *Archaeol Cambrensis*, 1847, 2, 359.

¹²⁶ Jones 1854; 1864, 257. See also n. 131 below.

¹²⁷ For the role and significance of correspondents of learned societies in this period, see Chaline 1995, 198–203.

¹²⁸ Anon 1869, 3; Anon 1873, 3.

¹²⁹ Cf Chaline 1995, 203.

¹³⁰ Cf Anon 1837, esp 136–7, 144–5, 303–8; Duffy 2013, 23–4, 26, 68–9, 78, 105; Petit 1841, II, 84, 256–7.

¹³¹ Jones 1870.

ABBREVIATIONS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviations

AN	Archives Nationales, Paris
BA	<i>Bulletin archéologique publié par le Comité historique des arts et monuments</i>
Jones, 'Report'	AN, F/17/3313
NLS	National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh
NLW	National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth
PP	Parliamentary Papers

Manuscript sources

- AN, F17/2810/1
- AN, F17/3313, H L Jones to the Minister of Public Instruction, Paris, 27 Feb 1840
- AN, F17/13268, minutes of the *Comité historique des arts et monuments*
- NLS, MSS 4061, 4075, 4084
- NLW, Papers of the CAA, L1

Published sources

- Aldrich, M 2009. 'Thomas Rickman's handbook of Gothic architecture and the taxonomic classification of the past', in M Aldrich and R J Wallis (eds), *Antiquaries & Archaists: the past in the present, the present in the past*, 62–74, 153–5, Spire Books Ltd, Reading
- Anon 1837. *Galignani's New Paris Guide*, A. and W. Galignani, Paris
- Anon 1839. *Instructions du Comité historique des arts et monuments*, Imprimerie royale [Paris]

-
- Anon 1844. *A Collection of Documents Expressive of Public Opinion on the Utility and Importance of the Ordnance Memoir of Ireland*, M. H. Gill, Dublin
- Anon 1845. ‘Subscribing and corresponding members of the Archaeological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland’, *Archaeol J*, **2**, 1–27
- Anon 1846a. ‘Antiquarian questions and instructions. No. I. – Celtic remains’, *Archaeol Cambrensis*, **1**, no. 2, 135–8
- Anon 1846b. ‘Antiquarian questions and instructions. No. II. – Roman Remains. – Part I.’, *Archaeol Cambrensis*, **1**, no. 3, 353–6
- Anon 1846c. ‘Antiquarian questions and instructions. No. II. – Roman Remains. – Part II.’, *Archaeol Cambrensis*, **1**, no. 4, 416–18.
- Anon 1847a. ‘Cambrian Archaeological Association’, *Archaeol Cambrensis*, **2**, no. 6, 178–81
- Anon 1847b. ‘Miscellaneous antiquarian notices’, *Archaeol Cambrensis*, **2**, no. 5, 94–5
- Anon 1847c. ‘Miscellaneous notices’, *Archaeol Cambrensis*, **2**, no. 7, 280–3
- Anon 1848a. ‘The Cambrian Archaeological Association’, *Archaeol Cambrensis*, **3**, no. 12, 344–68
- Anon 1848b. ‘Miscellaneous notices’, *Archaeol Cambrensis*, **3**, no. 9, 79–82
- Anon 1855. Review, Abbé Cochet, *La Normandie Souterraine*, *Archaeol Cambrensis*, 3rd ser, **1**, no. 4, 288–91
- Anon 1857. Review, M. de Caumont, *Abécédaire ou rudiments d’archéologie*, *Archaeol Cambrensis*, 3rd ser, **3**, no. 10, 237–8
- Anon 1863. ‘Cambrian Archaeological Association. 1863. List of members’, *Archaeol Cambrensis*, 3rd ser, **9**, no. 36, separate pagination, 1–11
- Anon 1869. ‘Cambrian Archaeological Association. 1870. List of members’, *Archaeol Cambrensis*, 3rd ser, **15**, no. 60, separate pagination, 1–12
- Anon 1871. ‘Obituary: Harry Longueville Jones’, *Archaeol Cambrensis*, 4th ser, **2**, no. 5, 94–6
- Anon 1873. ‘Cambrian Archaeological Association. 1873. List of members’, *Archaeol Cambrensis*, 4th ser, **4**, no. 16, separate pagination, 1–12
- Anon 2007. ‘Inventaire général du patrimoine culturel: église paroissiale Saint-Denys. Ile-de-France ; Val-de-Marne; Arcueil’

-
- <http://www.culture.gouv.fr/public/mistral/merimee_fr?ACTION=CHERCHER&FIELD_98=REF&VALUE_98=IA94000406> (13 Nov 2015)
- Anon 2015. ‘Inventaire général du patrimoine culturel: église paroissiale Saint-Germain-d’Auxerre. Ile-de-France ; Val-de-Marne; Fontenay-sous-Bois’, <http://www.culture.gouv.fr/public/mistral/merimee_fr?ACTION=CHERCHER&FIELD_98=REF&VALUE_98=IA00050016> (13 Nov 2015)
- Aston, T S 1934. *Economic and Social Investigations in Manchester, 1833–1933: a centenary history of the Manchester Statistical Society*, P S King and Son, London
- Barber, G 1961. ‘Galignani’s and the publication of English books in France from 1800 to 1852’, *The Library*, **5**, no. 16, 267–86
- Bercé, F 1997. ‘Arcisse de Caumont et les sociétés savantes’, in P Nora (ed), *Les Lieux de mémoire*, ‘Quarto’ edn, I, 1545–73, Gallimard, Paris
- Bercé, F 2000. *Des monuments historiques au patrimoine du XVIIIe siècle à nos jours ou ‘Les égarements du cœur et de l'esprit’*, Flammarion, Paris
- Boucher-Rivalain, O 1998. ‘Attitudes to Gothic in French architectural writings of the 1840s’, *Architectural History*, **41**, 145–52
- Broglie, G de 2011. *La monarchie de Juillet 1830–1848*, Fayard, Paris
- Brown, G B 1905. *The Care of Ancient Monuments: an account of legislative and other measures*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Bullen, J B 2004. ‘The Romanesque revival in Britain, 1800–1840: William Gunn, William Whewell, and Edmund Sharpe’, *Architectural History*, **47**, 139–58
- Cazaux, T 2012. *Paris romantique. La capitale des enfants du siècle*, Parigramme, Paris
- Chaline, J-P 1995. *Sociabilité et érudition: les sociétés savantes en France XIX^e–XX^e siècles*, Mémoires de la Section d’histoire moderne et contemporaine, 10, Éditions du C.T.H.S, Paris
- Charmes, X 1886. *Le Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques (histoire et documents)*, 2 vols, Imprimerie Nationale, Paris
- Cooper, T 2009. ‘Rokewode, John Gage (1786–1842)’ (rev. J M Blatchly), in H G C Matthew and B Harrison (eds), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography: online edition* <<http://0-www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24017>> (20 June 2015)

-
- Crook, J M 2008. ‘Britton, John (1771–1857)’, in H G C Matthew and B Harrison (eds), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography: online edition* <<http://0-www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3458>> (20 June 2015)
- Davis, T 1883. *Literary and Historical Essays* (ed C P Meehan), James Duffy & Co., Dublin
- Didron, [A N] 1839. ‘Programme d’un cours d’archéologie chrétienne’, *L’Artiste*, 2nd ser, **1**, 241–5, 257–60, 272–4
- Didron, [A N] 1845a. ‘Mélanges et nouvelles’, *Annales Archéologiques*, **2**, 309–28
- [Didron, A N] 1845b. ‘Mélanges et nouvelles’, *Annales Archéologiques*, **2**, 363–74
- Didron, [A N] 1846a. ‘Mouvement archéologique’, *Annales Archéologiques*, **4**, 109–32
- Didron, [A N] 1846b. ‘Mouvement archéologique’, *Annales Archéologiques*, **5**, 329–45
- Doherty, G M 2004. *The Irish Ordnance Survey: history, culture and memory*, Four Courts, Dublin
- Duffy, S 2013. *The Discovery of Paris: watercolours by early nineteenth-century British artists*, Wallace Collection, London
- Edwards, N 2013. *A Corpus of Early Medieval Inscribed Stones and Stone Sculpture in Wales. Volume III: North Wales*, University of Wales Press, Cardiff
- Edwards, N and Gould, J 2013. ‘From antiquarians to archaeologists in nineteenth-century Wales: the question of prehistory’, in N Evans and H Pryce (eds), *Writing a Small Nation’s Past: Wales in comparative perspective, 1850–1950*, 143–63, Ashgate, Farnham
- Fermigier, A 1997. ‘Mérimée et l’inspection des monuments historiques’, in P Nora (ed), *Les Lieux de mémoire*, ‘Quarto’ edn, I, 1599–1614, Gallimard, Paris
- Gasparin, [A-E] 1838. ‘Rapport à M. de Salvandy, Ministre de l’instruction publique, sur les travaux du Comité historique des arts et monumens pendant la session de 1838’, *Journal Général de l’Instruction Publique*, **7**, no. 110 (8 Aug), 716–20
- Gerson, S 2003. *Pride of Place: local memories and political culture in nineteenth-century France*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY and London
- Goujon, B 2012. *Monarchies postrévolutionnaires 1814–1848*, Seuil, Paris
- Hamilakis, Y 2007. *The Nation and its Ruins: antiquity, archaeology, and national imagination in Greece*, Oxford University Press, Oxford

-
- Hill, R 2007. *God's Architect: Pugin and the building of romantic Britain*, Allen Lane, London
- Jones, H L 1829. *Illustrations of the Natural Scenery of the Snowdonian Mountains: accompanied by a description, topographical and historical, of the county of Caernarvon*, Charles Tilt, London; Thomas Stevenson, Cambridge
- Jones, H L 1838. 'Restoration of the fine arts of the middle ages in France', *Foreign Quarterly Rev*, **22**, no. 43 (1838), 1–34
- Jones, H L 1839a. 'The antiquities of France', *Gent's Mag*, new ser, **10**, 74–7
- Jones, H L 1839b. Review, M. H. Géraud, *Paris sous Philippe le Bel*, *Foreign Quarterly Rev*, **22**, no. 44, 356–8
- [Jones, H L] 1840. 'France', *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, **48**, no. 300, 522–34
- Jones, H L 1841a. 'The conventual college of the Bernardins at Paris', *Gent's Mag*, new ser, **15**, 592–7
- [Jones, H L] 1841b. 'England, France, Germany, and Russia', *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, **49**, no. 303, 97–108
- [Jones, H L] 1842. 'Report on general education, superior, secondary, and primary, in France', *J Statistical Soc London*, **5**, no. 1, 1–31
- [Jones, H L] 1843. 'Chronicles of Paris. The rue St Denis', *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, **54**, no. 336, 525–37
- Jones, H L 1844a. 'On the medieval antiquities of Anglesey', *Archaeol J*, **1**, 40–5
- Jones, H L 1844b. 'On the medieval ecclesiastical architecture of Paris. [First period]', *Archaeol J*, **1**, 237–42
- Jones, H L 1844c. 'On the medieval ecclesiastical architecture of Paris. [Second period]', *Archaeol J*, **1**, 336–46
- Jones, H L 1844d. 'Remarks on some of the churches of Anglesey', *Archaeol J*, **1** (1844), 118–30
- J[ones], H L 1846a. 'Cymmer abbey, Merionethshire', *Archaeol Cambrensis*, **1**, no. 4, 445–60
- Jones, H L 1846b. 'A new sentimental journey', *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, **60**, no. 372, 481–8
- Jones, H L 1846c. 'On the study and preservation of national antiquities', *Archaeol Cambrensis*, **1**, no. 1, 3–16

-
- J[ones], H L 1847. ‘Arvona mediaeva. No. II. Beddgelert priory’, *Archaeol Cambrensis*, 2, no. 6, 153–66
- Jones, H L 1854, ‘Villes et chateaux du XIII^e siècle au Pays de Galles’, *Annales Archéologiques*, 14, 361–9
- J[ones], H L 1864. ‘On the destruction and preservation of ancient buildings. No. II’, *Archaeol Cambrensis*, 3rd ser, 10, no. 39, 256–9
- Jones, H L 1870. *Essays and Papers on Literary and Historical Subjects*, J. Russell Smith, London
- Kendrick, T D 1941. ‘A late Saxon hanging-bowl’, *Antiq J*, 21, 161–2
- Lebeuf, J 1754–8. *Histoire de la ville et de tout le diocèse de Paris*, 15 vols, Prault pere, Paris
- Leniaud, J-M 1998. ‘L’état, les sociétés savants et les associations de défense du patrimoine: l’exception française’, in J Le Goff (ed), *Patrimoines et passions identitaires*, Éditions du Patrimoine, Paris, 137–54
- Léon, P 1951. *La vie des monuments français: destruction, restauration*, A. et J. Picard, Paris
- Leroy, R 2001. ‘Le Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques (1834–1914): entre animation et contrôle du mouvement scientifique en France’, unpublished D. E. A. thesis, École nationale des chartes, Paris
- Lewis, E 2004. ‘Les rapports avec les antiquaires anglais’, in V Juhel (ed), *Arcisse de Caumont (1801–1873): érudit normand et fondateur de l’archéologie française. Actes du colloque international organisé à Caen du 14 au 16 juin 2001*, 273–83, Mémoires de la Société des antiquaires de Normandie, 40, Caen
- Lloyd, J L n.d. ‘Introduction’, in V E Nash-Williams (ed), *A Hundred Years of Welsh Archaeology: centenary volume, 1846–1946*, 11–23, Cambrian Archaeological Association, Gloucester
- Mansel, P 2001. *Paris between Empires 1814–1852*, John Murray, London
- Marlès, J de 1837–8. *Paris ancien et moderne ou Histoire de France divisée en douze périodes appliquées aux douze arrondissements de Paris, et justifiée par les monuments de cette ville célèbre*, 4 vols, Parent-Desbarres, Paris
- Miele, C 2000. ‘Victorian internationalism and the Victorian view of monument care on the continent’, in J de Maeyer and L Verpoest (eds), *Gothic Revival: religion,*

-
- architecture and style in western Europe 1815–1914*, 211–22, Universitaire Pers Leuven, Leuven
- Milne, J M 1984. ‘The politics of *Blackwood’s*, 1817–1846: a study of the political, economic and social articles in *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine*, and of selected contributors’, unpublished PhD thesis, University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne
- Moore, D 2001. ‘Cambrian meetings 1847–1997: a society’s contribution to the changing archaeological scene’, *Archaeol Cambrensis*, **147**, 3–55
- Morris, P 2001. ‘*Bleak House* and the struggle for the state domain’, *English Literary History*, **68**, 679–98
- Owen, W 1793. *Geiriadur Cymraeg a Saesoneg: a Welsh and English dictionary*, E and T Williams, London
- Owen, W 1803. *A Dictionary of the Welsh Language*, 2 vols, E Williams, London
- Petit, J L 1841. *Remarks on Church Architecture*, 2 vols, James Burns, London
- Poulot, D 1988. ‘The birth of heritage: “le moment Guizot”’, *Oxford Art J*, **11**, no. 2, 40–56
- PP 1841. *Report from Select Committee on National Monuments and Works of Art; with the minutes of evidence, and appendix*, 1841 Session 1 (416) VI.437
- PP 1844. *Report of the Commissioners Appointed to Inquire into the Facts Relating to the Ordnance Memoir of Ireland; together with the minutes of evidence, appendix, and index*, 1844 (527) XXX.259
- PP 1845. *Commons Sitting of Friday, June 27, 1845. House of Commons Hansard*, 3rd ser, vol 81
- Ray, G N (ed) 1945–6, *The Letters and Private Papers of William Makepeace Thackeray*, 4 vols, Oxford University Press, Oxford
- Ray, G N 1955. *Thackeray: The Uses of Adversity (1811–1846)*, Oxford University Press, London
- Roberts, D 1977. ‘The social conscience of Tory periodicals’, *Victorian Periodicals Newsletter*, **10**, no. 3, 154–69
- Searby, P 1997. *A History of the University of Cambridge. Volume III: 1750–1870*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
- Sommerard, A du 1834. *Notices sur l’Hôtel de Cluny et sur le Palais des Thermes*, Ducollet, Paris
- Sommerard, A du 1838. *Les arts au moyen âge*, I–IV, Techener, Paris

-
- Swenson, A 2013. *The Rise of Heritage: preserving the past in France, Germany and England, 1789–1914*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Thomas, B B 1978. ‘The Cambrians and the nineteenth-century crisis in Welsh studies, 1847–1870’, *Archaeol Cambrensis*, **127**, 1–15
- Walford, E 1878. *Old and New London*, IV, Cassell, Petter and Galpin, London
- Way, A 1844. ‘Introduction’, *Archaeol J*, **1**, 1–6
- Wetherall, D M 1991. ‘The British Archaeological Association: its foundation and split’, unpublished MA thesis, Durham University
- Williams, H G 1990–1. ‘Longueville Jones and Welsh education: the neglected case of a Victorian H.M.I.’, *Welsh History Rev*, **15**, 416–42
- Williams, H G 2000. ‘Nation state versus national identity: state and inspectorate in mid-Victorian Wales’, *History of Education Quarterly*, **40**, no. 2, 145–68
- Williams, H G 2008. ‘Jones, Harry Longueville (1806–1870)’, in H G C Matthew and B Harrison (eds), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography: online edition*, <<http://0-www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/15009>> (1 Dec 2015)
- Wright, T 1836. ‘M. Guizot’s *Commission Historique* and the English Record Commission’, *Foreign and Quarterly Rev*, **17**, no. 33, 362–90
- Wroth, W W 2013. ‘Knight, Henry Gally (1786–1846)’ (rev J Harding), in H G C Matthew and B Harrison (eds), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography: online edition* <<http://0-www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/15721>> (20 June 2015)

CAPTIONS

Fig 1. ‘Llyn a Castel Dolbadarn’. Engraving from Jones’s sketch of Lake Padarn and the thirteenth-century castle of Dolbadarn, Caerns, in Jones 1829, facing p 22.

Fig 2. Jones’s letter to the Minister of Public Instruction, Paris, 27 Feb 1840, p 1, in AN F17/3313.

Fig 3. ‘College of the Bernardins, Paris’, drawn by Jones and engraved by George Hollis, in Jones 1841a, between pp 592 and 593.